

Road Safety Research Report No. 82 Evaluation of the National Child Pedestrian Training Pilot Projects

Kirstie Whelan, Elizabeth Towner, Gail Errington and Jane Powell Centre for Child and Adolescent Health, University of the West of England, Bristol

March 2008

Department for Transport: London

Although this report was commissioned by the Department for Transport (DfT), the findings and recommendations are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the DfT. While the DfT has made every effort to ensure the information in this document is accurate, DfT does not guarantee the accuracy, completeness or usefulness of that information; and it cannot accept liability for any loss or damages of any kind resulting from reliance on the information or guidance this document contains.

Department for Transport Great Minster House 76 Marsham Street London SW1P 4DR Telephone 020 7944 8300 Web site www.dft.gov.uk

© Queen's Printer and Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 2008, except where otherwise stated

Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.

This publication, excluding logos, may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium for noncommercial research, private study or for internal circulation within an organisation. This is subject to it being reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The copyright source of the material must be acknowledged and the title of the publication specified.

For any other use of this material, apply for a Click-Use Licence at www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/index.htm, or by writing to the Licensing Division, Office of Public Sector Information, St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich NR3 1BQ, fax 01603 723000, e-mail licensing@opsi.x.gsi.gov.uk

This is a value added publication which falls outside the scope of the Public Sector Information Click-Use Licence.

To order further copies contact: DfT Publications PO Box 236 Wetherby LS23 7NB Tel: 0870 1226 236

Fax: 0870 1226 237 Textphone: 0870 1207 405 E-mail: dftinf@capita.co.uk

ISBN 978 1 904763 84 0

If you would like to be informed in advance of forthcoming Department for Transport priced publications, or would like to arrange a standing order, call 020 7944 4673.



Printed in Great Britain on paper containing at least 75% recycled fibre.

CONTENTS

E	KECU	TIVE	SUMMAR	RY	13	
1	INTRODUCTION					
2	AIM	IS AND	OBJEC	FIVES OF THE EVALUATION PROJECT	21	
	2.1	Aims			21	
	2.2	Objec	tives		21	
3	BAC	CKGRC	OUND		22	
	3.1	The in	nterventio	n	22	
	3.2	Overv	view of the	e National Network	23	
	3.3	Backg	ground lite	erature related to 'Kerbcraft'	25	
4	OVI	ERVIE	W OF EVA	ALUATION METHODS	28	
5	EVA	LUATI	ON STUI	DIES	30	
	5.1	Skills	assessme	nt exercise	30	
		5.1.1	Rational	le	30	
		5.1.2	Study ai	ms	30	
		5.1.3	Method		30	
			5.1.3.1	Participants	30	
			5.1.3.2	Selection process	30	
			5.1.3.3	Control group selection	31	
			5.1.3.4	Experimental design	31	
			5.1.3.5	Testers – Social Research Associates (SRa)	32	
			5.1.3.6	Testing locations and materials	32	
		5.1.4	Skill 1: (Choosing a safe place to cross	32	
			5.1.4.1	Training rationale	32	
			5.1.4.2	Testing procedure	32	
			5.1.4.3	Testing materials	33	
			5.1.4.4	Scoring	33	

	5.1.4.5	Participant numbers	33
	5.1.4.6	Main effect of Safe Places training	34
	5.1.4.7	Gender differences	36
	5.1.4.8	Effect of number of training sessions	36
5.1.5	Skill 2:	Crossing safely at parked cars	37
	5.1.5.1	Parked cars training rationale	37
	5.1.5.2	Testing procedure	38
	5.1.5.3	Testing materials and scoring	38
	5.1.5.4	Participant numbers	39
	5.1.5.5	Basic crossing skills shown by trained and control children	39
	5.1.5.6	Effect of Safe Places training on Parked Cars performance at pre-test	40
	5.1.5.7	Main effect of training on 'preparing to cross safely'	40
	5.1.5.8	Main effect of training on 'stopping/pausing at sightline'	40
	5.1.5.9	Main effect of training on 'key looking behaviours'	41
	5.1.5.10	Gender differences	41
	5.1.5.11	Effect of number of Parked Cars training sessions	41
5.1.6	Skill 3:	Crossing safely at junctions	42
	5.1.6.1	Training rationale	42
	5.1.6.2	Testing procedure	43
	5.1.6.3	Testing materials and scoring	43
	5.1.6.4	Participant numbers	44
	5.1.6.5	Differences in baseline (pre-test) performance	44
	5.1.6.6	Established behaviours	45
	5.1.6.7	Improvement at post-test	45
	5.1.6.8	Improvement at post-test	45
	5.1.6.9	Scoring for behaviours involving 'recognising and moving away from obstructions'	46
	5.1.6.10	Gender differences	47
	5.1.6.11	Effect of number of Junctions training sessions	48

5.2	Volun	teer surv	eys	49
	5.2.1	Rationa	le	49
	5.2.2	Method	l	50
	5.2.3	Results	from Questionnaire 1: general survey	50
		5.2.3.1	Reasons for participating in the Kerbcraft programme	50
		5.2.3.2	Recruitment methods	51
		5.2.3.3	Volunteer training	51
		5.2.3.4	Kerbcraft essentials	51
		5.2.3.5	Police checks	52
		5.2.3.6	Future intentions	52
		5.2.3.7	Demographic information	52
		5.2.3.8	Social capital results	53
	5.2.4	Results	from Questionnaire 2: follow-up surveys	55
		5.2.4.1	Response rates for Questionnaire 2	55
		5.2.4.2	Key results from active volunteers – Q2a	56
		5.2.4.3	Key results from drop-out volunteers – Q2b	57
5.3	Cases	studies		57
	5.3.1	Rationa	le	57
	5.3.2	Method	l	58
	5.3.3	Results		58
		5.3.3.1	Theme 1: Kerbcraft in a rural school	58
		5.3.3.2	Theme 2: Impact of community ethnic diversity on Kerbcraft delivery	59
		5.3.3.3	Theme 3: Kerbcraft delivery in a Scottish 'model' school	60
		5.3.3.4	Theme 4: Longitudinal study of changes and challenges in two neighbouring schemes over	61
		5225	14 months	61
		5.3.3.3	Thoma 6: Korboraft delivery in avera of extreme	02
		5.3.3.0	deprivation	63
		5.3.3.7	Theme 7: Impact of skills assessment in schools	64

5.4	Surve	Survey of co-ordinators				
	5.4.1	Rationa	le	66		
	5.4.2	Method	ls	66		
	5.4.3	Results		66		
	5.4.4	Co-ordinators' background details				
		5.4.4.1	Gender, age and ethnic origin	67		
		5.4.4.2	Children	67		
		5.4.4.3	Education	67		
		5.4.4.4	Recent employment and experience of working with children and volunteers	67		
		5.4.4.5	Experience of road safety and of local area and schools	67		
	5.4.5	Appoin	tment process	68		
		5.4.5.1	Information provided	68		
		5.4.5.2	Understanding of the Drumchapel scheme	68		
		5.4.5.3	Motivation for applying for the post, personal qualities and experience	68		
		5.4.5.4	Level of pay and provision of facilities	68		
	5.4.6	Co-ord	inator training	69		
		5.4.6.1	Courses	69		
		5.4.6.2	Rating the training course	69		
		5.4.6.3	Understanding the principles underlying the Kerbcraft programme	70		
	5.4.7	Post-tra	aining support for co-ordinators	70		
		5.4.7.1	MVA, road safety officer and co-ordinator support	70		
	5.4.8	Recruit	ment of volunteers	71		
		5.4.8.1	Recruitment methods	71		
		5.4.8.2	Volunteers' activities	72		
		5.4.8.3	Persuading volunteers to take part	72		
		5.4.8.4	Criminal Record Bureau checks	73		
		5.4.8.5	Motivating volunteers	73		

	5.4.9	Trainin	g of volunteers	73
		5.4.9.1	Type and content of training	73
		5.4.9.2	Provision of facilities for volunteers	73
		5.4.9.3	Volunteer drop-out	74
	5.4.10	Genera	l comments from co-ordinators	74
	5.4.11	Summa	ry of key findings	75
5.5	Surve	ys of roa	d safety officers	75
	5.5.1	Rationa	lle	75
	5.5.2	Method	s	75
	5.5.3	Results		76
		5.5.3.1	Reasons for participation in the scheme	76
		5.5.3.2	Funding levels	76
		5.5.3.3	Co-ordinator recruitment and retention	77
		5.5.3.4	Co-ordinator and road safety officer training	77
		5.5.3.5	Recommendations to improve the Kerbcraft training programme	78
		5.5.3.6	Managing co-ordinators	79
		5.5.3.7	Meetings with other road safety officers	79
	5.5.4	Sustain	ability	79
	5.5.5	Conclus	sion	80
5.6	Head	teacher s	survey	80
	5.6.1	Rationa	le	80
	5.6.2	Objecti	ves	80
	5.6.3	Method	l	80
	5.6.4	Results		81
		5.6.4.1	Contextual information	81
	5.6.5	Setting	up, management and maintenance of schemes	81
	5.6.6	Impact	on schools, communities and volunteers	82
		5.6.6.1	Sustainability of schemes	83
	5.6.7	Summary of key outcomes		

5.7.1 5.7.2 5.7.3 5.7.4 5.7.5	Backgro Introdu Data ca Econom	ound oction pture	85 85 85	
5.7.2 5.7.3 5.7.4 5.7.5	Introdu Data ca Econom	ction pture	85 85	
5.7.3 5.7.4 5.7.5	Data ca Econom	pture	85	
5.7.4 5.7.5	Econom	nia avaluation design		
5.7.5		inc evaluation design	86	
	Analysi delivery	s 1: Costs at the local authority level – Kerbcraft y by local authorities in England and Scotland	87	
	5.7.5.1	Findings from analysis 1 (local authority level costs)	87	
5.7.6	Analysi	s 2: Costs associated with behaviour change (school level)	88	
	5.7.6.1	Analysis of the improvement in children's roadside performance and associated costs over time	89	
5.7.7	Conclus	sions	90	
MVA	staff inte	rviews	90	
5.8.1	Rationa	lle	90	
5.8.2	Objecti	ves	91	
5.8.3	Method	l	91	
5.8.4	Results		91	
	5.8.4.1	Overview of the management of the national pilot	91	
5.8.5	Setting	up, management and maintenance of schemes	92	
5.8.6	Factors	for success and failure of schemes	93	
5.8.7	Sustaina	ability of schemes	93	
5.8.8	Summary of key outcomes			
THES	IS OF RE	ESULTS	95	
Objec Pilot l	tive 1: To Projects o	o establish the impact of the Child Pedestrian Training on the safety of children's behaviour at the		
roads	ide		95	
6.1.1	Safe Pla	aces training outcomes	95	
	6.1.1.1	Main effect of training on children's behaviour at the roadside	95	
	6.1.1.2	Gender differences	96	
	6.1.1.3	Effect of number of training sessions	96	
	5.7.6 5.7.7 MVA 5.8.1 5.8.2 5.8.3 5.8.4 5.8.5 5.8.6 5.8.7 5.8.8 THESI Objec Pilot I roadsi 6.1.1	delivery 5.7.5.1 5.7.6 Analysi 5.7.6.1 5.7.7 Conclus MVA staff inte 5.8.1 Rationa 5.8.2 Objecti 5.8.3 Method 5.8.4 Results 5.8.4 Results 5.8.4 Results 5.8.5 Setting 5.8.6 Factors 5.8.7 Sustain 5.8.8 Summa THESIS OF RH Objective 1: To Pilot Projects of roadside 6.1.1 Safe Pla 6.1.1.1	delivery by local authorities in England and Scotland5.7.5.1Findings from analysis 1 (local authority level costs)5.7.6Analysis 2: Costs associated with behaviour change (school level)5.7.6.1Analysis of the improvement in children's roadside performance and associated costs over time5.7.7ConclusionsMVA staff interviews5.8.15.8.1Rationale5.8.2Objectives5.8.3Method5.8.4Results5.8.5Setting up, management and maintenance of schemes5.8.6Factors for success and failure of schemes5.8.7Sustainability of schemes5.8.8Summary of key outcomesChild Pedestrian Training Pilot Projects on the safety of children's behaviour at the roadside6.1.1Safe Places training outcomes6.1.1.2Gender differences 6.1.1.36.1.1.3Effect of number of training sessions	

	6.1.2	Parked	Cars training outcomes	96
		6.1.2.1	Effect of previous Safe Places training	96
		6.1.2.2	Basic crossing skills shown by trained and control children	96
		6.1.2.3	Main effect of training on 'preparing to cross safely'	97
		6.1.2.4	Main effect of training on 'stopping/pausing at sightline'	97
		6.1.2.5	Main effect of training on 'key looking behaviours' at post-test 1 and 2	97
		6.1.2.6	Gender effects	97
		6.1.2.7	Effect of the number of training sessions	97
	6.1.3	Junctio	ns training outcomes	98
		6.1.3.1	Effect of previous training	98
		6.1.3.2	Main effect of training	98
		6.1.3.3	Behaviours involving recognising and avoiding obstructions	99
		6.1.3.4	Gender differences	99
		6.1.3.5	Effect of the number of training sessions	99
	6.1.4	Compa	risons with the Drumchapel pilot	99
6.2	Objec comm	tive 2: To unities a	o determine the impact of the projects on schools, nd volunteers	100
	6.2.1	Impact	of the projects on schools	100
		6.2.1.1	Benefits to the schools and fitting in with the school ethos and other activities	100
		6.2.1.2	Contact between parents and schools	101
		6.2.1.3	Issues surrounding parental consent for children's participation in training	101
		6.2.1.4	Obtaining support from parents, governors, teachers and other members of the school community	102
		6.2.1.5	Class teachers' views on timetabling arrangements for children extracted from class for small group training	102
		6.2.1.6	Impact on children's behaviour or their verbal or social skills resulting from increased contact with parent volunteers and other adults	102

		6.2.1.7 Problems experienced in accommodating parent volunteers within the school	103	
	6.2.2	Impact of the projects on communities	103	
	6.2.3	Impact of the projects on the volunteers	104	
6.3	Objec terms requin of all j comm	tive 3: To determine the cost-effectiveness of such schemes in of positive outcomes versus the amount of resources and effort red to establish and maintain the schemes from the point of view participants – local authorities, other providers (if any), unities, schools, volunteers and parents	105	
	6.3.1	Objectives	105	
	6.3.2	Data capture	105	
	6.3.3	Economic evaluation methods	105	
	6.3.4	Economic evaluation findings	105	
	6.3.5	Conclusions	106	
6.4	Objec aspect failed	tive 4: To identify the most effective schemes and explore those ts that determine their success and also reasons why any schemes to meet their objectives	107	
6.5	5 Objective 5: To investigate the setting up, management and maintenance of the schemes, exploring both reasons for success and failure at the national level (MVA management) and the local level (individual			
	6.5.1	National management	109	
	6.5.2	Co-ordinator recruitment and training	109	
	6.5.3	Volunteer recruitment and training	110	
	6.5.4	Delivery of pupil training/role of the school	111	
6.6	Objec schem	tive 6: To identify factors that contribute to the sustainability of nes, in particular the retention and continued recruitment of		
	volun	teers and local sources of funding	112	
	6.6.1	Sources of funding beyond the pilot phase	112	
	6.6.2	Retention and continued recruitment of volunteers	113	
	6.6.3	Co-ordination of scheme	114	
	6.6.4	'Adding value' to Kerbcraft training	115	
	6.6.5	Other modifications	116	
	6.6.6	Kerbcraft training after the national pilot project	116	

7	COMMENTARY ON THE STUDY	118
	7.1 Strengths and weaknesses of the intervention	118
	7.2 Strengths and weaknesses of the evaluation	119
8	RECOMMENDATIONS	121
	8.1 Implications for policy	121
	8.2 Implications for research	121
	8.3 Implications for practice – future delivery of Kerbcraft training	121
9	CONCLUSIONS	123
10	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	124
11	REFERENCES	128
AF	PPENDIX 1: Skills assessment	130
	A1.1 Guidelines for skills testers	130
	A1.2 Top tips for SRA testers	134
	A1.3 Safe Places test sheets 1–3	136
	A1.4 Parked Cars test instructions and test sheet	139
	A1.5 Junctions test instructions and test sheet	143
	A1.6 Skills assessment results: gender differences for all three skills	148
AF	PPENDIX 2: Volunteer surveys	155
	A2.1 General survey questionnaire – covering letter to participants and questionnaire sheet	155
	A2.2 Follow-up questionnaire – covering letter to participants, 'still active' and 'dropped out' questionnaires	167
AF	PPENDIX 3: Case studies	180
	A3.1 General questions interview schedule	180
	A3.2 Ethnicity study 1 outcome summary	183
	A3.3 Ethnicity study 2 outcome summary	187
	A3.4 Extreme deprivation study outcome summary	193
	A3.5 Longitudinal study 1 outcome summary	197

A3.6 Longitudinal study 2 outcome summary	202
A3.7 Model schools study outcome summary	205
A3.8 Rural school study outcome summary	209
A3.9 Scottish case study outcome summary	218
A3.10 Skills assessment school study outcome summary	224
APPENDIX 4: Co-ordinator/road safety officer survey	229
A4.1 Surveys of co-ordinators conducted in Tranches 1, 2 and 3	229
APPENDIX 5: Head teacher interview schedule	241
APPENDIX 6: MVA DATA	245

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report documents the evaluation of the National Child Pedestrian Training Pilot Project (Kerbcraft) across English local authorities and Scottish unitary authorities in areas of high deprivation and high child pedestrian casualty rates. The evaluation was conducted between August 2002 and March 2007. The training delivered throughout the national pilot was based on the Kerbcraft practical child pedestrian skills training programme (Thomson et al., 1996). This report examines the field trial of the Kerbcraft programme in a wide range of different settings and pays particular attention to the processes of delivery and implementation.

Aims of the evaluation

To assess the impact of the national pilot project, in both England and Scotland, on children's pedestrian safety, and to identify the most effective ways of establishing and sustaining practical child pedestrian training schemes at the local level.

Objectives

- To establish the impact of the National Child Pedestrian Training Pilot Project on the safety of children in terms of behaviour.
- To determine the impact of the projects on schools, communities and volunteers.
- To determine the cost-effectiveness of Kerbcraft in terms of local authority spending and children's behaviour change.
- To identify the most effective schemes and explore those aspects that determine their success and also the reasons why any schemes failed to meet their objectives.
- To investigate the setting-up, management and maintenance of the schemes, exploring both reasons for success and failure at the national level (MVA Consultancy management) and the local level (individual schemes, feedback from children, schools and volunteers).
- To identify factors that contribute to the sustainability of schemes, in particular retention and continued recruitment of volunteers and local sources of funding.

The intervention

The Kerbcraft programme was developed by the University of Strathclyde and piloted in the Drumchapel area of Glasgow in the early 1990s. It is firmly based on learning theories and educational evidence. The programme was designed to enhance three pedestrian skills in 5-7-year-old children over a period of 12 to 18 months. A package of three skills was developed: (1) recognising safe versus

dangerous crossing places; (2) crossing safely at parked cars; and (3) crossing safely near junctions. It was recommended that these skill packages should be delivered in four to six, four and six sessions respectively. The most important aspect of the programme is that all training is practical in nature and takes place at the roadside. The programme is progressive, with each skill building on earlier ones. Training was conducted by local volunteers in the streets surrounding the children's schools. The volunteers were trained and supported by co-ordinators based in the local authority's road safety department.

The programme was disseminated throughout a National Network of 115 pilot schemes, set within 64 local authorities in England and 12 unitary authorities in Scotland. The pilot schemes in England were funded by the Department for Transport and those in Scotland by the Scotlish Government. Three tranches of funding were made available (2002–05, 2003–06 and 2004–07), each providing funding for scheme co-ordinators over a three-year period.

Methods

A range of evaluation methods was employed in order to capture the complexities of the project. The component evaluation studies included telephone interviews and questionnaire surveys to co-ordinators and road safety officers; questionnaires to volunteers; telephone interviews with head teachers; and face-to-face interviews with project staff. Ten case study schools were randomly selected to illuminate issues related to deprivation, ethnicity and rurality. A pedestrian skills assessment of a randomly selected sample of trained children and a matched sample of untrained children was conducted at the roadside before, and immediately after, training and again two months later. An investigation into the cost-effectiveness of the intervention was also conducted. Quantitative and qualitative methods were used as appropriate to analyse the data collected.

Results

The results have been synthesised to present the main conclusions in relation to the six study objectives:

1. **The impact on behaviour** – the study shows strong statistical evidence of the positive impact of training in all three Kerbcraft skills. In relation to Safe Places training, trained and control groups showed similar levels of construction of 'safe' routes before the intervention (17%). This rose to 28% in trained children immediately after training (post-test 1) and to 20% in control children. At post-test 2, two to four months later, trained children had further increased their safe scores to 44%, whereas control children's scores had risen moderately to 29%. The increase was statistically significant for the trained children but not for the control children. In relation to Parked Cars training, trained children showed a significant increase in the key actions associated with checking the parked cars

for occupants and signs of activity, and also showed a significant increase in the proportion of trials where they clearly stopped (rather than paused) to look right and left for traffic at the sightline. The mean scores for key looking behaviours while stopped at the sightline increased significantly for trained children and were accompanied by a corresponding decrease in less rigorous looking behaviours, which are only conducted while crossing (without first stopping at the sightline). In relation to Junctions training, trained children had a significant advantage over control children at pre-test, possibly the result of informal learning occurring during the two earlier skills training sessions. Trained children again outperformed controls; one example was that the trained group was significantly better than the controls in relation to moving away from obstructions. The improvements made by the trained children in this study, however, were not as great (for each skill) as those observed in the original pilot study in Drumchapel, owing to the larger scale and more disparate nature of the sample. There was no gender difference for baseline performance or the impact of Kerbcraft training.

- 2. The impact on schools, communities and volunteers schools were supportive towards road safety training when it actively reinforced current educational and curricular links. The programme was found to fit in with schools' ethos and to improve relationships between the schools and parents. In the head teacher survey, 43% thought that the Kerbcraft programme had actively improved the relationship between parents and the school, 36% reported no change, and no school reported a detrimental effect. In relation to volunteers, the programme has provided opportunities to develop social contacts, to take advantage of educational and employment opportunities, and to encourage greater participation in local schools. Active volunteers identified benefits resulting from involvement in the Kerbcraft training as feeling valued by the school and project staff (59%), social benefits of meeting new people (50%) and improved relations with schools (30%).
- 3. Cost-effectiveness the budgets and the number of children trained in the Kerbcraft courses for each local authority were compared and costs per child were calculated. These were below £100 per child in all seven local authority schemes sampled. Costs lay in the range of £28 to £99 per child. The cost of Kerbcraft in six of the local authorities was below £40. The added cost per initial 1% proportionate change in 'safe' behaviour scores for Safe Places training across all the trained children in each local authority sampled ranged from £919 to £5,999.
- 4. Success and failure of schemes key ingredients related to the success of schemes focused on the skills and ability of the co-ordinator. The ideal co-ordinator was a person who was able to develop a good relationship with schools, parents and volunteers, who could motivate others and had a flexible approach to work. The supply of volunteers was also important, with the most effective recruitment strategy being the use of a letter from the school/

co-ordinator, followed up by personal invitation. Where parental interest/ availability was low, recruitment was extended into the wider community. These community volunteers included community/street wardens, school-crossing patrollers, police, churches and social clubs, and students on childcare courses. Other ingredients for the success of schemes included the co-operation of schools, innovation and creativity in the delivery of the training, and practical factors such as timetabling training to avoid clashes within the National Curriculum.

- 5. Setting up, management and maintenance of schemes early teething problems in Tranche 1 were addressed as the project evolved, and road safety officers and co-ordinators were more positive with the support they obtained in Tranches 2 and 3. This was facilitated by improvements throughout the project's lifespan in the communication and feedback processes between co-ordinators, network managers and the evaluation team. The training and support of co-ordinators was also an important factor. In some areas, co-ordinators added 'value' to the Kerbcraft training. These features included: providing children with skills for walking safely in rural areas; timetabling extra sessions to introduce new or unusual environments, such as Home Zones; and the inclusion of refresher sessions for skills 12 months after children completed their initial Kerbcraft training programme.
- 6. Sustainability of schemes securing funding to continue pedestrian safety training beyond the timescale of the national Kerbcraft pilot has presented a challenge to all participating local/unitary authorities. A wide range of funding sources was accessed to sustain schemes, including the New Deal for Communities, Neighbourhood Renewal Funding, Local Transport Plan, Local Public Service Agreement, Safety Camera Partnership and Community Regeneration Funding. Both schools and authorities recognised the positive impact of the scheme and most are keen to continue with it. A survey conducted between six and nine months after the pilot funding ceased showed that, of the 39 authorities, 69% were still undertaking some form of practical roadside training and that a further 21% were planning to do so. However, few had continued with the full number of recommended sessions.

Recommendations

Implications for policy

- Cross-departmental initiatives between the Department for Transport and the Department for Children, Schools and Families would enhance the impact of similar schemes.
- The Kerbcraft programme has highlighted the importance of involving the evaluation team at an early stage. The expectation that stakeholders and participants will be involved in this process should be stated at the outset.

Implications for research

- There is a need for further investigation into the impact of community deprivation on this type of intervention.
- There is a need for further work on the impact of ethnicity and of rurality on this type of intervention.
- A longer-term review of the impact on casualty reduction and on behavioural change in children would determine if the positive effects of the training are sustained over time.
- Evaluation of the impact of training schemes on parents/family members would illuminate how far safety messages are transferred once pupils have been trained.
- Opportunity exists to investigate the use of volunteers in other road safety initiatives.
- A review should be undertaken of the sustainability/continuation of the training programme to ascertain whether training has continued within schemes, the nature of any modifications made and the effect of these on outcome measures.

Implications for practice – future delivery of Kerbcraft training

- The behavioural gains children achieved were observed when the programme was delivered in line with current recommendations on the amount of training received: four to six Safe Places sessions; four Parked Cars sessions; and four to six Junctions sessions.
- The process evaluation confirmed the importance of including a 'practical' roadside element within child pedestrian safety training.
- Children benefit from a non-didactic, participative way of learning, and delivering the training to small groups also provides the bonus of peer-supported collaborative learning.
- The Kerbcraft programme has highlighted the importance of delivering training at each stage of the intervention to co-ordinators, to volunteers and to pupils.
- Schools are likely to be more amenable and supportive towards road safety training when this reinforces current educational and curricular links.
- Challenges relating to ethnicity, deprivation and rurality/physical environment can be overcome. Closer community participation is a key ingredient for success.
- The process of setting up the scheme may take longer than anticipated in some schools. Starting with those who are ready to go and coming back to others has been a good strategy used by co-ordinators.

• The programme is sustainable and economically viable with careful management, and authorities should consider targeting available funds to the most vulnerable children in their area.

Conclusions

The evaluation of the national child pedestrian training programme contributes to the field in a number of ways. It provides a report of a major field trial, which operated in a variety of settings across England and Scotland. Specific account was taken to include authorities where the effects of rurality, ethnicity and social deprivation could be examined. In addition, the outcomes of the skills assessment component confirm the earlier findings of the Drumchapel pilot scheme, but this time in a larger and more disparate sample.

This study has made a contribution to two approaches related to tackling inequalities. In relation to strengthening individuals, the study has demonstrated an increase in children's pedestrian skills and has enhanced the range of volunteers' skills in working with children and working more closely with schools. In relation to strengthening communities, the study has shown that it has been possible to recruit and retain a large number of community volunteers and strengthen their links with local schools and local authorities.

1 INTRODUCTION

This report documents the evaluation of the National Child Pedestrian Training Pilot Projects across English local and Scottish unitary authorities in areas of high deprivation and high child pedestrian casualty rates. The evaluation was conducted between August 2002 and March 2007. The training delivered throughout the National Network was based on the practical child pedestrian skills training programme, Kerbcraft, which was developed by the University of Strathclyde and piloted in the Drumchapel area of Glasgow in the early 1990s. This report examines the field trial of the Kerbcraft programme in a wide range of different settings and pays particular attention to the processes of delivery and implementation:

Following this introduction, Section 2 sets out the aims and objectives of the evaluation project. In Section 3, on the background to the study, we describe the intervention and the network developed to implement the pilot programme, and then summarise previous research on children's acquisition of training skills, including the results of the pilot Drumchapel study.

Section 4 is an overview of the evaluation methods employed. In Section 5 we present the methods and results of the component studies: the skills assessment exercise; volunteer survey; case studies of schools; co-ordinator survey; road safety officer survey; head teacher survey; cost-effectiveness study and the MVA Consultancy (project management) survey.

In **Section 6** we synthesise the results, pulling together the main conclusions in relation to the six study objectives. These are:

- 1. the impact on behaviour;
- 2. the impact on schools, communities and volunteers;
- 3. cost-effectiveness;
- 4. aspects that determine the success and failure of schemes;
- 5. the impact of setting up, managing and maintaining schemes on their success; and
- 6. factors that contribute to the sustainability of schemes.

Section 7 is a commentary on the results, discussing the strengths and weaknesses of both the intervention and the evaluation. Consideration is given to the contribution made by the study to both injury prevention and the wider health promotion field.

Section 8 summarises the implications for policy, practice and research. Section 9 is the conclusion. Sections 10 and 11 provide acknowledgements and references, followed by appendices.

There is some overlap in **Sections 5 and 6**, particularly in relation to Objectives 6(1) and 6(3), because these two syntheses each rely mainly on one component study. However, in order to gain an understanding about the report's findings, we believe that it is important to retain a summary in Section 6 because this section describes whether the six study objectives have been achieved.

2 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION PROJECT

2.1 Aims

- To assess the impact of the National Child Pedestrian Training Pilot Projects (Kerbcraft) in both England and Scotland on children's pedestrian safety.
- To identify the most effective ways of establishing and sustaining practical child pedestrian training schemes at the local level.

2.2 Objectives

- To establish the impact of the National Child Pedestrian Training Pilot Projects on the safety of children in terms of behaviour.
- To determine the impact of the projects on schools, communities and volunteers.
- To determine the cost-effectiveness of Kerbcraft in terms of local authority spending and children's behaviour change.
- To identify the most effective schemes and explore those aspects that determine their success, and also the reasons why any schemes failed to meet their objectives.
- To investigate the setting up, management and maintenance of the schemes: exploring both reasons for success and failure at the national level (MVA management) and the local level (individual schemes, feedback from children, schools and volunteers).
- To identify factors that contribute to the sustainability of schemes, in particular retention and the continued recruitment of volunteers and local sources of funding.

3 BACKGROUND

3.1 The intervention

This project's aim is to assess the impact of the Kerbcraft child pedestrian training programme, which was disseminated throughout a National Network of 115 pilot schemes, set within 64 local authorities (LAs) in England and 12 unitary authorities (UAs) in Scotland. Authorities were invited to tender for funding for delivery of Kerbcraft training, with competition criteria based on measures of local community deprivation, child pedestrian casualty rates and potential support available from local schools. Areas of higher social deprivation and higher child pedestrian killed or seriously injured (KSI) rates were preferentially targeted, since it is in these areas that the risk of child pedestrian injury is highest.

Funding for the pilot in England was provided by the Department for Transport, and in Scotland by the Scottish Government. This pilot was one of a number of initiatives undertaken across the UK as part of a national strategy to reduce road casualty rates. While the UK has a good overall record on road accident deaths, figures for child pedestrian injuries are not so good. In 2000 the Department for Transport launched *Tomorrow's Roads – Safer for Everyone* (Department for Transport, 2007a) which outlines a number of casualty reduction targets, including the reduction by 50% of serious and fatal injuries to children aged between 0 and 15 years by 2010, in comparison with the average rates for 1994–98. The latest review of casualty figures from the Department for Transport shows a reduction of 49% in 2005, so the target is on track to be achieved and even improved upon already (Department for Transport, 2007b).

The Kerbcraft programme has been designed to enhance three pedestrian skills in 5-7-year-old children over a period of 12-18 months. Three skills packages have been developed:

- 1. recognising safe versus dangerous crossing places;
- 2. crossing safely at parked cars; and
- 3. crossing safely near junctions.

An important component of the programme is that this practical training is all undertaken in the road environment. The training is progressive, with each skill building on earlier ones. Children work in small groups supported by an adult trainer who provides prompts and clues to encourage their decision making.

Training on each skill is delivered over four to six sessions by trained volunteers. A scheme co-ordinator based in the local authority road safety department has responsibility for the recruitment, training and ongoing management of the volunteers. The volunteers (usually parents) conduct the training with small groups

of children in the streets surrounding the school. Figure 3.1 shows the way in which the different elements of the Child Pedestrian Training Pilot Project schemes fit together.



3.2 Overview of the National Network

Three tranches of funding were set up, with schemes starting in 2002, 2003 and 2004 in both England and Scotland. Each tranche provided 3 years' funding of up to \pounds 30,000 p.a. for each scheme to appoint a scheme co-ordinator to set up and deliver training in approximately 10 schools in their particular area. The co-ordinators were managed and supported by road safety officers within existing road safety departments.

Table 3.1 shows the number of schemes funded and the approximate number of children trained in each tranche across England and Scotland.

Table 3.1: Number of schemes and children trained per tranche across theNational Network in England and Scotland from 2002 to 2007						
	Total no. of schemes	English schemes	Scottish schemes	Total number of children trained		
Tranche 1 (2002–05)	41	38	3	31,641		
Tranche 2 (2003–06)	42	39	3	28,349		
Tranche 3 (2004–07)	32	26	6	22,453*		
Totals	115	103	12	82,443		
* Tranche 3 figures only relate to seven of the nine terms within the three-year funding period.						

At the start of Tranche 1, 38 schemes in England were funded for a three-year period: co-ordinators were appointed in early 2002 and the training of the children began within one to four months, depending on the local authority. In Scotland, three unitary authorities were funded to start in May 2002 with the appointment of co-ordinators, and the training of the children started later in the summer. In Tranche 2, 39 schemes in England and three in Scotland were funded for three years, commencing in early 2003. In Tranche 3, 26 schemes in England and six in Scotland were funded, commencing in early 2004. In total, 115 schemes were involved, spread over 64 local authorities in England and 12 unitary authorities in Scotland.

Each scheme co-ordinator had a target of working with approximately 10 schools or 300 children per year and 900 over the project's lifetime. This target was based on the number of children trained across each school year in the original pilot project in Drumchapel. Some Kerbcraft co-ordinators, working in larger schools or more schools across their authority, were able to exceed this, while a few co-ordinators working in very rural areas, where their Kerbcraft schools had small numbers of children and there were larger distances to travel, had targeted smaller numbers of children for training from the outset. Across the lifespan of the pilot project, approximately 82,443 children received some training in Kerbcraft skills (this does not include the final two terms of training for Tranche 3 schemes).

The participating local and unitary authorities were drawn from across England and Scotland, and represented a wide range of geographical, social, economic and cultural environments. Schemes were located in inner-city areas, metropolitan boroughs, residential and suburban areas, small towns, home zones, housing estates and rural communities.

Authorities appointed their own co-ordinators, negotiated working hours, pay scales, and terms and conditions to fit within the existing road safety department structure. Where co-ordinators left the project before funding ended, authorities sought to appoint a replacement for the remainder of the contract.

Scheme co-ordinators were supported within the National Network by MVA Consultancy project staff, who provided information and advice on all aspects of setting-up schemes, recruiting volunteers, working with schools and children, and delivering Kerbcraft skills. Co-ordinators were encouraged to share information with each other, through a series of regional networking meetings, regional and national seminars and website facilities provided by MVA, and through independent networking relationships.

MVA staff worked closely with the evaluation team to share information on schemes and working practices, and provided a forum through which progress on the evaluation could be fed back to co-ordinators.

3.3 Background literature related to Kerbcraft

In the 1960s and 1970s many educationalists believed that a young child's judgement in traffic could not be improved through training and that children's traffic decisions were limited by their age and level of cognitive development. Influential research by Stina Sandels in Sweden stressed that Piagetian stages posed biological constraints on what children could comprehend at different ages. Sandels concluded, 'it is not possible to adapt fully young children to the traffic environment ... they are biologically incapable of managing its many demands' (Sandels, 1975). Thomson and his colleagues do not support Sandels' view and believe that Piagetian models of development are considerably more flexible than were previously envisaged. They thus consider that practical training programmes, properly targeted on relevant and clearly defined road crossing skills, have considerable potential. A review of the literature conducted by Thomson *et al.* (1996) examined child development and the aims of road safety education. They pointed out that:

'Skiing or swimming, driving or learning to ride a bike all require practical experience: no-one has ever learned to do these things just sitting at a desk. Yet this is precisely how we expect young children to cross the road.'

The review presents the theoretical underpinning of why practical skills training is effective, concentrating in particular on the theories of Gibson, Piaget, and Vygotsky (Thomson *et al.*, 1996). Skills and strategies cannot be taught solely by verbal means but need to be built up from their constituent behaviours, and practised and discussed repeatedly in a relevant context. There is strong evidence that learning is more flexible than was previously supposed, particularly when appropriate interventions are delivered in the environment where the skills will later be deployed. The authors conclude that appropriate training (focused sessions in a roadside context) could begin as early as four years of age. The review also discusses the implications of child development theory for training, and considers the role of peer tutoring, adult-led training and peer collaboration. The first two of these methods stem from a Vygotskian approach and are likely to be best suited to the learning of skills and strategies. Peer collaboration, on the other hand, is more in line with Piagetian theory and would appear to be more useful in the provision of conceptual understanding. The authors believe that successful training needs to include both approaches.

A systematic review of 10 studies examining the effects of pedestrian skills training concluded that pedestrian skills training programmes had been shown to improve children's skills both for individual skills, such as timing and finding safe places to cross, and a combination of skills, provided that they were specifically targeted and that practical roadside experience was an essential ingredient of pedestrian skills training (Towner *et al.*, 2001).

Competent pedestrian behaviour involves a wide range of complex perceptual, cognitive and motor skills, making safe interaction with the traffic environment possible. Rivara et al. (1991) estimated that road crossing can involve up to 26 different tasks in order to negotiate traffic successfully. Although adults demonstrate considerable competence in applying such pedestrian skills, children do not. Thomson and colleagues developed a practical road-side training programme for children between the ages of five and seven years, and piloted it in a community in Glasgow (Drumchapel) where there was a very high child pedestrian casualty rate. The programme was administered through schools by parent instructors. The results of the pilot evaluation of the Drumchapel project showed that children who had been exposed to the programme displayed significantly better traffic judgements and traffic behaviours compared with a control group of children from the same classes. Moreover, the improvements were robust, with no deterioration when children were tested two to three months later. The level of skill seen in trained children was several years in advance of what could normally be expected of children in this age range. The improvements were achieved on the basis of four to six training sessions, each lasting only half an hour (Thomson and Whelan, 1997).

The pilot study also demonstrated that the improvements in children's pedestrian skills were similar to the results of earlier studies, where training had been conducted by highly experienced trainers rather than parent volunteers. These findings present compelling evidence of the efficacy of a community approach to road safety education. The benefits of this go some way to overcoming the perceived challenges of deploying a time- and labour-intensive training programme (see Figure 3.2). The advantages of involving local parents and community members were potentially much broader:

'Involving volunteers improves contact between the community and the school more generally, which is desirable in itself. It involves the community directly in the process of finding solutions to its own problems rather than relying on "experts" drafted in from outside.' (Thomson and Whelan, 1997)



Parent volunteers, with proper training and preparation, were capable of highly positive results. The methods developed in the Drumchapel pilot study were published in a manual for professional users (1997) and revised in 2002 (Thomson *et al.*, 2002).

In summary, reviews of health promotion and injury prevention initiatives (Lister-Sharp *et al.*, 1999) suggest that the most effective road-safety-specific interventions are those which are: theory-based; taught at the roadside; involve participation and support from parents/local community; and are integrated into a 'whole school' strategy for health promotion. The Kerbcraft model incorporates all of these key criteria.

4 OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION METHODS

A range of evaluation methods was employed in order to capture the complexities of the project. Individual components are shown in Table 4.1, together with the number of participants involved and the funding tranche of the programme. The methods included observational studies, telephone interviews, self-completion questionnaires, case studies, data extraction from site visits and an investigation into the cost-effectiveness of the intervention. Quantitative and qualitative methods were used as appropriate to analyse the data collected. Further details of the methods employed within each study, along with the relevant findings, can be found in Section 5. Technical reports are also available as appendices to this report.

Table 4.1: Evaluation methods used during national Kerbcraft pilot projects						
Evaluation studies	Number of participants involved					
	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3	Total		
Skills assessment	-	15 schools	-	15 schools		
Volunteer surveys	-	Survey 1 – 228 respondents Survey 2 – 87 respondents	_	Survey 1 – 228 respondents Survey 2 – 87 respondents		
Case studies	-	8 schools	2 schools	10 schools		
Co-ordinator surveys*	38 respondents	41 respondents	29 respondents	108 respondents		
RSO† surveys*	40 respondents	21 respondents	18 respondents	79 respondents		
Head teacher survey Cost-effectiveness study: Cost/child Cost/1% improvement in safety behaviour	-	- 4 LA/UA† 18 schools 2,108 pupils 12 LA/UA 13 schools	42 respondents 3 LA/UA 29 schools 3,288 pupils	42 respondents 7 LA/UA 47 schools 5,396 pupils 12 LA/UA 13 schools		
MVA staff interviews	-	-	5 respondents	5 respondents		
* Tranche 1 sunvey conducted by structured telephone interview. Tranche 2 sunveys by self-						

 Tranche 1 survey conducted by structured telephone interview, Tranche 2 surveys by selfcompletion questionnaire.

 $\label{eq:LA} \mbox{ LA} = \mbox{ local authority; UA} = \mbox{ unitary authority; RSO} = \mbox{ road safety officer.}$

Figure 4.1 shows how the component studies/sources of evidence have been used to answer the questions set out in Objectives 1 to 6. Section 5 of this report examines the component studies (Sections 5.1 to 5.8) and Section 6 provides a synthesis of the evidence for each of the six objectives.

Figure 4.1: Evaluation of the Ch component studies	ild Pedestrian Training Pilot Projec	ts objectives and
Objectives		Component studies
1. Impact on behaviour		A. Skills assessment exercises
2. Impact on schools, communities and volunteers		B. Volunteer surveys
3. Cost-effectiveness		C. Case studies
4. Ourseens and failure of		D. Co-ordinator
schemes		E. Road safety officer surveys
5. Setting up, management and maintenance		F. Head teacher survey
6. Sustainability of schemes		G. Cost-effectiveness study
		H. MVA staff

5 EVALUATION STUDIES

5.1 Skills assessment exercise

5.1.1 Rationale

The skills assessment exercise was undertaken to meet the requirements of Objective 1 of the evaluation project, which is concerned with the impact of training on children's behaviour at the roadside. The study's aims were:

5.1.2 Study aims

- To undertake roadside skills testing of a randomised sample of Tranche 2 children from schools participating in the National Network, together with matched control children.
- To use the same assessment methodology and analysis techniques as were used in the original evaluation of Kerbcraft in Drumchapel (Thomson and Whelan, 1997).
- To compare any improvements in trained children's skill level with the matched control group from the same local authority areas that did not receive Kerbcraft training.

5.1.3 Method

5.1.3.1 Participants

All participants were drawn from schools in Tranche 2 schemes before training started in September 2003. All participating children were from Year 1 or 2 in English primary schools and had an average age of six years, seven months at the beginning of the testing exercise (age range = 40 months). Final participant numbers for each skill are shown in separate tables under each individual skill results section.

5.1.3.2 Selection process

The schools chosen for participation in the skills testing were selected using a computer-generated random sampling technique. An initial sample of 20 schools was selected, from which eight schools were identified as suitable for inclusion (with regard to timetable, volunteer availability, suitable testing sites and agreement in principle from the head teacher). A further seven schools were selected from a second round of random sampling.

The final list of 15 schools was therefore drawn from two randomly generated samples. The second sample was limited to those where Safe Places training would

commence in the autumn term of 2003 and where the co-ordinators deemed there would be sufficient volunteers to commence training. The 15 schools chosen represented a broad geographical spread across all Tranche 2 schools, and included:

- schools with high and low levels of deprivation in the surrounding wards;
- schools with high and low percentages of children from black and minority ethnic (BME) groups;
- different types of school, including community schools and church schools (Roman Catholic, Church of England); and
- schools from inner-city areas and more suburban/small town environments.

5.1.3.3 Control group selection

A matched control group was selected from schools in the same local authority areas with a similar profile on the following criteria:

- level of deprivation, as measured by the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) for the surrounding ward;
- per cent of children from BME groups on the school roll; and
- type of school (e.g. church school, community school, etc.).

Scheme co-ordinators and road safety officers provided assistance in selecting suitable control schools in each area.

Once the individual schools were selected, 15 children from each school were randomly selected to participate in the initial Safe Places pre-training test. These children were then followed through a pre- and post-training test for each of the three skills in the Kerbcraft programme.

5.1.3.4 Experimental design

Shortly before training on each skill commenced, each child was individually tested at the roadside to establish a baseline measure of skill (**pre-test**). The training programme for Safe Places then began. This consisted of four to six training sessions delivered at the rate of approximately one session per week: the exact scheduling differed slightly for each school involved, dependent on weather, volunteers and school timetable. Shortly after training was completed, the same children were then re-tested to establish if any improvements in their judgements and behaviour had occurred (**post-test 1**). This was then followed by a further test between two to four months later (**post-test 2**), which was aimed at exploring the longer-term effects of training. Control children undertook the testing programme in the same way.

5.1.3.5 Testers – Social Research Associates (SRa)

A pool of eight testers was identified from SRa staff and given a one-day intensive training course, covering the background and aims of the Kerbcraft model and the testing procedure for each of the three skills. A practical session at the roadside was also included to reinforce testing procedures and to highlight relevant roadside safety and child protection issues. Members of SRa undertook all testing in both Kerbcraft and control schools over an 18-month period. Where original trained testers were not available, SRa provided ad hoc training for new testers.

5.1.3.6 Testing locations and materials

Testing sites for all three skills were identified at all 30 schools by the evaluation project manager, with assistance from each scheme co-ordinator. Testing materials were then developed to 'fit' with each location, based on the materials used in the original pilot study. More detailed examples of testing materials and procedures can be found in Appendix 1.

5.1.4 Skill 1: Choosing a safe place to cross

5.1.4.1 Training rationale

Safe Places training focuses on the two main errors young children make when trying to cross the road unattended. Firstly, children often choose to cross from locations where their view of oncoming traffic is obscured – for example, beside a parked car, high hedge or at a sharp bend. Secondly, they assume that the most direct route to their chosen destination is the safest, and will often walk diagonally across the road to reach it. This can even happen at crossroads and staggered junctions. They justify this by arguing that they are going 'straight across the road' – an obvious misinterpretation of common advice to young children.

Children receive four to six 30-minute training sessions. They work in groups of two or three with an adult trainer to find a number of 'safe' routes through the local traffic environment. The adult trainer presents the children with a dangerous starting location and a destination across the road, diagonally opposite. The children are then encouraged to discuss how they can circumvent the dangers at the starting location to find a safe route to their destination. The trainer supports their discussion by using indirect prompts and suggestions when the children are unable to move forward.

5.1.4.2 Testing procedure

Children were taken individually to 12 different 'dangerous' locations, such as a parked car, junction or sharp bend, and were asked to imagine that s/he wanted to cross to a destination a short distance diagonally opposite. To perform the task successfully, the child would have to assess the surrounding traffic environment, take into account all of the relevant features, construct a route which would avoid

the inherent dangers and then give an explanation, justifying their choice of 'safe' route.

Two key pieces of information were recorded at each of the 12 testing locations: the route indicated by the child (behaviour score) and the verbatim explanation of why the child considers that route to be 'safe' (conceptual score).

5.1.4.3 Testing materials

Following the methodology of previous Safe Places tests, we created a schematic 'map' of each testing site at each school, clearly showing the start points and destinations for each route. Further details on the testing materials and example maps can be found in Appendix 1.

5.1.4.4 Scoring

As with previous studies, the routes and explanations generated by the children were to be coded using an established criterion in which the behaviour (route) score could be modified by the explanation score. This allowed for a more accurate reflection of ability and understanding. The routes chosen by the children were coded into one of four categories (A–D). These reflect the degree to which the route avoids the initial danger and constructs safe passage through the environment to the destination.

A small number of behaviour responses did not conform to the existing coding framework. These new behaviours comprised trials where the child either did not respond, refused to cross, or the route was not recorded by the tester. At pre-test these routes accounted for less than 10% of all responses and had virtually disappeared by the final test phase (post 2); they were therefore discounted from any further analysis. A sample of the children's responses was recoded by an independent rater using the new scoring framework. The inter-rater reliability analysis showed a high correlation between the independent coding and the overall coding as conducted by the evaluation project researcher (Pearson's correlation = 0.086 as averaged across pre-test, post 1 and post 2 results).

5.1.4.5 Participant numbers

Table 5.1 shows the number of tested children included in the main analysis. In total, 400 children took part in some testing for Safe Places. The table shows participant numbers which are representative of the children for whom we had a full set of data at each testing phase for the purposes of analysis. It was anticipated that it would be more difficult to gain access to testing participants by the delayed posttest two to four months after training ended (due to illness, absence or children leaving the school). Therefore the post-test 2 sample size was reduced (for all three skills) in order to accommodate this.

Table 5.1: Participant numbers for Safe Places tests across all test phases				
	Pre-test	Post-test 1	Post-test 2	
Trained group Control group	188 212	150 156	73 64	

5.1.4.6 Main effect of Safe Places training

Table 5.2 shows the mean number of routes falling into each of the four main 'route' categories. These means are presented as a function of training (trained group versus control group) and test phase (pre-test, post-test 1 and post-test 2).

Considering the main behavioural data (Table 5.2), it can be seen that, prior to training, the majority of routes for the trained and control group fall into the 'unsafe' categories (A and B). The first post-training test (post 1) shows a marked reduction in 'unsafe' scores for the trained group (79% at pre-test to 68% at posttest), with a corresponding increase in 'safe' (C and D) scores from 17% at pre-test to 28% at post-test. By comparison, the control group showed no reduction in aggregated 'unsafe' scores (75% at pre- and post-test) and a much more modest shift in the proportion of 'safe' scores (17% at pre-test to 20% at post-test).

Delayed post-test results (post-test 2) show a continued improvement for the trained group, with a further increase in 'safe' (C and D) scores more than two months after completing training. The control group show a slight improvement, which is seen mainly in the shift from A to B scores (as compared with the pattern for controls seen at post-test 1).

Table 5.2: Proportion of AD behaviour responses as a function of training and test phase (A = very unsafe, B = unsafe, C = more safe and D = safe)								
	Trained			Control				
	Α	В	С	D	А	В	С	D
Pre-test Mean S.D.	0.53 0.3	0.26 0.23	0.11 0.16	0.06 0.11	0.54 0.32	0.21 0.22	0.12 0.16	0.05 0.09
Post 1 Mean S.D.	0.29 0.3	0.39 0.28	0.15 0.17	0.13 0.18	0.47 0.33	0.28 0.28	0.13 0.18	0.07 0.12
Post 2 Mean S.D.	0.15 0.24	0.41 0.23	0.28 0.2	0.16 0.16	0.29 0.31	0.42 0.41	0.15 0.14	0.14 0.17

The statistical analysis conducted to explore the main effect of training used 'safe' scores (C + D) as the main unit of measurement, as this aggregated score represented 'conceptually more advanced choices where children showed evidence of insight into the dangers posed by the road layout and proposed routes which at least partially took them into account'.¹ The pattern of 'safe' scores across pre-test, post-test 1 and post-test 2 can be seen in Table 5.3 and in Figure 5.1.

Table 5.3: Mean proportion of 'safer' (C + D) routes constructed by children before and after training				
	Pre-test	Post 1	Post 2	
Trained Mean S.D.	0.17 0.21	0.28 0.27	0.44 0.27	
Control Mean S.D.	0.17 0.21	0.2 0.25	0.29 0.25	



This pattern of results was analysed using a three-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), with experimental group (trained versus control), test phase (pre-test, post-test 1 and post-test 2) and gender as factors. The results showed a significant main effect of TEST (F (1, 116) = 81.292, p < 0.000) and a significant main effect of EXPERIMENTAL GROUP (F (1, 116) = 8.773, p = 0.004), thus confirming the pattern shown by the mean scores, i.e. that the trained group are significantly outperforming the control group at post-test 1 and that their improvement has increased by the delayed post-test. The significant interaction between test phase and experimental group confirms the strength of this finding (F (1,116) = 14.652, p < 0.000). Furthermore, a planned post hoc comparison of pre- to post-test differences for the trained and control groups separately shows that only the trained group make a significant improvement at post-test 1 (t = -4.729, df = 139, p < 0.000 (one-tailed)).

¹ The analytical use and definition of 'safe' scores is taken directly from the original evaluation report from Drumchapel. See Thomson and Whelan (1997).

5.1.4.7 Gender differences

There are appreciable differences in the pedestrian accident rates for boys and girls, with boys (0-15) being significantly more at risk than girls of the same age. However, previous studies exploring the impact of Kerbcraft training consistently identified no significant gender differences in either baseline performance or improvements on any of the three skills. In keeping with this pattern, results from this study show **no significant effect of gender** on Safe Places behaviours. A full set of descriptive statistics for gender effects (for all three skills) can be found in Appendix 1.

5.1.4.8 Effect of number of training sessions

Analysis of the results from the original Kerbcraft study in Drumchapel (Thomson and Whelan, 1997) indicated that those children receiving between four and six training sessions (as recommended) showed a similar level of improvement at posttest 1. However, those children who received three or fewer sessions showed a significantly poorer post-test performance. Results from the delayed post-test also showed that those receiving three or fewer sessions, while showing a small improvement, did not improve to the level of the other trained children.

Based on these findings, co-ordinators within the National Network were advised to ensure that all children received at least four Safe Places training sessions in order to maximise the benefits of training. The majority of children did receive the minimum recommended amount (83% at pre-test), however, as with the original pilot, there were children in the testing cohort who received less than four sessions. Reasons for this varied, but were mostly due to children being absent from school for some part of the training. Participant numbers for those receiving various amounts of Safe Places training are shown in Table 5.4.

Table 5.4: Number of participants at each testing phase for Safe Places				
Group	Pre-test	Post 1	Post 2	
6 sessions 5 sessions 4 sessions <= 3 sessions Controls	28 24 92 30 196	24 26 77 23 144	12 12 45 4 64	

An opportunistic attempt was made to analyse the current sample for evidence of the impact on performance of receiving less than four training sessions. However a number of problems arose from this analysis: group numbers were very small (with as few as four children in one group at post-test 2) and closer inspection of the participants from each small group showed many of the children all being from the same schools or authority areas. The resulting analysis was inconclusive.
However, the positive and statistically significant **overall** improvements (discussed earlier in this section) made by trained children in this pilot were made after the vast majority of that group received at least four Safe Places training sessions, and therefore reflect the impact of that amount of training. Thus, despite no further statistical evidence, the recommendations concerning the minimum amount of Safe Places training that children should receive remain as before, at four sessions. Future scheme managers would be advised to consider timetabling for the full compliment of six sessions, as children's individual rate of uptake of new skills will differ. Indeed, in order to maximise the benefits for every child and ensure quality training in future Kerbcraft schemes, co-ordinators could make use of existing monitoring materials (available from the Kerbcraft manual (Thomson *et al.* 2002)) to assess the improvement level for individual children (e.g. by testing skill level at session 4) and, from there, tailor the amount of subsequent training that each child receives.

5.1.5 Skill 2: Crossing safely at parked cars

5.1.5.1 Parked cars training rationale

Training on Skill 2 deals with a specific and difficult situation: how to minimise the danger of crossing from between parked cars, when there is no safer crossing place available.

Children have four training sessions, each lasting approximately 15–20 minutes. The trainer/child ratio is 1:2 as the group are required to cross as part of the task. The training uses a Behavioural Modelling approach (Bandura, 1977), which reinforces a safe crossing strategy made up of key actions in a specific order. The trainer would model the 'correct' procedure, explaining each step to the children, the group then practised the steps together, each child would then take the group through the steps independently and, to finish, the trainer would model the 'correct' procedure for the children again.

The strategy itself is designed to teach children a number of actions, which will reduce the risk inherent in crossing between cars. These include preparatory actions, such as choosing a gap the right size, making sure that there is a space to cross to on the pavement opposite, checking that there are no occupants in the car and checking for signs of activity in or near the car (exhaust fumes, reversing lights, etc.). The next actions involve stepping out into the space between the cars and stopping at the **line of sight** at the outside edge of the cars. Finally, the children are taught to cross carefully, making sure that they look and listen properly for traffic while crossing.

The following list shows the actions which children should learn from their training using the Parked Cars training strategy:

1. Find a space between two parked cars that is wide enough for three people to cross through.

- 2. Check that there is a gap on the other side of the road to reach the pavement.
- 3. Stop at the kerb.
- 4. Look in both parked cars to make sure there are no people sitting in them.
- 5. Also look for other clues that the car might move: reversing lights; exhaust fumes; engine noise, etc.
- 6. If there is someone in either car or any of the other clues are present, walk to another place as the car could start moving.
- 7. If both cars are empty, walk to the outside corner of the car on the left and STOP (this is called the 'line of sight').
- 8. Look RIGHT to see if there is any traffic coming. If there isn't, then ...
- 9. Look LEFT to see if there is any traffic coming. If there isn't, then ...
- 10. Look RIGHT AGAIN for traffic. If there is no traffic coming, then ...
- 11. Cross the road at a steady pace. Hold hands and continue to look and listen for traffic as you go.
- 12. If traffic should appear while you are standing at the line of sight, **step back to the kerb** and wait for it to pass. Then, step forward again and repeat from step 6.
- 13. If several cars should come along, go back to the pavement and wait until it is quieter before starting the procedure again from the beginning.

5.1.5.2 Testing procedure

The children were tested individually at sites near the school as with Skill 1. The test required each child to take the tester through the steps necessary to cross safely between two parked cars. Every child was asked to take the tester across safely on four separate occasions. Ideally this would be at different locations, but was often between the same two cars where there were few vehicles parked in appropriate locations in close vicinity to the school. The tester held the child's hand at all times, and would act accordingly, if necessary to keep the child safe.

5.1.5.3 Testing materials and scoring

The tester recorded the child's actions relative to the list of key actions on a scoring sheet, which had been designed for the original Drumchapel pilot to reflect the key actions covered in the Parked Cars training. As the child takes part in four trials per testing session, the raw scores are coded to show the proportion of correct actions over all four trials at each of the pre- and post-test phases. Details of the testing procedure and materials can be found in Appendix 1.

5.1.5.4 Participant numbers

Table 5.5 shows the number of tested children included in the main analysis. In total, 284 children took part in testing for Parked Cars. The table shows the number of the children for whom we had a full set of data at each testing phase for the purposes of analysis. The sample size at post-test 2 was deliberately reduced to account for the drop in the number of tested children available two to four months after training was completed.

Table 5.5: Participant numbers for Parked Cars testing across all test phases						
	Pre-test Post-test 1 Post-test 2					
Trained group Control group	144 140	113 116	69 63			

5.1.5.5 Basic crossing skills shown by trained and control children

Table 5.6 shows the pre-test, post 1 and post 2 scores for trained and control groups across all key Parked Cars behaviours. Results for questions 9a-9c (concerning the speed at which children cross the road) are excluded as they show a high baseline ceiling for both groups and do not show any further improvement after training.

Table 5.6: Proportion of children exhibiting the target behaviours during crossing at parkedcars before and after training							
	Sig.*		Trained		Control		
		Pre-	Post 1	Post 2	Pre-	Post 1	Post 2
 Preparing to cross safely 1. Stops at kerb? 2. Looks in both cars after stopping? 3. Checks exhaust/lights/engine noise? 4. Advances to parked car on left? 	$ee \Omega ightarrow \Omega ightarrow \Omega ightarrow \Omega ightarrow \Omega$	0.85 0.1 0.06 0.29	0.94 0.64 0.49 0.52	0.95 0.5 0.52 0.55	0.84 0.03 0.04 0.19	0.86 0.15 0.09 0.17	0.96 0.13 0.11 0.3
Stopping/pausing at the sightline 5a. Stops at line of sight? 5b. Pauses at line of sight?	$\bigvee \\ \Omega \\ \Omega$	0.6 0.17	0.92 0.06	0.89 0.05	0.57 0.14	0.51 0.2	0.68 0.16
 Key looking behaviours 6a. Looks RIGHT at line of sight? 6b. Looks RIGHT while walking? 7a. Looks LEFT at line of sight? 7b. Looks LEFT while walking? 8a. Looks RIGHT AGAIN at line of sight? 	$ \begin{array}{c} \checkmark \\ \Omega \\ \Delta \\ \lor \\ \Omega \\ \Delta \\ \lor \\ \downarrow \\ 0 \end{array} $	0.55 0.31 0.53 0.33 0.3	0.92 0.06 0.92 0.07 0.78	0.83 0.05 0.86 0.1 0.73	0.49 0.28 0.45 0.27 0.26	0.54 0.26 0.51 0.25 0.32	0.64 0.15 0.67 0.19 0.44
8b. Looks RIGHT AGAIN while walking?	Δ	0.38	0.21	0.13	0.26	0.23	0.23

* $\sqrt{1}$ - Significant increase in a safe behaviour for trained children at post-test 1.

 Δ - Significant decrease in an unsafe behaviour for trained children at post-test 1.

 Ω - Trained children perform significantly better than control group children at post-test 2.

5.1.5.6 Effect of Safe Places training on Parked Cars performance at pre-test

Mean scores show that trained children appear to start from a higher baseline performance at pre-test on many of the key parked cars actions, indicating the possible influence of Skill 1 on generally 'safe' roadside behaviours. However, a series of independent samples (*t*-tests) on key questions shows that only question 2 (Looks in both cars after stopping? (t = 2.78 (df = 230.167) p = 0.003 one-tailed)) and question 4 (Moves out to edge of parked car on the left? (t = 2.044 (df = 273.209) p = 0.021 one-tailed)) show a significantly higher baseline performance for trained children in comparison to controls.

5.1.5.7 Main effect of training on 'preparing to cross safely'

The trained children show a marked increase in the key actions specifically associated with checking the parked cars for occupants and signs of activity (questions 2-4). Any increases shown by the control group are modest by comparison, and question 4 actually shows a decrease at post-test. This is borne out by highly significant main effects of test (pre-/post-1) and experimental condition (trained/control) for all three 'preparation actions'. Post-test 2 scores (see Table 5.7) and follow-up *t*-tests show that the gains made by the trained group have been maintained two to four months after training and that this group are still significantly outperforming the control group.

5.1.5.8 Main effect of training on 'stopping/pausing at sightline'

Trained children show a marked increase in the proportion of trials where they clearly **stop** to look at the line of sight (question 5) and this was reinforced by highly significant main effects of test and experimental condition.

A corresponding decrease in the trials where they just **pause** (question 5b) can also be seen for trained children at post-test 1. By contrast, control children stop at the sightline **less often**, and show an **increase** in their propensity to pause instead of stop at post-test 1. Although question 5b did **not** show a significant effect of test phase and showed only a borderline significant difference between trained and control groups (training condition), the significant interaction between test phase and training condition reinforces the strength of the inverse pattern of performance at post-test for trained and control children. An independent samples *t*-test on prepost 1 difference scores for trained and control children on question 5b confirms this by indicating a highly significant difference between trained and control children on pre- to post-test improvement score. Further *t*-tests on post-test 2 scores for trained and control groups show the trained group again holding their gains at a significant level over the controls.

5.1.5.9 Main effect of training on 'key looking behaviours'

The mean scores for looking correctly while stopped at the sightline **increase** substantially for trained children (questions 6a, 7a and 8a) and are accompanied by a corresponding **decrease** in the undesirable and less rigorous looking behaviours conducted **after** stepping straight out from between the cars without stopping (questions 6b, 7b and 8b).

In comparison, children in the control group show no such marked increases in the key looking behaviours while safely stopped at the sightline and negligible decreases in the more dangerous alternative of looking for traffic after stepping out from between the cars. With one exception, all of these differences between trained and control children show highly significant main effects of training and test phase in favour of the trained group.

Responses for questions 6, 7 and 8 show a significant pattern of improvement at post-test 2 for trained children in comparison with the control group. *T*-test results show that trained children are still significantly better at the key looking behaviours than their untrained counterparts.

5.1.5.10 Gender differences

Mean results from Parked Cars tests show very slight differences in pre-test performance for boys and girls, but these are clearly negated by training. By posttest 2, scores show no significant differences. We can therefore conclude that any gender differences apparent in Parked Cars behaviours are compensated for by training. A table of mean score by gender for trained and control children across all test phases can be found in Appendix 1.

5.1.5.11 Effect of number of Parked Cars training sessions

The Social Learning Theory principles (Bandura, 1977) underpinning Skill 2 Parked Cars training suggest that participants require repeated exposure to the 'strategy' in order to embed successful learning. Thus, following the Behavioural Modelling process, it was recommended that children receive an optimum four Parked Cars training sessions, each of which would allow them an opportunity to observe, discuss, practise individually and finally observe again the parked cars strategy.

As with Safe Places training, although the majority of children in the testing cohort received the recommended amount of training, some did not. Table 5.7 shows the actual participant numbers receiving various amounts of training.

Table 5.7: Number of participants at each testing phase for Parked Cars				
Group	Pre-test	Post 1	Post 2	
5 sessions 4 sessions <= 3 sessions Controls	21 95 27 139	14 82 17 116	14 54 1 63	

Again, an ad hoc analysis was conducted on these results but did not show any significant differences between those with four sessions and those with three or fewer. The results of this pilot were further confounded by the disparity in participant numbers in each group and the fact that some children received five sessions, one more than the recommended maximum.

As the majority of the children tested were given at least the recommended four training sessions (81%), it is this group that best reflects the **overall** positive and significant impact of Parked Cars training discussed earlier in this section. Thus, despite no further statistical evidence, the recommendations concerning the minimum amount of Parked Cars training that children should receive remain as before at four sessions. As individual children differ in their uptake of new skills, it may be the case that some children will require slightly more or less training. Thus, in order to maximise the benefits for every child and ensure quality training in future Kerbcraft schemes, co-ordinators could make use of existing monitoring materials (available from the Kerbcraft manual (Thomson *et al.*, 2002)) to assess the improvement level for individual children (e.g. by testing skill level at session 3) and, from there, tailor the amount of subsequent training that each child receives.

5.1.6 Skill 3: Crossing safely at junctions

5.1.6.1 Training rationale

Junctions training focuses on teaching children how to safely negotiate crossing the road at or near a junction. This can involve anything from a simple 'T' junction to a more complex layout with more than three roads, a staggered junction or a junction with visual obstructions (parked vehicles, hedges, etc.). The training uses the same Behavioural Modelling approach as Skill 2 Parked Cars, where a series of behaviours is modelled by the trainer and then practised by the children (under supervision).

The key training messages focus on the 'looking strategy' which involves a 360° visual sweep of all roads meeting at the junction, starting with the road to the child's immediate right – this may be behind them. Children are then encouraged to recall and utilise the basic principles learned from earlier skills training which involve moving away from any visual obstructions to find a safer place to cross. In this way, Junctions training provides not only a strategy for dealing with a specific complex road layout but also the opportunity to reinforce key skills from earlier training sessions.

Children were trained in groups of two or three over four to six 30-minute sessions. During each session, the group would visit a number of junction locations, which increased in complexity over the course of training, starting with simple 'T' junctions, moving on to more hazardous junctions with obstructions (e.g. parked cars) and finishing with the most complex junctions where the road layout was more unusual (crossroads, staggered junctions).

An example of the steps children learn through Junction training is as follows:

- 1. From a start position near the junction, move to the kerb and stop.
- 2. Look down the road furthest to the **RIGHT** this may be behind you. If you have a clear view . . .
- 3. Look down the next road to your LEFT. If you have a clear view
- 4. Look down the next road to your **LEFT**. If you have a clear view, continue to look around in a full 360° sweep until every road at the junction has been covered. If your view down **ALL** the roads at the junction is clear . . .
- 5. Look around in a full 360° sweep **AGAIN**.
- 6. If you have a clear view and there is no traffic approaching, cross in a straight line, making sure that you look right and left and listen for traffic.
- 7. If at any point you do not have a clear view down any road at the junction, then it would not be safe to cross and an alternative crossing place must be found.

Training was again based around the Behavioural Modelling approach (Bandura, 1977). At each location, the trainer would initially 'model' the strategy for crossing safely, the children would practice the strategy together, each child would then lead the group through the strategy independently (with the trainer present and helping only where required), and the session would then end with the trainer reinforcing the 'correct way' to cross safely at the junction. Where there was an obstruction to a clear view down any of the roads meeting at the junction, the children were encouraged to find a safer crossing place in the same way as they would for Safe Places training.

5.1.6.2 Testing procedure

Tests were conducted for individual children at junctions close to the school which were selected by the evaluation project manager and scheme co-ordinator. During every test session, each child was asked to demonstrate the crossing procedure four times (from different positions) at the same junction, generating results from four test trials for each child at each test phase.

5.1.6.3 Testing materials and scoring

The tester recorded the child's behaviours relative to the list of key actions on a scoring sheet, which had been designed for the original Drumchapel pilot to reflect the key actions covered in Junctions training. As the child takes part in four trials per testing session, the raw scores are coded to show the proportion of correct

actions over all four trials at each of the pre- and post-test phases. An example of the testing materials for Junctions can be found in Appendix 1.

5.1.6.4 Participant numbers

Table 5.8 shows the number of tested children included in the main analysis. In total, 241 children took part in testing for Junctions. The table shows the number of the children for whom we had a full set of data at each testing phase for the purposes of analysis. The sample size at post-test 2 was deliberately reduced to account for the drop in number of tested children available two to four months after training was completed.

Table 5.8: Participant numbers for Junctions tests across all test phases					
Pre-test Post-test 1 Post-test 2					
Trained group Control group	121 120	116 114	74 65		

Table 5.9 shows the main trends observed in the trained and control groups at each test phase (pre-test, post-test 1 and post-test 2).

Table 5.9: Pre-test, post-test 1 and post-test 2 mean scores for key Junctionsbehaviours for trained and control groups (standard deviations shownin brackets)					
	Pre-test	Post-test 1	Post-test 2		
Trained group Q1 – Kerbside position Q2 – Stops at kerb Q3a – Looks down all streets Q3b – Total no. of streets missed Q4 – Looks in correct sequence Q5 – Repeats looking sequence Q9 – Safe route to destination	0.73 (0.37) 0.96 (0.11) 0.49 (0.41) 1.74 (1.99) 0.68 (0.42) 0.67 (0.43) 0.71 (0.39)	 0.89 (0.2) 0.99 (0.08) 0.8 (0.29) 0.91 (1.65) 0.87 (0.25) 0.81 (0.31) 0.94 (0.15) 	 0.87 (0.25) 0.97 (0.13) 0.6 (0.34) 1.9 (1.9) 0.79 (0.32) 0.74 (0.35) 0.66 (0.42) 		
Control group Q1 – Kerbside position Q2 – Stops at kerb Q3a – Looks down all streets Q3b – Total no. of streets missed Q4 – Looks in correct sequence Q5 – Repeats looking sequence Q9 – Safe route to destination	0.65 (0.41) 0.83 (0.32) 0.37 (0.37) 3.44 (0.36) 0.47 (0.42) 0.46 (0.44) 0.71 (0.37)	 0.73 (0.39) 0.94 (0.15) 0.43 (0.39) 2.67 (2.68) 0.62 (0.37) 0.53 (0.4) 0.84 (0.29) 	0.88 (0.27) 0.96 (0.13) 0.37 (0.37) 3.52 (2.47) 0.6 (0.39) 0.59 (0.41) 0.73 (0.39)		

5.1.6.5 Differences in baseline (pre-test) performance

Mean group scores for trained and control children (Table 5.11) show that the trained children have a significant advantage at pre-test over controls (independent *t*-tests on key questions 2, 3b, 4 and 5 confirm that this trend is significant). This is

most likely to be the result of informal learning on Junctions behaviours picked up during training on the previous two skills, and is similar to trends found in previous studies (Drumchapel).

5.1.6.6 Established behaviours

As in Parked Cars training, it can be seen that some Junctions behaviours were exhibited by both groups from the outset. The majority of trained and control children found a safe kerbside position, stopped at the kerb and were able to find a safe route to the destination (questions 1, 2 and 9). However, the post-test results for these actions indicate that performance on these behaviours was not at a ceiling level, as trained children were able to improve significantly on their baseline scores in comparison with the control group on two of these three behaviours (questions 1 and 9).

5.1.6.7 Improvement at post-test 1

Analysis of the pre-and post-test 1 scores using a repeated measures two-way ANOVA (test phase × experimental group) indicate that trained children also show a significant improvement at post-test 1 on all actions associated with the 'junctions looking strategy'. Analysis shows significant main effects of TEST and EXPERIMENTAL GROUP for question 3a (Test: F (1,221) = 41.426; p > 0.000; ExpGroup: F (1,221) = 49.709; p > 0.000), question 3b (Test: F (1,131) = 17.105; p > 0.000; ExpGroup F (1,131) = 28.351; p > 0.000), question 4 (Test: F(1,210) = 31.493; p > 0.000; ExpGroup: F (1,210) = 42.558; p > 0.000) and question 5 (Test: F (1,210) = 13.217; p > 0.000; ExpGroup: F(1,210) = 34.559; p > 0.000).

5.1.6.8 Improvement at post-test 2

There is some evidence that trained children are slipping back on some 'looking behaviours' by post-test 2 (two to four months after training). A series of paired samples *t*-tests on each of the key questions shows a significant decline in performance for questions 3a, 3b and 9. These questions relate to whether or not children look down all roads at each junction, give a measure of how many roads they miss, and provide an indication of whether their final route to the destination is 'safe'. While this could be construed as disappointing, the mean scores for each question shown in Table 5.9 clearly indicate that the trained group are still outperforming the controls at post-test 2. Indeed, the control group performance across all behaviours at post-test 2 is still consistently poorer than that of the trained group's overall performance prior to any training at all (at pre-test). T-tests confirm that any modest improvements made by the control group at post-test 2 are not statistically significant. The slight drop-off in trained children's performance two to four months after training could possibly be related to the fact that no one received the full compliment of six training sessions in Junctions. This may have been because co-ordinators ran out of time to complete training at the end of a

school term or because volunteers were more difficult to retain towards the end of the project.

5.1.6.9 Scoring for behaviours involving 'recognising and moving away from obstructions'

Junctions training provides an opportunity for children to revisit the key themes of earlier Kerbcraft training, particularly the fundamental premise of Safe Places training, which states that any roadside situation where children are unable to detect the presence of oncoming traffic is inherently dangerous and should be avoided.

Trainers encourage children to select crossing points at a junction where they can see clearly down all the streets from which traffic might approach. Where there are any obstructions to the child's view down any street (e.g. a parked car or hedge), children are reminded that they can choose to move away to a 'safer' location where they can see more clearly. During the testing process, this aspect of the training was captured by questions 6-8 on the checklist, which required the tester to record the following information:

- Question 6 Are there any obstructions to a clear view down any road?
- Question 7 If there are any obstructions, does the child suggest moving away?
- Question 8 If the child moves away, is the final location safe?

These scores were recoded to be expressed in the form of proportion scores in order to aid analysis. This allows for a more accurate and sensitive interpretation of the group means and a more appropriate resulting analysis. Key outcomes from this aspect of the Junctions results are shown in Table 5.10 and are discussed further below.

The key outcomes from the analysis of results from questions 6, 7 and 8 are as follows:

- Both trained and control groups show a similar pattern in the number of obstructions encountered across all testing sessions (question 6 results). This is a positive finding as it indicates that there are no relevant environmental differences in the testing locations for trained and control groups. A two-way ANOVA (test phase × experimental group) confirms that this is non-significant.
- 2. Means for question 7 show that even at pre-test, trained children are choosing to move away from obstructions almost twice as often as controls. An independent samples *t*-test between trained and control group scores at pre-test confirms that this difference is significant (t = 2.033 (df = 148.687) p = 0.022). At post-test 1, this trend becomes even more marked. Although control children make a modest improvement, the trained group are again moving away twice as often as

Table 5.10: Mean proportion scores for questions 6 to 8 for trained and controlchildren at each test phase (standard deviations are shown in
brackets)

Drackets)			
	Pre-test	Post 1	Post 2
Trained group			
Q6 – Are there any obstructions? (proportion of total trials)	0.39 (0.37)	0.38 (0.34)	0.25 (0.3)
Q7 – If obstructions, does the child suggest moving? (proportion of total trials with obstructions)	0.29 (0.42)	0.62 (0.61)	0.36 (0.46)
Q8 – If child moves, is new location safe? (proportion of total trials where child moved away)	0.9 (0.3)	0.9 (0.21)	0.9 (0.27)
Control group			
Q6 - Are there any obstructions? (proportion of total trials)	0.37 (0.39)	0.38 (0.34)	0.21 (0.3)
Q7– If obstructions, does the child suggest moving? (proportion of total trials with obstructions)	0.17 (0.34)	0.27 (0.59)	0.31 (0.43)
Q8 – If child moves, is new location safe? (proportion of total trial where child moved away)	0.94 (0.25)	1 (0)	0.65 (0.47)

their untrained counterparts, and the performance of the trained group is significantly better than that of the controls (t = 3.602 (df = 154) p > 0.000).

3. Post-test 2 means for the **control group** show no further improvement in the children's ability to avoid obstructions (question 7) and a drop off in the proportion of trials where they move away to a safe final location (question 8). By comparison, the **trained group** also appear to loose some of the gains they made at post-test 1 in moving away from the obstruction (question 7) but can still consistently choose a safe final crossing place (question 8).

5.1.6.10 Gender differences

Investigation of the Junctions testing mean scores across all behaviours for boys and girls indicate some evidence of a slightly better baseline performance from the boys. However, this does not appear to lead to any lasting advantage, as the girl's performance by post-test 1 is at least equivalent, if not better, than that of the boys. This post-training improvement is sustained to post-test 2. A three-way ANOVA (test phase \times trained/control \times gender) showed **no** significant main effect of gender for all key questions with only one exception (question 4). Follow-up *t*-tests show that the female participants perform significantly better on this behaviour **at post-test 2 only**. (t = 2.167 (df = 60.778); p = 0.034). From these means, and the

subsequent analyses, we should conclude that there is no evidence of a sustained pattern of gender effects on trained children's performance on the Junctions task. A table of mean score by gender for trained and control children across all test phases can be found in Appendix 1.

5.1.6.11 Effect of number of Junctions training sessions

Based on outcomes from the Drumchapel pilot, co-ordinators were recommended to ensure that trained children received a minimum of four Junctions sessions. As with the other skills, this was, at times, not achievable and 38% of tested children received three or fewer sessions. It also appears that there were **no** children within the skills testing sample who received the full compliment of six training sessions. The larger number of children not receiving minimum levels of training for this skill may have resulted from co-ordinators running out of time at the end of a school term, or less volunteers being available at the end of the training programme. Group numbers for those receiving various amounts of Junctions training are shown in Table 5.11.

Table 5.11: Number of participants at each testing phase for Junctions				
Group	Pre-test	Post 1	Post 2	
6 sessions 5 sessions 4 sessions <= 3 sessions Controls	0 20 45 39 139	0 19 45 33 116	0 14 45 12 65	

An opportunistic analysis was conducted on these results but again did not show any conclusive pattern of significant difference between groups.

Junctions training **overall** made a significant impact on trained children, despite the fact that more than a third of the testing sample did not receive the advised minimum amount of training. Unlike the other two skills, Junctions training, if structured properly, can provide the opportunity to revisit and reinforce previously learned skills. The more complex junction layouts often create problems where children may have to move away to find an alternative 'safe' crossing place, and which may involve crossing between parked cars further down the street. In addition to this, Junctions training itself builds children's skills by offering them the experience of solving problems at a number of different types of junction, and thus requires a minimum number of training sessions to adequately cover the different layouts available near each school. Based on these factors, the recommendation concerning the optimum amount of Junctions training that children should receive remains as before at four to six sessions.

Again, as individual children differ in their uptake of new skills, it may be the case that some children will require slightly more or less training. Thus, in order to maximise the benefits for every child and to ensure quality training in future Kerbcraft schemes, co-ordinators could make use of existing monitoring materials (available from the Kerbcraft manual (Thomson *et al.*, 2002)) to assess the improvement level for individual children (e.g. by testing skill level at session 4) and, from there, tailor the amount of subsequent training that each child receives.

A summary of the main findings of the skills assessment in relation to the project objectives can be found in Section 6.1.

5.2 Volunteer surveys

5.2.1 Rationale

The volunteer trainers involved in the Kerbcraft national pilot tended primarily to be parents or grandparents of children who received training, but were also often drawn from school staff (lunchtime supervisors, classroom assistants, and school crossing patrollers) and other local voluntary/community organisations. The ongoing recruitment and maintenance of a pool of well-trained volunteers was crucial to the success of every scheme, as without them no training could be delivered to the children.

The volunteer survey strand of the evaluation process focuses on the involvement of volunteer trainers in terms of:

- their overall participation;
- their perceptions of the scheme and its management in their area;
- their experiences of training and working with the children;
- the rewards which motivated them; and
- the personal impact of their involvement in the scheme.

The objectives for the volunteer surveys are as follows:

- To gather qualitative data from volunteers which will feed into both the ongoing management and implementation of Kerbcraft schemes within the National Network.
- To identify and explore the rewards and motivators which encourage participation and the barriers and enhancers for participation.
- To explore potential outcomes for the personal development of volunteers.
- To identify and explore any links between volunteer participation and social capital indices in areas of social and economic deprivation.

- To track the progress of key Kerbcraft training messages from co-ordinators through to the volunteers who implement training directly with the children.
- To use the information to provide guidelines for future volunteer recruitment and sustainability of volunteer participation in the programme.
- To develop best practice guidelines in the management of volunteer recruitment, training and support.

5.2.2 Method

The survey methodology involved distributing two questionnaires to a sample of volunteers from Tranche 2 of the National Network. Questionnaire 1 (Q1) asked for general information from volunteers and was sent out to volunteers from all schemes within Tranche 2. A two-part follow-up questionnaire (Q2a and 2b) was then distributed to respondents from Q1 approximately 12 months later. The two-part design of Q2 allowed for a separate survey of the experiences of continuing 'active' volunteers (Q2a) and those who had 'dropped out' of the project (Q2b) by that point. For further details of questionnaire design and sampling, please refer to Appendix 2.

5.2.3 Results from Questionnaire 1: general survey

Table 5.12: Response rates for the first volunteer survey					
	Number sent out	Total number of responses	Response rate (%)		
Overall total England Scotland	495 411 84	228 188 40	46 46 48		

A total of 495 (Q1) questionnaires were sent out to volunteers in England and Scotland. Table 5.12 shows the response rates.

Note, these response rates may differ for individual questions as not everyone answered every question.

5.2.3.1 Reasons for participating in the Kerbcraft programme

Over 60% of volunteers are parents of children in the school and a third of all volunteers already work in the school. This pattern is consistent with the anecdotal evidence coming from co-ordinators and with our experience in previous similar studies with volunteer trainers.

In terms of general motivation, the clear prime motivator appears to be in the value of the project to the children involved: this is not a personally motivated activity for most volunteers, or even one strongly linked to a local road safety problem. While 45% of respondents indicated that they would like to help in school, the fact that

38% of them already do suggests that our volunteers are already engaged in the school community and comfortable with that environment.

5.2.3.2 Recruitment methods

The large majority of volunteers were recruited through a letter home from their child/school. This is generally the first strategy that co-ordinators use to generate interest in the project, along with more focused information sessions in the school (23.6% reported co-ordinators spoke to them directly at school) and asking the head teacher to make suggestions and/or approach parents already helping at school (18.6%). This is consistent with the advice given to co-ordinators at their initial training course on recruiting volunteers and generating interest in the project at a whole-school level.

5.2.3.3 Volunteer training

The majority of volunteers (77%) received some formal training, as suggested in the Kerbcraft manual (Thomson *et al.*, 2002) and at co-ordinator training courses. Of those who did not receive training (n = 48), almost all had some practice time at the roadside, with only 6% receiving no input at all, prior to working with the children. Volunteers were asked how the training had helped to prepare them for working with the children. They were able to select a number of responses, the most popular of which were that they:

- had been able to practise at the roadside (65%);
- were able to better appreciate the traffic environment from a child's perspective (75%);
- could compare the information from their training manual to a real road environment (53%); and
- were better able to relate to the interactive problem-solving approach of safe places (54%).

5.2.3.4 Kerbcraft essentials

The key training messages, passed down from the initial co-ordinator training, are coming through strongly for each Kerbcraft skill. This is vitally important to ensure the quality of training that children then receive at the roadside. While the results are very positive in this respect, there were a number of aspects of training which volunteers did not consider to be 'essential' but only 'important'. These include:

- the trainer encouraging children to solve problems themselves;
- training taking place at the roadside;

- trainers using prompts and clues; and
- the order in which skills are delivered.

These elements of the training are 'essential' to its success and a stronger emphasis should be places on these with volunteers in the future.

5.2.3.5 Police checks

The vast majority of volunteers (92%) did not report any problems with the Criminal Record Bureau procedure. Anecdotal evidence from co-ordinators suggests that the number of volunteers requiring assistance in completing the forms may be higher than expressed by volunteers (44%), and that there may be a 'social desirability effect', where volunteers are reluctant to report that they required assistance with this aspect of the administration process. It is also worth noting the number of volunteers not responding to this question (17% – 37 out of 220 total respondents for this question).

5.2.3.6 Future intentions

Eight-eight per cent of volunteers said they intended to continue with Kerbcraft training up until they had completed all three skills. The main reasons for wanting to continue were:

- the importance of training for the children;
- that volunteers really enjoy working with the children; and
- that they want to make a difference at their child's school.

5.2.3.7 Demographic information

Of the 228 volunteers who responded:

- 93% are female;
- 52% are aged between 30 and 39;
- 93% have children (this may include older children);
- 11% are grandparents;
- 16% had no formal qualifications (others spread fairly evenly);
- 11% are working full-time;
- 41% are working part-time;
- 28% are at home;
- 83% are White British, with the next largest group being 7% Pakistani;

- 87% have English as a first language;
- 59% have a driving licence;
- 64% have regular access to a car;
- 66% own their houses; and
- 20% are council tenants.

5.2.3.8 Social capital results

Definitions of social capital are broad and often conflicting. The predominant research definition comes from work by Robert Putnam, initiated in the 1970s in Italy and mainly associated with the effects of social cohesion and community participation on economic development and the community politics of alleviating poverty. Subsequent research has focused mainly on economic and social regeneration of deprived inner-city communities in the USA (Putnam, 2000). However, social capital measures are increasingly being used to explore the links between social cohesion, poverty and health inequalities. Recently, studies in the UK, USA and Australia have explored the impact of non-profit-organisations, community engagement and volunteering in areas of poverty and deprivation on both individuals and community institutions, such as schools and church groups. The results of this research show broadly that interventions which increase social capital in poor neighbourhoods can result in positive outcomes for individuals, as well as the wider community. Individuals who engage in community 'action' have greater education and/or employment opportunities outside their community, enabling them to:

- reinvest skills and knowledge back into their neighbourhood;
- become 'active' participants in policy making for their community, rather than being passive recipients; and
- report anecdotal evidence of an increase in their quality of life.

Similarly, the wider community can benefit, not only from increased economic viability and political power but also from increased social cohesion and efficacy in the management of community affairs (Hampshire and Healy, 2000; Saegert *et al.*, 2001). Full results from the social capital section of the general volunteer survey can be found in Appendix 2. The key outcomes are discussed below.

The majority of respondents have lived in the same area for more than 10 years (60%), with two-thirds of all the volunteers having lived in the same house for more than five years (66%). This creates a picture of people who are very much established within their communities. This is further reinforced by the number of volunteers with close relatives and friends living nearby. Thirty-four per cent of volunteers have five or more relatives living within a 15 to 20 minute walk from

them, and 33% have five or more close friends living within the same short distance of them.

The majority of respondents feel that the facilities in their area are 'average' or 'poor'. With regard to leisure facilities, a third felt they were 'average' (31%), 25% felt they were 'poor' and 13% felt they were 'very poor'. The reaction was more marked for children's facilities, with 29% of respondents rating them as 'average', 34% as 'poor' and 19% as 'very poor'. This may be reflecting the fact that 60% of our volunteers are parents and are therefore more sensitive to the provision of child-orientated facilities in their area.

Over half (55%) of the respondents used a car as their main form of transport, despite the fact that just under half of the respondents did not drive. The next most frequent mode of transport was walking (28%), with use of public transport making up the majority of the remaining responses (14%).

Almost all of the respondents reported that they felt 'very safe' (25%) or 'safe' (67%) walking through their neighbourhood during the day time. However, very few reported feeling 'very safe' at night (3%) and while approximately a third (35%) felt 'safe' walking about at night, nearly half of the respondents felt either 'a bit' or 'very unsafe'. While respondents clearly felt less confident walking in their neighbourhoods at night, the results of these two questions would appear to indicate that volunteers are generally comfortable in their home communities and do not seem to feel **unduly** threatened or vulnerable.

Comparatively, volunteers report finding a safe play area for their children to be the biggest problem they face in each of their communities (33% very big problem), followed by a concern over the speed/volume of traffic in the area (45% fairly big problem). This suggests that, as parents, our volunteers are very focused on the aspects of their community which directly affect their children. Interestingly, however, when asked to rate their perception of the child pedestrian accident rate in their area, over a third (37%) of respondents did not know how to describe the local rate, and over 25% felt that it was 'normal', with few volunteers rating it as 'high' (15%) or 'very high' (5%) in their area. This would suggest that volunteers were not initially motivated to participate in the Kerbcraft project as a result of any heightened perception of a local risk to children from pedestrian traffic injuries.

The final questions in this section of the survey focused on community participation and were designed to capture a measure of how much involvement volunteers had in other aspects of their communities, and whether they felt able to influence actions that affected the community. Volunteers were asked to rate their agreement with the following statement:

'By working together, people in my neighbourhood can influence decisions that affect the community.'

Our volunteers were very positive in their response to this statement, with 36% 'agreeing strongly' with it, and a further 39% 'agreeing' with it. This is all the more interesting when their responses to the final questions are considered. Volunteers were asked whether they had been involved in local organisations over the last three years – only 25% of volunteers responded 'yes'. Finally, volunteers were asked whether they had held any positions of responsibility in local organisations in the last three years. This question had a 'not applicable' option, which was included for those who had responded 'no' to question 16. However, there seems to have been some confusion over responses to this final question, as only 7% gave the 'n/a' response, with 58% saying 'no' and 24% saying 'yes'. Anecdotal evidence from school staff, co-ordinators and case study interviews suggests that Kerbcraft volunteers are in actual fact very active in various aspects of their school and community life (e.g. informally helping at their child's school, supporting the local church, etc.), but do not perhaps perceive their contributions to be sufficient to merit a formal recognition.

5.2.4 Results from Questionnaire 2: follow-up surveys

5.2.4.1 Response rates for Questionnaire 2

A total of 208 two-part questionnaires were sent out to volunteers in England and Scotland who had given permission for us to contact them again after the initial general survey. Volunteers were requested to complete either part of the questionnaire, dependent on whether they were still an active Kerbcraft volunteer trainer or they had dropped out of the project over the previous 12 months. Table 5.13 shows the response rates and the total number of questionnaires returned from the second survey round (both active and dropped out volunteers).

Table 5.13: Response rates for second volunteer survey				
	Number sent out	Total number of responses	Response rate (%)	
Overall total England Scotland	208 171 37	87 68 19	42 40 51	

Table 5.14 shows the division of responses for Q2 for active and drop-out volunteers overall and separately for English and Scottish volunteers.

Table 5.14: A comparison of active and drop-out volunteers					
	Total Q2 responses received	Responses from active volunteers (Q2a)	Responses from drop-out volunteers (Q2b)		
Overall total England Scotland	87 68 19	34 22 12	53 46 7		

5.2.4.2 Key results from active volunteers – Q2a

Volunteers showed a good overall understanding of the important aspects of general road safety education. When asked to identify important aspects of each individual Kerbcraft skill, they tended to focus on more general issues. This would suggest that a slightly stronger emphasis on the essential elements of each skill should be incorporated into volunteer training in the future. On a positive note, volunteers appeared to be very clear on the important aspects of Junctions training in particular, which is encouraging as this is often perceived to be the most complicated of the three skills. Almost all volunteers (82%) indicated that they had weekly after-training meetings and that these were very important to allow them to discuss training issues and get guidance and support from the co-ordinator and each other.

Volunteers reported no particular difficulties in working with the children at the roadside. The challenges identified related more to working with children in general, and involved managing groups and maintaining attention. However, volunteers did not find working with a group of three children at the roadside to be a particular challenge. This is encouraging as much of the training is designed around this adult/ child ratio.

Volunteers reported no major pattern of emergency incidents at the roadside. Although, they seemed to feel that more information and guidance from coordinators on emergency procedures would be useful. One-hundred per cent of volunteers who responded (n = 34) reported that their co-ordinator was 'very supportive'. Almost all volunteers (82%) felt that the head teacher was 'very supportive' of their scheme, and that the majority (70%) felt that the class teacher was very supportive. The slightly lower numbers here for class teachers may reflect the fact that it is their teaching time and lesson plans which are most disrupted by Kerbcraft training. This highlights the need for co-ordinators to build strong relationships with teaching staff to facilitate the delivery of Kerbcraft within schools.

Over a third of respondents were aware that there were volunteers in their scheme who did not have children or grandchildren at the school. This gives an indication of the success of some alternative recruitment strategies involving adults from the wider community. Motivators cited for remaining with the scheme over 12 months centred around volunteers' enjoyment of working with the children, realising how important the skills were and a desire to make a difference at their child's school. Similarly, the perceived benefits of participation in Kerbcraft were focused on feeling valued by the school and the co-ordinator, on meeting new people, and on improving their personal relationship with the school and its staff. The top three recommendations for new volunteers were:

- seeing the children learn something new every week;
- the positive benefits for one's own children; and
- the overall benefit to the wider community.

The more personal benefit options listed were seen to be much less important.

5.2.4.3 Key results from drop-out volunteers – Q2b

Almost all (over 90%) of the respondents had trained children in all three of the Kerbcraft skills and 75% of volunteers had received some form of training from their scheme co-ordinator prior to working with the children. The majority of volunteers who responded (81%) stated that they enjoyed Kerbcraft 'a lot' and no one felt that they had 'not enjoyed' their experience of Kerbcraft.

Volunteers would appear to be leaving their schemes mostly because of changes in their own personal circumstances which resulted in them no longer having time to participate in Kerbcraft (36%). Of the 16 volunteers who stated 'other' reasons, the majority (n = 5) told us that they had not been contacted again after a holiday or a period of no training. This may have been because there was not sufficient support from the school to continue training, or because the co-ordinator was unable to continue training at that time. No one cited a negative aspect of the scheme itself as their reason for leaving.

The majority of volunteers (72%) felt that they had ample support from their coordinators and that they benefited personally from participating in the scheme. The most popular benefits selected were similar to those cited by the active volunteers:

- they felt valued;
- they enjoyed being rewarded; and
- they met new people and made new friends.

5.3 Case studies

5.3.1 Rationale

A series of case studies was undertaken to meet the following objectives:

- Gather information on the impact of Kerbcraft participation on schools, volunteers and communities.
- Explore the delivery of Kerbcraft in challenging environments, based around key themes in road safety.

• Add to the development of best practice guidelines for delivering and managing Kerbcraft schemes in the future.

5.3.2 Method

Ten case studies were undertaken, covering the following themes:

- extreme deprivation (one school);
- community ethnic diversity (two schools);
- rural environment (one school);
- 'model' Kerbcraft schools (two schools);
- Impact of Skills Assessment process (one school);
- longitudinal study (two schools); and
- Scottish case study (one school).

Ten schools were selected randomly from Tranche 2 and 3 to fit with the seven study themes. The evaluation team worked closely with scheme co-ordinators to arrange suitable interview dates with school head teachers, volunteers and other stakeholders (e.g. school staff and road safety officers). Site visits took place in all the case study schools. Structured interviews were conducted with head teachers, class teachers, other school staff, volunteers, children and parents (where available) to gather general information on Kerbcraft delivery in that school and to gather specific information on the associated study theme. Interviews were tape-recorded (occasionally notes were taken instead) and later transcribed to access key outcomes. For further details of the interview schedule and outcome summaries of the case studies, please refer to Appendix 3.

5.3.3 Results

A brief background and a summary of key outcomes are presented for each theme below.

5.3.3.1 Theme 1: Kerbcraft in a rural school

There is little in the way of research on children as vulnerable road users in rural areas. Recent reviews of the literature show that there are fewer road accidents reported involving children in rural areas than in urban areas. This is combined with heavier car use generally in rural areas, leading to lower exposure for children to the road environment. Finally, the physical layout of the road environment in rural areas often presents problems for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians as high hedges and sharp bends reduce sightlines (Christie *et al.*, 2002) (Figure 5.2).

The key outcomes were as follows:

- A small, close-knit community aids volunteer recruitment.
- There were problems with a lack of variety in the locations available for training, but the scheme worked well with what was available.
- There were major problems outside the school at children's drop-off and collection times, creating congestion on the narrow country road many near-misses were reported at these times (this did not happen during Kerbcraft sessions).
- There were local problems with drivers not adhering to speed limits through villages and hamlets.
- The scheme co-ordinator has adapted training to include specific skills required in rural road environments: walking in single-file to face oncoming traffic; dealing with a lack of pavements and with grass verges; stronger focus on 'listening' skills as this is easier than in urban areas.



5.3.3.2 Theme 2: Impact of community ethnic diversity on Kerbcraft delivery

Children from Black and minority ethnic (BME) backgrounds tend to be overrepresented in UK child pedestrian accident rates. Research indicates that a key factor may be the increased vulnerability of children from new/isolated BME groups, such as refugees, asylum-seekers and traveller communities (Thomson *et al.*, 2001). Two schools were selected for inclusion in this part of the study, each representing a different aspect of community ethnic diversity:

- school 1 had a high percentage of children from an established Asian community; and
- school 2 had children from many different community groups, including traveller families, refugees and asylum-seekers.

The key outcomes were as follows:

- Both schools had a very strong emphasis on inclusion and positively embraced all aspects of diversity. This pre-existing culture facilitated Kerbcraft delivery to children in BME groups within both schools.
- In school 1, the co-ordinator and class teacher worked together to encourage volunteers from the local Pakistani community to participate. The co-ordinator was familiar with local community issues and speaks fluent Urdu and Punjabi.
- In school 2, parents of children from traveller communities were encouraged into the school to shadow all new school activities to reduce any anxiety or suspicion. This existing process made the Kerbcraft scheme more accessible to children from traveller families within the school. The school also had teaching staff trained specifically to work with, and provide social and emotional support for, vulnerable new children with no English. This facility again made the inclusion of children with little or no English into the Kerbcraft programme an easier process, as children's language development was supported so well in school.

5.3.3.3 Theme 3: Kerbcraft delivery in a Scottish 'model' school

One Scottish case study was undertaken to provide information on successful Kerbcraft scheme delivery in Scotland. 'Model' schools were defined as those who won or were nominated for the MVA School of the Year Award. Nominations were submitted from scheme co-ordinators detailing the outstanding nature of the school's contribution to and support of Kerbcraft training.

The key outcomes were as follows:

- Kerbcraft made an immediate impact on the head teacher as it was perceived to be a 'quality' project and was then wholly integrated into the school curriculum.
- The co-ordinator made use of links with the local community centre to overcome initial volunteer recruitment problems.
- The co-ordinator and volunteers were highly valued, trusted and respected within the school and the local community.

Figure 5.3: Children undertaking Kerbcraft training



- The school was part of a wider health education programme involving local primary and secondary schools.
- The head teacher felt Kerbcraft had a positive impact on children's self-esteem and understanding of citizenship this is concurrent with Scottish education strategies.
- The training was undertaken by the same volunteers over the three years of the project, and these volunteers are now valued by the school and co-ordinator as highly skilled, professional trainers.
- Kerbcraft has a high profile within the school community thanks to the highvisibility clothing worn by volunteers and children (Figure 5.3), and as a result of the school's links with the local community centre and other local schools.

5.3.3.4 Theme 4: Longitudinal study of changes and challenges in two neighbouring schemes over 12 months

This longitudinal study focused on gathering in-depth information from all parties involved in Kerbcraft at each of two schools in the course of several visits over a 12-month period. The study followed one established scheme (Tranche 2 in their second year) and one 'new start' scheme (Tranche 3 in their first year) to ascertain which of the challenges faced may be resolved over time, and which may be more particular to the implementation of the scheme itself. Schools were selected from neighbouring schemes with similarly deprived urban community demographics.

The key outcomes were as follows:

• Both schools struggled initially to recruit volunteers and both ended up with parents who were already involved in other school activities.

- The Tranche 2 school had already been awarded the National Healthy School Standard, and the Tranche 3 school was working towards it when the study started (October 2004).
- Both schools are church schools and encourage parents to attend regular faith services and assemblies with the children throughout the year. These are often used to celebrate achievements, including presenting children and volunteers with Kerbcraft certificates and awards.
- The Tranche 2 school established a very committed pool of volunteers who remained with the project throughout its lifetime. One of the volunteers became an administrative assistant in the school, but always made sure she had time for Kerbcraft training.
- The Tranche 3 school struggled to maintain a group of regular volunteers and training ceased at the school during the 12 months of the study owing to a lack of volunteers.
- The 'Every Child Matters' Agenda (Children's Act 2004) was launched during the case study period and the head teacher from the Tranche 2 school felt that this had made a considerable difference to the delivery of programmes such as Kerbcraft, by allowing schools to accommodate this kind of essential life skills training within the curriculum.
- The head teacher at the Tranche 3 school felt that the project had got off to a poor start as key members of the school staff were on sick leave and she was unable to give Kerbcraft much of her own attention. At the initial interview, she predicted that the school might struggle to retain volunteers over the three years of the programme

5.3.3.5 Theme 5: Kerbcraft delivery in 'model' schools

The aim of this part of the study was to provide qualitative data on the implementation and progress of Kerbcraft training in two schools which had been recognised as 'model' examples of Kerbcraft in practice (based on the MVA School of the Year awards). Our objectives were to explore the factors which have made Kerbcraft so successful in these schools, and to identify any challenges faced in the process of implementing and delivering Kerbcraft training.

The key outcomes were as follows:

- Both schools had close links with community organisations (church groups, volunteer agencies) and used these links to facilitate health education activities within the school.
- Both schools had initial problems recruiting volunteers. The co-ordinators tried various strategies, including parents' evenings and playground visits at home-

time. The more successful strategy was to recruit parents through the school, either by sending a letter home or by direct request from the head teacher.

- Both schools had a dedicated member of staff who was the key Kerbcraft contact. This clearly facilitated the delivery of training in both schools and the ease with which any problems were resolved. Both co-ordinators had worked very closely with these teachers and this had aided the smooth-running of both projects (Figure 5.4).
- Both schools actively celebrated Kerbcraft achievements for both children and volunteers by supporting and hosting volunteer 'parties' and by publicising children's achievements at school assemblies (along with volunteers and parents).
- Both schools had a very strong staff 'team', who clearly worked well together and were kept well informed of activities by the head teacher.
- Both co-ordinators noted that their schools were very 'open' and were willing to try new activities and pilot new initiatives. This atmosphere made a big difference to the delivery of Kerbcraft within both schools, as co-ordinators reported feeling that the school was a supportive and flexible environment to work in, where 'nothing is too much trouble'.



5.3.3.6 Theme 6: Kerbcraft delivery in areas of extreme deprivation

Research shows that there is a clear association between high levels of socioeconomic deprivation and child pedestrian accident rates, with children from the most deprived areas of the UK being most vulnerable to death or injury as pedestrians. Our aim was to collect qualitative data on the implementation and progress of Kerbcraft training within such schools. One school running a viable Kerbcraft scheme was randomly selected from the 5% most deprived schools in Tranche 3 of the pilot sample (n = 19 in total).

The key outcomes were as follows:

- The recruitment of volunteers was the main challenge for this school and in another school nearby that was also participating in the Kerbcraft scheme.
- Other local schools echoed the problem of encouraging parent participation. A neighbouring Kerbcraft school had to rely on 'community street wardens' as the co-ordinator was unable to recruit anyone from within the school community. This proved most successful when wardens were already involved in other school activities.
- However, there was a small group of parents at the case study school who remained committed to the Kerbcraft project throughout its lifetime. They all enjoyed the training and reported an increase in their own confidence and self-esteem as a result of taking part. One volunteer started a new job and another reported a big improvement in her language skills having recently arrived in Britain with English as a second language.
- Kerbcraft training was sometimes cancelled during bouts of bad weather, as children were not adequately dressed no warm coats or good footwear. The coordinator has provided 'Kerbcraft hats' for children in these circumstances to attempt to alleviate this issue.

5.3.3.7 Theme 7: Impact of skills assessment in schools

As part of the evaluation study, skills assessments were conducted in schools in 14 local authorities across England. The assessments involved a programme of visits to a randomly selected Kerbcraft school and a matched control school (where no Kerbcraft training took place). Approximately 15 children were tested at each school on three occasions over a school year.

The aims of this case study were to:

- assess the impact of the skills assessment process on the school, children and coordinator;
- identify any barriers and facilitators to the assessment process in that school;
- explore the general impact of Kerbcraft training on the school, volunteers and community; and
- add to the development of best practice guidelines on delivery of Kerbcraft in schools, as gathered from all the case studies.

The key outcomes were as follows:

- The class teacher was very impressed with the scheme and reported no problems with disruption. She felt that it was useful to have some children out of the classroom for periods of time as it allowed her to listen to individual children's reading and concentrate on 'quiet' tasks with smaller groups of children.
- The class teacher felt that Kerbcraft training had directly improved some children's self-confidence as they were becoming more accustomed to working with new people and to being outside a classroom environment.
- The interviewed volunteer reported that the training made a positive impact on her whole family: she enjoyed it; it has shown her children that their parents can become more involved in the school and it has filtered down to her younger child. She is now helping with other school activities on a regular basis.
- The co-ordinator reported a very positive impact from the skills assessment team. Although he was present for all the testing sessions, the co-ordinator did not report this as problematic in any way. He contacted the director of the company responsible to commend the team's performance.
- The class teacher reported no additional disruption or negative impact as a result of the skills assessment programme. She noted that the co-ordinator was always present on testing days and took charge of the organisation of removing and returning groups of children from the classroom.
- The class teacher also noted that the children reacted positively to the testing situation and that they were obviously being praised and treated well by the testers as they did not feel under pressure or uncomfortable in any way.
- The children themselves reported that they enjoyed the testing experience and that the tests were easy(!). They also noted (after some prompting) that it sometimes helped them to recall some aspects of the training that they had forgotten.

While the school described here had a very positive experience of the skills assessment process, not all the schools involved found it an easy process. Anecdotal evidence from some co-ordinators suggests that the testing could be disruptive to some schools involved and that there were problems with the organisation and administration of the school visits by testers. As with any measurement of behaviour in a real world context, there is also the possibility that the testing process itself had an influence on the children's behaviour. This could have been a positive impact, in that the tests reinforced skills learned during training, or it could have resulted in a loss of attention by the children as they became bored of the repeated process of testing and training.

5.4 Surveys of co-ordinators

5.4.1 Rationale

The surveys of co-ordinators and road safety officers were designed to gather information from the local authority point of view. They set out to examine issues regarding the management of the project and to determine the resources and effort required to establish and maintain the schemes. The two sets of surveys were carried out simultaneously, to gather information at certain points in the delivery of the schemes. The questions to the road safety officers and co-ordinators were linked to look at certain issues from the two different perspectives. Here we examine the results of the co-ordinator surveys.

5.4.2 Methods

The method of data collection for the co-ordinator surveys changed after the first tranche. The first survey for the Tranche 1 road safety officers and co-ordinators was carried out by structured telephone interviews. Surveys of Tranche 2 and 3 co-ordinators and road safety officers were carried out by means of self-completion questionnaires.

The interview schedule for Tranche 1 co-ordinators was developed using co-ordinator comments from the summer 2002 seminar, discussions with co-ordinators and consultation with the project team and Department for Transport. The questionnaires were piloted in face-to-face meetings with two co-ordinators and modifications were made. The conversion of the Tranche 1 telephone survey to the self-completion format used in Tranches 2 and 3 involved further piloting. The interview survey and self-completion questionnaires included questions on the co-ordinators' background details, the appointment process, Kerbcraft training courses, post-training support, recruitment and training of volunteers, and an open-ended section for general comments.

The telephone interview surveys were conducted with Tranche 1 co-ordinators in December 2002 and January 2003. Thirty-eight out of the forty co-ordinators were interviewed, a response rate of 95%. Interviews lasted from 35 minutes to over an hour in one case. The questionnaires were sent to 44 Tranche 2 co-ordinators in October 2003 and 41 responded (93% response rate). In December 2004, 31 questionnaires were sent to Tranche 3 co-ordinators, with 29 returned (94% response rate). The overall response rate was 95%. For further details of results, please refer to Appendix 4.

5.4.3 Results

The following results relate to the 38 Tranche 1, 41 Tranche 2 and 29 Tranche 3 co-ordinators who responded.

5.4.4 Co-ordinators' background details

5.4.4.1 Gender, age and ethnic origin

The co-ordinators in all three tranches were predominately female. The average age of co-ordinators was 37, ranging from 21 to 61 years. The ethnic origin of co-ordinators in all tranches was predominately 'White British', though this proportion declined slightly over the tranches: from 87% of Tranche 1 to 76% of Tranche 3 respondents. The great majority of respondents felt that their ethnic background had neither helped nor hindered their work.

5.4.4.2 Children

Many co-ordinators had children of their own. Co-ordinators from Tranche 1 had the highest number of primary school-aged children, while those in Tranche 3 had the highest percentage of adult children.

5.4.4.3 Education

Co-ordinators were asked about their highest level of educational achievement. The percentage of respondents educated to degree or diploma level increased from Tranche 1 to Tranche 3, with the majority of respondents in Tranche 3 educated to degree or diploma level.

5.4.4.4 Recent employment and experience of working with children and volunteers

The majority of respondents in all tranches reported that their most recent employment was 'education or other work with children'. The percentage reporting this rose from 50% in Tranche 1 to 59% in Tranche 3. Ninety per cent of respondents in Tranche 2 and 89% in Tranche 3 reported that they had previous experience working with children. Eighty-one per cent of Tranche 3 and 70% of Tranche 1 co-ordinators reported experience of working with volunteers.

5.4.4.5 Experience of road safety and of local area and schools

The majority of respondents in all three tranches lived in the area or knew the area where the scheme operated. Respondents were, however, less likely to know the schools than the area itself. Co-ordinators were very likely to report an interest in, or knowledge of, road safety or child safety issues, particularly those in Tranche 3.

5.4.5 Appointment process

5.4.5.1 Information provided

In relation to information on the co-ordinator job specification provided prior to interview, respondents in Tranche 1 were slightly less likely to have received this than those in the other two tranches. Co-ordinators were asked about the information provided to them after appointment but prior to training. A high proportion of Tranche 1 respondents received a basic job description after the interview.

5.4.5.2 Understanding of the Drumchapel scheme

Co-ordinators were asked if they had an understanding of the Drumchapel scheme before they underwent training. A large majority of Tranche 1 respondents reported a definite understanding of the scheme, but those in Tranches 2 and 3 were less familiar with it.

5.4.5.3 Motivation for applying for the post, personal qualities and experience

Co-ordinators were asked why they applied for the post. A similar distribution of motives was found in all three tranches, with 'working with children' the most popular response. Co-ordinators were asked an open question about the qualities and experience they brought to the post. Responses relating to their experience included:

- experience with volunteers;
- with children and schools;
- working in deprived areas;
- working in childcare;
- working in road safety; and
- working in education and nursing.

The responses relating to their personal qualities included:

- interpersonal and communication skills;
- organisational and management skills; and
- enthusiasm and initiative.

5.4.5.4 Level of pay and provision of facilities

The majority of respondents in Tranches 1 and 2 reported that the salary was about right for the responsibilities of the job, but less satisfaction was reported from Tranche 3 co-ordinators. This may reflect the higher levels of educational attainment in respondents from Tranche 3. Co-ordinators from both Tranches 2 and 3

commented that the co-ordinator salary was not commensurate with the level of responsibility and complained of inconsistencies in salary between local authorities.

Co-ordinators were asked whether or not they had been provided with office facilities after appointment. Thirty-eight per cent of Tranche 1 and 27% of Tranche 2 and 3 co-ordinators said that they had been provided with office space. However, information from the MVA management team shows that in one Tranche 1 local authority, the lack of office facilities resulted in two co-ordinators leaving and led to the failure of the scheme overall. Thirty per cent of Tranche 1, 27% of Tranche 2 and 26% of Tranche 3 co-ordinators had been provided with a computer, but very few had access to the internet (none in Tranche 1 and 16% in Tranches 2 and 3). Within the option to report 'other facilities', some co-ordinators stated that they were also provided with high-visibility clothing and parking permits.

5.4.6 Co-ordinator training

5.4.6.1 Courses

Eighty per cent of Tranche 2 and 79% of Tranche 3 co-ordinators reported they had attended the Kerbcraft co-ordinator residential training course. Most believed that there were advantages to the courses being residential. The opportunities to network with other co-ordinators, make contacts and share ideas were all considered important. Co-ordinators were asked an open question about what they had hoped to gain from the training course. The responses included:

- 'learning about Kerbcraft best practice';
- 'learning about risk assessment';
- 'the concepts behind Kerbcraft';
- 'practical advice on implementing the scheme'; and
- 'practical advice on recruiting volunteers'.

Most respondents reported that they had got all they wanted from the course and this increased with successive tranches. Co-ordinators were asked to offer suggestions on how the course could be improved. Those received related to a desire for more practical training, in particular about conducting risk assessments and completing Criminal Record Bureau (CRB) forms. Satisfaction with the training increased over successive tranches.

5.4.6.2 Rating the training course

Co-ordinators were asked how they rated the organisation of the training course on a five-point scale from 'very good' to 'very bad'. Forty per cent of Tranche 1 respondents were unhappy with the organisation of the non-residential courses, rating it as 'bad' or 'very bad'. In subsequent years, the training was offered on a

residential basis and satisfaction among respondents in Tranches 2 and 3 was much higher, particularly so for those in Tranche 3 (72% rated the course as 'very good' or 'good'). Most co-ordinators said that they had received copies of the materials: the Kerbcraft manual (Thomson *et al.*, 2002), the course training manual (unpublished) or other information. Co-ordinators found these increasingly helpful as the project progressed, and satisfaction with the training materials increased in successive Tranches. Suggestions for improving the co-ordinator training courses included more input on risk assessment, more detail on filling in CRB forms and better video presentations.

5.4.6.3 Understanding the principles underlying the Kerbcraft programme

The National Network used a cascade training process to disseminate Kerbcraft training: MVA trained the co-ordinators, the co-ordinators then recruited and trained volunteers in each of their participating schools and those volunteers delivered Kerbcraft training to children in practical sessions at the roadside. The quality of the training delivered to the co-ordinators was thus fundamental to the success of the overall project, and it was important to establish co-ordinators' understanding of the concepts and ethos of Kerbcraft. Tranche 2 and 3 co-ordinators were asked which specific features of the Kerbcraft programme they considered the most important. Practical training at the roadside and the interaction with the children were cited as the top priorities. The use of community volunteers and community involvement were also considered important.

5.4.7 Post-training support for co-ordinators

5.4.7.1 MVA, road safety officer and co-ordinator support

The majority of respondents had contacted MVA for support, with those in Tranches 1 and 3 more likely to have done so. Most respondents, but in particular those from Tranche 3, were satisfied with the assistance provided. Co-ordinators in Tranche 3 were less likely to have approached their road safety officer for assistance than those in the other two tranches. When seeking assistance from the road safety officers, topics raised by co-ordinators included:

- 'risk assessments';
- 'recruiting volunteers';
- 'assistance with CRB forms';
- 'budget issues'; and
- 'dealing with children with behavioural difficulties'.

The great majority of respondents reported that the road safety officer was able to assist them without having to go elsewhere. Over 80% of respondents, but in

particular those in Tranche 3, reported meeting other co-ordinators at least quarterly and found this contact helpful.

5.4.8 Recruitment of volunteers

5.4.8.1 Recruitment methods

Co-ordinators used a range of methods to recruit volunteers, including letters to parents, leaflets, school meetings and meeting at school gates. The success of the methods varied; in all tranches (particularly in Tranche 3) the letter to parents was the most successful.

Most respondents reported that it had been particularly difficult to recruit volunteers in some schools. The reasons for these difficulties included:

- 'work commitments on the part of parents';
- 'child care commitments';
- 'parental concerns regarding income benefits';
- 'language barriers';
- 'parental concerns regarding CRB checks';
- 'poor relationship between school and parents'; and
- 'high mobility among parents'.

The majority of respondents, especially those in Tranche 3, also reported having schools where it was particularly easy to recruit volunteers. Reasons for this included:

- 'co-operation of head teachers and teachers';
- 'good school/parent relationships';
- 'presence of home/school liaison officers';
- 'presence of established parent groups';
- 'faith schools'; and
- 'schools where there are high proportions of parents waiting to get back to work after having children'.

Most respondents in Tranches 2 and 3 reported that head teachers had provided names of at least a few volunteers. However, nearly a quarter of respondents in Tranche 2 reported schools where no names had been provided. Co-ordinators from Tranche 1 were asked a slightly different question, but 85% of them reported that teachers provided them with names of likely volunteers. The majority of

respondents reported that they had not recruited outside the school community. Those who had, recruited volunteers from a variety of different sources, including:

- community/street wardens;
- road safety clubs;
- school crossing patrols;
- the volunteer development bureau;
- local businesses;
- off-duty firemen;
- the police;
- churches; and
- social clubs and other volunteer groups.

Another successful approach was to enlist local college students studying for nursery-related qualifications. Involvement in Kerbcraft contributed to the placement element of their studies. The great majority of respondents reported that their volunteers had children at the school, though this was lower for Tranche 2 volunteers.

5.4.8.2 Volunteers' activities

Ninety-seven per cent of the Tranche 3 co-ordinators and 71% of the Tranche 2 co-ordinators reported that the volunteers only worked in one school. Co-ordinators from Tranche 2 and 3 schemes were asked how many volunteers already did some form of work in the school besides Kerbcraft training. The responses showed that, in the majority of schools, at least some of the volunteers were already involved in some capacity.

5.4.8.3 Persuading volunteers to take part

When asked how they persuaded potential volunteers to take part in training, some differences emerged between tranches. Thirty-four per cent of Tranche 2 coordinators reported that they had described the scheme and provided information, 61% reported that they had stressed the importance of road safety, and 5% reported they had told the volunteers about the incentives offered. The Tranche 3 coordinators reported describing the benefits of the scheme to volunteers, emphasising the success of Drumchapel – 42% used personal encouragement; 24% described the practical aspects of the road safety training; and 14% described the benefits in terms of a route into employment. Ten per cent of the Tranche 3 co-ordinators surveyed relied on incentives.
5.4.8.4 Criminal Record Bureau checks

Tranche 3 respondents (24% of the total) were more likely to report concerns on the part of volunteers relating to CRB checks. The responses show that, in both Tranches 2 and 3, very few volunteers (less than 10%) had been substantially delayed from starting because of a late return of CRB forms.

5.4.8.5 Motivating volunteers

When asked about new ways they believed would motivate volunteers, the majority of co-ordinators in Tranches 2 and 3 suggested the use of money or incentives (50% in Tranche 2 and 52% in Tranche 3). However, when the volunteers themselves were asked a similar question about motivation, a different picture emerged: that their main motivators appeared to be in the value of the project to the children and their schools (see Section 5.2).

Other suggestions for motivating volunteers included:

- offering volunteers a recognised qualification (Tranche 2 31%; Tranche 3 16%);
- involving and encouraging the volunteers (Tranche 2 9%; Tranche 3 16%);
- 4% (Tranche 3) suggested providing childcare for parents with young children; and
- a further 12% suggested other methods, including assistance with literacy levels.

5.4.9 Training of volunteers

5.4.9.1 Type and content of training

The majority of co-ordinators used group training methods rather than individual methods to train volunteers, in line with Kerbcraft recommendations and the advice received in initial co-ordinator training. Co-ordinators from Tranche 2 and 3 schemes were asked if they had agreed with head teachers on the best practice policies for several situations. These included 'behaviour management', 'emergencies', 'supervision of children' and 'child/trainer ratios'. The great majority reported they had done so for all the situations listed. Eighty per cent of Tranche 3 and 76% of Tranche 2 co-ordinators reported that their volunteers had practised training at the roadside. Some commented that this helped to build volunteers' confidence.

5.4.9.2 Provision of facilities for volunteers

Co-ordinators were asked if schools provided adequate facilities for volunteers. The majority reported that they had done so, but the proportion was lower for Tranche 1 respondents.

5.4.9.3 Volunteer drop-out

Although the majority of Tranche 1 respondents reported that many volunteers dropped out between recruitment and training children, fewer dropouts were reported in subsequent tranches.

5.4.10 General comments from co-ordinators

Co-ordinators from Tranche 2 and 3 schemes were given the opportunity to make further comments about their Kerbcraft scheme. Fifty-eight per cent of Tranche 2 and 48% of Tranche 3 co-ordinators responded. Many of the comments were positive reflections on the scheme as a whole:

'As a professional I was sceptical of training 5/6 year olds but can fully justify it now. Watching the volunteers and pupils gain confidence and bring their own style to the sessions makes it all worthwhile.'

'Having worked as a Kerbcraft co-ordinator for almost three years, I am even more convinced than ever that Kerbcraft has a very positive effect on the children and their awareness at the roadside is greatly increased. I have never met a teacher or parent that didn't share this view.'

The negative comments related to the length of time the training required and the practicalities of finding suitable localities for training:

'Sixteen weeks of training is too long in terms of the commitment required from volunteers and the disruption to classes.'

'In an inner-city environment, Skill 1 [Safe Places] is very difficult to apply, particularly with 5-6 repetitions. There are often no safe places to cross apart from dedicated crossing points.'

'The initial training needs to provide more advice on dealing with tricky road situations.'

'Unable to work in many schools due to lack of parental interest in volunteering.'

'Some volunteers get bored by doing similar sessions four times.'

'There is insufficient time to find genuinely different training sites.'

5.4.11 Summary of key findings

- The co-ordinators from all three tranches were predominantly female and of 'White British' ethnic origin. Their ages spanned from 21 to 61 years, with an average age of 38. The educational level of co-ordinators increased over the three tranches, with the majority of Tranche 3 co-ordinators educated to degree level.
- Most co-ordinators had worked in education or had done other work with children before recruitment. Most knew the area where the scheme operated, and their main motivation for applying was a wish to work with children.
- A high proportion of co-ordinators had attended the residential training courses and had found them helpful. Satisfaction with the courses increased across the tranches. Features of Kerbcraft that were felt to be most important were the practical training at the roadside and the interaction with the children.
- Co-ordinators used a range of methods to recruit volunteers, including letters to parents, leaflets, school meetings and meeting at school gates. Nearly all co-ordinators had experienced some schools where it was difficult to recruit volunteers.
- In addition to parents from the schools, other volunteers included community/ street wardens, road safety clubs, school crossing patrols, volunteer groups and local college students.

5.5 Surveys of road safety officers

5.5.1 Rationale

The surveys of road safety officers and co-ordinators were designed to produce an account over time of issues and changes in the management and implementation of pilot schemes. Questions to road safety officers and co-ordinators were linked to look at certain issues from the two different perspectives. Here we examine the results of the road safety officers' surveys.

5.5.2 Methods

The method of data collection for the road safety officers' surveys changed after the first tranche. The first survey for the Tranche 1 road safety officers was carried out by structured telephone interview. Surveys of Tranche 2 and 3 road safety officers were carried out by means of self-completion questionnaires.

The interview schedule for Tranche 1 road safety officers was developed using road safety officer comments from the summer 2002 seminar, discussions with road safety officers, and consultation with the project team and the Department for Transport. The questionnaires were piloted in face-to-face meetings with two road

safety officers and modifications were made. The conversion of the Tranche 1 telephone survey to the self-completion format used in Tranches 2 and 3 involved further piloting.

The questionnaire dealt with the road safety officer's background, length of service, management levels, reporting structures, road safety budgets, reasons for taking part in Kerbcraft, expectations of the scheme and any future planned expenditure. The road safety officers were also asked to comment on the recruitment process for coordinators, providing details of skills, grades and salary expectations. Other questions related to attendance at training courses, expectations about Kerbcraft and whether or not the courses could be improved upon.

The survey of Tranche 1 road safety officers took place in February 2003 and covered all 40 participating Tranche 1 road safety officers. The second survey took place in October 2003 and was restricted to those road safety officers participating in Tranche 2 schemes only (n = 21). The questionnaire for the Tranche 3 schemes was distributed in December 2004, several months after these schemes had started. It was sent to those (18) road safety officers who were only participating in Tranche 3 schemes.

5.5.3 Results

The following results relate to 40 Tranche 1, 21 Tranche 2 and 18 Tranche 3 road safety officers. Ten of the road safety officers were from Scottish unitary authorities, 3 in Tranche 1, 3 in Tranche 2 and 4 in Tranche 3. Typically the schemes were managed at the level of senior road safety officer or road safety officer.

5.5.3.1 Reasons for participation in the scheme

The road safety officers were asked about the main reason for their decision to participate in the Kerbcraft pilot scheme. There were differences between responses from different tranches. In Tranche 1, 94% of respondents reported a particular desire to operate a pedestrian training scheme for the first time. Respondents in Tranches 2 and 3 reported a wider range of motives. The most common motive for their participation in Tranche 2 (35%) was to take advantage of an opportunity that they would not otherwise have to run such a scheme; while in Tranche 3 (39%) the motivation was that pedestrian training was a part of their overall road safety strategy.

5.5.3.2 Funding levels

Road safety officers were asked whether they thought the level of funding for Kerbcraft schemes was about right. The great majority of participants in all three tranches reported that the funding level was adequate. (However, those road safety officers who felt it was inadequate are unlikely to have participated and sought funding.)

5.5.3.3 Co-ordinator recruitment and retention

Recruitment and retention of an efficient and effective co-ordinator is essential in establishing, managing and maintaining Kerbcraft schemes. One Tranche 3 road safety officers summed it up thus: 'we have been especially lucky in getting an experienced teacher with road safety knowledge and experience to take up the co-ordinator's role – this has made the implementation and management for the initiative easy'.

In all three tranches, road safety officers reported that the preferred qualities they sought in the co-ordinator were self-motivation, followed by experience and outgoing personality. The level of formal qualifications was considered to be less important than these human factors. The road safety officers were asked whether there was sufficient time available to recruit co-ordinators and whether the information provided, including a job description from the Department for Transport, was useful: most felt that there had been sufficient time and that the information provided was helpful, though most respondents used extracts from the job description rather than the entire job description.

5.5.3.4 Co-ordinator and road safety officer training

The Child Pedestrian Training Pilot Projects paid considerable attention to training co-ordinators, so that they understood the concepts of the Kerbcraft model. Road safety officers in Tranches 2 and 3 were asked if they had also attended the residential co-ordinators training courses: the majority of road safety officers had attended the courses, particularly those in Tranche 2 (85%). Most people saw the fact that the course was residential as advantageous, with the main advantage being the networking opportunities provided.

Road safety officers in Tranches 2 and 3 were asked whether or not they got everything they wanted from the residential course. While a majority of respondents in both tranches reported they had got all they wanted from the course, this proportion was much higher for Tranche 3 respondents. When asked what more they would have liked from the residential course, the suggestions included:

- practical knowledge of courses in action;
- more positive experiences of delivering the training programme; and
- more experienced course trainers.

Other suggestions included:

- clearer links to the school curriculum;
- more time with the children; and
- experienced co-ordinators.

Respondents also identified an interest in attending a practical workshop to explain the process of conducting risk assessment at a specific site. This would feed into the production of a written document to assist evaluation.

Road safety officers were asked to comment on the adequacy of the Kerbcraft manual (Thomson *et al.*, 2002) and the training course manual (unpublished). Comments included:

'Kerbcraft manual not always available, some schools/individuals were not able to access it electronically.'

'The manuals are not very helpful with the practical aspects of the work.'

'The sample letters provided in the training course manual are too complicated and the level of English skills required is too high for recipients in deprived areas regardless of culture.'

'The manuals are too detailed. They become much easier to understand once the scheme is underway.'

5.5.3.5 Recommendations to improve the Kerbcraft training programme

Recommendations to improve the Kerbcraft training programme made by the road safety officers included a number of suggestions about the flexibility of the programme, including that the number of sessions in some skills should be reduced and the programme should be shortened to six weeks in duration (see also Section 5.5.4). Suggested ways of increasing the level of volunteer trainers included the provision of funds for volunteer trainers to be paid and for two co-ordinators to be appointed to the programme to carry out the training in schools together, omitting the need for volunteers. A video/CD of the training was also suggested as a resource to show potential volunteers what would be expected of them and to train them in specific skills (a volunteer training video/CD was provided for all co-ordinators in 2005). The need to assess children's behaviour once they reach secondary school age was also put forward to ascertain whether learning influenced practice in the longer term. Guidance was also requested on how best to involve children with mobility difficulties (guidelines for working with children in wheelchairs were provided for all co-ordinators in 2004).

5.5.3.6 Managing co-ordinators

Road safety officers were asked what percentage of their time was taken up managing Kerbcraft. The proportion of road safety officers' time that was required to manage the schemes was relatively low. The average proportion of time reported was 12% for respondents in Tranche 1, 7% for respondents in Tranche 2 and 13% for respondents in Tranche 3. These figures, however, conceal considerable variation over time. Respondents from all tranches reported that the initial stages of a scheme required much more of their time than later stages. There were also differences between the tranches. Responses from Tranches 1 and 3 reported more variation in the proportion of time required to manage schemes. Eighteen per cent of respondents in Tranche 1 and 21% of Tranche 3 respondents reported spending more than 20% of their time on the scheme. One Tranche 2 road safety officer summed this up as:

'Time spent on Kerbcraft is minimal as scheme [is] well documented, co-ordinator can apply it with little supervision – does have unrestricted access to me though, should she require assistance.'

5.5.3.7 Meetings with other road safety officers

Road safety officers were asked if they met regularly with other colleagues in their locality. The great majority of respondents said that they did. This was particularly the case for Tranche 1 respondents.

Road safety officers in Tranches 2 and 3 were asked about what they considered to be the most important features of Kerbcraft. The results show a similar pattern of response in both tranches. Overall the practical nature of the Kerbcraft training at the roadside was considered as the most important feature, followed by 'dialogue/ interaction with children' and 'use volunteers/community involvement'.

5.5.4 Sustainability

Road safety officers with schemes in Tranches 2 and 3 were asked whether they would be able to secure funding to continue the scheme after the pilot. Respondents in Tranche 3 were more optimistic than those in Tranche 2. Of the Tranche 3 road safety officers, 47% said that they hoped to be able to secure funding to continue the scheme after the pilot, and 47% stated that they would not be able to secure the funding. Of the Tranche 2 road safety officers, 33% of respondents said that they hoped to be able to secure funding to continue the scheme after the pilot, and 60% stated that they were unlikely to be able to secure funding. One Tranche 3 road safety officer felt that:

'There is a perennial problem regarding funding – whilst additional funding opportunities will continue to be explored, the scheme may regrettably fold if we are unsuccessful.'

Tranche 1 road safety officers were asked if they wished to continue the scheme and whether they anticipated any difficulties. Ninety-five per cent of respondents would like to continue with the scheme but anticipated difficulties, mainly financial. Of those wishing to continue with the scheme, 49% reported that they thought they would be able to overcome any obstacles. Information on sustained schemes was gathered by MVA from Tranche 1 and 2 after pilot funding ended and is discussed in more detail in Section 6.6.

5.5.5 Conclusion

Many of the recommendations made by the road safety officers, regarding improvements to the training course, were put into action during the period of the project, for example a video was made which showed practical training in action and materials were prepared on the links of the project with the National Curriculum and on involving children with mobility difficulties. Overall, the management of the scheme was not seen as onerous to road safety officers and they were able to support their co-ordinators effectively.

5.6 Head teacher survey

5.6.1 Rationale

A telephone survey of head teachers was undertaken to obtain the school's perspective on the setting up and delivery of the Kerbcraft scheme, and also the school's perception of the impact on participants.

5.6.2 Objectives

- To investigate the setting up, management and maintenance of the schemes, exploring reasons for success and failure at the local level.
- To determine the impact of the projects on schools, communities and volunteers.
- To explore potential means of sustaining the Kerberaft training programme beyond the national pilot phase.

5.6.3 Method

A minimum of two schools that were running Kerbcraft in spring 2006 were randomly selected from each Tranche 3 scheme, and in each the head teacher was approached and asked to participate in a telephone interview, or to nominate a representative where this was not possible. The total sample contacted was 61 schools, from which 42 interviews were completed. The completed interviews were from 27 of the 32 Tranche 3 authorities. The interviews gathered contextual information about the school, explored the way in which the scheme had been established and implemented, assessed the impact of the scheme on the wider school community and considered possible means of sustaining the training beyond the pilot phase. For further details of the head teacher interview schedule, please refer to Appendix 5.

5.6.4 Results

5.6.4.1 Contextual information

- The majority of respondents (88%) were head teachers.
- Thirty-seven of the schools (88%) had a written health promotion policy.
- Fourteen schools (33%) had achieved the Healthy School Standard (or Health Promoting School in Scotland), a further 21 schools (50%) were working toward this goal.
- Kerbcraft had been included within the documentation for one or other of these initiatives within 19 (45%) of the schools.
- All but two of the schools (95%) indicated that they were participating in other road safety initiatives alongside Kerbcraft. Those most commonly mentioned were the development of a School Travel Plan (50%) and Walk to School Week (36%).
- The provision of road safety education and the key professionals involved appears to vary between local authorities.
- Half of the schools (21 out of 42) reported that road safety had been a specific interest area for them prior to their involvement in Kerbcraft. Reasons given included their location, problems with traffic congestion or parental parking.
- Kerbcraft was perceived to build on schools' ethos in a variety of ways, the most popular reported being by involving parents (48%). Other factors identified included promoting general child safety, delivering practical roadside learning, promoting collaboration and a caring environment, and providing links to 'Every Child Matters' and the National Curriculum.
- Twelve of the schools (29%) had an Ofsted/HM Inspectorate of Education (HMIe) visit during the time the training was running, and in three of these schools inspectors made specific mention of the programme.
- Thirty-four schools (81%) have included, or intend to include, reference to Kerbcraft in the documentation for their Self-Evaluation Form (SEF).

5.6.5 Setting up, management and maintenance of schemes

Schools were asked a series of questions about the process of implementing Kerbcraft, from inception to their current position within the training. The majority reported that school staff had been extremely supportive in delivering the training. School Governors (the School Board in Scotland) were also generally reported to be supportive, with some governors taking on the role of volunteer trainers. Comments regarding the role of the Kerbcraft co-ordinator were very positive, with schools particularly appreciating the way in which co-ordinators were able to adapt and deliver training flexibly to meet particular needs. Among the skills valued in a coordinator were organisational ability, good communication skills with all individuals/groups involved, experience in road safety and/or knowledge of the local community. Finding space in school to run training activities did not present a problem for most (88%) schools, despite only a minority having access to community facilities/parents rooms. Five schools (12%) reported some specific problems related to temporary overcrowding/building work or a general lack of space. The benefits of the programme were seen to outweigh any inconvenience or disruption caused by releasing children from the classroom, with 40 schools (95%) reporting no problem with this element of the programme.

The recruitment of volunteers generated much comment from schools. Where initial attempts at recruitment by letter home resulted in little interest from parents, school staff or the co-ordinator would often approach individuals to encourage their participation. The involvement of a parent mentor/home-school liaison officer was felt to be beneficial in this process, as was holding meetings with parents and pupils to raise the profile of the scheme. Several barriers to the recruitment of volunteers were identified. These included:

- the length of time required to commit to the programme;
- unavailability of parents during the school day;
- low parental self-esteem/own negative experiences of school;
- delays caused by Criminal Record Bureau (CRB) checking; and
- parents with English as an Additional Language (EAL) who may find communication difficult.

Maintaining volunteers throughout the training process also posed problems, with several schools reporting the need to recruit replacements for those who left, though in some cases where they had taken on additional responsibility or moved into paid employment this was seen in a positive light for both the individual and the school. Running Kerbcraft had no, or minimal, cost implication for the schools.

5.6.6 Impact on schools, communities and volunteers

The effect of Kerbcraft is difficult to ascertain since most schools are simultaneously participating in other programmes which could impact on road safety. Among the general impact perceived by schools was the belief that the programme had increased road safety knowledge and influenced safer behaviours. Schools reported that pupils enjoyed taking part, benefited from working in small groups, and had become more familiar with their local area. The programme was felt to enhance the curriculum and to raise the profile of road safety among the wider school community. The effect of the programme on school policies was limited in part by the uncertainty regarding future funding, with 15 schools (36%) reporting no influence at all. Eighteen schools (43%) considered Kerbcraft to have improved the relationship between parents and school. The impact beyond school was less certain, although five schools (12%) did report having received positive feedback from the community. Since so many schools were running several initiatives which may have influenced a pupil's mode of travel to/from school, it was difficult to determine the direct impact of Kerbcraft in this respect. Several factors were identified which may play a more important role in influencing the way in which pupils travel between home and school. All respondents rated the investment of their own time and effort in running the scheme as very little to moderate. Thirty-four respondents (81%) rated the benefits of running Kerbcraft as high or very high.

5.6.6.1 Sustainability of schemes

(Note, a more detailed discussion of the findings relating to the sustainability of the Kerbcraft programme can be found in Section 6.6 of this report.)

Nineteen schools (45%) viewed Kerbcraft as an integral part of the wider school curriculum on road safety, 17 schools (40%) saw it as a project running alongside everything else, one school considered it to be both. Interest was shown by a small number of schools in extending the programme to include children from other year groups to reinforce the messages delivered. The most popular option for sustaining the scheme beyond the pilot phase was for schools to form consortia and 'buy in' to a pool of volunteers (86% of schools would consider this). Provisos were that funding was available and costs were reasonable, and that volunteers were CRB checked and had received adequate training to be competent in both road safety skills and working with children. Twenty-five schools (60%) said that they would consider having parents run the scheme. Again, the importance of appropriate training was highlighted. Among the 14 schools (33%) who did not think this approach would work for them, the barriers identified included lack of volunteer reliability, the need to involve a road safety professional, concern over the views of other parents and issues of responsibility/reliability. Seventeen schools (40%) would consider continuing the programme under the co-ordination of a member of school staff. This option relies on funding being available to cover the duties of the member of staff involved and on the school having the capacity to redeploy staff time in this way. Barriers to this approach, in addition to the lack of funding and capacity, were competing priorities and the belief that the impact is greater with the involvement of a road safety professional.

5.6.7 Summary of key outcomes

- Kerbcraft provides an opportunity for schools to build on the road safety provision offered within the existing curriculum in a way which enhances the delivery of safety education.
- The Kerbcraft ethos supports other school initiatives, such as the School Travel Plan, Healthy Schools Award/Health Promoting School status, and Walk to School events. It is inclusive and encourages partnership working.
- The programme encourages the participation of parents and the wider community, and can lead to increased parental involvement in school activities.
- The method of delivery is sufficiently flexible to be tailored to the needs of individual schools. The scheme can be implemented without major disruption to classroom activities and has little/no resource implications for the school.
- The role of co-ordinator was highly regarded by schools. Particular value was placed on the individual's organisational skills, ability to communicate effectively with different groups, and knowledge/experience of road safety and/ or the local environment.
- The recruitment and retention of volunteers can present considerable challenges. Innovative recruitment methods and flexibility in the delivery of training can help to overcome the initial reticence of potential volunteers.
- The involvement in Kerbcraft can raise the self-esteem of volunteers and enable them to take on greater responsibility.
- The programme was perceived to have raised awareness and encouraged safer pedestrian behaviour among pupils and parents. Assessment of the impact of Kerbcraft is complicated by the fact that most schools are simultaneously participating in other initiatives which may affect these same outcomes.
- The uncertainty over funding beyond the pilot phase can act as a disincentive to include Kerbcraft in future school planning and policy review.
- The suggestion that Kerbcraft might be sustained by forming consortia of schools which could 'buy in' to pools of trained volunteers was met favourably by the majority (86%) of schools.
- Having parents run the scheme was also considered a viable option (60% of schools), while appointing a member of the school staff as co-ordinator was also considered a possibility in 40% of schools.
- Importance was attached to having a road safety professional involved in the programme, albeit in a less intensive role, to lend gravitas.
- Eighty-one per cent of respondents rated the benefits of running Kerbcraft as high or very high.

5.7 The economic evaluation

5.7.1 Background

In recent years the demand for the economic evaluation of programmes and services that have an impact on the community has risen (Kelly *et al.*, 2005; Orme *et al.*, 2007). This rise has occurred in response to the modernisation agenda of government and the focus upon programmes in the public sector, such as Kerbcraft, that are aimed at reducing child pedestrian accident rates and at the same time reducing health and social inequalities. The process elements of any intervention can be crucial to its success (or otherwise), but these were often ignored within economic evaluation frameworks because these tend to focus on costs and final outcomes (Powell, 2007). The economic evaluation of the Kerbcraft scheme aims to incorporate process and context into the analysis.

The challenge of capturing and learning from Kerbcraft outcomes has been a key concern of the national evaluation. It is possible to measure gains made in terms of individual children's skill acquisition in the road safety setting. However, capturing the impact of this on attitudes, knowledge and behaviour within a wider sense may prove more difficult. Attributing specific outcomes to Kerbcraft can also be problematic due to the collaborative and indirect ways in which Kerbcraft schemes often work as a 'value added' programme. The case studies have demonstrated that the most effective Kerbcraft schemes have a high coverage of schools in a local authority area, a plethora of volunteers to support the scheme and consistency in delivering training to children.

5.7.2 Introduction

The objectives of this economic evaluation are:

- to undertake a comparative economic evaluation of seven local authority Kerbcraft schemes in terms of their cost-effectiveness; and
- to undertake a comparative economic evaluation of children's behaviour change scores after Kerbcraft training at the school level.

5.7.3 Data capture

Local authorities and schools were selected at random through Tranches 2 and 3 of the Kerbcraft schemes. For economic evaluation it was felt important that the following factors were represented across the Kerbcraft schemes and schools selected: deprivation, rurality, ethnicity, metropolitan and non-metropolitan boroughs.

The data used for economic evaluation and the development of the assumptions for modelling was largely primary data collected by MVA that formed part of their

ongoing management and monitoring of the network. The skills assessments and case studies were part of the wider formal evaluation by the University of the West of England (UWE). The skills assessments gathered observational data of children's behaviour and explanations at the roadside for each Kerbcraft skill, and each case study involved semi-structured interviews with Kerbcraft co-ordinators, users and other stakeholders.

5.7.4 Economic evaluation design

The 'opportunity costs' of ways of organising any programme in local authorities are crucial, as, within a finite budget, saved resources can be redirected to other priorities or redeployed in other ways to achieve alternative outcomes for a population. It is sometimes argued that economic frameworks provide an explicit framework for choice (Kelly *et al.*, 2005), but it is important to acknowledge that this approach to evaluation includes some value judgements.

Cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA) is a type of economic evaluation focusing on programme delivery with one activity-related outcome. In CEA the evaluator estimates total (and component) unit costs and activity for one relevant outcome dimension. In this CEA, the number of children trained by the Kerbcraft training schemes per annum by local authority and the proportion change in road safety behaviour scores across 13 schools were estimated and compared with the cost. School costs are not included.

An economic evaluation framework allows activity measures on the number of children trained and the change in children's pre- and post-test scores to be modelled, estimated and compared vis-à-vis the total and component costs. It was not possible to estimate the resource savings of Kerbcraft. This economic evaluation did not seek to identify new costs that were not already supported within the local authority system.

Ideally, common currency estimates of outcome or quality adjustment would be estimated in economic evaluation. The change in children's pre- and post-test scores (testing their behaviour and understanding at the roadside) were used as quality adjustment measures at the school level of analysis. The use of quality adjustment measures that can be used to compare the outcome of each Kerbcraft scheme in 'like terms' is very useful from a resource allocation perspective.

Kerbcraft child pedestrian training is likely to confer resource savings to society as a whole in terms of accident prevention and safety awareness. While it is important to acknowledge that these savings to other sectors will occur as a result of Kerbcraft schemes, it was not possible to estimate these savings with great accuracy using the data available. Costs and outcomes were compared for one time period or between time periods. Consequently, the timing of costs and outcomes relates to 2004 and 2005, and has not been projected into the future. This means that there has not been

a need to 'discount' future costs and outcomes to their present values. Predictive analysis will be undertaken separately to support the case for investment in Kerbcraft training and development.

5.7.5 Analysis 1: Costs at the local authority level – Kerbcraft delivery by local authorities in England and Scotland

Seven Kerbcraft schemes were selected for the comparative economic evaluation of Kerbcraft. Table 5.15 depicts the annual budgets and the number of children on Kerbcraft courses in the seven selected schemes, using 2004 data for Tranche 2 and 2005 data for Tranche 3 schemes. In addition, the numbers of volunteers to support Kerbcraft and the percentage of BME groups (BMEGs) in each local authority were collated.

Table 5.15: Local authorities and Kerbcraft delivery						
Local authority (LA) type	Number of volunteers	Annual budget (£)	% BMEGs	Number of children on Kerbcraft courses		
(A) Rural LA, Tranche 3	84	23,325	0.84	612		
(B) LA with high socio-economic deprivation, Tranche 2	54	28,540	21.41	906		
(C) LA with low socio-economic deprivation, Tranche 3	77	29,209	4.81	805		
(D) LA with high levels of BMEGs, Tranche 3	86	28,644	77.31	770		
(E) LA with a high level of BMEGs, Tranche 3	54	30,315	73.71	1101		
(F) Metropolitan LA, Tranche 2	24	23,564	65.76	240		
(G) Non-metropolitan LA, Tranche 2	40	27,978	67.32	962		

5.7.5.1 Findings from analysis 1 (local authority level costs)

The budgets and the number of children receiving Kerbcraft training within each scheme from Table 5.15 were compared and costs per child were calculated. These are presented in Table 5.16 and are all below £100 per child per scheme, with costs lying in the range of £28 to £99 per child. The cost of Kerbcraft in six of the schemes is below £40, with only one local authority above £40 per child. This can be partially explained by the absence of a Kerbcraft co-ordinator in the first six months of the scheme, which had the effect of reducing coverage of the schools and the number of children trained.

Table 5.16: Cost of Kerbcraft delivery in local authorities					
Local authority (LA) type	Number of children on Kerbcraft courses that actually took place	Annual budget (£)	Number of schools	Cost per child* (£)	
(E) LA with high levels of BMEGs, Tranche 3	1,101	30,315	7 of 7	27.53	
(G) Non-metropolitan LA, Tranche 2	962	27,978	5 of 12	29.08	
(B) LA with high socio- economic deprivation, Tranche 2	906	28,540	10 Of 15	31.50	
(C) LA with low socio- economic deprivation, Tranche 3	805	29,209	7 of 9	36.28	
(D) LA with high levels of BMEGs, Tranche 3	770	28,644	5 of 7	37.20	
(A) Rural LA, Tranche 3	612	23,325	10 of 10	38.11	
(F) Metropolitan LA, Tranche 2	240	23,564	3 of 12	98.18	
 Cost per child = annual budget (£)/number of children on Kerbcraft courses that actually took place. 					

5.7.6 Analysis 2: Costs associated with behaviour change (school level)

Table 5.17 presents a second analysis showing change in behaviour scores. Schoollevel data on the change in Safe Places (Skill 1) test scores was applied. These represent the proportion of 'safe' behaviours averaged across all children tested in each school at pre-test, post-test 1 and post-test 2. These tests are described below:

- **Pre-test (baseline)** measured children's scores on Safe Places skills prior to any training.
- **Post-test 1** measured children's scores on Safe Places behaviours immediately after Safe Places training had finished.
- **Post-test 2 (delayed test)** measured children's scores on Safe Places behaviours two to four months after Safe Places training had finished.

The scores in Table 5.17 are the average percentage for improvement in Safe Places behaviour scores across the children in each school. They show the change (improvement or reduction) in scores between each of the three tests described above.

Table 5.17: Average improvement in Safe Places behaviour scores acrossKerbcraft schools				
School in local authority	Per cent improvement in Safe Places behaviour scores 1*	Per cent improvement in Safe Places behaviour scores 2^{\dagger}		
School 1	4	29		
School 2	27	17		
School 3	Negative	Not sampled [‡]		
School 4	20	Not sampled [‡]		
School 5	17	14		
School 6	10	Not sampled [‡]		
School 7	26	Less than 1		
School 8	3	Not sampled [‡]		
School 9	4	Not sampled [‡]		
School 10	13	Not sampled [‡]		
School 11	9	22		
School 12	Negative	Not sampled [‡]		
School 13	18	Not sampled [‡]		

* Improvement in Safe Places behaviour scores from pre-test to post-test 1 across all children.
 † Improvement in proportion of Safe Places behaviour scores from post-test 1 to post-test 2 (two to four months after training was completed) across all children.

[‡] Not sampled because the sample size was too small.

5.7.6.1 Analysis of the improvement in children's roadside performance and associated costs over time

Table 5.18 contains incremental 'change data' or 'improvement data' for both costs and outcomes. The local authority Kerbcraft budget was used for 2004 in Tranche 2 and 2005 for Tranche 3 schemes in the absence of school-level budget data. Costs were compared with the outcome data at school level for improvement in Safe Places behaviour scores for the actual number of trained children in each school. The figures in column four represent the added cost in pounds of making a 1% improvement in the Safe Places behaviour test scores for all of the trained children involved in Kerbcraft in a local authority area. The figures in column five represent the longer-term added cost in pounds of making a 1% improvement in the Safe Places behaviour scores for all of the trained children involved in Kerbcraft in a local authority area. The figures in column five represent the longer-term added cost in pounds of making a 1% improvement in the Safe Places behaviour scores for all of the trained children involved in Kerbcraft in a local authority area.

The figures in column five of Table 5.18 are indicative of the robustness of Kerbcraft, as they indicate that Safe Places behaviour scores continue to improve once Kerbcraft schemes have finished at a faster rate than cost (compare column four with column five to see this robustness effect). The added cost per initial 1% proportionate change in Safe Places behaviour scores across all children in a local authority ranged from £919 to £5,999 (see column four). The added cost per 1% proportionate change in Safe Places behaviour scores ranged from £5 to £99 across all the children (see column five). In one local authority, the long-term cost of Kerbcraft per 1% change in Safe Places behaviours across all schools in the local

Table 5.18: Costs and behaviour change						
A school in a local authority (LA)	% ethnicity	Mean IMD	Additional cost of basic improvement across all schools in LA* (£)	Additional cost of training robustness across all schools in LA [†] (£)		
School 2	4.9	36.71	919	-164		
School 7	3.9	29.95	763	63		
School 4	No data	39.01	1,052	Not sampled		
School 5	7.7	36.79	1,373	5		
School 13	11.1	57.04	1,308	77		
School 10	18.5	55.58	1,534	Not sampled		
School 6	No data	60.9	2,472	Not sampled		
School 11	4.03	37.24	2,680	99		
School 1	6.7	53.21	3,211	56		
School 8	5.9	57.76	5,999	Not sampled		
School 9	75.2	50.01	4,966	Not sampled		
School 12	87.4	57.04	Not cost-effective	Not sampled		
School 3	No data	43.03	Not cost-effective	Not sampled		
* Additional cost (f) of improving the Safe Places behaviour scores between pre-training and						

* Additionalcost (£) of improving the Safe Places behaviour scores between pre-training and post-training across all the trained children involved in Kerbcraft in the local authority area by 1%.

[†] Additional cost (£) of improving the Safe Places behaviour scores between post-training and two-month post-training follow-up across all the trained children involved in Kerbcraft in the local authority area by 1%.

authority was negative. The local authority in question found itself saving ± 164 after the completion of Kerbcraft.

Table 5.18 demonstrates that the cost-effectiveness of Kerbcraft increases over time adding more to outcome than to cost while it is running and having a robust impact on safe road behaviour after its completion.

5.7.7 Conclusions

A summary of the main findings of the economic analysis in relation to the project objectives can be found in Section 6.3.

5.8 MVA staff interviews

5.8.1 Rationale

One-to-one interviews with MVA project staff were undertaken to obtain a management perspective on the setting up and delivery of the Kerbcraft scheme nationally.

5.8.2 Objectives

- To investigate the setting up, management and maintenance of the schemes, exploring reasons for success and failure at the national and local levels.
- To explore potential means of sustaining the Kerbcraft training programme beyond the national pilot phase.

5.8.3 Method

Five interviews were conducted during September and October 2006, with MVA staff involved in managing the Kerbcraft pilot programme. Four face-to-face interviews were held at MVA offices, the fifth was a telephone interview with a member of staff now based at home. The interviews gathered information on the background to the management of the national pilot, explored the specific roles of individuals, their understanding of these and subsequent satisfaction with them, looked at factors for success and failure of schemes, and considered options for their sustainability. For further details of the staff interview schedule, please refer to Appendix 6.

5.8.4 Results

5.8.4.1 Overview of the management of the national pilot

The management structure and individual roles were agreed at project inception and consisted of the project director, project manager and assistant project managers with regional responsibilities. Additional skills were brought in as required, involving other members of staff to perform specific tasks, for example web site design. That MVA had the capacity and flexibility to meet these needs in-house appears to have been a strength in keeping the management team unified. Regular team meetings were held to discuss project issues as they arose, with ad hoc meetings as required to address specific needs. Support to schemes was provided by the assistant project managers on a needs-led basis, with the level of support required varying from scheme to scheme. After the first year of the project, the financial systems were revised and an additional member of staff joined the team to process and oversee the authorisation of local and unitary authority invoices. Project milestones were delivered in negotiation with the team from the Department for Transport and MVA staff reported this process to have worked well, acknowledging the level of co-operation shown by the Department for Tranpsort. Feedback from road safety officers and co-ordinators indicated that the management system worked well and an interactive approach has enabled the process to evolve during the project, thereby improving efficiency over time. National and regional conferences/ seminars have provided an opportunity for road safety officers and co-ordinators to network and share resources. Issues raised by co-ordinators during the programme include questions as to why there will be no further Department for Transport funding, issues surrounding the completion of the Form 7s (online questionnaire to

record training being undertaken in each scheme), queries regarding permissions for payment and volunteer rewards, and concerns regarding the assessor competencies for the initial skills assessment tests. Throughout the programme, information has been disseminated at conferences and via the Kerbcraft web site.

5.8.5 Setting up, management and maintenance of schemes

The initial project set-up involved collaboration between four agencies – the Department for Transport (commissioning agency), MVA (management agency) and UWE and Jacobs Babtie. UWE and Jacobs Babtie both had responsibility for elements of the evaluation. The partnership appears to have worked well in the main, although initial communication problems caused some frustration. However, communications improved over the lifetime of the project and resulted in better use of MVA data to inform the evaluation process. The project timetable was realistic and achievable, with key dates to be adhered to and reasonable negotiation between parties within these. All interviewees indicated that there had been plenty of opportunity to reflect on practice as the project developed and to make appropriate changes following team discussion. Within the training programme, core elements were identified which schemes were expected to adhere to. Beyond these, schemes were able to deliver the training flexibly, enabling MVA and the evaluation team to observe the effect of different approaches. Satisfaction at being involved in the programme was rated highly by all interviewees. All respondents were very clear about the expectations and requirements of their role. The project met the expectations of all respondents very well. No major barriers to effectiveness were identified and team members universally cited each other as facilitators to progress. Two interviewees were asked if they were aware of any adaptations which had been made to the Kerbcraft model by any of the schemes. Adaptations they were aware of included:

- reduction in the number of pupil training sessions;
- change in order of skills;
- delivering a minimum of 10 minutes training at the roadside;
- delivering all training within one term; and
- provision of wet weather training indoors to replace roadside sessions.

These issues were addressed by MVA staff with the authorities concerned as soon as they became aware of them.

5.8.6 Factors for success and failure of schemes

Key elements of a successful scheme as identified by the respondents included:

- the characteristics and skills of the co-ordinator;
- a willing and ready supply of volunteers able to take on some responsibility for the scheme themselves;
- co-operative schools; and
- innovation and creativity in the delivery of training and timetabling which takes into account the demands of the National Curriculum.

Conversely, barriers to success included:

- insufficient volunteers;
- a lack of support from schools; and
- a co-ordinator without key skills.

The recruitment of volunteers was considered to be the greatest challenge to co-ordinators during the project. Challenges to MVA included dealing with co-ordinators who felt that their managers were unsupportive, the delivery of training to co-ordinators, and building relationships between the regional project managers and co-ordinators.

5.8.7 Sustainability of schemes

Interviewees were given three options as to how Kerbcraft might be sustained following the end of Department for Transport funding for the pilot programme:

- 1. for an existing member of school staff to take on the role of co-ordinator;
- 2. to have parents run the scheme in school; and
- 3. to establish a consortium of schools in the area and 'buy in' time/skills from a pool of trained volunteers.

(These three options are the same as those given to head teachers within the survey reported in Section 5.6.) Opinions were mixed as to which might offer the best chance of success and the differences between individual schools was acknowledged. An alternative suggestion was included to provide professional co-ordinator support, with schools taking responsibility for the delivery of pupil training. The suggestion that volunteers could be paid for their involvement in the scheme met with a mixed reaction. It was felt that this may help in motivating volunteers in some areas, while in others some of the essence of volunteering might be taken away if payment incentives were introduced. Financial incentives may

affect the payment of state benefits, while offering 'gifts', such as vouchers, may be more acceptable.

5.8.8 Summary of key outcomes

- Reasoned discussion and co-operation to enable an evolving approach on the part of the commissioning agency have greatly assisted in the management of the project.
- Working in partnership can be successful where roles are well defined, communication channels kept open and progress on key tasks is monitored throughout the project.
- Clear expectations of individual roles and mutual support between team members have resulted in high levels of staff motivation and satisfaction.
- Key elements of a successful Kerbcraft scheme reflect on the skills and abilities of the co-ordinator, co-operation and support from schools, and innovation and creativity within the timetabling and delivery of training.
- The recruitment and retention of volunteers was seen as the greatest challenge to co-ordinators and also the biggest potential threat to the successful running of the programme at a local level.
- Sustaining Kerbcraft schemes beyond the end of the national pilot phase may require a combination of approaches which reflect the specific needs of individual schools.

6 SYNTHESIS OF RESULTS

6.1 Objective 1: To establish the impact of the Child Pedestrian Training Pilot Projects on the safety of children's behaviour at the roadside

(Sources used: skills assessment exercise.)

The assessment methods used in the skills assessment exercise were based on the original Kerbcraft evaluation pilot study in Drumchapel. Here the outcomes for the three training elements are summarised and compared with the results from the original Drumchapel pilot. This section provides a summary of the technical results reported in the Section 5.1.

6.1.1 Safe Places training outcomes

6.1.1.1 Main effect of training on children's behaviour at the roadside

The main results confirm the statistically significant positive impact of the Safe Places programme on trained children's behaviour at the roadside. Trained children show a significant improvement in their choice of 'safe' routes at post-test 1 in comparison with the matched control cohort (Figure 6.1). Two to four moths after training ended, the trained group results show that they have not only retained their skills but improved upon their earlier gains in comparison with the control group. An analysis of **individual differences** at pre-test and corresponding improvements at post-test 1 and 2 show that children who start from a lower baseline make the greatest improvements as a result of training, indicating that low pre-test performance does not inhibit learning.



6.1.1.2 Gender differences

There are no significant gender differences either before or after Safe Places training.

6.1.1.3 Effect of number of training sessions

An ad hoc analysis of the impact of amounts of Safe Places sessions received by children in the testing cohort did not show any conclusive results. However, as by far the majority of tested children received the minimum amount of training recommended and their roadside behaviour improved significantly, the current recommendation of a programme of four to six Safe Places sessions remains.

6.1.2 Parked Cars training outcomes

6.1.2.1 Effect of previous Safe Places training

Mean scores show that trained children appear to start from a higher baseline level than controls at pre-test on many of the key Parked Cars actions. This may well suggest some transfer of skills from earlier Safe Places training, particularly in areas where there are many parked cars in the streets surrounding the school (Figure 6.2). However, as this trend is only significant for two key behaviours, it would appear that trained children are not advantaged **across the board** as a result of previous Safe Places training, and that gains made at post-test 1 and 2 are specific to Parked Cars training.



6.1.2.2 Basic crossing skills shown by trained and control children

The high pre-test scores for general road safety behaviours (stopping at the kerb; walking at a suitable pace across the road) show that all children have a basic understanding of the mechanics of crossing the road safely. Both trained and control

children show a similar slight increase in correct behaviour on these actions at posttest, suggesting that, even for the control group, participating in the testing trials is sufficient to reinforce these basic actions.

6.1.2.3 Main effect of training on 'preparing to cross safely'

The trained children showed a significant increase in the key actions specifically associated with checking the parked cars for occupants and signs of activity. Any increases shown by the control group were modest (non-significant) by comparison.

6.1.2.4 Main effect of training on 'stopping/pausing at sightline'

Trained children also showed a significant increase in the proportion of trials where they clearly **stop** (rather than **pause**) to look right and left for traffic at the sightline. This was reinforced by highly significant main effects of test and experimental condition at post-test 1 and was maintained at post-test 2. A corresponding decrease in the trials where they just **pause** can also be observed for trained children. By contrast, control children stop at the sightline **less often**, and show an **increase** in their propensity to pause (instead of stop).

6.1.2.5 Main effect of training on 'key looking behaviours' at post-test 1 and 2

The means scores for looking correctly while stopped at the sightline **increase** significantly for trained children and are accompanied by a corresponding **decrease** in less rigorous looking behaviours, which are only conducted while crossing (without first stopping at the sightline).

In comparison, children in the control group show no such marked increases in key looking behaviours while safely stopped at the sightline and negligible decreases in the less safe alternative of looking for traffic after stepping out from between the cars. With one exception, all of these differences in key behaviours between trained and control children show highly significant main effects of training and the test phase in favour of the trained group (at post-test 1) and these gains are again maintained at post-test 2.

6.1.2.6 Gender effects

There is no gender effect associated with Parked Cars training.

6.1.2.7 Effect of the number of training sessions

Again, an ad hoc analysis of the impact of amounts of Parked Cars sessions received by children in the testing cohort did not show any significant pattern of difference between groups. However, as by far the majority of tested children received the minimum amount of training recommended and their roadside behaviour improved significantly, the current recommendation of four Parked Cars sessions remains.

6.1.3 Junctions training outcomes

6.1.3.1 Effect of previous training

Means show that trained children have a significant advantage at pre-test over controls. This is most likely to be the result of informal learning on key Junctions behaviours picked up during training on the previous two skills, and is similar to trends found in the pilot Drumchapel study.

From the outset both groups exhibited some key Junctions behaviours. However, the post-test results for these actions indicate that performance on these behaviours was not at a ceiling level, as trained children were able to improve significantly on their baseline scores in comparison with the control group.

6.1.3.2 Main effect of training

Trained children show a significant improvement at post-test 1 on all actions associated with the 'junctions looking strategy' (Figure 6.3). At post-test 2 (two to four months after training), mean scores indicate that, across the board, trained children are still clearly out-performing controls. Indeed, the control group performance across all behaviours at post-test 2 is still consistently **poorer** than that of the trained group's overall performance **prior to any training at all (at pre-test)**. There is some evidence that trained children are slipping back on **some** key 'looking behaviours' at post-test 2. However, any slight drop-off in performance **may** be explained by the amount of training that the trained group received, as most children only received four sessions.



6.1.3.3 Behaviours involving recognising and avoiding obstructions

Throughout the testing process, both trained and control groups encountered the same number of opportunities to detect and move away from obstructions at junctions – this is consistent across all test phases. The results showed that trained children are choosing to move away from obstructions twice as often as controls. Even prior to training, this trend is statistically confirmed, is stronger at post-test 1 and is maintained at post-test 2.

6.1.3.4 Gender differences

There is no evidence of a gender effect on Junctions training.

6.1.3.5 Effect of the number of training sessions

As with the other skills, an ad hoc analysis of the impact of amounts of Junctions sessions received by children in the testing cohort did not show any significant pattern of difference between groups. However, despite a third of the testing sample receiving less than four training sessions (38%), the trained group **overall** showed significant improvements in their behaviour at junctions as a result of training. As Junctions training deals with situations which increase in complexity from week to week, a minimum of four to six sessions is advisable to allow children the varied experiences they require to develop appropriate skills.

6.1.4 Comparisons with the Drumchapel pilot

The current study shows strong statistical evidence of the positive impact of training in all three Kerbcraft skills. While the improvements made by trained children in this study are not as great (for each skill) as those observed in the original pilot study in Drumchapel (Thomson and Whelan, 1997), there are clear differences in the scale and diversity of the sample group, which go some way towards explaining this.

The original pilot study showed no gender differences in either baseline performance or impact of Kerbcraft training. Again, this study confirms this outcome with no statistical evidence or clear descriptive pattern of gender influence on the results, either before or after training.

Analyses of the impact of the amount of training children receive for each skill was inconclusive. However, as the majority of children in the testing cohort for each skill did receive the minimum recommended amounts of training, their statistically significant improvements suggest that this **minimum** level of training has a strong and sustained impact on children's behaviour. Thus, the recommendations for future schemes remain as before at four to six Safe Places sessions, four Parked Cars sessions and four to six Junctions sessions. Future scheme managers could perhaps

make use of existing monitoring resources to tailor the amount of training delivered to individual children's needs.

A programme of training based on these recommendations will provide ample opportunity for children to develop a holistic and transferable set of road crossing skills at a pace that is appropriate for each of them individually.

6.2 Objective 2: To determine the impact of the projects on schools, communities and volunteers

(Sources used: head teacher survey, case studies and volunteer survey.)

6.2.1 Impact of the projects on schools

The Kerbcraft training schemes have the potential to produce both positive and negative impacts on the schools and their organisation. Schools are faced with crowded timetables and staff often have difficulty responding to external requests for classroom space for many areas of work. Here we consider a series of questions.

6.2.1.1 Benefits to the schools and fitting in with the school ethos and other activities

The head teacher survey showed that the programme was perceived to have obvious benefits in terms of increasing children's knowledge and road safety awareness, and was regarded by many as supporting the school curriculum, for example in familiarising children with the geography of their local area. The programme was perceived to fit well into the school ethos and support specific initiatives, such as the School Travel Plan.

One of the case study schools demonstrated how Kerbcraft had been tied into other road safety initiatives for older children in the school – the Junior Road Safety Officer scheme operates in the school and the Primary Year 7 (10-11-years-old) children involved also learned about Kerbcraft so that they could make the rest of the school aware of the key messages.

The programme can also be used as part of the Ofsted inspection. The head teacher survey showed that nearly a third of the schools (29%) had received an Ofsted inspection (or HMIe in Scotland) while the Kerbcraft programme was running. In three of these schools, inspectors made specific mention of the programme. In the fourth, training was taking place during the visit, though no specific mention was made. Information gathered during MVA site visits indicates that some schools even asked co-ordinators to rearrange Kerbcraft training days to coincide with an Ofsted visit. All schools were asked if they had made reference to Kerbcraft within the documentation for their Self-Evaluation Form (SEF). Twenty-six (62%) schools reported that this had already been done, and eight (19%) indicated that they could

include information in the future. In future schemes it should be brought to the attention of the head teachers of participating schools that Kerbcraft can provide valuable evidence to fit into the self-evaluation process for Ofsted.

6.2.1.2 Contact between parents and schools

In the head teacher survey, 43% of respondents indicated that they considered Kerbcraft to have improved the relationship between parents and the school. Thirtysix per cent thought that there had been no change and no schools reported a detrimental effect. One of the case study schools revealed that Kerbcraft had a very visible presence in the school, with lots of images, posters, etc., in the foyer and around the school.

One of the case study schools was very enthusiastic of the fact that Kerbcraft involved parents regularly and in a manner where they could lead activities with children, without the need for supervision by school staff (Figure 6.4).



6.2.1.3 Issues surrounding parental consent for children's participation in training

The number of children in participating schools who did not receive any training were generally small (13% Tranche 1; 13% Tranche 2 and 15% Tranche 3). One of the most common reasons for not receiving training was a lack of parental consent for participation in the training programme. As the training involved activities at the roadside, outside the school and involved volunteer trainers, it was important that parents could make a fully informed decision on consent. For this reason, co-ordinators had been advised to use 'opt-in' consent forms which involved parents/ guardians actively signing and returning the form to confirm consent, rather than just signing and returning an 'opt-out' form if they did **not** want their child to take part. The use of 'opt-in' forms is crucial under these circumstances, but is often made more difficult in 'hard to reach' areas where parents have little contact with the school and a poor rapport with school staff, and where they may have literacy

problems or (most commonly) have English as a second language. The numbers of children not trained due to lack of consent were fairly small and relatively consistent across the lifetime of the project: 8% for Tranche 1, 8% for Tranche 2 and 5% for Tranche 3. Other reasons for children not being trained included:

- persistent absence;
- Kerbcraft clashed with another activity (e.g. music lessons, physiotherapy);
- the child's physical or behavioural needs could not be accommodated into training safely;
- the child refused to come out; and
- the child had inappropriate clothing (no warm coat or sturdy shoes in cold/wet weather).

6.2.1.4 Obtaining support from parents, governors, teachers and other members of the school community

The head teacher survey revealed that none of the schools had received any objections from parents to their children taking part in the programme. Some schools indicated that there was a time implication for their administrative staff in chasing up letters of consent from parents. School Governors (in Scotland, the School Board) were generally reported to have been supportive. Some schools had been successful in recruiting governors as volunteers within the Kerbcraft training.

6.2.1.5 Class teachers' views on timetabling arrangements for children extracted from class for small group training

In the head teacher survey most respondents (95%) reported no particular difficulties in freeing up pupil time to enable them to participate in the training. Several schools mentioned that the value of the programme outweighed any inconvenience caused. Only two schools reported minor problems.

In one of the case study schools, one class teacher expressed positive benefits of extracting children from class. She felt that it was useful to have some children out of the classroom for periods of time as it allowed her to listen to individual children's reading and concentrate on 'quiet' tasks with smaller groups of children.

6.2.1.6 Impact on children's behaviour or their verbal or social skills resulting from increased contact with parent volunteers and other adults

At one of the case study schools, one of the teaching assistants was involved in training some children with challenging behaviour who were often excluded from other activities. She found Kerbcraft to be very appropriate for these children, and that their behaviour and attention at the roadside was very good. Another teaching

assistant from a case study school reported that Kerbcraft had made a positive difference to the children's behaviour and concentration in school, and that she referred back to behaviour during Kerbcraft sessions to focus on listening and attention in the classroom.

In one of the case study schools, the head teacher felt that the scheme had a very positive general impact on the children participating as it was strongly focused on developing children's self-esteem and concept of citizenship. Throughout the site visits conducted by MVA, several class teachers and teaching assistants commented on the positive impact of Kerbcraft training on children's behaviour in the classroom. One class teacher said: 'The scheme is carried out at the right age and helps with their maths, oral skills, language, geography, spatial awareness, confidence and social skills.'

6.2.1.7 Problems experienced in accommodating parent volunteers within the school

The majority of respondents in the head teacher survey (88%) experienced no problems with allocating space for the training of volunteers or as an alternative to outdoor sessions if the weather was poor. Although there were frequent comments regarding the lack of 'free' space, most seemed to have been able to accommodate the scheme without too much disruption.

6.2.2 Impact of the projects on communities

The case studies have provided some insights into the question of whether people living in the vicinity of the schools were aware of the programme. The programme has alerted local residents about the fact that the school is tackling the problem of parental parking and traffic. There have been positive comments from local residents regarding the children's behaviour. In particular, a positive impact on the relationship between the school and the community, involving those parties not usually involved, has been seen. When local people see children out and about in the streets, wearing their high-visibility bibs, they have been interested to find out about the programme.

External agencies, such as police community support officers, have also used the programme as an opportunity to build links with the school.

Many co-ordinators have developed support materials to encourage parents of Kerbcraft-trained children to continue with Kerbcraft themes at home. Leaflets were produced by a number of local authorities that outline the key behaviours associated with each of the three skills and provide parents with information on how they can discuss safe road crossing strategies with their children. The resources were often shared and redeveloped across schemes through the Kerbcraft web site and coordinator networks. These materials provide a vital additional resource to support parents and reinforce important road safety messages.

6.2.3 Impact of the projects on the volunteers

The Kerbcraft programme has the potential to make an impact on volunteers at both the individual and community levels. Kerbcraft could provide opportunities for individuals to develop social contacts, to take advantage of education and employment opportunities and, for parents, it encourages participation in their child's school community. Secondly, by focusing on an issue which has a community-wide impact, it promotes increased tolerance of diversity, as well as increasing general social cohesion and participation within the community.

Part of the survey of volunteer experiences and attitudes explored the motivation and the specific benefits of the 'Kerbcraft' programme on both active volunteers and those who had dropped out of the scheme. Active volunteers were asked what motivated them to remain with the project for over 12 months. The most popular reason was the enjoyment of working with the children (85%), followed by recognising the importance of the training (79%) and feeling that they could make a difference at their child's school (65%). The responses which focused more on personal benefits for the volunteers themselves were the least commonly chosen motivators, indicating again that Kerbcraft volunteers are more motivated by the social impact of the programme than any perceived personal benefits.

Active volunteers were also asked to identify any specific benefits they may have felt as a result of their involvement in Kerbcraft. The most frequent response was the fact that they felt valued by the school and project staff (59%), followed by the social benefits of the project of meeting new people and making new friends (50%), and recognition of improved relations with the school (35%).Twenty-three per cent said that volunteering made them feel more part of their community and 21% that it improved their self-confidence. Interestingly, the perceived benefit, which received the least responses (6%), was that training led to further work or education opportunities. Anecdotal accounts from scheme co-ordinators suggest that many volunteers have requested references and gone on to work more formally within and outside their school, and have gone back into education, and have cited the confidence gained as a Kerbcraft volunteer as a supporting factor in their search for further work/education opportunities.

Drop-out volunteers had very similar views, on both the issues of motivation and specific benefits, as active volunteers. The main reason for leaving was a change in personal circumstance (36%), while 26% had started work or educational courses.

6.3 Objective 3: To determine the cost effectiveness of such schemes in terms of positive outcomes versus the amount of resources and effort required to establish and maintain the schemes from the point of view of all participants – local authorities, other providers (if any), communities, schools, volunteers and parents

(Source used: cost effectiveness study.)

6.3.1 Objectives

The objectives of this economic evaluation were:

- to undertake comparative economic evaluation of seven local authority Kerbcraft schemes in terms of their cost-effectiveness; and
- to undertake a comparative economic evaluation of children's behaviour change scores after Kerbcraft training at the school level.

6.3.2 Data capture

Local authority schemes and schools were selected at random through Tranches 2 and 3 of the Kerbcraft network. For economic evaluation it was felt important that the following factors were represented across the Kerbcraft schemes and schools selected: deprivation, rurality, ethnicity, metropolitan and non-metropolitan boroughs. The data used for economic evaluation and the development of the assumptions for modelling were largely primary data collected by MVA that formed part of their ongoing management and monitoring of the network. The skills assessments and case studies were part of the wider formal evaluation by UWE. The skills assessments gathered observation data of children's behaviour and explanations at the roadside for each Kerbcraft skill, and each case study involved semi-structured interviews with Kerbcraft co-ordinators, users and other stakeholders.

6.3.3 Economic evaluation methods

Seven local authority schemes and 13 schools were selected for the comparative economic evaluation of Kerbcraft and associated cost-effectiveness measures were calculated.

6.3.4 Economic evaluation findings

The budgets and the number of children receiving Kerbcraft training within each scheme were compared and costs per child were calculated. These were below £100 per child in all local authorities. Costs lay in the range of £28 to £99 per child. The

cost of Kerbcraft in six of the local authorities was below £40. Costs in the one local authority above £40 per child can be explained by the absence of a Kerbcraft coordinator in the first six months of the scheme. This had the effect of reducing coverage of the schools and the number of children trained.

The added cost per initial 1% proportionate change in 'safe' behaviour scores (Skill 1) across all trained children in a local authority ranged between £919 and £5,999. The added cost per 1% proportionate change in safe behaviour scores across all children in a local authority after completion of Kerbcraft ranged between £5 and £99. In one local authority, the long-term cost of Kerbcraft per 1% change in safe behaviours across all schools in the local authority was negative. The local authority in question found itself saving £164 after the completion of Kerbcraft. Findings also showed that the cost-effectiveness of Kerbcraft increases over time, adding more to outcome than to cost while it is running and having a robust impact on safe road behaviour after its completion.

6.3.5 Conclusions

Some local authorities in the inner cities appear to have performed well in terms of rolling out the Kerbcraft scheme and the coverage they have managed across their nominated schools. One of the inner-city local authorities included in this economic evaluation did not have a high level of volunteer support for Kerbcraft, but had managed to cover all its nominated schools and enroll large numbers of children into Kerbcraft, spreading the cost widely. Local authorities with a greater than 65% representation from BMEGs were not affected in terms of cost-effectiveness either. It seems that the Kerbcraft scheme had managed to reach and be run cost-effectively in local authorities with high representation from BMEGs and high levels of socio-economic deprivation. This should have longer-term impacts on child pedestrian accident rates in the future. There is no clear pattern of cost-effectiveness in terms of the rurality or the size of a local authority from this data.

The findings of this cost-effectiveness analysis support the idea that the full benefit of Kerbcraft could be obtained by expanding the scheme further in terms of scale (until the additional benefits and additional costs are equal). It suggests that the scheme is robust and has medium-term benefits that accrue after the Kerbcraft scheme has ended. Kerbcraft may also have long-term benefits as well, but we do not have the data at this stage to build the evidence to support that argument. However, the dramatic fall in the cost per change in safe behaviours test scores suggests that investment in Kerbcraft would pay back benefits and value in terms of safe behaviours long after its implementation.

6.4 Objective 4: To identify the most effective schemes and explore those aspects that determine their success and also reasons why any schemes failed to meet their objectives

(Sources used: MVA staff survey, road safety officer survey, co-ordinator survey and case studies.)

The survey with MVA staff managing the National Child Pedestrian Training Pilot Projects included a question on defining what made a successful scheme. The key ingredients identified were:

- the quality of the co-ordinator;
- the supply of volunteers;
- the co-operation of schools;
- innovation and creativity in the delivery of the training; and
- practical factors such as timetabling training to avoid clashes within the National Curriculum.

The qualities needed for an effective co-ordinator were enthusiasm and dedication. The ideal co-ordinator was a person able to develop a good relationship with schools, parents and volunteers, and who could motivate others. A flexible approach to work was needed in order to juggle all the demands of the role. Someone who has trained a reasonable number of children themselves was also important. There was a reasonably high turnover of co-ordinators throughout the lifetime of the project. Mostly, co-ordinators went on to more permanent positions within their road safety departments or left for alternative employment close to the end of funding. Where there were lengthy gaps in time without a replacement, this had an impact on the number of children trained and often made it more difficult to re-establish the momentum of the project with schools and volunteers.

A willing and ready supply of volunteers, who have consistent involvement in the project, was also vital. The volunteers needed to be able to take on some of the responsibility for the delivery of the scheme themselves. The co-operation of schools – in particular the head teacher and class teacher – was also stressed as an important factor in the uptake and implementation of the programme. This was further highlighted in several of the case studies and findings gathered during MVA site visits.

These key ingredients of successful schemes are supported by comments made by road safety officers in the road safety officer surveys. The recruitment and retention of an efficient and effective co-ordinator was considered essential in establishing, managing and maintaining Kerbcraft schemes. One Tranche 3 road safety officer summed this up: 'we have been especially lucky in getting an experienced teacher with road safety knowledge and experience to take up the co-ordinator's role – this has made the implementation and management for the initiative easy'.

The support received by co-ordinators from their line managers and host departments also had an appreciable impact on the successful delivery of Kerbcraft in their area. Site visit records from MVA show that where co-ordinators did not feel they were adequately supported, they lacked self-confidence and the focus to overcome other external challenges.

A road safety officer from Tranche 3 reinforced the issue relating to volunteers:

'Kerbcraft scheme works well with committed volunteers – when support begins to falter, which can be a problem in areas of deprivation, the coordinators struggle. Maintaining interest and recruiting new volunteers is a constant challenge for the co-ordinators in most of the schools.'

The co-ordinator survey showed that the recruitment of volunteers had been easier in some schools, where there had been co-operation of the head teacher and class teachers, well-established school/parent relationships, and where there were existing home school liaison officers or established parents groups.

Two of the case study schools were selected as 'model' schools, providing good examples of Kerbcraft in practice. Both schools had initial problems recruiting volunteers, but succeeded in overcoming them. The co-ordinators tried various strategies, including parents' evenings and playground visits at home time. The more successful strategy was to recruit parents through the school, either by letter home or by direct request from the head teacher.

In the first 'model school' the co-ordinator recruited more than 20 volunteers, around half from within the school (classroom assistants and lunchtime supervisors) and the rest were parents. There was a concerted effort to involve parents, new to the school, in the project each year. The school took the project very seriously from the start and planned ahead carefully to integrate training sessions properly into the timetable.

In the second 'model' school, the road safety officer had been very supportive and helped with training when volunteers were thin on the ground. The co-ordinator also had one 'champion' volunteer who had been happy to train in several schools when required and who has been involved in the project for over two years. Both schools have allocated responsibility for facilitating Kerbcraft to a key member of staff.

Both these schools demonstrated commitment to road safety over and above the programme itself. The first school conducted refresher courses for trained children
12 months after they complete training. The second school had follow-up work in the classroom after Kerbcraft training.

6.5 Objective 5: To investigate the setting up, management and maintenance of the schemes, exploring both reasons for success and failure at the national level (MVA management) and the local level (individual schemes, feedback from children, schools and volunteers)

(Sources used: volunteer survey, case studies, co-ordinator survey, road safety officer survey, head teacher survey, MVA staff survey.)

6.5.1 National management

MVA Consultancy was commissioned to manage the project and support the schemes. This arrangement appears to have been successful, the key factors being open communication between the agencies involved, co-operation between all parties involved to enable the project to evolve and continued monitoring of progress throughout the project. MVA project staff reported clear expectations of their individual roles from the outset, and together, with a strong ethos of team working, this has provided a solid project management base. Early teething problems identified by road safety officers/co-ordinators have been addressed as the project has evolved, thereby improving efficiency during the later phases.

6.5.2 Co-ordinator recruitment and training

The recruitment and retention of an efficient and effective co-ordinator was identified as key to the success of Kerbcraft from the perspective of both the employing local authority and the participating schools. Authorities had used their own advertisements for the co-ordinator posts, finding the job description provided by the Department for Transport useful in informing this process. The preferred qualities sought included self-motivation, experience in road safety and an outgoing personality. Co-ordinators themselves rated their own key qualities as interpersonal/ communication skills, enthusiasm and initiative. These are similar to those regarded most highly by schools and are those most often relied on to overcome problems associated with the recruitment and retention of volunteers. The training of co-ordinators was given considerable emphasis, with 80% of Tranche 2 and Tranche 3 co-ordinators attending training, as did 85% of Tranche 2 road safety officers. The residential nature of training programme increased steadily over successive tranches.

6.5.3 Volunteer recruitment and training

The recruitment and retention of volunteers is critical to the successful running of the Kerbcraft scheme at a local level. Several of the schools involved in the case studies, as well as those which participated in the head teacher interviews, identified initial problems in attracting and recruiting parent volunteers. This was substantiated in the co-ordinator surveys. Difficulties included:

- parents who were unavailable during the school day, owing to work or family commitments;
- parents with low self-esteem or negative personal experiences of school;
- parents with communication difficulties;
- parents with English as an additional language/poor literacy levels;
- parents concerned over the potential loss of state benefits;
- high-mobility populations; and
- the delay caused by CRB checks.

The most effective recruitment strategy appears to have been using a letter from the school/co-ordinator, followed up by a personal invitation to encourage specific individuals to become involved.

Extending recruitment into the wider community enabled schemes to operate in areas where parental interest/availability was low. Volunteers have included community/street wardens, road safety clubs, school crossing patrollers, police, churches and social clubs, and students on childcare courses. Links developed by the co-ordinator or by a nominated member of the school personnel have facilitated this process. The majority (93%) of volunteers were female, most were parents and many were already involved in school activities. Flexibility in the provision of volunteer training and in the scheduling of pupil sessions enabled co-ordinators to meet specific needs within their schools, for example in order to include volunteers with part-time work commitments. Volunteer surveys highlighted the value of receiving training in the roadside environment before accompanying children outside school.

Co-ordinators have worked hard to develop good relationships with their volunteers, often meeting with them after training sessions in a less formal context and by ensuring contact was maintained between sessions. Some schemes have provided rewards to volunteers in the form of small gifts and social events on completion of the training. Others have provided payment for the delivery of training sessions. Retaining volunteers has been a challenge. Participation in Kerbcraft has resulted in some taking on additional responsibility within school or moving into paid employment. Though this necessitates further recruitment, the impact on both individuals and schools was viewed positively.

6.5.4 Delivery of pupil training/role of the school

In delivering the Kerbcraft programme, core elements were identified by the national management team to which schemes were expected to adhere. Outside of these, flexible delivery was encouraged in order to meet individual needs. This has resulted in several schemes operating in a modified format, for example by providing 'blocks' of training within one or two terms rather than spread out over the whole school year. Several schemes also reduced the number of pupil training sessions or changed the order in which the skills were taught, despite this having been highlighted as one of the core elements that they were expected to adhere to.

From a school perspective, it is vital that the pupil sessions are run so as to minimise disruption to the school day. Advance timetabling of these enables teaching staff to plan activities accordingly, and provides an opportunity to develop links between Kerbcraft and cross-curricular themes. Some schemes have also opted to provide follow-up classroom/refresher sessions to reinforce the educational messages. There appears to be some interest among certain schools to extend the training to older pupils. This was viewed as an opportunity to reinforce learning and to develop a whole-school approach to pedestrian safety training. Kerbcraft provides an all-inclusive means of teaching road safety, accessible to pupils with severe physical/ educational needs. This was seen as a benefit by participating schools. Extending the school behavioural policy to pupil training positive behaviour in children and demonstrates commitment to the scheme within the wider school curriculum. The school offers a valuable context for training.

Support and co-operation from school staff emphasises to the wider community the importance attached to the safety of their pupils as pedestrians (Figure 6.5). Appointing a senior member of school staff, such as the head teacher or school-home liaison worker, as the Kerbcraft 'link' person was seen to have benefit in making the scheme more accessible to parents and helped in raising the profile.



6.6 Objective 6: To identify factors that contribute to the sustainability of schemes, in particular the retention and continued recruitment of volunteers and local sources of funding

(Sources used: volunteer surveys, case studies, co-ordinator surveys, road safety officer surveys, head teacher survey and MVA staff interviews.)

One of the key strengths of the Kerbcraft Pedestrian Safety Training Programme is the contribution that it is able to make within other areas of the school curriculum. Responses from the head teacher survey indicate the value in linking training to a wider range of school-based initiatives, such as the School Travel Plan and Health Promoting School/Healthy School Awards. The inclusive ethos of Kerbcraft, with its focus on partnership working, can be used to demonstrate school commitment to the 'Every Child Matters' agenda. This can be used as evidence within the Self-Evaluation Form (SEF), now a requirement of the Ofsted inspection process for schools in England.

6.6.1 Sources of funding beyond the pilot phase

Securing funding to continue pedestrian safety training beyond the timescale of the national Kerbcraft pilot presents a challenge to schools and local/unitary authorities. A wide range of funding sources has been accessed to sustain those schemes originally participating in Tranche 1 or Tranche 2 of the pilot. These include:

- the New Deal for Communities;
- the Neighbourhood Road Safety Initiative (NRSI);
- Neighbourhood Renewal Funding;
- the Local Transport Plan;
- the Local Public Service Agreement;
- the Safety Camera Partnership;
- Community Regeneration Funding;
- the Performance Reward Grant;
- Council Revenue;
- the Road Safety Budget; and
- the Adult Continuing Learning Programme.

Some of these initiatives afford the opportunity for child pedestrian safety training to be linked with other outcomes, such as continuing adult education and training.

The survey of road safety officers showed increased optimism for securing funding beyond the pilot at Tranche 3 compared with Tranche 2.

Schools themselves may also be prepared to contribute towards the cost of continuing the scheme, as evidenced by discussion with one of the case study schools. In the head teacher survey, 86% of schools indicated that they would consider 'buying in' to a pool of trained volunteers. This obviously will depend on the costs involved, but indicates a willingness to support pedestrian safety training from the school budget.

On a cautionary note, it appears from discussions during the head teacher survey that the time-limited nature of central funding for the pilot phase may have discouraged some schools from including the training within their medium- to longterm planning and policy cycles.

6.6.2 Retention and continued recruitment of volunteers

A consistent and reliable supply of volunteers is central to the success of running Kerbcraft. The volunteer surveys showed that the majority of those involved would be happy to continue in the future. The primary motivators for becoming involved were the perceived benefits for local children and schools, and the personal enjoyment afforded to the volunteers by participating. Importance was placed on feeling valued by the school and the co-ordinator, and the social elements – meeting new people and improving relationships with school staff – were also highlighted. Among those volunteers who were no longer involved in the training, none cited negative aspects of the scheme as their reason for leaving.

Continuing the scheme with the same group of volunteers was perceived by one of the case study schools as beneficial: 'The longer the project runs in school with the same volunteers, the better and more professional the training becomes.'

Parent 'turnover' as children progress through schools undoubtedly has an impact on volunteer availability, necessitating the need for continued recruitment if training is to be sustained. A variety of recruitment methods have been employed and are referred to in greater detail in the previous section (see Sections 5.4 and 5.5). One of the case study schools suggested that including information on the scheme in the school prospectus might raise its profile with new parents.

Surveys of road safety officers and co-ordinators identified one scheme where links with a local college had resulted in a ready supply of volunteers as well as the incorporation of child pedestrian training into vocational college courses such as childcare. This is an innovative way to sustain the training and to extend road safety education to another audience. Similar partnerships exist between some of the schools and local businesses, thereby encouraging community participation. Information on these relationships was gleaned from anecdotal discussions with co-ordinators or from MVA site visit records. The links to businesses were mostly developed from pre-existing personal contacts either with the Kerbcraft co-ordinator or with someone within the school.

In the survey of co-ordinators, half of the respondents felt that offering payment/ incentives, or a recognised qualification for volunteers, might encourage recruitment and retention. The interviews with MVA staff revealed mixed views as to the benefit of paying volunteers for their involvement in the training. On the one hand, payment may act as a motivational incentive, though this needs to be balanced with the view that offering payment takes away that essence of 'volunteering' which may prove so satisfactory to some of those involved. It should be considered that payment has financial consequences for the local authority involved, and may result in a loss of volunteers if payment can not be sustained long term. Volunteers who felt that payment might attract people to the schemes for the wrong reasons echoed this sentiment. Providing volunteers with 'gifts' (vouchers, etc.) may be a more appropriate mechanism for some and will not interfere with the payment of state benefits in the way that cash payments could. Finally, the impact of making volunteers feel personally 'valued' cannot be overstated, as this was consistently mentioned as a major motivator by volunteers themselves.

6.6.3 Co-ordination of scheme

Findings from the case studies emphasise the importance and value of the role of the co-ordinator in contributing to the success of the programme. Retaining a co-ordinator external to the school (a local authority employee, for example) gives the advantage of support from a dedicated road safety professional. This professional element was seen as important by some of the schools responding to the head teacher survey, in that it raises the profile of the training. Interest in professional training, perhaps leading to a qualification such as an NVQ or a National Transport Qualification, was also expressed by co-ordinators at the national conference in December 2006. This would go some way towards acknowledging the importance of the co-ordinator role and could also provide the basis for a continuing career in road safety.

It may be possible to increase the capacity for school recruitment, and also to reduce the amount of time spent by the co-ordinator in any one school, by delegating some of the administrative elements of volunteer recruitment and pupil training to school staff.

Having parents run the scheme was seen as a possibility by 60% of schools responding to the head teacher survey, although this did raise concerns over issues of responsibility and reliability. In one of the case study schools, parents had expressed interest in continuing the programme themselves. The head teacher felt that in order to pursue this, there would be a need for additional training and support for those involved. Forty per cent of schools responding to the head teacher survey

thought that having a member of the school staff responsible for continuing the scheme could be viable. The major barriers to this approach were the lack of capacity within the school to release staff to take on this role, and the lack of time which teaching staff, in particular, could dedicate to the scheme.

Supporting materials and resources for the Kerbcraft scheme were well received. Feedback from the national conference in December 2006 highlighted suggestions for future improvements, including the provision of translated materials to cater for minority populations, developing resources for children with special needs, such as dyslexia, and the provision of supporting materials for parents. The Kerbcraft web site was viewed as a valued tool, and desire was expressed that it continues in order to provide a means of information sharing and disseminating good practice.

6.6.4 'Adding value' to Kerbcraft training

Throughout the course of the national pilot there were many instances where coordinators, road safety officers and volunteer trainers worked together to develop further training strategies which 'added value' to Kerbcraft training in their area. These include:

- providing children with skills for walking safely in rural areas (walking in single-file, facing oncoming traffic, dealing with grass verges instead of pavements, placing a stronger emphasis on listening skills to anticipate traffic);
- timetabling in extra sessions to introduce new or unusual environments, such as Home Zones, where there are no pavements and/or ambiguous 'shared surfaces';
- including refresher sessions for each skill 12 months after children complete their initial Kerbcraft training programme;
- extending training to older children (aged eight or nine) where a skills/resource gap was identified;
- involving local businesses and service providers (e.g. the police, fire and rescue) as an additional source of volunteer trainers in local schools;
- using local college students on childcare/nursery nurse courses as volunteer trainers, and making their contribution an accredited part of their course work;
- providing class teachers with resource materials to further reinforce Kerbcraft messages in the classroom;
- the design and delivery of Kerbcraft-based wet weather activities to keep children focused on Kerbcraft even when outdoor training cannot be undertaken;
- providing additional training for volunteer trainers on the safe use of designated crossings where these are located nearby the school and used to access Kerbcraft training sites;

- providing hats and ponchos for children to better enable training during the winter;
- producing training materials specifically for parents to reinforce Kerbcraft messages at home; and
- organising a more flexible training timetable to accommodate schools' requirements, including running all training back-to-back within one school term.

6.6.5 Other modifications

Within the National Network, all authorities taking part in the pilot were advised to deliver Kerbcraft training as suggested in the Kerbcraft manual (Thomson *et al.*, 2002) in order that the impact of the Kerbcraft model on a range of environments could be systematically evaluated. However, for various reasons, a number of authorities made significant modifications to the mode of delivery of Kerbcraft skills in their areas. While in some areas this may have allowed co-ordinators to train more children in their target schools, the impact of these modifications was outside the remit of the evaluation process. Therefore there are some concerns over the impact of these modifications on the quality of training delivered to children. These modifications include:

- delivering less than the recommended number of training sessions for each skill
 this could have a negative impact on children's retention of skills over time;
- merging skills together into fewer sessions this could detract focus from the main training messages for each skill and confuse children; and
- changing the order in which skills are delivered the skills making up the Kerbcraft package are designed to build progressively on each other. Starting with the basic premise of Safe Places, children can then make sense of how to deal with crossing between parked cars when no safer place is available. Training concludes with Junctions, the most conceptually challenging of the three skills, which also provides an opportunity to recap on the previous training messages. Changing the order in which the skills are delivered could confuse children and undermine their understanding of the key messages of each skill.

6.6.6 Kerbcraft training after the national pilot project

The survey of Tranche 2 road safety officers conducted by MVA between six and nine months after pilot funding ceased showed that, of the 39 authorities, 69% were still undertaking some form of practical roadside training and a further 21% were planning to do so. Fifteen per cent of the schemes were run according to the Kerbcraft principles, 63% were based on Kerbcraft, though with some modifications, and 22% ran other forms of practical training. Six of the seventeen authorities running 'Kerbcraft with some modifications' still employed a road safety

offcier/co-ordinator to manage this but with increased involvement of schools personnel/paid trainers. This enabled them to reach a greater number of children with the training. Sixteen of the same seventeen authorities reported having reduced the number of training sessions and/or merged skills and/or changed the order in which the skills were taught. This gives some cause for concern in the light of the findings from the skills assessment (Section 5.1), which suggest the significant positive impact on children's behaviour of delivering the Kerbcraft programme as it is currently structured.

7 COMMENTARY ON THE STUDY

It is clear from the main outcomes of each element of the evaluation that the Kerbcraft programme, as delivered through the National Child Pedestrian Training Pilot Project, has had a positive impact on the children, schools, volunteers, coordinators and authorities involved.

7.1 Strengths and weaknesses of the intervention

The Kerbcraft model itself possesses a number of strengths. It is firmly based on learning theories and educational evidence (Thomson *et al.*, 1996), was extensively piloted in a deprived community in Glasgow (Thomson and Whelan, 1997) and subsequently nationwide in 115 different schemes across England and Scotland in this study. The Skills Assessment from this evaluation confirms that the Kerbcraft model, where delivered as recommended, can significantly improve children's road crossing skills and behaviours and is sufficiently flexible to deliver positive outcomes in a wide range of social and physical environments. A responsive management structure and training programme at the national and local level has enabled the programme to be modified, improved and adapted to a range of environments. An example of this was when training was adapted to include specific skills required in rural road environments, such as walking in single-file to face oncoming traffic and dealing with a lack of pavements.

A further strength of the intervention was the emphasis placed on the quality of training provided for road safety officers, co-ordinators and volunteers. Co-ordinators and road safety officers reported a high level of satisfaction with the training and supporting resources provided. The 'network' system managed by MVA was very successful in providing advice and support, and in facilitating contact among the co-ordinators. Indicators for success were also identified where co-ordinators spent time developing strong personal relationships with volunteers and school staff, and where they demonstrated initiative in 'adding value' to the training programme.

Surveys of head teachers and volunteers have indicated that involvement in Kerbcraft has often further developed school-parent relationships, and volunteers reported increased confidence and self-esteem as a result of their contribution to the scheme. Kerbcraft schemes have been most successful in areas where schools have embraced the programme, have integrated it thoroughly into the whole school community, and have linked it to relevant aspects of the curriculum and Ofsted/ HMIe process.

The evaluation also identified a number of challenges in delivering the Kerbcraft programme. It can make intensive demands on time and resources at every level. The recruitment and retention of volunteers was, as anticipated, the main challenge

for co-ordinators. However, the evaluation (and MVA monitoring) of the national pilot has identified a huge variety of rewards, incentives and motivators that were successfully used to retain volunteers throughout the lifetime of the project. The teething problems in setting-up and managing schemes experienced by some Tranche 1 co-ordinators were successfully overcome within the first 12 months of the project and were mostly avoided in subsequent tranches. This was facilitated by improvements throughout the project lifespan in the communication and feedback processes between co-ordinators, network managers and the evaluation team.

In order to overcome time management issues, some co-ordinators chose to modify the core elements of the training, some to such an extent that effectiveness may have been reduced. For example, some schemes provided fewer training sessions than recommended for a certain skill in order to fit training into a tight timetable or to compensate for a lack of volunteers. Also, the training process proved disruptive for some schools, interfering with the National Curriculum timetable and SAT tests for Key Stage 1 pupils. However, it should be pointed out that the majority of schools overcame any inconveniences.

The delivery of training to schools in 'hard to reach' areas also presented challenges, particularly with regard to engaging school support and in recruiting volunteers from within the school community. However, in many areas these challenges were overcome through dogged persistence on the part of the coordinator in utilising and developing links with the school and surrounding community. The case studies highlight best practice strategies for delivering training in schools in very deprived areas and in communities with less stable ethnic minority groups and vulnerable families.

Regardless of these not inconsiderable challenges, co-ordinators and managers within participating authorities clearly valued their participation in the pilot project as many of them have gone on to seek independent funding to continue with Kerbcraft training (in some form) after the pilot ends. This report identifies a number of current funding sources successfully accessed by authorities in this regard. Many schemes have chosen to run a 'modified' version of Kerbcraft training in order to reach more schools within their target areas. However, an evaluation of the impact of these modifications was not within the remit of this study, thus the authors cannot comment on the efficacy of any modified training. Recommendations for delivering successful and effective schemes can be found in the final section of this report.

7.2 Strengths and weaknesses of the evaluation

The Kerbcraft programme took place over a five-year period, providing considerable opportunity to gather large amounts of information on the management and implementation of the schemes from a range of stakeholders. The data were collected through a combination of methods, for example self-completion questionnaires, telephone surveys, case studies of schools and behavioural testing at the roadside. Quantitative data from the surveys have been complimented by qualitative information, for example from the case study schools. The results have been synthesised to provide an evidence-base for the implications and recommendations of the study.

Another strength of the evaluation has been that it incorporates a cost effectiveness and cost-benefit analysis. Such components are rarely included within health promotion programmes. In a wider context, the outcome measures are not just roadsafety related, but extend beyond this to cover areas such as social capital, community participation and wider educational gains.

The evaluation possessed a number of weaknesses. Firstly, the study design was not that of a randomised controlled trial. While matched comparisons were conducted as part of the skills assessment exercise, randomised controlled trials are the most rigorous way of determining whether a cause-effect relationship exists between a treatment/intervention and an outcome. They have the advantage over other study designs that they can detect the associations and that one can be confident that this was not caused by a third factor linked to both intervention and outcome (Sibbald and Roland, 1998). This method could have been used in the evaluation of the National Child Pedestrian Training Pilot Project: local authorities could have been selected to take part in the evaluation and then randomised into an intervention group to receive funding in Tranche 1 and a control group which would receive funding at a later stage.

Secondly, practical constraints meant that the evaluation began later in the programme than would have been ideal, resulting in little data capture from Tranche 1 schemes. Finally, the evaluation did not extend to measuring knowledge transfer/ change in behaviour among the parents/wider family of pupils who received the training.

8 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

8.1 Implications for policy

- Cross-departmental initiatives between the Department for Transport and the Department for Children, Schools and Families would enhance the impact of similar schemes.
- The Kerbcraft programme has highlighted the importance of involving the evaluation team at an early stage. The expectation that stakeholders and participants will be involved in this process should be stated at the outset.

8.2 Implications for research

- There is a need for further investigation into the impact of community deprivation on this type of intervention.
- There is a need for further work on the impact of ethnicity and of rurality on this type of intervention.
- A longer-term review of the impact on casualty reduction and on behavioural change in children would determine if the positive effects of the training are sustained over time.
- Evaluation of the impact of training schemes on parents/family members would illuminate how far safety messages are transferred once pupils have been trained.
- Opportunity exists to investigate the use of volunteers in other road safety initiatives.
- A review should be undertaken of the sustainability/continuation of the training programme to ascertain whether training has continued within schemes, the nature of any modifications made and the effect of these on outcome measures.

8.3 Implications for practice – future delivery of Kerbcraft training

- The behavioural gains children achieved were observed when the programme was delivered in line with current recommendations on the amount of training received: four to six Safe Places sessions; four Parked Cars sessions and four to six Junctions sessions.
- The process evaluation confirmed the importance of including a 'practical' roadside element within child pedestrian safety training.

- Children benefit from a non-didactic, participative way of learning, and delivering the training to small groups also provides the bonus of peer-supported collaborative learning.
- The Kerbcraft programme has highlighted the importance of delivering training at each stage of the intervention to co-ordinators, to volunteers and to pupils.
- Schools are likely to be more amenable and supportive towards road safety training when this reinforces current educational and curricular links.
- Challenges relating to ethnicity, deprivation and rurality/physical environment can be overcome. Closer community participation is a key ingredient for success.
- The process of setting up the scheme may take longer than anticipated in some schools. Starting with those who are ready to go and coming back to others has been a good strategy used by co-ordinators.
- The programme is sustainable and economically viable with careful management, and authorities should consider targeting available funds to the most vulnerable children in their area.

9 CONCLUSIONS

The evaluation of the National Child Pedestrian Training Pilot Project (Kerbcraft) investigated its impact on children's pedestrian behaviour and on schools and volunteers across English local authorities and Scottish unitary authorities in areas of high deprivation and high child pedestrian casualty rates. The most effective ways of establishing and sustaining practical child pedestrian schemes at a local level were identified.

This study contributes to the field in a number of ways. It provides a report of a major field trial, which operated in a variety of settings, taking specific account of the effects of rurality, ethnicity and social deprivation. In addition, the outcomes of the skills assessment component confirm the earlier findings of the Drumchapel pilot scheme (Thomson and Whelan, 1997), but this time in a larger and more disparate sample.

This study provides evidence related to two approaches used in tackling health inequalities (Whitehead, 1995). In relation to strengthening individuals, the study has demonstrated an increase in children's pedestrian skills and has enhanced the range of volunteers' skills in working with children and working more closely with schools. In relation to strengthening communities, the study has shown that it has been possible to recruit and retain a large number of community volunteers and strengthen their links with local schools and local authorities.

10 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank the following:

- Deirdre O'Reilly and Simon Maxwell of the Department for Transport, and Hamish Clark of the Scottish Government for their support and encouragement;
- Carry Stephenson, John Wicks and Lisa Hartley at MVA Consultancy for their assistance with, and contribution to, data collection;
- Social Research Associates for conducting the skills assessments; and
- Professor James Thomson of Strathclyde University and Professor Andrew Tolmie of the Institute of Education, University of London, for their invaluable help and advice throughout the project.

Funding for the project was provided by the Department for Transport and the Scottish Government to whom we express our gratitude.

We would also like to extend particular thanks to all the road safety officers, Kerbcraft co-ordinators, teachers, support staff, volunteers and pupils who welcomed us into their Kerbcraft projects and contributed so much, not just to the evaluation but also to making their own communities safer.

Special thanks go to the following schools, staff and pupils for their substantial contribution to the evaluation project:

- Aberhill Primary, Fife Council;
- Abingdon Primary, Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council (MBC);
- Alexandra First, Northumberland County Council;
- All Saints Primary, Bolton MBC;
- All Saints Roman Catholic Infant School, Liverpool City Council;
- Avondale Primary, Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council;
- Bangabandhu Primary, London Borough of Tower Hamlets;
- Bankfoot Primary, Bradford MBC;
- Bannockburn Primary, London Borough of Greenwich;
- Barrhill Primary, South Ayrshire Council;
- Birchills Community Primary School, Walsall MBC;
- Bramble Brae Primary, Aberdeen City Council;
- Brandling Primary, Gateshead Council;

- Bygrove Primary, London Borough of Tower Hamlets;
- Byker Primary, Newcastle upon Tyne;
- Cale Green Primary, Stockport MBC;
- Castleway Primary, Wirral MBC;
- Christ Church Primary, Kent County Council;
- Christ Church Primary, North Somerset Council;
- Collydean Primary, Fife Council;
- Connaught Primary, Bristol City Council;
- Coulson Park First, Northumberland County Council;
- Croft Community Primary, Walsall MBC;
- Crowmoor Primary, Shropshire County Council;
- Daisyfield Primary, Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council;
- Edward Wilson Primary, London Borough of Westminster;
- Glebeland Primary, Leicester City Council;
- Granton Primary, Edinburgh City Council;
- Greenacres Primary, Shropshire County Council;
- Greengates Primary, Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council;
- Gwladys Street Primary and Nursery School, Liverpool City Council;
- Harcourt Primary, Kent County Council;
- Heartsease Primary, Norfolk County Council;
- High Blantyre Primary, South Lanarkshire Council;
- Holy Cross Primary, Leicester City Council;
- Holy Trinity Primary, Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council;
- Kirkby Avenue Primary, Doncaster MBC;
- Kirkby Church of England Primary, Knowsley MBC;
- Knowle Park Infants, Bristol City Council;
- Lark Hill Primary, Salford MBC;
- Lister Drive Primary, Liverpool City Council;
- Longford Park Primary, Coventry City Council;
- Longview Primary, Knowsley MBC;

- Lord Blyton Primary, South Tyneside Council;
- Low Ash Primary, Bradford MBC;
- Macmerry Primary, East Lothian Council;
- Marchburn Primary, Aberdeen City Council;
- Mesty Croft Primary, Sandwell MBC;
- Montgomery Primary, Birmingham City Council;
- Moorside Community Primary, Newcastle City Council;
- Mundella Primary, Kent County Council;
- North Grecian Street Primary, Salford MBC;
- Oakfield Primary, Isle of Wight Council;
- Our Lady of Lourdes Roman Catholic Primary, Wirral MBC;
- Our Lady of Perpetual Succour Roman Catholic Primary, Halton Borough Council;
- Queen's Park Primary, London Borough of Westminster;
- Sandown Primary, Isle of Wight Council;
- St Aidan's Church of England Primary, Gateshead Council;
- St Aidan's, Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council;
- St Ann's Church of England Primary, London Borough of Haringey;
- St Benedict's, Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council;
- St Gerard's, Middlesbrough, Borough Council;
- St John's with St Mark's Primary, Bury MBC;
- St Joseph's and St Bede's RC Primary, Bury MBC;
- St Mary's Roman Catholic Primary, London Borough of Camden;
- St Patrick's Roman Catholic Primary, London Borough of Camden;
- St Paul's Primary, Newcastle City Council;
- St Stephen's Primary, Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council;
- St Vincent's Roman Catholic Primary, Newcastle City Council;
- Sunnfields Primary, Doncaster MBC;
- Tameside Primary, Sandwell MBC;
- Tuckswood Primary, Norfolk County Council;

- Victoria Road Primary, Aberdeen City Council;
- Warout Primary, Fife Council;
- Welbourne Primary, London Borough of Haringey;
- Windmill Hills Primary, Gateshead Council;
- Worlebury Primary, North Somerset Council; and
- Yorkley Primary, Gloucestershire County Council.

11 REFERENCES

Bandura, A. (1977) Social Learning Theory. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Christie, N., Dale, M. and Lowe, C. (2002) *Child Road Safety in Rural Areas: A Critical Review of the Literature and Commentary.* Road Safety Research Report No. 32. London: Department for Transport.

Department for Transport (2007a) *Tomorrow's Roads – Safer for Everyone. The Second Three-year Review.* London: Department for Transport.

Department for Transport (2007b) *Child Road Safety Strategy 2007*. London: Department for Transport.

Hampshire, A. and Healy, K. (2000) Social capital in practice. In *Family Futures: Issues in Research and Policy*, 7th Australian Institute of Family Studies Conference, Sydney, July 2000. Melbourne: Australian Institute of Family Studies. Online at http://www.aifs.gov.au/institute/afrc7/hampshire.html.

Kelly, M., McDaid, D., Ludbrook, A. and Powell, J. (2005) *Economic Appraisal of Public Health Interventions: Evidence Briefing*. London: National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. Online at http://www.publichealth.nice.org.uk/page.aspx?o=513209.

Lister-Sharp, D., Chapman, S., Stewart-Brown, S. and Sowden, A. (1999) Health promoting schools and health promotion in schools: two systematic reviews. *Health Technology Assessment*, 3(22).

Orme, J., Powell, J., Taylor, P., Harrison, T. and Grey, M. (eds) (2007) *Public Health for the 21st Century: New Perspectives on Policy Participation and Practice.* Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Powell, J. (2007) Health economics in public health. In Orme, J., Powell, J., Taylor, P., Harrison, T. and Grey, M. (eds) *Public Health for the 21st Century: New Perspectives on Policy Participation and Practice*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Putnam, R. D. (2000) The prosperous community: social capital and public life. *The American Prospect*, 4(13).

Rivara, F., Booth, C., Bergman, A., Rogers, L. and Weiss, J. (1991) Prevention of pedestrian injuries to children: currently available prevention strategies. *Pediatrics*, 88(4), 770.

Saegert, S., Thompson, J. P. and Warren, M. R. (eds) (2001) *Social Capital and Poor Communities* Sage. New York: Russel Sage Foundation. p. 1.

Sandels, S. (1975) Children in Traffic, revised edn. Surrey: Elek Books.

Sibbald, B. and Roland, M. (1998) Understanding controlled trials: why are randomised controlled trials important? *British Medical Journal*, 316: 201.

Thomson, J., Dickson, M., McBrearty, L., Motion, A. and Docherty, J. (2002) *Kerbcraft. Smart Strategies for Pedestrian Safety. A Handbook for Road Safety Professionals.* London: Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions. Online at http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_rdsafety/documents/ page/dft_rdsafety_029948.pdf.

Thomson, J., Tolmie, A., Foot, H. and McLaren, B. (1996) *Child Development and the Aims of Road Safety Education: A Review and Analysis.* Road Safety Research Report No. 1. London: Department of Transport.

Thomson, J., Tolmie, A. and Mamoon, T. (2001) *Road Accident Involvement of Children from Ethnic Minorities*. Road Safety Research Report No. 19. London: Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions.

Thomson, J. and Whelan, K. (1997) *Community Approach to Road Safety Education*. Road Safety Research Report No. 3. London: Department of Transport. Online at http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_rdsafety/documents/pdf/ dft_rdsafety_pdf_504588.pdf

Towner, E., Dowswell, T., Mackereth, C. and Jarvis, S. (2001) *What Works in Preventing Unintentional Injuries in Children and Young Adolescents? An Updated Systematic Review.* London: Health Development Agency.

Whitehead, M. (1995) Tackling inequalities: a review of policy initiatives. In Benzeval, M., Judge, K. and Whitehead, M. (eds), *Tackling Inequalities in Health*. *An Agenda for Action*. London: King's Fund. pp. 22–52.

APPENDIX 1 Skills assessment

A1.1 Guidelines for skills testers

Guidance notes for Kerbcraft Testers at the roadside

Safe Place Finding - Summary of Training principles and style:

Addresses two fundamental errors made by young children:

- 1. They often choose to cross from beside a parked vehicle or other obstruction which blocks their view of any oncoming traffic, leading to 'dart out' accidents.
- 2. They often choose to cross diagonally, believing that this is quickest and most direct route to their destination, therefore the safest.

Key elements of training:

- 1. Identifying the danger inherent at the starting point of the task.
- 2. Understanding and being able to explain why the starting place is dangerous.
- 3. Deciding to move away from the starting place
- 4. Finding a safer place to move away to where they can see clearly in both directions
- 5. Choosing not to cross diagonally and being able to explain why that's important.

Points to note about this skill:

- Foundation skill on which whole programme is based.
- Focus on identifying safe and dangerous places to attempt to cross the road
- Uses adult-led peer group model of training, encouraging interaction between the children to solve the problem at the roadside. Children are

in groups of three as this is the optimum number in a group to promote exchange of ideas and explanations between children as part of the task decision-making process.

Testing Procedure for Safe Places

<u>Materials</u>

Liaison with the Schools and Kerbcraft Co-ordinators

Safety at the roadside

Testers should maintain high standards of safety and vigilance at the roadside at all times:

- Testers should hold children's hands wherever possible.
- At no time should children be allowed to make crossings on their own.
- At no time should children be left unattended.
- The tester should never allow children to undertake dangerous actions and should take charge of any actual crossings made.
- Where the journey to and from the school presents particular problems, e.g. a very busy road, dual carriage way, poor view of oncoming traffic, testers should lead the crossing and can support each other where a number of groups are out at one time.
- Testers can always step back from the kerb to discuss any aspect of the test in more detail. This is useful when testing at busier, noisier roadside locations.
- Children are NOT required to cross the road as part of the assessment task for Safe Places.

Injuries, Behaviour Problems, Child Protection and Personal Safety

Major Incidents involving injury to the child or the tester:

- Gather ALL testers and children together and return TOGETHER to the school immediately.
- Do NOT attempt to deal with any injury, no matter how slight, at the roadside.
- Any injury incident should be recorded in the school injury record book.
- Any incident involving a vehicle should be reported to the police.

Behaviour Management Incidents:

- Check with the class teacher/Kerbcraft Co-ordinator beforehand for any children with particular difficulties in managing their behaviour.
- Ask for the Co-ordinator or a Classroom Assistant/LST to accompany you if necessary.
- Explain to EVERY child, BEFORE leaving the class that they have the choice to return to school at ANY point during the test should they choose to do so.
- If the child is distressed or unco-operative then it's usually best to return to school as the test will be compromised, and the situation may deteriorate.

Child Protection issues:

- Children cannot be physically restrained, unless under extreme and justifiable circumstances (i.e. they're about to step out infront of a vehicle; get bitten by a dog etc.). Generally, the only physical contact you should have with the children is holding their hand.
- You are NOT responsible should the child you're testing choose to leave with another adult or on his/her own. Inform the school immediately, they will deal with the situation.
- If you have photographic ID, or an ID badge from the school, carry it with you at all times in case you are challenged by a passer-by.

General tips for safety and good practice:

- Remain in sight of other testers
- If returning to school after a problem, return as a group.
- Carry a mobile phone and have a contact number for the school
- Raise your arm to attract the attention of another tester if you have a problem.
- Try to remain calm !!!

A1.2 Top tips for SRA testers

'TOP TIPS' FOR KERBCRAFT ROADSIDE TESTING

Agree to meet at the first school of the day well BEFORE 9am - this gives time to have a look round the test locations with the Co-ordinator before collecting the children, and helps to avoid the traffic build-up outside the school around 9am.

Get a class list from the teacher / co-ordinator before taking the children out and write children's full names on the score sheets. (Please include a copy of any class lists along with score sheets when returning test materials to KW.)

Key questions: "What's the safest way to get from here to X?"

"Why is that the safest way to go?"

If they seem a bit confused on the first question, then ask them to point and show you what way they'd go. Try not to suggest alternative routes to them, as they will pick up on the first or last suggestion and agree with it, thinking that's what you want them to say.

If they don't say anything, that's OK.

Write down VERBATIM what they say in response to the SECOND question it's really important not to interpret what they mean or paraphrase them - I need to know exactly what they said, even if it's rubbish.

Make sure you hold hands wherever possible.

Remember that you can stand back from the kerb, or walk away from the road all together if you want more time to write notes down - the children will get restless quickly, so it's better to move away from the road if you have to let go of their hands for any length of time. When standing back, try to make sure that you are between the child and the road.

Try to keep the child on the inside of the pavement when walking from one location to another.

Be aware of good practice when crossing roads with the children - you don't have to give them laboured explanations, or ask them to help you (especially if you're short for time), but you should make sure that you find a 'safe place' to cross where possible, and explain what you're doing when it's not.

Find out from the school what time morning interval and lunchtime is at, and plan your morning accordingly. You might be able to work through interval if you ask the teacher.

Try to make sure that your own ID badges are clearly visible at all times when out with the children and when in the school.

If possible, bring some tea, coffee, snacks and even a packed lunch as you may need to have a lunch break at school. You can usually get sandwiches/salads/ hot foods from the school dinner hall, just check with one of the teachers. Otherwise, ask the co-ordinator to recommend somewhere nearby.

Remember to draw other cars, vans, street furniture etc. onto the map on each test – giving notes where the child's view is obscured.

If in doubt, just write down everything - the more information on the situation of each test, the easier and more accurate the scoring process will be.

A1.3 Safe Places test sheets 1–3



AVONDALE - B'BURN & DARWEN

Notes:

Site 2 –	Parked Car	. Hindle	e street	nabiai	a sorder		antin antina
	Traffic		141 143	3	[14	2	
speed	Imng-						
	ndle s	14	×	×			· · ·
		. ~		v		~	school
	V		v		v	۲	0
		V	school grounds	٢		v	
Explan	nations						Bur
LL			-				
LR							
RL				e	_	1	
RR				•	1		
	1						

AVONDALE - B'BURN & DARWEN."

Notes:



138

A1.4 Parked Cars test instructions and test sheet

Parked cars testing – instructions for testers

Set-up

Set up with school for convenient time and date as before. Again, it will be useful to have co-ordinator present to facilitate with school and act as 'hands-free' adult while out of school with children.

Identify children from Safe Places testing – if not all 15 children are present or available, then carry on with those that are. DO NOT replace children with others who haven't previously been tested. Where possible, arrange to 'pick up' absent or unavailable children later.

Although this test will take place on the same day as the post-test for Safe Places, try where possible to make sure that the children see these as two separate tests. ALWAYS do the Safe Places test FIRST. These tests should not be intermingled in any way – they must remain entirely separate. (** see Testing Materials and Procedure below).

To minimise disruption to the children's class, inform the teacher that each child will be out of the classroom for at least half an hour. This may be longer if you have to walk quite far from the school to reach the testing sites, but shouldn't be any longer than about 45 mins or the children will become tired and distracted.

Roadside location for testing

The scheme Co-ordinator should be able to help you to select a street where there are a row of parked cars near the school. Ideally this would be a different street form that used in the parked cars element of the Safe Places test – as the first test only requires one parked car, whereas the Parked Cars test should really be conducted in a street full of parked cars. If there isn't another street suitable for the second test, use the same street that was used for the 'parked cars' element of the Safe Places test, BUT make sure that you have completed the Safe Places test and that the children are clear that this is a new set of questions before you move onto the Parked Cars test.

If there are few parked cars near the school, then the co-ordinator might be able to help you 'set up' a testing situation with teachers' cars parked outside the school for the day. The test requires the children to cross four times, and ideally this should be at four different places. However, if there is a shortage of parked cars in the area, then make the best of what's available, even if all tests are conducted between the same two cars!!

Testing materials and procedure

Unlike Safe Places, parked cars training is relatively simple and procedural and follows a more systematic methodology. The children learn a series of steps to ensure that, if they have to cross between parked cars, they minimise the danger of doing so. The training is based on a Behavioural Modelling methodology borrowed from Social Learning theory, where the trainer 'models' the correct sequence of actions, the children and trainer practise this together, and then the children have the chance to practise running through the sequence individually without any feedback. The session finishes with the adult modelling the correct behaviour again to reinforce the right message.

The testing procedure and materials reflect the more systematic nature of the parked cars training. The test sheet is a checklist of behaviours that have been distilled from the key points of the training. Each child is asked to take the tester across the road between two parked cars, and when both adult and child have reached the opposite pavement the tester records the actions of the child on the checklist, ticking either yes or no for each action on the list.

Particular attention should be paid to actions 6,7 and 8. These have the option to record whether the child completes the action while stopped, or while walking, or not at all. It's important that the testers are aware of the difference in these categories and record them appropriately. The child should be clearly stopped at the edge of the left hand car, where they can see clearly in both directions. If the child just pauses here to look or looks quickly while walking out, instead of stopping, then this is an important difference to note.

Procedure

Before commencing the test, the following explanation should be given to the children to ensure that they understand that this is a separate test to the one for Safe Places, and to ensure that they are not confused by the apparently conflicting messages from the two tests.

Ideally, you'll be in a street full of parked cars with very few, if any, safe sized gaps to cross between. If you can't find a street with lots of parked cars, make do with two cars parked about 8–10 feet apart and ask the children to imagine that the street is full of cars and there are no safe places to cross.

Explanation for children prior to Parked Cars test:

"The next test is totally different from what we've just done. Last time we were looking for safe places to cross, but this time we're going to think about what we might need to do if we can't find a safe place to cross. Imagine that this whole street is full of parked cars and there isn't anywhere safe to cross. How would you cross over safely to the other side?"

If they're not sure what you mean, use these prompts:

"Pretend that the whole street is full of parked cars. What would be the safest way to cross, if there was nowhere better to go?"

"Show me what you would do if you had to cross here. Where would you go, and what would you do?"

Once you've explained to the child what you want, lead them towards a row of parked cars with at least one suitable gap. Ask the child again to choose a gap and then demonstrate what they would do to cross safely by taking the tester across the road. Take care that there are no cars moving in the vicinity at the time of crossing. Record the children's behaviour on the check sheet as soon as you reach the opposite pavement. Then proceed to a new location. Repeat for all four trials.

Safety at the roadside

Please note the following:

- The tester should be holding the child's hand AT ALL TIMES.
- The child should never be asked to cross the road alone or undertake ANY part of the test unaccompanied.
- If a car should approach while the child is in between the parked cars, the child SHOULD suggest moving back onto the pavement. However, the tester MUST ensure that they both move back onto the pavement till the car passes.
- The tester should observe the child's actions closely and stop to record them ONLY when both adult and child are safely on the opposite pavement.
- The tester should move to the back of the pavement to complete the scoring sheet, making sure that they are between the child and the road.

			Pre-test	
Local Authority:				
School:				
Name:				
Tester:				
Date:				
Test	route: 1	L 2	3	4
1. Stops at the kerb	Yes			
	No			
2. Looks in both cars after stopping	Yes			
	No			
3. Checks exhaust/lights/engine noise	Yes			
	No			
4. Advances to parked car on left	Yes			
	No			
5. Stops at the line of sight	Yes			
	Pause			
	No			
6. Looks right at the line of sight Yes while s	stopped			
Yes while w	walking			
	No			
7. Looks left at the line of sight Yes while s	stopped			
Yes while w	walking			
	No			
8. Looks right again at the line of sight Yes while s	stopped			
Yes while w	walking			
	No			
9. Speed of crossing in a straight line	Slow			
	Normal			
Skip/ho	p/jump			
	Fast			

Comments:

A1.5 Junctions test instructions and test sheet

Junctions testing – instructions for testers

ALL SRa TESTERS <u>MUST</u> BE FAMILIAR WITH THIS DOCUMENT AND BE ABLE TO FOLLOW ITS INSTRUCTIONS <u>EXACTLY</u>

Set-up

Set up with school for convenient time and date as before. Again will be useful to have coordinator present to facilitate with school and act as 'hands-free' adult while out of school with children.

Identify children from previous testing - if not all 15 children are present or available, then carry on with those that are. DO NOT replace children with others who haven't previously been tested. Where possible, arrange to 'pick up' absent or unavailable children later.

Although this test will take place on the same day as the post-test for Parked Cars, try where possible to make sure that the children see these as two separate tests. ALWAYS do the Parked Cars test FIRST. These tests should not be intermingled in any way – they must remain entirely separate (** see Testing Materials and Procedure below).

To minimise disruption to the children's class, inform the teacher that each child will be out of the classroom for at least half an hour. This may be longer if you have to walk quite far from the school to reach the testing sites, but shouldn't be any longer than about 45 mins or the children will become tired and distracted.

Roadside location for testing

The scheme co-ordinator should be able to help you to select a <u>simple junction</u> (e.g. a 'T' junction where there are clear views all around) near the school. Ideally this would be a different junction from that used in the junctions element of the Safe Places test – so as to avoid repetition. However, if there isn't another suitable junction available for this Junction test, then it's acceptable to use the same junction as before.

There should be at least one suitable junction near the school, as already identified and used for Safe Places training/testing. If the circumstances here have changed and it's no longer suitable, then the co-ordinator should be able to help you find a new location – using a <u>simple junction</u> preferably. If there are no simple junctions, with unobstructed views, then ask the co-ordinator to help identify the most simple and unobstructed junction from those available near the school – this may be a crossroads or staggered junction. The test HAS to be done, so the aim is to make the best use of the locations that are available near the school.

It's possible to have two or three testers working at the same junction – all starting at different sides of the junction and moving in a different direction round the arms of the junction. This will take a bit of co-ordination to start off with.

*** It's important to note that all the children at each school MUST be tested at the same junction – ONLY one test location per school.

Aim of Junctions Training

Much like Parked Cars, Junctions Training is relatively simple and procedural and follows a more systematic methodology. The children learn a series of steps to ensure that, if they have to cross at a junction, they minimise the danger of doing so. The training is based on a Behavioural Modelling methodology borrowed from Social Learning theory, where the trainer 'models' the correct sequence of actions, the children and trainer practise this together, and then the children have the chance to practise running through the sequence individually without any feedback. The session finishes with the adult modelling the correct behaviour again to reinforce the right message.

The main focus of the training is to teach children how to look appropriately at a junction – i.e. that they cover all the roads which meet there, not just those to the left and right. The biggest mistake children make at junctions is to forget to look behind them and in front of them for traffic approaching the junction. The training teaches children to look in a 360 degree 'sweep', starting with the road furthest to the right and following round all roads at the junction – they then repeat this sweep, with a last check to the right before crossing.

The second key point of the training is to make sure that the children, having learned to look down all the roads meeting at the junction, can actually see down all of these roads. This reinforces Safe Places training, by encouraging the children to find an alternative crossing place, should they find that their view down one or more roads at the junction is obstructed.

Testing materials and procedure

The testing procedure and materials reflect the more systematic nature of the Junctions Training. The test sheet is a checklist of behaviours which have been distilled from the key points of the training. Each child is asked to take the tester straight across the road at the junction, when both adult and child have reached the opposite pavement the tester records the actions of the child on the checklist, ticking either yes or no for each action on the list.

Particular attention should be paid to actions 3 and 4. This allows us to check whether the child has picked up on the need to look in more than two directions (left and right). It's important that the testers pay close attention to the directions the child looks in, and records them appropriately. The training will teach the children to look in a 'sweep' from right to left – taking in all the roads along which traffic could approach. It's important that children do this in the right order/direction. Should the child be unable to see clearly down any road at the junction, then they should say so, and then choose to move away to find somewhere safer to cross. It is important that the tester is able to recognise whether the final crossing place is safe or not – i.e. that there is nothing obstructing the child's view of oncoming traffic.
Testing procedure

Before commencing the test, the following explanation should be given to the children to ensure that they understand that this is a separate test to either of the previous tests (Parked Cars, or Safe Places), and to ensure that they are not confused by the apparently conflicting messages from the other two tests.

1. Explanation for children prior to Junctions test:

"The next test is totally different from what we've just done. Last time we were thinking about how to cross safely between parked cars. This time we're going to think about how we could cross safely right at the corner of the junction. I know you wouldn't normally do this by yourself, but imagine that you wanted to cross over right here. OK?"

2. Stand with the child about 8–10 feet back from the corner of the junction – back from the kerb. (DO NOT TAKE THE CHILD RIGHT TO THE EDGE OF THE KERB – that's the first thing they should do.)

3. Show the child where they should cross over to - this should be straight across the road (NOT DIAGONALLY) to the other arm of the junction (see diagram showing routes for different junctions).

"I would like you to show me how you would cross over from the corner here to the other side of the road there (point to destination). What would be the safest way to go? Can you take me across the road?"

If they're not sure what you mean, use these prompts:

"Pretend that you're here on your own, and you want to get across to the other side (point at destination). What would you do first?"

"Show me what you would do if you had to cross here. Where would you go, and what would you do?"

KEY POINTS TO REMEMBER:

1. The child should choose the place on the kerb where they want to cross from (and look around from).

2. YOU MUST pay particular attention to where the child looks, and to whether they can see down each of the roads they look down. This is the crux of the whole test. (After training, they should look in a 360 degree 'sweep' from the road furthest right to that furthest left. They should then check back to the right before crossing.)

3. If the child chooses to move away from the corner to cross, then you MUST go with them and follow through with the crossing. Make sure you know whether they look properly at the new crossing place, and whether they can see properly from there.

4. THE CHILD HAS TO CROSS THE ROAD TO END THE TEST. Pay attention to what the children do when they are actually walking across the road with you – are they looking properly?

5. When it comes time to cross, take care that there are no cars moving in the vicinity at the time of crossing.

6. Record the children's behaviour on the check sheet as SOON as you reach the opposite pavement. Make sure that you stand well back from the kerb and that you are between the child and the road.

7. Then choose a new destination and repeat the test for route 2. Repeat for all four trials. (see diagram enclosed showing possible sequences of test routes at different junctions).

8. The four test routes for each child must be different. Do not simply repeat the same route four times. As you have to cross to complete each trial, you will be at a new start point anyway. You can either return to your original start point for route 2, or, if you're at a crossroads, you can work your way round each arm of the junction. (Please refer to the example routes diagram enclosed.)

Safety at the roadside

Please note the following:

- The tester should be holding the child's hand AT ALL TIMES.
- The child should never be asked to cross the road alone or undertake ANY part of the test unaccompanied.
- If a car should approach while the child is at the edge of the kerb, the child SHOULD suggest moving back onto the pavement. However, the tester MUST ensure that they both step back from the edge of the kerb till the car passes.
- The tester should observe the child's actions closely and stop to record them ONLY when both adult and child are safely on the opposite pavement.
- The tester should move to the back of the pavement to complete the scoring sheet, making sure that they are between the child and the road.

Crossing safely near junctions

Local Authority:		School:	
Child's			
Name:	<u> </u>	Date:	

		Test Route:	1	2	3	4
1.	Finds kerbside position offering view down all streets	Yes No				
2.	Stops at kerbs	Yes No				
3.	Looks down all streets	Yes No				
	If No, ho	w many missed				
4.	Looks in correct sequence (right to left)	Yes No				
5.	Repeats looking sequence	Yes No				
6.	Are there <i>any</i> obstructions to a clear view down <i>any</i> street?	Yes No				
7.	If yes, does the child suggest moving to another location?	Yes No				
8.	If yes, do they find a safer position?	Yes No				
9.	Is the proposed route to the destination safe?	Yes No				

Comments:

A1.6 Skills assessment results: gender differences for all three skills

A1.6.1 Safe Places

The means in Table A1.1 show a generally comparable performance before and immediately after training between male and female participants. However, while girls appear to be doing much better than boys by post-test 2, there is no statistical confirmation that this trend is significant.

Table A1.1: Safe Places gender differences (C + D) scores for male and female trained and control groups at pre-test, post-test 1 and post-test 2 (standard deviations and participant numbers are shown in brackets)					
		Pre-test	Post-test 1	Post-test 2	
Trained group	Female Male	0.18 (0.2) (<i>n</i> = 104) 0.16 (0.21) (<i>n</i> = 98)	0.26 (0.25) (<i>n</i> = 83) 0.28 (0.27) (<i>n</i> = 78)	0.49 (0.24) (<i>n</i> = 36) 0.39 (0.3) (<i>n</i> = 37)	
Control group	Female Male	0.18 (0.23) (<i>n</i> = 96) 0.16 (0.19) (<i>n</i> = 100)	0.20 (0.25) (<i>n</i> = 68) 0.20 (0.23) (<i>n</i> = 76)	0.26 (0.24) (<i>n</i> = 36) 0.32 (0.27) (<i>n</i> = 28)	

A three-way ANOVA was conducted on these results with test phase (pre/post 1/post 2), experimental group (trained/control) and gender (female/male) as factors. The findings show that there is no significant main effect of gender. A borderline interaction between gender and experimental group may reflect the girls' increased improvement at post-test 2 (F (1, 116) = 3.863; p = 0.52). However, planned post hoc comparisons confirm **no significant gender differences** in children's baseline performance at pre-test or in the amount of improvement made by trained children at post-test 1 and later at post-test 2. This indicates again that, with reference to Kerbcraft, there is no evidence of a consistent difference in the ability of boys and girls to recognise dangerous locations, or to find safer ones. For this reason, gender has been excluded from all further analyses.

A1.6.2 Parked Cars

An examination of the Parked Cars pre-test means (see Table A1.2) as a function of training group and gender indicates a marginal advantage for girls at baseline. However, a series of independent groups *t*-tests on each of the key behaviours shows that this advantage is only significant for **one** key behaviour at pre-test (question 4: moving out to the parked car on the left).

Table A1.2:	Parked Cars	effect of gender on Parked Cars baseline mean scores
	grouped mean	s for the pre-test scores for male and female participants in the
	trained and co	ntrol groups

Question (behaviour)	Traine	d group	Control group		
	Male (<i>n</i> = 70)	Female (<i>n</i> = 74)	Male (n = 74)	Female (<i>n</i> = 65)	
1. Stops at kerb?	0.85	0.84	0.88	0.79	
2. Looks in both cars after stopping?	(0.25) 0.1 (0.26)	0.32) 0.1 (0.26)	0.02 (0.09)	0.05 (0.2)	
3 Checks exhaust/lights/engine noise?	0.05	0.07	0.04 (0.17)	0.03 (0.16)	
4 Advances to parked car on left?	0.21 *	0.36 *	0.19 (0.34)	0.2 (0.34)	
5a. Stops at line of sight?	0.63	0.57 (0.45)	0.61 (0.42)	0.53 (0.46)	
5b. Pauses at line of sight?	0.16 (0.26)	0.18 (0.29)	0.17 (0.28)	0.14 (0.25)	
6a. Looks RIGHT at line of sight?	0.53 (0.45)	0.57 (0.43)	0.55 (0.44)	0.54 (0.43)	
6b. Looks RIGHT while walking?	0.35	0.28 (0.37)	0.26 (0.34)	0.31 (0.39)	
7a. Looks LEFT at line of sight?	0.51 (0.46)	0.54 (0.43)	0.5	0.39 (0.43)	
7b. Looks LEFT while walking?	0.37 (0.42)	0.29 (0.37)	0.29 (0.37)	0.25 (0.35)	
8a. Looks RIGHT AGAIN at line of sight?	0.31 (0.44)	0.3 (0.41)	0.26 (0.39)	0.26 (0.4)	
8b. Looks RIGHT AGAIN while walking?	0.41 (0.42)	0.35 (0.4)	0.28 (0.37)	0.23 (0.35)	
* Figures with asterisks indicate a significate	ant <i>t-</i> test result b	etween groups.		<u>I</u>	

A similar comparison of pre- to post-test 1 improvement mean scores (difference scores as shown in Table A1.3) indicates that boys are more than making up for any slight disparity at pre-test by improving to meet and, in some cases, overtake the performance of the female group at post-test 1. A series of independent *t*-tests on difference scores for the trained group indicates that the male group are improving significantly more than the females on questions 4 and 3 of the key looking behaviours (questions 6b, 7a and 8b).

Means from post-test 2 shown in Table A1.4 suggest that trained girls are performing better across many behaviours than trained boys. However, a series independent samples *t*-test of the mean scores for each behaviour show a significant advantage for girls on only one behaviour (question 4 - goes to parked car on left).

Question (behaviour)	Traine	d group	Control group		
	Male (n = 49)	Female (<i>n</i> = 55)	Male (n = 47)	Female (<i>n</i> = 51)	
1. Stops at kerb?	0.06	0.09	- 0.03	0.03	
2. Looks in both cars after stopping?	0.54 (0.57)	0.55 (0.48)	0.16 (0.36)	0.12 (0.36)	
3. Checks exhaust/lights/engine noise?	0.48 (0.49)	0.43 (0.55)	0.1 (0.34)	0.03 (0.26)	
4. Advances to parked car on left?	0.45 * (0.61)	0.11 * (0.69)	0.06 (0.54)	- 0.11 (0.47)	
5a. Stops at line of sight?	0.32 (0.46)	0.29 (0.47)	- 0.04 (0.63)	- 0.07 (0.53)	
5b. Pauses at line of sight?	- 0.15 (0.36)	- 0.1 (0.37)	0.08 (0.39)	0.06 (0.38)	
6a. Looks RIGHT at line of sight?	0.45 (0.47)	0.31 (0.49)	0.05 (0.6)	0.12 (0.48)	
6b. Looks RIGHT while walking?	- 0.39 * (0.44)	- 0.18 * (0.42)	0.05 (0.49)	- 0.06 (0.5)	
7a. Looks LEFT at line of sight?	0.49 [*] (0.47)	0.29 [*] (0.46)	0.06 (0.64)	0.1 (0.49)	
7b. Looks LEFT while walking?	- 0.38 (0.44)	- 0.19 (0.4)	- 0.01 (0.54)	- 0.02 (0.51)	
8a. Looks RIGHT AGAIN at line of sight?	0.58 (0.55)	0.37 (0.57)	0.02 (0.51)	0.01 (0.48)	
8b. Looks RIGHT AGAIN while walking?	- 0.37 * (0.47)	- 0.19 * (0.5)	0.03 (0.55)	- 0.03 (0.47)	

Table A1.4:	Parked Cars	effect of gender on Parked Cars delayed post-test scores
	grouped mean	s for post-test 2 scores for male and female participants in the
	trained and co	ntrol groups

Question (behaviour)	Traine	d group	Control group		
	Male (n = 36)	Female (<i>n</i> = 33)	Male (n = 28)	Female (<i>n</i> = 35)	
1. Stops at kerb?	0.94	0.96	0.95	0.96	
	(0.18)	(0.11)	(0.16)	(0.17)	
2. Looks in both cars after stopping?	0.42	0.58	0.11	0.16	
	(0.46)	(0.45)	(0.27)	(0.32)	
Checks exhaust/lights/engine noise?	0.46	0.58	0.12	0.11	
	(0.47)	(0.44)	(0.28)	(0.28)	
Advances to parked car on left?	0.42*	0.69*	0.32	0.28	
	(0.45)	(0.43)	(0.43)	(0.41)	
5a. Stops at line of sight?	0.85	0.93	0.66	0.69	
	(0.32)	(0.17)	(0.43)	(0.42)	
5b. Pauses at line of sight?	0.07	0.02	0.15	0.16	
_	(0.21)	(0.1)	(0.27)	(0.28)	
6a. Looks RIGHT at line of sight?	0.81	0.85	0.6	0.68	
_	(0.31)	(0.29)	(0.44)	(0.43)	
6b. Looks RIGHT while walking?	0.06	0.04	0.13	0.16	
	(0.19)	(0.11)	(0.26)	(0.32)	
7a. Looks LEFT at line of sight?	0.84	0.89	0.64	0.7	
	(0.29)	(0.28)	(0.42)	(0.42)	
7b. Looks LEFT while walking?	0.14	0.06	0.19	0.2	
_	(0.27)	(0.21)	(0.28)	(0.34)	
8a. Looks RIGHT AGAIN at line of sight?	0.67	0.8	0.41	0.47	
	(0.39)	(0.38)	(0.43)	(0.46)	
8b. Looks RIGHT AGAIN while walking?	0.17	0.09	0.2	0.25	
-	(0.28)	(0.22)	(0.29)	(0.35)	
* Figures in red indicate a significant t-test	result between g	groups.			

A1.6.2.1 Outcomes and brief recommendations

- A pre-test trend showing girls have advantage on **some** behaviours prior to training.
- Difference scores indicate boys making up for any pre-test disadvantage and, in some cases, outperforming girls at post-test 1.
- Group sizes for difference scores are quite small and standard deviations are often **very** big, indicating sizeable within-group variations in scores. This goes some way to undermine the strength of any significant differences.
- Significant group differences in improvement are **not** across the board but are restricted to only a few key behaviours.
- Post-test 2 scores show that female trained children are performing better than male trained children on many behaviours, but this trend is only significant for one behaviour from the parked cars strategy.

- The trend is there, but we should not make too much of it. It reinforces the need for a fourth training session, especially for girls, so it should be viewed as a positive outcome, rather than something problematic. Could recommend further future exploration of gender differences on more systematic training strategies.
- We would recommend that we do not report the means and *t*-test results in the final report, but state that any gender differences are compensated for after training.

A1.6.3 Junctions

The investigation of the Junctions testing mean scores (shown in Tables A1.5, A1.6 and A1.7) across all behaviours for boys and girls indicates some evidence of a slightly better baseline performance from the boys. However, this does not appear to lead to any lasting advantage, as the girls' performance by post-test 1 is at least equivalent, if not better, than that of the boys. This post-training improvement is sustained to post-test 2. A three-way ANOVA (test phase \times trained/control \times gender) showed **no** significant main effect of gender for all key questions, except question 4 (looks in the correct sequence). Follow-up *t*-tests show that the female participants perform significantly better on this behaviour at post-test 2 only (t = 2.167 (df = 60.778); p = 0.034).

The analysis of the mean scores in Table A1.5 shows no indication of any significant differences in baseline performance between male and female participants in the Junctions skill testing.

and control groups				lined	
Question (behaviour)	Traine	d group	Control group		
	Male (<i>n</i> = 60)	Female (<i>n</i> = 61)	Male (n = 56)	Female (<i>n</i> = 64)	
1. Finds kerbside position offering a view down all streets?	0.74 (0.36)	0.72 (0.37)	0.7 (0.44)	0.6 (0.37)	
2. Stops at the kerb?	0.97 (0.09)	0.95 (0.13)	0.81 (0.34)	0.85 (0.29)	
3a. Looks down all streets?	0.54 (0.41)	0.44 (0.4)	0.39 (0.38)	0.35 (0.37)	
3b. How many streets missed out?	1.26 (1.45)	2.2 (2.32)	2.98 (3.12)	3.82 (3.53)	
4. Looks in correct sequence (right to left)?	0.7 (0.39)	0.67 (0.43)	0.44 (0.42)	0.49 (0.42)	
5. Repeats looking sequence?	0.68 (0.41)	0.65 (0.44)	0.44 (0.44)	0.48 (0.44)	
6. Are there any obstructions to a clear view down any street?	0.4 (0.36)	0.39 (0.37)	0.37 (0.38)	0.37 (0.4)	
7. If yes, does the child suggest moving to another location?	0.38 (0.46)	0.2 (0.35)	0.19 (0.35)	0.15 (0.33)	
8. If yes, do they find a safer position?	0.95 (0.23)	0.83 (0.39)	1 (0)	0.86 (0.38)	
9. Is the proposed route to the destination safe?	0.74 (0.36)	0.67 (0.41)	0.71 (0.38)	0.7 (0.37)	

Table A1.5: Junctions effect of gender on Junctions baseline mean scores grouped

Table A1.6 shows the post-test 1 mean scores for boys and girls from both the trained and control groups. Again, the analyses of these scores showed no significant differences in performance after training, as a function of gender.

Table A1.6:	Junctions	effect of gender on Junctions post-test 1 mean scores	grouped
	means for t	he post-test 1 scores for male and female participants in	the trained
	and control	groups	

Question (behaviour)	Trained group		Contro	l group
	Male (n = 54)	Female (n = 61)	Male (n = 53)	Female (<i>n</i> = 61)
1. Finds kerbside position offering a view down all streets?	0.9 (0.15)	0.89 (0.23)	0.72 (0.36)	0.73 (0.41)
2. Stops at the kerb?	0.99	0.98	0.91	0.97
3a. Looks down all streets?	0.78	0.82	0.38	0.47
3b. How many streets missed out?	(0.0) 1.22 (1.95)	0.61	(0.07) 3.16 (2.72)	(0.4) 2.21 (2.6)
4. Looks in correct sequence (right to left)?	0.84	0.9	0.59	0.66
5. Repeats looking sequence?	(0.20) 0.8 (0.21)	(0.21) 0.81	(0.33) 0.51	(0.39) 0.54
6. Are there any obstructions to a clear view down any street?	(0.31) 0.43	(0.32) 0.34	(0.38) 0.34 (0.31)	(0.41) 0.37
7. If yes, does the child suggest moving to another location?	(0.30) 0.55	(0.32) 0.68	(0.31) 0.3 (0.74)	(0.4) 0.24
8. If yes, do they find a safer position?	(0.45) 0.98	(0.73) 0.91	(0.74) 1	(0.42) 1
9. Is the proposed route to the destination safe?	(0.09) 0.93 (0.16)	(0.28) 0.95 (0.14)	(0) 0.8 (0.29)	(0) 0.88 (0.29)

Finally, the Table A1.7 shows the mean scores for all Junctions behaviours at posttest 2, presented separately for male and female participants from both the trained and control groups.

The figures shown in red give the mean scores for the **only** behaviour in which male and female participants were found to differ significantly at this stage of the testing programme.

Question (behaviour)	Traine	d group	Contro	ol group
-	Male (n = 37)	Female (<i>n</i> = 37)	Male (n = 28)	Female (<i>n</i> = 37
1. Finds kerbside position offering a view down	0.89	0.86	0.94	0.84
all streets?	(0.23)	(0.27)	(0.17)	(0.32)
2. Stops at the kerb?	0.99	0.95	0.94	0.98
	(0.06)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.07)
3a. Looks down all streets?	0.55	0.65	0.4	0.36
	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.43)	(0.33
3b. How many streets missed out?	2.15	1.67	3.26	3.71
	(2.03)	(1.76)	(2.67)	(2.33
4. Looks in correct sequence (right to left)?	0.72*	0.87*	0.56	0.63
	(0.37)	(0.223)	(0.4)	(0.39
5. Repeats looking sequence?	0.66	0.82	0.5	0.65
	(0.38)	(0.3)	(0.42)	(0.4)
6. Are there any obstructions to a clear view	0.22	0.27	0.17	0.24
down any street?	(0.29)	(0.31)	(0.21)	(0.35
7. If yes, does the child suggest moving to	0.3	0.42	0.31	0.31
another location?	(0.42)	(0.49)	(0.48)	(0.44
8. If yes, do they find a safer position?	0.86	0.94	0.87	5
	(0.38)	(0.17)	(0.25)	(0.55
9. Is the proposed route to the destination safe?	0.63	0.69	0.77	0.7
	(0.43)	(0.4)	(0.35)	(0.42

Table A1.7: Junctions effect of gender on Junctions post-test 2 mean scores grouped

A1.6.3.1 Conclusions on the effects of gender

From these means, and the subsequent analyses, we should conclude that there is no evidence of a clear or sustained gender effect on trained children's performance on the Junctions task. Future recommendations for Junctions training should, however, stress the importance of ensuring the full compliment of four to six sessions, particularly for boys as their performance appears to fall off slightly more at posttest 2 compared with the female participants.

APPENDIX 2 Volunteer surveys

A2.1 General survey questionnaire – covering letter to participants and questionnaire sheet

21 January 2004

KERBCRAFT VOLUNTEER SURVEY

Dear

Thanks to you and your volunteers for agreeing to take part in the Volunteer Survey. We very much value the experiences and opinions of the volunteers participating in all our Kerbcraft Schemes and we hope that they take this opportunity to share their views with us.

Please find enclosed Volunteer Survey questionnaires for distribution to schools within your Kerbcraft Scheme. Along with the forms you will also find an SAE with the correct number of stamps to return ALL the completed forms to me.

Also enclosed is an information leaflet outlining the aims of the questionnaire, and ways in which you could help your volunteers complete the form should they require any assistance.

Please encourage your volunteers to complete the questionnaire as the results will help to make Kerbcraft a more efficient and enjoyable experience for everyone involved.

Many thanks for your assistance and co-operation.

Kirstie Whelan Senior Research Associate University of Newcastle upon Tyne Kerbcraft Evaluation Team



Kerbcraft Trainer Survey - General Questions

Thank you for agreeing to take part. This is your chance to have your say about Kerbcraft in your school. Please fill in the questions below based on how you feel <u>right now.</u> If you would prefer to talk through the questions on the telephone rather than fill in this form, please call me on the number below and I'll arrange a convenient time to call you back.

Thanks and Good Luck with your Kerbcraft Project ! *Kirstie Whelan, Newcastle University* . Tel: 0191 202 3072 / 3033

WHY DID YOU CHOOSE TO VOLUNTEER FOR KERBCRAFT?

1. Read the sentences below and tick the one that best describes why **you** volunteered for Kerbcraft. (Please tick one or more boxes if you need to.)

I'm a parent I work in the school already and am happy to help on a new project It's an important project as it helps children to become safer on the roads It's an important project as it helps my community to become a safer place to live in Our community has a road safety / traffic problem I'm not doing anything else with my time I want to get out of the house and meet new people I want to help in my child's school I want to work with children	
1 want to work with children Other: Please give details	
	·······

GETTING STARTED WITH KERBCRAFT

2. How did you hear about the Kerbcraft Project in your school? Read the sentences below and tick the ones that best describe how you got started. (Please tick one or more boxes if you need to.)

I heard directly from the Head Teacher The Kerbcraft Co-ordinator spoke to me in the school playground/ classroom/ foyer I heard through the school at a parent's evening / from the class teacher My child brought a letter home from school about the project	Tick
Another parent from the school told me about it Other - Please give details below:	

YOUR TRAINING TO BECOME A KERBCRAFT TRAINER
3a. Did you take part in a Kerbcraft volunteer training course, organised by your Co-ordinator, BEFORE starting Kerbcraft sessions with the children?
YES NO
If NO, (3b) did you do any of the following?: (Please tick one or more boxes if you need to). Tick
Have a one-to-one session with the co-ordinator where you went out to the roadside to discuss the training
Have a one-to-one session with the co-ordinator where you discussed the training indoors Watched a children's training session but didn't participate Got no training or information on the Kerbcraft skills before starting children's training Other-please give details.
If YES, (3c) Think about the training course you had with the co-ordinator BEFORE you started training the children. Look at the sentence below and put a tick in the box beside each of the endings below that describes how you feel. (Please tick one or more boxes if you need to).
"The training I did before I started training the children helped because" Tick
I got the chance to practice training at the roadside before starting for real
I was able to talk to and listen to the other volunteers' ideas and comments
It helped me to get used to working with the children I was able to compare the information in the booklet /notes the co-ordinator gave me
with what I'd actually be doing outside Tunderstood what the bigger project was all about, and how T could be a part of it
I learned how to help the children manage their own behaviour
I learned how to encourage the children to solve the problems themselves
I realised how vulnerable young children are when trying to cross the road Other: Please give details
3 d. Please use this space to write down anything you didn't like about your Kerbcraft training course, or the way you were given information about Kerbcraft Skills Training.

KERBCRAFT ESSENTIALS						
4. Now think about the information that your Kerbcraft Co-ordinator has given you about the background to Kerbcraft and the reasons why it should be successful. Read the sentences below and tick the box below each one that best represents how important YOU think that each thing is in making Kerbcraft training successful. (Please tick one box on each line.)						
a) Children are trained in small groups ESSENTIAL IMPORTANT NOT SURE NOT IMPORTANT						
b) The trainer has to encourage the children to solve the problems for themselves ESSENTIAL IMPORTANT NOT SURE NOT IMPORTANT						
c) All the training takes place at the roadside ESSENTIALIMPORTANTNOT SURENOT IMPORTANT						
d) Trainers learn to give children clues, not just tell them the answers ESSENTIAL IMPORTANT NOT SURE NOT IMPORTANT						
e) Having parents as volunteers helps to teach them and other adults how to be safer on the road ESSENTIAL IMPORTANT NOT SURE NOT IMPORTANT						
f) The order in which the 3 skills are taught makes it easier for children to develop their understanding over time ESSENTIAL IMPORTANT NOT SURE NOT IMPORTANT						
g) Trainers learn how vulnerable children are when crossing roads in quiet streets ESSENTIAL IMPORTANT NOT SURE NOT IMPORTANT						
h) Encouraging parents to volunteer as trainers helps to build positive relationships between parents and the school ESSENTIAL IMPORTANT NOT SURE NOT IMPORTANT I						
i) The co-ordinator is able to give support and advice to each trainer as and when they need it ESSENTIAL IMPORTANT NOT SURE NOT IMPORTANT						
j) Trainers can support and help each other by discussing problems after each session with the children						
ESSENTIAL IMPORTANT NOT SURE NOT IMPORTANT						
4k. Use the space below to write down any other aspects of Kerbcraft you think are important to its success.						

POLICE CHECK FORMS	
5a. How did you feel about completing the Police Check forms? (Please tick one box beside the answer that best describes your feelings.)	~k
It wasn't a problem]]
5b. Did your Co-ordinator help you to complete your Police Check form? YES NO]
KERBCRAFT IN THE FUTURE	
6a. Do you intend to carry on working as a Kerbcraft Trainer until you have completed training with children in all of the 3 skills?	
6b. If YES, what do you think will keep you coming back to Kerbcraft over the next 6- months? Read the sentence below and tick all those endings that describe how you fee just now. (Please tick one or more boxes if you need to.)	-12 el
"I intend to keep volunteering till the end of the programme because"	
I really enjoy working with the children I I think I'll enjoy the chance to meet other parents and new people I I want to make a difference at my child's school I I can learn things from this training that I wouldn't learn otherwise I I like helping out at the school as a lot of other parents don't / can't I I think that the training is really important for the children I I want to do something new that gets me out of the house I I want to get more experience of working in schools / with children so I I want to get more experience of working in schools / with children so I Other: Please give details. I	ck
	•

6c. If NO, why not? Please give details below:

7. Please use this space for **any** other comments you have about Kerbcraft. Continue on a separate sheet if necessary.

HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT YOUR NEIGHBOURHOOD

The following questions ask how you feel about your neighbourhood. Please circle the answer that best describes your feelings <u>at the moment.</u>

۵.	How	long	g have y	ou lived in this	area?	1			
			Year	S	Month	S			
b.	How	lon	g h <u>ave y</u>	ou lived in you	r prese	ent hor	ne?		
			Year	S	Month	S			
с.	How	do y	you rate	the social and	leisur	e facil	ities in	n your area	for people
	like y	/our	self? (e	.g. sports; com	munity	, centr	e; soc	ial clubs)	
(Plea	se tio	:k or	ne box).						
Very	Good	1		Good				Average	
Poor				Very	Poor				
d.	How	do	you rate	e the facilities	for ch	ildren	under	12?	
(Plea	ase ti	ck o	ne box).						
Very	Good	1		Good			Av	erage	
Poor				Very	Poor				
e.	Wha	t fo	orm of t	ransport do yo	u use r	nost of	f the t	time?	
(Plea	ase ti	ck o	ne box).						
Car				Motorbike/m	noped		Public	Transport	
Walk	ing			Other			Never	go out	
f.	How	saf	e do you	ı feel walking a	alone ir	n this d	area d	uring dayti <mark>n</mark>	ne?
(Plea	ase ti	ck o	ne box).						
Very	Safe	2		Fairly Safe				A bit unsafe	
Very	Unsat	fe [Don't go out alor	ie				
g.	Hov	v sa	fe do ya	ou feel walking	alone i	in this	area	after dark?	
(Plea	ase ti	ck o	ne box).						
		_							_
Very	Safe	2		Fairly Safe			A bit u	insafe	
Very	Unsat	fe [Don't go out alor	ie				

h.	How much of a problem is the speed or volume of traffic in you	r
	area? (Please tick one box).	

Very big problem Not at all a problem Don't know	Fairly big problem Minor problem It happens, but its not a problem
i. How much of a pr	oblem is parking in your area? (Please tick one box).
Very big problem 🗌 Not at all a problem 🗌 Don't know 🗌	Fairly big problem Minor problem It happens, but its not a problem
j. How much of a pr (Please tick one box).	oblem is dr ug and or alcohol abuse in your area?
Very big problem Not at all a problem Don't know	Fairly big problem Minor problem It happens, but its not a problem
k. How much of a pro your area? (Please	oblem is finding a safe play area for children in 2 tick one box).
Very big problem Not at all a problem Don't know	Fairly big problem Minor problem It's not easy, but its not a problem
I. How would you descr area? (Please tick on	vibe the number of child pedestrian accidents in this le box).
Very high	High Normal Very low Don't know
m. Apart from the peop close to live within a 15- (Please tick one box).	le you live with, how many relatives that you feel 20 minute walk or 5-10min drive, if any?
One or two	three or four

n. How many close friends live within a 15-20 minute walk or 5-10 minute drive away? (Please tick one box).

One or two	three or four	
Five or more	None	

o. To what extent do you agree / disagree with the following statement? (Please tick one box).

"By working together, people in my neighbourhood can influence decisions that affect the neighbourhood"

Strongly agree	Agree		
Neither agree nor disagree Strongly disagree	No opinion	Disagree	
57 5	'		

p. Have you been involved in any local organisations over the past three years? (Please tick one box).

	YES	NO		
If YES, Please give	details:			

q. In the past three years, have you had any responsibilities in this (these) organisation(s), such as being a committee member, raising funds, organising events or doing administrative or clerical work? (Please tick one box).

	YES	NO	
If YES, Please give de	etail s :		

SOME INFORMATION ABOUT YOU

It would be very helpful for us to have some details about you in order for us to get a clear picture of the kind of people who volunteer as Kerbcraft Trainers in different schemes all over the UK. All this information is <u>strictly confidential</u> and will not be used to identify any one individual person.

1. What age are you? (Please tick one box).

Under 20 years 40-49 years		20-29 years 50-59 years		30-3 60 p	9 years lus	
2. Are you			Male		Female	
3. Do you have a Do you have g If YES, what	childrei randch age(s)	n? nildren? are they?	YES YES		NO NO	

(Please enter the number of children / grandchildren you have in each age group in the boxes below.)

	PRIMARY AGE	SECONDARY AGE	ADULT (18+)
CHILDREN			
GRANDCHILDREN			

4. Do you have any of the following educational qualifications? (Please tick one or more boxes if you need to).

No qualifications	'O' Levels	
GCSEs	'A' levels/Highers	
HNC/ HND	Diploma / Degree	
Professional Qual.	Other	

If OTHER, please give details:

5a. Please choose the option(s) that best describes your employment situation just now: (Please tick one box).

Working full-time Looking for work Housewife / husband Retired		Working part-time Working informally Working from home Sick / unable to work		Other	
(5b) If you answered 'O	ther' fo	or your employment situat	ion, ple	ease give de	tails:

6a. How would you best describe your ethnic origin?

(Please choose the option that best describes you)

British		rish						
Any other White	□ N	/hite & Blo	ack Cari	ibbean				
White & Black African	N	/hite and /	Asian					
Any other mixed		ndian						
Pakistani	B	angladeshi						
Any other Asian	C	aribbean						
African	☐ A	ny other B	Black					
Chinese	☐ A	ny other						
6b. Is English your first 6c. If NO, what is your	t languag first la	ge? anguage?		YES	 N0		•••••	•••
7. Do you hold a driving	license?	>		YES	NO			
76 11			Veenc		Mor	the		
10. How long have you t	been ariv	/ing?	reurs		10101	1115		
8. Do you have regular	access t	o a car?	Y	VES	NO			

9. Which of the following best describes the type of housing you currently live in? (Please tick one box).

Private Rent	Housing Association Rent 🗌
Council Rent	Owner Occupier

KERBCRAFT IN THE FUTURE

10. We would like to contact you again in the future to ask a few more questions about your Kerbcraft experiences. If you are happy for us to contact you directly, please give your name and address below.

Your Name: Address:

Post code: Tel:

Best time of day to call:

IF YOU WOULD RATHER WE CONTACTED YOU THROUGH YOUR KERBCRAFT CO-ORDINATOR, PLEASE COMPLETE THE SECTION BELOW:

CO-ORDINATOR DETAILS

Your Name: Co-ord Name: School:

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR SHARING YOUR KERBCRAFT EXPERIENCES!

If you have any questions or comments about this questionnaire or any aspect of the evaluation of Kerbcraft Projects in the UK, please feel free to contact me.

Kirstie Whelan, Child Health, Newcastle University Sir James Spence Institute, Royal Victoria Infirmary Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 4LP Tel: 0191 202 3072 / 3033 A2.2 Follow-up questionnaire – covering letter to participants, 'still active' and 'dropped out' questionnaires



February 2005

KERBCRAFT VOLUNTEER FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

Are you still a Kerbcraft Volunteer?

Have you left Kerbcraft or gone onto something new?

We would like to hear about your experiences over the last year!!!

Dear Kerbcraft Volunteer Trainer,

Thank you very much for answering our questions about your Kerbcraft Project last year. Thank you also for giving us your contact details and agreeing to complete a follow-up questionnaire. We'd now like to find out about your experience in the last year.

What do you have to do?

It's very simple, and shouldn't take you too long. We've sent you 2 different questionnaires. We would like you to fill in ONE questionnaire ONLY:

If you are still a Kerbcraft Volunteer, please fill in QUESTIONNAIRE 1 ONLY

If you are no longer a Kerbcraft Volunteer, please fill in QUESTIONNAIRE 2 ONLY

Who will see your answers?

We hope that you will feel able to answer all questions honestly - even if you have something negative to say about Kerbcraft. <u>ALL</u> your answers will be completely **CONFIDENTIAL** and your Kerbcraft Co-ordinator will **NOT** see your finished questionnaire unless you want them to (you can show it to them if you want to). Your name and the name of your school will **NOT** appear in any reports or publications about Kerbcraft without permission.

Why are your opinions important to us?

Kerbcraft Training is going on in schools all over England, Scotland and Wales as part of a research project funded by the Department for Transport, the Scottish Executive and the National Assembly for Wales. The project has been very successful so far.

We could not run Kerbcraft Training anywhere if people like *YOU DIDN'T VOLUNTEER* to train children in their local schools. Your experiences of being a Kerbcraft Trainer are *VERY IMPORTANT* to us and will help us to develop better ways of managing and delivering Kerbcraft Training to other schools in the future.

WE NEED <u>YOUR</u> FEEDBACK ON THIS QUESTIONNAIRE TO HELP IMPROVE KERBCRAFT IN YOUR AREA AND ALL OVER THE COUNTRY!!!

Who should I send my questionnaire to?

You can return the questionnaire directly to the Evaluation Team by posting it in the SAE enclosed.

OR

You can seal your questionnaire into the envelope provided and give it back to your coordinator, who will forward it to the Evaluation Team.

***** To ensure your answers are <u>confidential</u>, please make sure you have sealed your questionnaire into an envelope <u>before</u> giving it to your Co-ordinator*****

Many thanks

Kirstie Mhani Whelan

Kirstie Whelan The Kerbcraft Evaluation Team University of West of England & Jacobs Babtie.



QUESTIONNAIRE 1 ARE YOU STILL A KERBCRAFT VOLUNTEER?

Please complete this questionnaire if you <u>ARE CURRENTLY</u> working as a Kerbcraft Volunteer Trainer. Fill in the questions below based on how you feel <u>right now</u>. Your answers will <u>NOT</u> be seen by your Kerbcraft Co-ordinator and will be kept completely confidential. Thank you!!

KERBCRAFT OVER THE LAST YEAR

1. You've been a Kerbcraft Trainer for over a year now. In comparison to how you felt about Kerbcraft when you first started, how do you feel about the training now? Please read the statements below and tick ONE box that best describes how you feel about Kerbcraft now, in comparison with when you started with the project (Tick ONE box only).

I'm enjoying it much more now I'm enjoying it a bit more now I feel the same as I did when I started I'm enjoying it slightly less now I'm enjoying it a lot less now



Please use the spaces below to tell us about what you enjoy and don't enjoy about being a Kerbcraft Trainer.

Things I enjoy about being a Kerbcraft Trainer:

Things I don't enjoy about being a Kerbcraft Trainer:

TRAINING THE CHILDREN IN THE THREE KERBCRAFT SKILLS

The next three questions are about the training you've done with the children. Please answer the questions for EVERY skill that you've taught (even if it was only for one or two sessions).

SAFE PLACES TRAINING

2. Thinking just about SAFE PLACES TRAINING, read the sentences below and tick the **three** boxes that in your opinion are the most important <u>Safe Places skills</u> for the children to learn? (Please tick **three** boxes)

Stop at the kerb Look right and left at the kerb Anything that blocks your view of the road is dangerous Do not cross the road diagonally Remember where the safe places are on every street near the school Be able to go somewhere new and find a safe place to cross

PARKED CARS TRAINING

3. Thinking just about PARKED CARS TRAINING, read the sentences below and tick the **three** boxes that in your opinion are the most important <u>Parked Cars skills</u> for the children to learn? (Please tick **three** boxes)

Look in each car before stepping out Pause to look for moving traffic at the edge of the cars Choose a gap the right size between the cars Decide not to cross between parked cars if there's a safer space Remember all the steps on the list in any order Remember to look both ways and listen while crossing the road

JUNCTIONS TRAINING

4. Thinking just about JUNCTIONS TRAINING, read the sentences below and tick the **three** boxes that in your opinion are the most important <u>Junctions</u> skills for the children to learn? (Please tick **three** boxes)

	Tick
Remember how to make sure you look down every road in the right order	
Decide never to cross at a junction because it's too complicated	
Remember that the steps are the same, no matter what type of junction	
it is	
Look right and left at the kerb before crossing	
Decide that it's safe to cross as long as you can see clearly down all roads	
Remember all the steps on the list in any order at all	



Tick

Tick

AFTER-TRAINING SUPPORT

5. Do you get the chance to talk about the children's training with other volunteers? (Tick ONE box only)

YES NO

5b. **If you answered YES**, how often do you talk about the training with other volunteers? (Tick ONE box only)

After every session Once per skill After every few sessions Only when necessary

5c. **If you answered YES**, what do you find most useful about talking through training sessions with other volunteers? Read the sentences below and tick those that best describe what you found most useful about the after-training sessions. (Tick more than one box if you need to.)

I was reassured to hear that other volunteers faced similar issues We were able to share experiences and tips to help each other out Interesting to see how other trainers dealt differently with challenges Gave me an insight into the different ways children learn things Compared notes on which groups of children worked well together It was a good chance to get to know each other It was a good chance to ask the co-ordinator about training issues	
Other. Please give details below:	
	•••••
	•••••

WORKING WITH THE CHILDREN

6. What do you feel are the main challenges you face when training the children? Read the following sentences and tick those the best describe the challenges you faced when working with the children. (Tick more than one if you need to.)

 Tick

 It was really difficult to make sure the children were paying attention

 It was difficult to manage a group where there was one very loud /very quiet child

 It was difficult to keep the children interested in the training

 If found it difficult to encourage the children to make suggestions

 I found some children's behaviour was difficult to manage

 I found it a challenge to work with a group of three children at once

 Other. Please give details below.

INCIDENTS AT THE ROADSIDE

7. During children's training sessions, were there any occasions (other than for bad weather) where you had to come back to school early? (Please tick one box).

NO 🗌 I don't remember YES

7b. If you answered YES, please use the space below to tell us what happened:

SAFETYAT THE ROADSIDE

8. Did you get information / advice from your Co-ordinator on how to deal with the following issues at the roadside? (Please tick one box on each line.)

Accidents and emergencies:	YES	NO 🗌
Children's behaviour problems:	YES	NO 🗌
General safety while out of school:	YES	NO 🗌

8b. If you answered YES to any of the above, was the information / advice given adequate? (Please tick one box on each line.)

Adequate info on accidents and emergencies	YES	NO 🗌
Adequate info on children's behaviour problems	YES	NO 🗌
Adequate info on general safety	YES	NO 🗌

MEDIA COVERAGE OF KERBCRAFT

9. As far as you know, have there been any stories about your Kerbcraft Project in the local newspapers / TV / Radio etc. over the last year?

	YES		NO 🗌	I don't know			
9b. Did you [.]	take par	t in any of the	e publicity for	your school?	YES		NO 🗌
Any other co	omments	s on Kerbcraft	publicity:				
	•••••					• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	

SUPPORT FROM YOUR CO-ORDINATOR

10. How do you feel about the support your Kerbcraft Co-ordinator has given you since you started with the project? Please tick ONE box below that best describes how you rated the support you got from your Co-ordinator. (Please tick ONE box only.)

My Co-ordinator is very supportive My co-ordinator gives me adequate supportive I would like a bit more support from my co-ordinator I would like a lot more support from my co-ordinator

•	T	ï	ck

Please use the space below to make any other positive or negative comments you have about the support you received from your Kerbcraft Co-ordinator. Please remember that your comments are all <u>completely confidential</u> and will <u>NOT</u> be seen by your Kerbcraft Coordinator.

SCHOOL SUPPORT FOR KERBCRAFT

11. How supportive has the school staff been of your Kerbcraft Project? (Please tick ONE box in each column.)

HEAD TEACHER:	(please tick	CLASS TEACHER:	(please tick
	one box)		one box)
Very supportive		Very supportive	
Quite supportive		Quite supportive	
Not sure		Notsure	
Quite unsupportive		Quite unsupportive	
Very unsupportive		Very unsupportive	

Use this space for any comments you have on the support that the school staff at your school have given Kerbcraft.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT FOR KERBCRAFT

12. As far as you know, has anyone who is **NOT** a parent or grandparent with children at the school been involved in Kerbcraft as a Volunteer Trainer at your school?

YES	NO		I don't know	
If YES, who are they?				
13. Do you think that the Kerbcraft Project at your school has made people in your community more aware of general road safety issues?				
YES	NO		I don't know	
DRIVING IN YOUR COMMUNITY				
14. Do you have a Driver's Licence	?			
YES	NO			
14b. If you DO HAVE a Driver's made <u>you</u> a safer driver?	Licenc	e, do y	ou think that I	being a Kerbcraft volunteer has
YES	NO		I don't know	

LOOKING BACK TO WHEN YOU STARTED WITH KERBCRAFT

15. What is it about being a Kerbcraft Trainer that has kept you involved in the project for all this time? Read through the sentences below and tick **ALL** those that describe why you have kept volunteering for Kerbcraft. (Tick more than one box if you need to.)

	TICK
I've really enjoyed working with the children	
I've enjoyed the chance to meet other parents and new people	
I wanted to make a difference at my child's school	
I've learned things from this training that I wouldn't learn otherwise	
I like helping out at the school, as a lot of other parents don't / can't	
I think that the training is really important for the children	
I wanted to do something new that gets me out of the house	
I wanted to do something useful for the community I live in	
I wanted to get more experience of working in schools / with children so	
that I can do other things in the future	
All the other volunteers were staying on, so I did too	
I liked working with the Co-ordinator / other volunteers	
I felt appreciated by the school and the co-ordinator	
Other. Please give details below.	

BENEFITS OF KERBCRAFT

16. In what ways (if any) do you feel **YOU** benefit from being a Kerbcraft Co-ordinator? Read through the options below and tick **ALL** those that describe any benefits you personally get from being a Kerbcraft Trainer. (Tick more than one box if you need to.)



Tick

KERBCRAFT IN THE FUTURE

17. How would you describe the scheme to someone else who was thinking about volunteering as a Kerbcraft Trainer? Read the sentences below and tick the **top three** reasons you'd give to encourage a new recruit to join. (Please tick **three** boxes.)



18. Please use this space for any other comments you would like to make about your experiences as a Kerbcraft Trainer.

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING OUR SURVEY - GOOD LUCK WITH KERBCRAFT!

If you have any questions about this questionnaire, or any other aspect of the Kerbcraft Evaluation, please feel free to contact me. *Kirstie Whelan, Health and Social Care, University of West of England c/o 2/L 39 Clincart Road, Glasgow, G42 9DZ, Tel: 0141 583 0093*



QUESTIONNAIRE 2 ARE YOU NO LONGER A KERBCRAFT VOLUNTEER? Please complete this if you are <u>NOT CURRENTLY</u> volunteering as a Kerbcraft Trainer. Your answers will <u>NOT</u> be seen by your Kerbcraft Co-ordinator and will be kept completely confidential. Thank you!!

YOUR TRAINING EXPERIENCE

1. We would like to know which Kerbcraft skills you worked on with the children. In the boxes below, please tick the box beside each skill you trained the children in. (Tick more than one box if you need to.)

Safe Places	Parked Cars	Junctions	
-------------	-------------	-----------	--

YOUR TRAINING TO BECOME A KERBCRAFT TRAINER

2. Did you take part in a Kerbcraft volunteer training course, organised by your Co-ordinator, BEFORE starting Kerbcraft sessions with the children? (Please tick ONE box only.)

YES	NO	I don't remember		
-----	----	------------------	--	--

YOUR EXPERIENCES AS A KERBCRAFT TRAINER

3. Did you enjoy being a Kerbcraft Trainer? Please tick ONE box below to show how much you enjoyed being a Kerbcraft Trainer.

I enjoyed it a lot
I enjoyed it a bit
I didn't enjoy it much
I didn't enjoy it at all
I'm not sure

Please use the space below to tell us about what you enjoyed / didn't enjoy about being a Kerbcraft Trainer.

DROPPING OUT OF KERBCRAFT

4. In order to help motivate other Kerbcraft Trainers, we'd like to know why you decided to leave the Kerbcraft project at your school. Read through the sentences below and tick **ALL** those that describe why you were unable to keep volunteering for Kerbcraft. (Tick more than one box if you need to.)



SUPPORT FROM YOUR CO-ORDINATOR

5. How do you feel about the support you received from your Kerbcraft Co-ordinator while you were a volunteer trainer? Please tick ONE box below that best describes how you rated the support you got from your Co-ordinator. (Please tick ONE box only.)

I had a lot of support from my co-ordinator I had enough support from my co-ordinator I would have liked a bit more support I would have liked a lot more support

Please use the space below to make any other comments you have about the support you received from your Kerbcraft Co-ordinator.

BENEFITS OF KERBCRAFT

6. Do you feel YOU personally benefited from being a Kerbcraft Volunteer?

YES NO I'm not sure

If YES, read through the options below and tick ALL those that describe how you benefited personally from being a Kerbcraft Trainer. (Tick more than one box if you need to.)

T met new people / made new friends	
It improved my self-confidence	
It improved my relationship with the school staff	
It led to new work / education opportunities	
I felt valued by the school and Co-ordinator	
I enjoyed socialising with other volunteers	
I received vouchers / certificates / rewards from the co-ordinator	
I feel more a part of my local community	
I didn't feel any personal benefit from being a Kerbcraft Volunteer Trainer	
Other. Please give details below:	
	••••••

ANY OTHER COMMENTS ABOUT KERBCRAFT

Please use the space below to make add any comments you would like to make about your experiences of being a Kerbcraft Trainer.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR CHOOSING TO BE A KERBCRAFT TRAINER AND FOR COMPLETING OUR TRAINER SURVEY

If you have any questions about this questionnaire, or any other aspect of the Kerbcraft Evaluation, please feel free to contact me. *Kirstie Whelan, Health and Social Care, University of West of England c/o 2/L 39 Clincart Road, Glasgow, G42 9DZ Tel: 0141 583 0093*

APPENDIX 3 Case studies

A3.1 General questions interview schedule GENERAL QUESTIONS COVERED IN CASE STUDY INTERVIEWS

Head/Asst. head teacher:

- Is the school working towards the National Healthy Schools Standard?
- Is the school involved in any other health promotion/education work?
- Does the school have a health promotion/education policy?
- Is road safety a special interest issue for the school?
- Have children from this school undertaken any other road safety training initiatives?
- What impact do you think Kerbcraft has had on the school in general?
- How easy has it been to set up Kerbcraft in this school? (In terms of space; time; disruption; volunteers; support from parents etc.)
- What non-financial costs have you incurred as a result of Kerbcraft delivery so far?
- At the moment, would you like to continue with Kerbcraft after the current coordinator funding is withdrawn in 2006/07?
- If Kerbcraft did continue in this school, what plans would you make to sustain it?
- What levels of parent participation are there in the school?
- Do you think that Kerbcraft has made any impact on this?

Class Teacher:

- What is your understanding of the process and content of Kerbcraft training at the moment?
- Has the co-ordinator given you enough information about Kerbcraft?
- Have you observed or participated in any Kerbcraft training at the roadside?
- (follow-up: if yes, why; if no, why?)
- Do you feel that there is a particular need for road safety education at this school?
- Have you done any previous road safety work with your class?
- Does the school have a specific health promotion strategy? Explore.
- If yes (above), how does Kerbcraft fit into that strategy?
- Are you happy with the set-up of Kerbcraft e.g. timetable; number of sessions etc?
- What impact has Kerbcraft training had on your lesson plans and general class timetable? (Give examples.)
- Has there been any classroom disruption as a result of Kerbcraft training?
- Do you feel that the Kerbcraft co-ordinator is sympathetic to the timetable system and general ethos of the school?
- Do you feel you have a good relationship with parents in the school already?
- How successful do you think volunteer trainers have been in passing on Kerbcraft skills to the children?
- How easy/difficult has it been to recruit and maintain a group of volunteers?
- What provision is there for inclusion of children with special needs in the Kerbcraft scheme? (e.g. availability of individual assistance for children at the roadside; flexibility of timetable to account for individual children's needs?)
- Have you done any follow-up work on Kerbcraft in the classroom?
- Has the co-ordinator suggested providing additional materials for follow-up classroom work? (e.g. vocabulary lists, wall charts etc.)
- Has the children's performance/behaviour on Kerbcraft been tied into any of the school's reward systems?
- What (if any) additional educational benefits do you think that the children may have gained from Kerbcraft training?
- Do you have any comments about the aims, content or method of Kerbcraft training?
- What challenges do you think you may face in the next year as a result of your class participating in Kerbcraft?
- What benefits (if any) do you think the school may gain from participating in Kerbcraft?
- If Kerbcraft were to become a permanent part of school life, do you feel that it could be incorporated into the timetable in its present form? Explore.
- What (if any) non-financial costs do you think the school may have incurred as a result of Kerbcraft training?

Questions for Volunteers:

- What made you volunteer for Kerbcraft?
- How did you hear about the project?
- Do you think that there are traffic-related problems in this area e.g. high numbers of children injured; speed etc?
- How long have you been involved with Kerbcraft here?
- Do you help out with any other school activities / other voluntary activities?
- Did all volunteers know each other beforehand?
- Did you have any prior interest in road safety?
- Is it difficult to get parents interested in school activities?
- What challenges have there been in running Kerbcraft here?
- How has Kerbcraft impacted on the community here?
- Are people outside the school aware of the project?
- What do you think should be done to make local people more aware of local road safety problems for children?
- What would encourage you to volunteer for more than 1 skill?
- What would make you want to stop volunteering?

- Other factors which might be important.
- Rewards, lunches, social time, vouchers how important?
- If paid an hourly rate, would more people help out?
- How to sell the scheme to new volunteers?
- Are crèche facilities important?
- Would a specific qualification be important, e.g. NVQ ?
- What do you like/dislike so far about Kerbcraft?

Areas to cover with children:

- Who teaches you Kerbcraft?
- What did you think about being taught by the volunteers?
- What have you told your parents/grandparents about Kerbcraft?
- Do you practise your Kerbcraft training when you're outside school?
- Do you help your parents cross the road now? How?
- Why do you wear yellow tops?
- How do they help to make children safer?
- Would they wear yellow jackets to school every day?
- How do you find a safe place to cross?
- How do you cross safely between parked cars?
- How do you cross safely at junctions?
- Why shouldn't you cross diagonally?
- What parts could be more fun?

Co-ordinator:

- General picture of how training has been set up at this school.
- Volunteer recruitment and maintenance.

A3.2 Ethnicity and cultural diversity issues case study – summary of key outcomes – School 1: established Asian community

A3.2.1 Introduction

A3.2.1.1 Theme of ethnicity and cultural diversity issues case study

UK child pedestrian accident data indicate an over-representation of children from Black and minority ethnic (BME) backgrounds (especially from Asian communities) in the general children's killed and seriously injured (KSI) rates. Recent research commissioned by the Department for Transport indicates a number of contributory factors in this pattern, a key one of which is the heightened vulnerability of children from new/isolated BME groups, such as refugees, asylumseekers and traveller communities (Thomson *et al.*, 2001).

Aim

To explore the implementation and impact of Kerbcraft training in two schools – one with an established BME community and one with smaller, more disparate and isolated ethnic groups (e.g. refugees, asylum-seekers and travellers).

A3.2.1.2 Selection of local authority scheme and individual school

Each school within the National Network provided information on the ethnic and cultural background of its pupils. From this information, and with some additional input from MVA, we selected a number of schools which fitted two criteria:

- a school population with a majority Asian population from an established and cohesive local Asian community; and
- a school population with children from a wide range of diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds, including children from traveller communities and asylum-seekers and refugees.

Having generated a shortlist of schools to fit both categories, we contacted the scheme co-ordinators to ascertain which schools were currently training and would be able to host a visit from the evaluation team. Once individual schools were identified, the head teachers were contacted to arrange suitable dates for an interview visit.

A3.2.2 Information from school 1: established Asian community

A3.2.2.1 School background information

• Kerbcraft is a clear part of the school's National Healthy School's profile and their general health education focus is on 'keeping safe and healthy'.

- There has been no particular road safety focus on the school up until its involvement with Kerbcraft. However, school staff feel that there is a road safety risk from the busy main road nearby. There have been a few injuries in the last 10 years and two deaths of older children from the school.
- The school asks that children in Year 1 are accompanied to and from school by an adult.
- Fifty per cent of children in the Kerbcraft class have English as a second language.
- All training is done in English (and reinforced in Urdu or Punjabi, where necessary).
- The surrounding community is fairly cohesive and has become more predominantly Asian and Muslim over the last few years.
- The school itself has got smaller over the last few years after local authority reorganisation and used to have a much more mixed-race population.

A3.2.2.2 Setting up, management and maintenance

- The co-ordinator is very organised and runs training in the school very efficiently. She has help from a full-time nursery nurse attached to Year 1 this has been a big help.
- The local community centre opened last year and the head teacher has been invited onto the management committee. They are building parental links with the school and developing courses for parents within the school. There are good community links which have been strengthened recently as the school headed up an earthquake appeal for Northern Pakistan. This was very successful and made use of local businesses, which have been involved in building the community from grass roots.
- Most of the volunteers have children in Years 1 or 2 and some of them knew each other before they started (two are sisters).
- A few volunteers were recruited through the school's links with the local community centre.
- All volunteers have been with the project for at least 12 months, some for more then two years.
- The volunteers from all schools in the area form a 'pool' of Kerbcraft trainers who often work in more than one school.

A3.2.3 Impact on the school, volunteers and community

A3.2.3.1 Impact on the school and children

- The class teacher decided to go out with the volunteers each week to help with training. She felt that this made lesson-planning easier to go out with the whole class as part of a PSE lesson as Kerbcraft has clear links to that part of the curriculum.
- The school has not had much in the way of parent participation, but there has been more recently due to the success of the earthquake appeal.

A3.2.3.2 Evidence of skill retention by the children

- Children had good recall of general road safety messages about looking right and left and not crossing diagonally.
- They also remembered that they could go to the 'pinch point' of the pavement (at the edge of parking bays) if their view was obscured by parked cars.

A3.2.3.3 Impact on the volunteers

- The volunteers are now more aware of road safety risks with their own children and have started to teach their family and friends' children.
- The most challenging aspect of the training for the volunteers has been to encourage the children to listen and to make sure that they have understood the basics.
- The volunteers reported that there was nothing that they disliked about the training.
- The volunteers really enjoyed the fact that the training is so well supported by the school.
- Currently they only work on the Kerbcraft project, but they reported that they would be interested in becoming involved in other school activities.

A3.2.3.4 Impact on the community

• The volunteers feel that road safety now has a much bigger profile in the local community (as a result of Kerbcraft) as people often stop them to ask what they are doing when they are out training.

A3.2.4 Success and failure factors

A3.2.4.1 Barriers

- The volunteers found it challenging to engage the children's attention and make sure they listened actively.
- Parents' language skills (many are not confident in English) may be a barrier to further participation in school activities.
- The current co-ordinator took over the project after an absence (the original Tranche 1 co-ordinator left).

A3.2.4.2 Facilitators

- The head teacher feels that the key factor for success is the close working relationship built up between the co-ordinator and the class teacher. This has enabled the school to encourage parents into the school and to create a non-intimidating and embracing atmosphere for parent recruitment to flourish.
- The Key Stage 1 and 2 teachers are all very child-focused and are keen to find any new opportunity to involve parents in classroom activities.
- As the class teacher regularly takes part in roadside training, she has a first-hand experience of the skills training and can reinforce key training messages in the classroom.
- The co-ordinator speaks fluent Urdu and Punjabi, and can reinforce training messages for both volunteers and children.
- Both the volunteers and the co-ordinator recognise that Kerbcraft is an opportunity for parents to improve their English and develop new vocabulary this is 'sold' very much as a plus point of participation in the project.
- The co-ordinator felt that it was important to have an understanding of how the community works, how to access it, to be sensitive to the language issue and that it was vital to create an atmosphere of trust with the volunteers.
- There is now a pool of volunteers from this and neighbouring communities who can be called upon for Kerbcraft training when required and who will work in any school in the area.
- The school was able to build on links with the local community centre to find additional volunteers.

A3.2.5 Sustainability

• The head teacher feels that Kerbcraft is sustainable as it fits clearly within the Every Child Matters Agenda. She felt that management of the scheme could be

continued by the school's parental involvement officer, and she would prefer to see someone from within the school overseeing training and supporting the volunteers as this would strengthen the profile of the programme and maintain its integrity.

A3.2.5.1 Comments on ethnicity and cultural diversity issues

• The majority of volunteers in this scheme are young Muslim women who are very much integrated into the local community and who are developing links with their children's school over time. They are very keen to become more involved in school activities, but may perhaps have initially lacked confidence and language skills. They have all been CRB checked and are happy to be photographed and meet with visitors to discuss Kerbcraft in their schools.

A3.2.5.2 Recommendations for good practice

- Recruit a co-ordinator with appropriate language skills and understanding of local community issues.
- Work closely with the school staff to create a trusting and supportive atmosphere for parents/volunteers.
- If possible, involve the class teacher in training at the roadside as this reinforces key messages for children.

A3.3 Ethnicity and cultural diversity issues case study – summary of key outcomes – School 2: working with transient communities

A3.3.1 Introduction

A3.3.1.1 Theme of ethnicity and cultural diversity issues case study

UK child pedestrian accident data indicate an over-representation of children from BME backgrounds (especially from Asian communities) in the general children's KSI rates. Recent research commissioned by the Department for Transport indicates a number of contributory factors in this pattern, a key one of which is the heightened vulnerability of children from new/isolated BME groups, such as refugees, asylumseekers and traveller communities.

Aim

To explore the implementation and impact of Kerbcraft training in two schools – one with an established BME community and one with smaller, more disparate and isolated ethnic groups (e.g. refugees, asylum-seekers and travellers).

A3.3.1.2 Selection of local authority scheme and individual school

Each school within the National Network provided information on the ethnic and cultural background of its pupils. From this information, and with some additional input from MVA, we selected a number of schools which fitted two criteria:

- a school population with a majority Asian population from an established and cohesive local Asian community; and
- a school population with children from a wide range of diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds, including children from traveller communities and asylum-seekers and refugees.

Having generated a shortlist of schools to fit both categories, we contacted the scheme co-ordinators to ascertain which schools were currently training and would be able to host a visit from the evaluation team. Once individual schools were identified, the head teachers were contacted to arrange suitable dates for an interview visit.

A3.3.2 Information from school 2: working with transient communities

A3.3.2.1 School background information

- The school has recently amalgamated with another smaller local school and has used that opportunity to completely review and update all school policies.
- The school has been awarded the National Healthy School Standard. The Action Plan revolved initially around Healthy Eating activities (including an 'Economical Meals for Families' project involving the school cook), but is now being extended to cover Healthy Behaviours (including play leader interventions and a drugs awareness scheme). The policy is a work in progress and is regularly updated to include new school activities, such as Kerbcraft.
- Road safety has recently become more of a focus for the school as the problem is more subtle – the school is tucked away off a side road, so motorists are seldom aware that it is even there. Traffic has increased around the school as the number of children attending has doubled (in 18 months since amalgamation) and there has already been one child knocked down. The head teacher is currently pursuing a request for a traffic survey and the possible allocation of a school crossing patrol from the local authority.
- The school is set within a residential area with narrow streets, lots of parked cars and not much off-street parking.
- The school has taken part in road safety activities for older children (cycling training) but has recently dropped this training after the head teacher's concerns over the quality of the bikes used by the children.

• The school has only a small number of parents who regularly get involved in activities.

A3.3.3 Setting up, management and maintenance

- The head teacher delegated responsibility for facilitating Kerbcraft to a key member of staff to act as the contact point for the co-ordinator and volunteers.
- They managed to recruit two volunteers from within the school sisters who are school dinner ladies, but also had children in the Year 1 class to be trained.
- The co-ordinator ran a practice session to give the volunteers a chance to experience training at the roadside before launching into the full programme.
- All the children who take part in Kerbcraft training get a silver badge from their co-ordinator when they have completed the training. They also receive stickers after each weekly training session.
- The training is run back to back in a 12-week block across one term, as the co-ordinator and the school agree that this is the best way to maintain the involvement of the volunteers and the attention of the children.

A3.3.4 Impact on the school, volunteers and community

A3.3.4.1 Impact on the school and children

- The head teacher reports more children coming to school with reflective materials on clothing and bags as a result of the focus on 'being seen' as part of Kerbcraft training. The school sells bookbags with reflective designs and the head teacher has seen an increase in the numbers sold to children who have completed Kerbcraft training.
- The school has borne no major non-financial costs as a result of hosting Kerbcraft. The school spends more money on road-safety-related materials now, but this is perceived as a positive and necessary outcome.
- Staff are now focusing more on road safety resources when considering new materials for classroom sessions.
- Teachers report no major disruption in class as a result of Kerbcraft, as the sessions are well organised and they have lists of children for training each week.
- Kerbcraft training has helped to bring original school communities together, as volunteers have worked together and got to know each other.
- Both class teachers interviewed reported that Kerbcraft may be helping children to listen more attentively, work together more successfully and improve their

problem-solving skills in the classroom. In addition to this, they feel that training has had a positive impact on children's confidence.

- Younger children in the school are now aware of the training and are clearly excited about taking part when it is their turn.
- The co-ordinator reported that children who might struggle with more academic tasks in the classroom are really excelling during Kerbcraft training because it is more practical and there are no pressures on them. This has helped to make these children more confident in class as they see that they have skills which others do not.
- Kerbcraft is promoting parent participation in the school.

A3.3.4.2 Evidence of skill retention by children

- Good recall of types of junctions.
- The children were clear on general road safety messages about looking right and left, and standing back from the kerb.
- The children did point out that they were not to cross beside a corner or a parked car because they were not very tall and they might not be able to see another car coming down the road.
- The children were very clear on why wearing their yellow tops makes them safer during the day and at night. The children also commented on how the yellow tops make it easier for them all to see each other when they are out training and that it would be easier to be found if they got lost.

A3.3.4.3 Impact on the volunteers

- The head teacher reports a positive impact of Kerbcraft on particular volunteers, in terms of developing confidence and creating a purpose.
- Volunteers have gone on to undertake further activities in the school.
- Volunteers report their own children are much more confident crossing the road and that they now give them slightly more leeway and independence. As parents they now take more time when crossing the road in order to explain their actions to their own children.
- Volunteers report that they would not be any more motivated to participate if they were paid for their training. One volunteer said she was very happy to get a certificate stating what training she had done.

A3.3.4.4 Impact on the community

- Kerbcraft training is helping to build a culture of trust within the school where parents are welcome and are given the opportunity to meet and get to know people from other community groups.
- The class teacher is very aware of local children playing unsupervised around the school and feels sure that trained children are taking key messages home to parents.
- Volunteers have local people asking about training while they are out, and the parents of trained children have commented on the training and its impact on the children.

A3.3.5 Success and failure factors

A3.3.5.1 Barriers

- The school was going through a stressful amalgamation process when Kerbcraft was initially offered, thus the head teacher was not initially that receptive to the project.
- The amalgamation and closure of a smaller local school caused 'an awful lot of discontent' locally, as many parents felt they were being forced to send their children to a new school with unfamiliar staff.
- Community groups were 'thrown together' as a result of the amalgamation and it took time for these different groups to settle and gel with each other. The head teacher felt that Kerbcraft had actually facilitated this process as volunteers came from both original schools to work together.
- Many parents with English as a second language see a lack of language skills as a barrier to participating in school activities.
- There is not much parent participation in the school at present.
- It has been difficult to get parents to volunteer for Kerbcraft. At the moment, both trainers are dinner ladies in the school (although they are both parents of trained children).

A3.3.5.2 Facilitators

• The co-ordinator is seen as extremely important to the successful delivery of Kerbcraft at the school and all the groups interviewed commended the sensitive and gentle way in which the co-ordinator approached working with the volunteers, staff and children.

- The school is now encouraging a dedicated and reliable group of regular volunteers.
- Cross-curriculum links with Kerbcraft and the Geography and Healthy schools initiatives are recognised within the school.
- The school has a bi-lingual classroom assistant who can translate for parents whose English is not that good.
- A growing number of Asian parents are sitting on school committees.
- The school liked the project as it was so clearly branded (with logos, yellow tabards and jackets, etc.) and was delivering formal training for the children.
- Training sessions are all run in the afternoon, which fits in better with the school timetable.
- The head teacher is experienced in working with more transient community groups and has promoted a very open and inclusive ethos within the school. She has worked hard to get to know individual parents and to encourage them to become part of the school community.

A3.3.6 Sustainability

- The head teacher is keen to sustain training after funding ends as she sees the impact on the children, even one to two years after training has ended.
- The head teacher feels that the school could not support a rigorous a programme of training as is currently delivered without a dedicated co-ordinator, and she does not anticipate that school staff would be available to take on this responsibility.
- The head teacher does not consider it appropriate that a volunteer should take on the managerial responsibility for Kerbcraft training in the future as there would be issues with insurance and health and safety legislation. She felt that whoever took over the post would require comprehensive training and support, and that was not the responsibility of a 'volunteer'.
- Ideally, the training would be condensed into a few intensive weeks prior to school trips during the summer and placed within the curriculum as part of the PHSE and Citizenship strand.
- The school would aim to train up a group of 20 or more volunteers who could undertake training with more children across the school.

A3.3.6.1 Comments on ethnicity and cultural diversity issues

• We recommend working closely with the traveller liaison officer to promote links between resident travelling families and the school staff. Parents are often

anxious and suspicious of school activities (having perhaps had negative experiences of school themselves) and, as a result, are reluctant to give consent for participation in any school-based activities unless they are fully briefed and can take part themselves. This must be understood and accommodated if traveller children are to be included in activities like Kerbcraft.

- The school has a bi-lingual classroom assistant through whom they are working to build relationships with new (Asian) community groups.
- Staff are specially trained to find 'access points' to children with no or limited English who are new to the school. They have had many successes in integrating and supporting refugee and asylum-seeker children into the school (and wider) community.
- The head teacher has worked hard to build personal relationships with parents who may be anxious about interacting with the school. All parents are encouraged to take part in, or shadow, new school activities and to make the most of their own skills and talents in order to contribute to school activities.

A3.3.6.2 Recommendations for good practice

- Try to develop personal relationships with parents in more transient community groups to help build trust and banish anxiety and suspicion.
- To promote inclusion, understand the individual's needs and act accordingly, for example telephoning certain parents for consent rather than sending a letter home when the parent has poor literacy skills or English as a second language.
- Celebrate individual achievements by parents and children in order to reinforce the school environment as a supportive and inclusive community.

A3.4 Extreme deprivation schools case study – summary of key outcomes

A3.4.1 Introduction

A3.4.1.1 Theme of impact of extreme deprivation

Research shows that there is a clear association between high levels of socioeconomic deprivation and child pedestrian accident rates, with children from the most deprived areas of the UK being the most vulnerable to death or injury as pedestrians. Our aim was to collect qualitative data on the implementation and progress of Kerbcraft training in schools in deprived areas.

We hope to explore the factors which have made Kerbcraft so successful in each school, and to identify the challenges faced in the process of implementing and delivering Kerbcraft training in a deprived area.

A3.4.1.2 Selection of local authority scheme and individual school

We have selected two schools where there is a viable Kerbcraft scheme up and running from the 5% most deprived schools (n = 19 approximately) in Tranche 3 of the National Network pilot scheme.

A3.4.1.3 School background information

- There is a perceived road safety risk around the school while it is tucked away in a square of no through roads and lanes, it is only accessible via a busy main road.
- The smaller, narrower roads around the school are difficult also, as there are many places were views of the road are obscured by buildings and railings/ hedges/bushes.
- There is a lot of congestion when children are dropped off/picked up from school, and that is aggravated by deliveries, etc. There are traffic-calming measures in the local streets (speed bumps) but they are not always observed.

A3.4.2 Setting up, management and maintenance

- Two of the three volunteers have been with the project since the beginning (two years ago) and the third joined recently.
- The two initial volunteers both have children in the current Year 2 class and are typical regular helpers in the school.
- The third trainer wanted to get involved as she had recently moved to the UK (she was applying for residency at the time) and wanted to become integrated into the community she does a lot of charity and voluntary work through her local Baptist church, including Sunday school teaching and she feels that it is important to be a part of the community she likes the feeling of being known locally.

A3.4.3 Impact on the school, volunteers and community

A3.4.3.1 Impact on the school and children

- The class teacher feels that it is very important and positive for the children to be learning skills outside the classroom and that they are getting to know their environment better.
- The class teacher does a class-based week of road safety sessions each year as part of the literacy hour, and recognises that Kerbcraft also has clear links to maths, science and geography (within the National Curriculum framework).

A3.4.3.2 Evidence of skill retention by children

- Children had a clear recall of all the key parked cars steps, including looking for a space the right size, looking for drivers/lights/exhaust fumes, and remembering to listen carefully for traffic.
- When prompted, they reported that they talked to their parents about Kerbcraft, especially when their parents crossed the road diagonally.
- The children knew that wearing their yellow tops made them more visible to drivers and other people during the day.
- The children are very motivated about the training and clearly enjoy it very much. It encourages good behaviour and good manners, and there is a consistent approach from the teachers and trainers.

A3.4.3.3 Impact on the volunteers

• Two of the volunteers knew each other before volunteering as their daughters are in the same class and are best friends – this relationship has been made stronger by their participation in Kerbcraft.

A3.4.3.4 Impact on the community

- It would appear that most local residents are out during school hours, but those that are around have been helpful by not moving cars until after training sessions were finished, etc.
- As the area is all residents' parking, the trainers were initially mistaken for traffic wardens.
- It is difficult to isolate an impact on local drivers, but as they use the main road on which the school is located a lot, the residents there are aware of the programme.

A3.4.4 Success and failure factors

A3.4.4.1 Barriers

- The biggest difficulty in starting the project was getting volunteers. Initially there were three/four other volunteers, but they dropped out along the way for various reasons (became pregnant, started work, learning English, etc.).
- The most challenging aspects of the training have been getting the group dynamics right separating some children out from each other and giving others adequate support. This year's group has needed less support, but last year there were two children with ASD who were taken out individually by the co-

ordinator. Their abilities were fairly limited but they were able to take some of the key messages on board.

• The class teacher felt that the only negative aspect of Kerbcraft was the timing of the training sessions – in the morning, during the core teaching period for Numeracy and Literacy. She felt it was impossible to plan a normal classroom lesson while training was taking place. However, she accepts that this road safety training is essential for children at this age and sees it as a reasonable trade-off against the lesson plan disruption. She would rather it was an afternoon session as she feels under pressure to reach national targets for Ofsted.

A3.4.4.2 Facilitators

- School staff felt that Kerbcraft had been good for developing links with parents, as Kerbcraft volunteers have now become available for other school activities.
- The class teacher felt that the Kerbcraft programme is of a very high standard, is clearly structured and is much better quality than anything that could be delivered by school staff, just because of the time and resource implications.
- The school staff feel that the co-ordinator is excellent and the volunteers are extremely well trained.

A3.4.5 Sustainability

A3.4.5.1 Comments on Kerbcraft training in areas of extreme deprivation

- The current Year 1 class teacher felt that this training was particularly important for children in the local area as many of them have English as a second language and Kerbcraft has provided another context for language development.
- The school staff are aware that lots of local children play in the streets around the school, and so the class teacher feels that it is particularly important for children from this community to be learning these skills (Kerbcraft).

A3.5 Longitudinal case study – summary of key outcomes – Tranche 2 school

A3.5.1 Introduction

A3.5.1.1 Theme of changes and challenges over 12 months

This longitudinal study focused on gathering in-depth information from all parties involved in Kerbcraft at each of two schools in the course of several visits over a 12-month period. The study followed one established scheme (Tranche 2 in their second year) and one 'New Start' scheme (Tranche 3 in their first year) to ascertain which of the challenges faced may be resolved over time, and which may be more particular to the implementation of the scheme itself. We currently propose to work with Gateshead (Tranche 2) and Newcastle (Tranche 3).

A3.5.1.2 Selection of local authority scheme and individual school

The team agreed to select both schools from schemes in neighbouring local authorities (which were within reasonable travelling distance for the researcher) in order to facilitate efficient data collection over the 12 months of the study. Once the schemes were identified, the co-ordinators were contacted and asked to nominate viable Kerbcraft schools where training was taking place and where the school staff would agree to a number of interview visits.

A3.5.1.3 School background information

- The school has built up a good relationship with parents, but it tends to be the same parents to volunteer to help with all school activities.
- School staff and volunteers identified the busy main road outside the school as the school's main road safety risk. The majority of pupils live within walking distance of the school, so there are no major problems with parking at drop-off/ collection times.
- School staff recognise that many school pupils play and ride their bikes unaccompanied in the surrounding neighbourhood after school.
- Children are trained at this school in Year 1.
- All training takes place within a few streets of the school and trainers try to avoid crossing the main road whenever possible.
- The school has already been awarded the National Healthy School Standard and is currently running a number of healthy eating programmes for parents and children, including setting up a food shop selling fruit and vegetables, and running cooking lessons for the children with the school dinner ladies.
- The head teacher has developed a very clear 'open door' policy for parents and

community members, and sees the school very much as a 'hub' for activities within the local community.

• This school is a church school and encourages parents to attend services with the children throughout the year, as well as inviting them to weekly assemblies to celebrate school/community achievements.

A3.5.2 Setting up, management and maintenance

- Setting up Kerbcraft has been relatively easy as the co-ordinator worked closely with the assistant head teacher to agree a suitable timetable and to recruit volunteers.
- The class teacher feels that she is not very involved in Kerbcraft activities but has sufficient information and works well with the co-ordinator.
- All the volunteers have children/family members at the school and were already involved in many school activities. They were recruited by the co-ordinator after a visit to a parents' afternoon meeting at the school.
- The school is sited in a very deprived urban area.

A3.5.3 Impact on the school, volunteers and community

A3.5.3.1 Impact on the school and children

- Initially both the class teacher and the head teacher reported some anxiety over disruption to Literacy sessions in the morning.
- Over time, any classroom disruption has lessened and the class teacher and head teacher agree that any negative aspects are outweighed by the benefits of Kerbcraft training for the children.
- Volunteers have overheard trained children directing parents on how to cross the road safely when they are collected at home time.
- The head teacher reports fewer incidents of children running out from between cars parked near the school at drop-off and pick-up times.
- Kerbcraft has sparked the children's interest in other aspects of road safety and the co-ordinator has been able to arrange for further road safety work to be done with the whole school (e.g. a demonstration of the benefits of wearing a seat belt from the local road safety officer).
- The head teacher felt that the biggest impact on the school would be the benefit of Key Stage 1/2 children being involved in something which has continuity and progression.

- The class teacher feels that children have benefited from Kerbcraft training in terms of improving language skills and developing new vocabulary.
- School staff felt that Kerbcraft had improved on the already good links with parents and the wider community.

A3.5.3.2 Evidence of skill retention by children

- The children show a good understanding of general road safety messages.
- The children particularly enjoyed Parked Cars training as they got to look into and underneath the cars.
- The children love wearing their yellow tops and would happily wear them to and from school. They were also able to discuss why the tops helped to keep them safer.

A3.5.3.3 Impact on the volunteers

- Volunteers report that they really get a lot of personal enjoyment out of participating in Kerbcraft ('I also like it because it gets me out of the house and gives me time for myself').
- One of the volunteers is now working part-time in the school as an administrative assistant as a result of spending so much time there as a parent volunteer.
- Volunteers recognise the improvement in their own road safety skills and they now take more time to discuss their crossing behaviour with their own children.
- The head teacher feels that Kerbcraft (along with other school activities) has made a very positive impact on the parents who have taken part that they are now more comfortable in school and that they feel valued by the school community.
- The one volunteer who drives felt that participating in Kerbcraft training had made her much more aware of children at the roadside while she was driving.

A3.5.3.4 Impact on the community

- Lots of local residents have asked about the training while children and volunteers are working outside near the school.
- As the volunteers all live locally, many of their friends, neighbours and relatives are aware that they are volunteering on a road safety project, so they feel that will have increased awareness in the immediate neighbourhood.

- Volunteers felt that local people did not view the roads in the area as being particularly high risk for children.
- Both the school staff and the volunteers feel that the (male) co-ordinator is a very good (male) role model for the children.

A3.5.4 Success and failure factors

A3.5.4.1 Barriers

- Initially, there was little flexibility within the school timetable to accommodate Kerbcraft without disrupting the core teaching hours in the morning.
- There were initial problems with recruiting volunteers from outside the usual group of parents who get involved in everything.
- Existing volunteers felt that some other parents were put off by having to complete a CRB check.
- The volunteers felt that some parents may be reluctant to take part in more school activities (including Kerbcraft) as their group is very close and may be perceived as being a bit of a 'clique'. They have tried hard to dispel this perception and to actively invite other parents to attend a weekly parents group where they can all get to know each other better.
- Volunteers found the final skill (Junctions) the most difficult to teach the children and to fully understand themselves.
- The school amalgamated four years ago and parents are still being encouraged to become more active in the school. One perceived barrier to this is the negative experiences of the school environment that many parents may have had themselves.
- The class teacher initially struggled to plan a normal lesson during Kerbcraft sessions.

A3.5.4.2 Facilitators

- Changes to the curriculum as a result of the Every Child Matters Agenda have opened up the timetable and allowed Kerbcraft to be more clearly integrated into the school day for Year 1 pupils.
- Had a group of parents who already know each other and who helped with activities in the school.
- Everyone interviewed at the school gave very high praise for the scheme coordinator who is not only efficient and organised but is also very enthusiastic and inclusive, and has the personal skills to 'pitch' Kerbcraft in the right way for that school and those parents.

- Volunteers felt that they were very well rewarded for their contribution both by the school and the co-ordinator. They received certificates, small gifts (Kerbcraft pens) and had regular get-togethers.
- The school regularly celebrates the children's and volunteers' achievements at a whole school assembly, which parents are always invited to attend.

A3.5.5 Sustainability

- The volunteers are extremely dedicated and enthusiastic, and felt they could continue with the programme themselves after the co-ordinator's funding ceased.
- The head teacher feels that Kerbcraft should be part of the curriculum as it is an essential life skill for children. She would like the school to continue with the training themselves, but she feels that they would only be able to do that with guidance and information from the local authority.
- The head teacher is aware that many schools would back away from the responsibility of running this type of project themselves (because of the risk assessment, need for training and supervision, and insurance issues) so any continuation of the project in this way would have to be carefully considered and set up.
- The head teacher would consider giving volunteers the responsibility for running Kerbcraft, but feels that they would require additional training and support on the more administrative aspects of the scheme management.

A3.5.5.1 Recommendations for good practice

- Discuss with the class teachers how to plan lessons effectively around Kerbcraft training sessions (especially when training takes place during Numeracy and Literacy hours).
- Highlight the ability to flex the curriculum in light of the Every Child Matters Agenda.
- In hindsight, the head teacher at this school would have tried to consider more carefully how Kerbcraft could have been integrated and sustained within the school from the very start of the project. She recommends contacting the local Healthy Schools co-ordinator (England) to assist with integrating the training in the longer term.

A3.6 Longitudinal case study – summary of key outcomes – Tranche 3 school

A3.6.1 Introduction

A3.6.1.1 Theme of changes and challenges over 12 months

This longitudinal study focused on gathering in-depth information from all parties involved in Kerbcraft at each of two schools in the course of several visits over a 12-month period. The study followed one established scheme (Tranche 2 in their second year) and one 'New Start' scheme (Tranche 3 in their first year) to ascertain which of the challenges faced may be resolved over time, and which may be more particular to the implementation of the scheme itself. We currently propose to work with Gateshead (Tranche 2) and Newcastle (Tranche 3).

A3.6.1.2 Selection of local authority scheme and individual school

The team agreed to select both schools from schemes in neighbouring local authorities (which were within reasonable travelling distance for the researcher) in order to facilitate efficient data collection over the 12 months of the study. Once the schemes were identified, the co-ordinators were contacted and asked to nominate viable Kerbcraft schools where training was taking place and where the school staff would agree to a number of interview visits.

Note, all the information here is from the first round of visits to the school. When it came time to revisit the school 12 months later, training was no longer running at the school due to a lack of volunteers. We were unable to conduct second interviews with any of the scheme participants at that time.

The training was completed at this school some time later when the coordinator was able to recruit some volunteers for a short period of time. It is not known whether the school has plans to continue the training after funding ends.

A3.6.1.3 School background information

- At the time of the interview, the school was working towards the National Healthy Schools Standard.
- The school was running a number of Healthy Eating projects, including a Kids' Café, where parents and children can come to learn about and practice cooking new foods.
- The school is set at the junction of two main roads and there have been two pupils seriously injured since the head teacher arrived. There is also a major problem with congestion and illegal parking outside the school at drop-off and

pick-up times. The school is working with the local road safety department to install parking restrictions and a barrier at the school entrance, and they have had the local police liaison officer at the school to leaflet and move along parents who are parking irresponsibly.

- The main concern of local residents is the high incidence of car crime (primarily joyriding) and the perceived road safety risk that this brings to the area.
- Older children in the school (Year 6) have a session at 'Safety Works' the local static facility for health and safety education for children in the area.
- The school has a small number of parents who help with some activities, but has struggled to get volunteers to help on a regular basis in the past.

A3.6.2 Setting up, management and maintenance

• The Kerbcraft training is tied into the classroom rewards system, where children may get an extra star on the class chart if they have behaved especially well during a Kerbcraft session.

A3.6.3 Impact on the school, volunteers and community

A3.6.3.1 Impact on the school and children

- The head teacher foresees a very positive impact from having parent trainers involved in children's road safety training at the school.
- The head teacher does not anticipate any non-financial costs for the school as she feels that the co-ordinator is very organised and efficient.
- The class teacher felt that the training was initially a little disruptive as she would forget when it was taking place, but once it became a regular occurrence, it had little disruptive impact on the class.
- The class teacher feels that children's listening skills and ability to follow instructions may improve as a result of taking part in Kerbcraft.

A3.6.3.2 Evidence of skill retention by children

- Children had good recall of general road safety messages.
- Some children remembered the details of finding safe places to cross ('you need to find somewhere you can see, all the places where you need to look, if you can see there's a car coming').
- Children enjoy wearing their yellow tops and would like to wear them to and from school.

• The parents interviewed reported that their children were talking about Kerbcraft at home and that they saw a big improvement in their children's ability to cross the road safely.

A3.6.3.3 Impact on the volunteers

• Only one volunteer is active in the school on Kerbcraft at the moment.

A3.6.3.4 Impact on the community

• The parents interviewed said that they allow their children to play in the street, but only during the summer and within sight of the house. They felt that 'stranger danger' and bullying by older children were the main risks for young children playing further away from the house.

A3.6.4 Success and failure factors

A3.6.4.1 Barriers

- The school does not have a lot of parents who help out regularly and it was a struggle to recruit volunteers for Kerbcraft. The head teacher feels that many parents lack confidence to approach the school and help with activities regularly.
- At the very beginning of the project, the Year 1 class teacher was on sick leave, so the class was taken by a supply teacher who did not have the same level of 'investment' in the project that the regular class teacher would have had.
- The head teacher had many other issues to manage in the school at the outset of the project, and feels that she was not able to give her time to it as much as she would have liked. This delayed the start of the training.
- The class teacher was concerned that children are missing out on an hour of core teaching a week during their SATs year.

A3.6.4.2 Facilitators

• The scheme co-ordinator has already approached the class teachers with additional materials to reinforce Kerbcraft in the classroom.

A3.6.5 Sustainability

- The head teacher would try to encourage more volunteers by raising the profile of the project with new parents and as part of the school prospectus.
- The school staff recognise that regular parent participation in the school is low

and that there may be problems maintaining a core number of volunteers for the project over the next few years.

- The class teacher felt that Kerbcraft could only be sustained if it were organised as an afternoon session, as part of PSE or Citizenship teaching.
- The co-ordinator is looking for ways to fund Crossroads training in the future to follow-on from Kerbcraft in the same schools. They are hoping to connect into New Deal funding for adults learning computer skills.

A3.7 Model schools case study – summary of key outcomes

A3.7.1 Introduction

A3.7.1.1 Theme of model schools

The aim of this study was to provide qualitative data on the implementation and progress of Kerbcraft training in two schools which had been recognised as 'model' examples of Kerbcraft in practice (based on the MVA awards in 2005). Our objectives were to explore the factors which have made Kerbcraft so successful in these schools, and to identify any challenges faced in the process of implementing and delivering Kerbcraft training.

A3.7.1.2 Selection of local authority scheme and individual school

- MVA runs an annual competition for Kerbcraft 'School of the Year' schools are nominated by scheme co-ordinators and the award is presented at the National Seminar each year in December.
- The award is judged on evidence presented by the co-ordinator of the outstanding contribution made by the school to their Kerbcraft scheme. Nominations are reviewed by MVA staff who are not associated with the Kerbcraft project.
- We selected the school which won the award in 2005. The second school selected was nominated for the award and its key volunteer won the award for Kerbcraft Volunteer for the Year. The team agreed that these schools were suitable for inclusion as case study schools.
- We contacted the scheme co-ordinators to discuss the possibility of visiting the school and meeting with the staff, volunteers and pupils, and a suitable date for both visits was agreed.

A3.7.1.3 School background information

- School 1 is a church school with a large and socially varied catchment area. The school is at the end of a narrow dead-end residential street and congestion caused by parent parking is a big problem at drop-off and pick-up times. Kerbcraft fits well with the school ethos and has filled a gap for the younger children in terms of road safety focus. It also contributes to the school's involvement in the Local Authority School Travel Plan process.
- School 2 serves one of the most deprived wards within the local authority and is sited on a busy corner beside a nursery with lots of through traffic and congestion at key drop-off and pick-up times. The school is well on its way to achieving the Healthy School Standard, with several members of staff involved in developing the school's bid for the award. As the school is close to a main road and a railway line, there was already a strong road and rail safety focus.
- Both schools have close links with community organisations (church groups, volunteer agencies) and use these links to facilitate health education activities within the school.

A3.7.2 Setting up, management and maintenance

- Both schools had initial problems recruiting volunteers. The co-ordinators tried various strategies, including parents' evenings and playground visits at home time. The more successful strategy was to recruit parents through the school, either by letter home or by direct request from the head teacher.
- In school 2 the road safety officer has been very supportive and has helped with training when volunteers were thin on the ground. The co-ordinator also has one volunteer who is happy to train in several schools when required and who has been involved in the project for over two years.
- The co-ordinator at school 1 has recruited more than 20 volunteers around half from within the school (classroom assistants and dinner ladies) and the rest are parents. There was a concerted effort to involve new parents to the school in the project each year. The school took the project very seriously from the start and carefully planned ahead to integrate training sessions into the timetable properly.
- Both schools have allocated responsibility for facilitating Kerbcraft to a key member of staff.
- School 2 has had follow-up work in the classroom after Kerbcraft training.
- School 1 conducts refresher courses for trained children 12 months after they complete training.

A3.7.3 Impact on the school, volunteers and community

A3.7.3.1 Impact on the school and children

- The male co-ordinator is perceived as being a very good role model for the children.
- Kerbcraft has strengthened relationships between parents and school staff. Clearly there were already close links with parents in both schools, but both schools' staff and volunteers report that the relationship has become closer still.
- At school 2 one of the teaching assistants was involved in training some children with challenging behaviour who were often excluded from other activities. She found Kerbcraft to be very appropriate for these children, and that their behaviour and attention at the roadside was very good.
- Another teaching assistant at school 2 feels that Kerbcraft has made a very positive difference to the children's behaviour and concentration in school, and she refers back to behaviour during Kerbcraft sessions to focus on listening and attention in the classroom.
- The head teacher at school 2 feels that Kerbcraft has impacted very positively on the children as it has not only taught them strategies for crossing roads safely, but has also improved their understanding of their own responsibility for safe travel to and from school.
- Teaching staff at both schools reported no major disruption to lesson plans, as Kerbcraft has been very clearly integrated into the timetable.

A3.7.3.2 Impact on volunteers

- Some volunteers from school 1 were involved in NVQ courses, so Kerbcraft was very useful for them. A questionnaire distributed to the volunteers showed examples of them making new friends and gaining confidence.
- Volunteers at school 1 say they love being involved in the project and look forward to coming into the school:

'it keeps you going, coming into the school; you'd just be bored at home otherwise!'

- Volunteers at school 2 report an increase in personal confidence and how much they have enjoyed meeting each other and becoming friends.
- Volunteers did not rate payment as being a useful motivator as they felt that it may attract people for the wrong reasons. Volunteers at both schools felt very valued by both the school and their co-ordinator, they enjoyed the training, enjoyed the social spin-offs, and loved working with the children and being involved in the school.

A3.7.3.3 Impact on the community

- Volunteers at both schools report that people from the local community are becoming more aware of the project and often ask what is going on during training sessions. Both schools report that more could be done to make local residents more aware of traffic dangers around the schools.
- In school 2, the head teacher has close links to transient families in the area. There is a family liaison officer permanently in the school, and school facilities are used by the local community during holidays.

A3.7.4 Success and failure factors

A3.7.4.1 Barriers

- One scheme had a break in the co-ordinator's post of nine months and there was some ground to recover with schools and volunteers when the new co-ordinator started the scheme up again.
- Variations in the number of volunteers across the schools and in the lifetime of the project make it difficult to plan training ahead of time across all schools.
- The project took a while to get off the ground in school 1 as the head teacher did not have the time to get personally involved and was somewhat suspicious of 'another new project' in the school. However, once some volunteers came on board and training started, the project really took off within the school and another member of staff was appointed as the Kerbcraft contact within the school.
- Involving a co-ordinator from outside the school community was initially challenging, and it took some time for the relationship to develop with school staff and volunteers.
- One volunteer felt that the Junctions training was too complex for younger children and that it tends to be the skill which volunteers struggle with most. The volunteer would prefer to do this skill with older children.

A3.7.4.2 Facilitators

- The co-ordinator undertaking other tasks to facilitate road safety understanding within the whole school. One example is a session with an adult friend who was knocked down and seriously injured (as an adult) and who came in to give a short talk to the whole school about her accident and its consequences.
- Both schools have a dedicated member of staff who is the key Kerbcraft contact. This has clearly facilitated the delivery of training in both schools and the ease with which any problems were solved. Both co-ordinators have worked very

closely with these teachers and this has aided the smooth-running of both projects.

- Both schools actively celebrate Kerbcraft achievements for both children and volunteers by supporting and hosting volunteer 'parties' and by publicising children's achievements at school assemblies (along with volunteers and parents).
- Both schools have a very strong staff 'team', who clearly work well together and are kept well informed of activities by the head teacher.
- Both co-ordinators noted that their schools were very 'open' and were willing to try new activities and to pilot new initiatives. This atmosphere has made a big difference to the delivery of Kerbcraft within both schools, as co-ordinators report feeling that the school is a supportive and flexible environment to work in, where 'nothing is too much trouble'.
- The Kerbcraft contact teacher has taken time to prepare for Kerbcraft training each week, producing a class list, and reviewing the timetable with the co-ordinator and class teacher.

A3.7.5 Sustainability

- The role of co-ordinator is perceived by both schools to be very valued and important. The head teacher of school 1 had doubts about a parent filling such a role in the future as there was the possibility that they would loose interest as their own child moved on through the school. She also felt that, while school staff could take on the role, there were no 'spare' staff to do that at present.
- The head teacher at school 2 felt that the project would have to be cascaded across all the schools in the local authority area in order to fairly sustain the project. He felt that it was possible that schools could bid for funding to sustain training and that the project should focus on building capacity within schools themselves to deliver training with the support of a central co-ordinator.

A3.8 Rural case study – summary of key outcomes

A3.8.1 Introduction

A3.8.1.1 Rural road safety issues

- There is very little specific research data on the behaviour of children as vulnerable road users in rural areas.
- Child pedestrians and cyclists are involved in fewer accidents than in urban areas. Most accidents involving children occur with children as car passengers.
- There is evidence of heavier car use in rural areas, especially on longer journeys.

- Children in rural areas therefore have lower exposure to the road environment in general.
- Some evidence of specific danger areas for child pedestrians and cyclists at T, Y and staggered junctions. Child pedestrians are more likely to walk along country roads with their backs to the traffic (risk with high-speed traffic) and child cyclists appear more at risk near driveways.
- The layout of rural roads increases risks for pedestrians and cyclists as there tends to more sharp bends and high hedges, which reduce sight lines for drivers and other road users (Christie *et al.*, 2002).

A3.8.1.2 Selection of local authority scheme and individual school

- MVA input/information on most rural local authority across all tranches (at time). The most rural authority by far was in Gloucestershire where they were working in schools located in and around the Forest of Dean.
- Contacted the co-ordinator and asked her to select a school in a rural setting where training was currently running and the staff and volunteers were able/ willing to take part in the evaluation interviews.
- The co-ordinator made the final selection based on rurality, accessibility and success of current training.

A3.8.1.3 School background information

- The school is in a conservation area (Forest of Dean).
- There are villages and hamlets in the area linked by very narrow B-roads, lanes and farm tracks. Speed limits range from 60 mph on B-listed roads to 30 mph zones through larger villages (on busier roads).
- The local authority could not run the programme in the areas with the most rural schools as they felt they had to find places where they could implement Kerbcraft without fundamentally changing it, so they have chosen schools in areas with pavements in order to deliver training safely.
- The school selected for the case study is set in one of the main villages in the area. The village has a few shops, a pub and a post office. It has a small area of local authority housing near the school, which affords a quiet and (mostly) appropriate typical 'street' layout for Kerbcraft training.
- The school lies on one of the main access roads to the village and is (just) within the 30 mph zone. The 60 mph speed limit signs are a few hundred yards further up the road, leading out of the village. There is pavement on the school side of the road only and very little parking nearby the school.

• However, the school is perceived as desirable throughout the area as it is in a central location and has a nursery/playgroup attached for younger children.

A3.8.2 Setting up, management and maintenance of scheme

A3.8.2.1 The school

- The school is now in the second year of Kerbcraft training.
- Children from Year 1 are being trained at this school.
- The co-ordinator has deliberately organised afternoon sessions for two reasons: (1) the volunteers prefer this as they are able to train all afternoon then collect their own children as school finishes; and (2) the class teacher finds this time of day the least disruptive to the whole class and her lesson plan.
- The current head teacher has only been in the post for 18 months but the co-ordinator has talked her through the Kerbcraft skills and she feels that she is familiar with the project.
- Everyone helping at the school is CRB checked.
- The school has a good relationship generally with parents and has a group who help regularly with school activities, although more recently they have found it harder to get parents interested as more are now working.

A3.8.2.2 Volunteers

- There is no major problem with volunteer recruitment at this school as it is in a more concentrated community.
- However, it has been harder to recruit volunteers in the second year of training this is a common factor in many schools, where parental participation ebbs and flows with each new year group as parents are more/less available and/or interested.
- The school takes responsibility for the initial contact with parents to recruit volunteers.
- The school also initiates letters out to new Year 1 class parents and a subsequent follow-up, and distributes and collects children's consent forms for training (this creates administration time for school staff).
- While the pupils appear to be from quite a large catchment area, the co-ordinator does not feel that this has had a direct negative effect on volunteer recruitment.

A3.8.2.3 Kerbcraft training

- Have managed to find locations nearby to the school which are appropriate for all three Kerbcraft skills. However, there is little scope for variety from one session/skill to the next.
- The co-ordinator has had particular problems with Parked Cars and Junctions training as there is a limited number of locations within easy walking distance of the school.
- There are no children with special needs in the current Kerbcraft cohort.
- The class teacher has not done any specific follow-up work in class, but there have been road safety sessions in assembly and the class teacher would be interested in doing some Kerbcraft-focused class work in the future.
- The children get stickers at the end of each Kerbcraft session and the class teacher is informed if anyone has misbehaved. There is no structured link to classroom targets or behaviour systems, but the children understand that the school's behaviour policy extends to Kerbcraft sessions. There have been no major behaviour problems during Kerbcraft sessions since the project began.
- The volunteers meet with the co-ordinator after training sessions if they have time before school finishes and they have to collect their children.

A3.8.3 Impact on the school, volunteers and community

A3.8.3.1 Impact on the school and children

- The head teacher is very happy with the co-ordinator's organisation of training in the school and feels that there have been no negative impacts or problems including accommodating a room for parent trainers to meet and discuss training sessions over a coffee each week.
- The school has taken on some administrative tasks (contacting volunteers, managing consent forms) so they acknowledge 'time' as a non-financial cost to the school but feel that 'any costs are outweighed by what we get' (head teacher).
- The head teacher is planning an application for the National Healthy School Standard in the next 18 months. The school is currently running a number of localised schemes to encourage and facilitate healthy activities for all the family outside school. The head teacher is currently reviewing the existing Health Education policy within the school and believes that Kerbcraft has clear links to that as it is dealing with a 'whole school health issue'. She said:

'It [Kerbcraft] has got to be one of the jigsaw pieces, hasn't it? I'll be very interested in how other schools have approached it. There's no

doubt that we're getting to the lessons – like risk assessment – and we've learned so much from the whole initiative that lots of aspects of it will fit into different parts of the policy.'

- The school is not aware of any **direct** increase in parent participation as a result of Kerbcraft.
- Volunteers reported a noticeable improvement in children's self-esteem as the programme unfolds. They attributed this to the focused time that children spent in a small group, receiving support and praise directly from an adult during Kerbcraft training.
- The class teacher for the currently trained Year 1 class feels that the set-up works really well. She said:

'It's not too intrusive and doesn't interfere with our whole class teaching.'

• The class teacher feels that the children have benefited from the fact that Kerbcraft training takes place outside the classroom. She commented:

'[Kerbcraft] seems very sensible; they go out in small groups, I like that; and it's not too long, it's short, sharp sessions that'll save them getting bored, and it's a regular occurrence.'

A3.8.3.2 Children's comments on Kerbcraft training

• Children show evidence of retention of key Kerbcraft messages – the most important thing learned was:

'Not having to cross if there's a hedge in front of you, you would find somewhere else to cross.'

• The children enjoy working with the volunteers because:

'We can get to learn things with other people.' 'I think that the Kerbcraft wouldn't be as good with teachers!'

• The children reported that their favourite bits to practise outside school and tell mum and dad about were:

'Going between parked cars – you have to check the lights coz one of the cars might be reversing.'

• The children did not like wearing their yellow tops because they are uncomfortable – too tight with the straps and sweaty! However, they would wear a normal jumper in fluorescent yellow as they think it is important to be seen.

A3.8.3.3 Impact on the volunteers

- One current volunteer has been with the project since the start (over a year previously) and the other volunteer has just started with this round of training. Both volunteers are very enthusiastic and committed to the project.
- Both volunteers were already helping at the school and knew each other prior to their involvement in Kerbcraft.
- The volunteers were motivated by the need for children to learn to be safe most children arrive/go home by car and are not aware of traffic-related dangers.
- The following were selling points for new recruits:
 - get people to come out on a training session;
 - biggest motivator would be seeing how much the children enjoy the training as well as how much they learn from it each week;
 - volunteers would see that there is not a great deal of work involved and that you do not have to sit down and learn a book before going out;
 - The major benefit of working in small groups is that children really get your time and attention, and it is not often that they get that; and
 - you really learn things about the children themselves, they are so talkative!
- Volunteers did **not** feel that being paid an hourly rate would encourage more people to get involved. They felt that it would have to be a very high hourly rate to make such a small time commitment attractive to people.
- Volunteers did feel that (for some people) a certificate of volunteer experience may be useful especially for people involved in other work with children who want evidence of their experiences.

A3.8.3.4 Impact on the community

- Although the village is small and close-knit, the volunteers feel that the rest of the community are not really aware of the project and that more could be done to publicise it locally, for example posters in the post office and the pub. This might get some more volunteers from the village and encourage local people to be more aware of children on the roads.
- Volunteers feel that speeding on the country roads is a big problem. Speed limits are not adhered to, especially at night, and they are aware of the problems caused by speeding through the village and near the school.
- Both volunteers live nearby but would rather not walk with children to and from school as the roads are narrow and twisting, and they feel that local drivers often disregard the speed limits.

• To combat local school parking problems, volunteers suggested encouraging parents to park at a nearby recreation ground and then walking to and from there to drop-off and collect children from the school. The local authority is about to trial this system at another school where there are similar parking and congestion problems.

A3.8.4 Factors for success and failure

A3.8.4.1 Barriers

- The growing numbers of working parents reduces the availability of parents to help at school during the day.
- Smaller schools may struggle to provide accommodation for trainers and the coordinator each week.
- There is not much engagement/awareness/support from local community.
- Children have very little experience of interacting with traffic.
- All the Kerbcraft schools are spread over a large area, reducing the time available for the co-ordinator to spend at each school and stretching the costs of co-ordinator's travel among the schools.
- A lack of choice of locations/roads for training.
- Very rural roads that are narrow with no pavements, combined with major routes through villages where HGVs are using roads that are not really suitable for them.
- Local drivers' attitudes to speeding may be more complacent compared with urban areas.
- Blind bends and high hedges reduce visibility.
- Old villages where roads, pavements and buildings were laid out pre the motor vehicle.
- No pedestrian crossing points.
- Grass verges in place of pavements/inconsistent pavements.
- Sheep.
- The main problem with the school location is parking and the associated congestion around the school at drop-off and pick-up times.
- Drivers entering the village on this road have only just passed the 60 to 30 mph changeover and will not all have slowed down by the time they pass the school.
- At key times, passing traffic has to negotiate around parked and waiting parents' cars.

- Parents are not sufficiently aware of the dangers this poses and encourage children to run across to waiting cars outside the school.
- There have been a number of very near-misses with children and countless vehicle to vehicle bumps as a result of parents parking inconsiderately.
- A secondary problem of children's over-familiarity with quiet, country lanes with little passing traffic is no sense of caution or awareness of the risk on roads.
- When crossing roads, children tend to just wander out no notion of how to cross safely or where safe places might be.
- Many children are not as closely supervised by parents as they might be in a more urban setting. Children spend lots of time out on bikes, playing by themselves, using lanes, paths and farm tracks. There is not much interaction with traffic as pedestrians.

A3.8.4.2 Facilitators

- The support of school staff in recruiting volunteers and in the administration of consent forms.
- A pool of existing school volunteers. The head teacher believes this is particularly useful for the school as this group of parents develop skills in working with children generally and are sympathetic to the school ethos and policy.
- An area of housing with typical 'street' layout nearby for training purposes.
- The long-term commitment of volunteers.
- The enthusiasm and ingenuity of the co-ordinator in finding appropriate alternative training locations for each skill and in finding 'safe' ways to train the children to deal with the specific challenges of their local environment.

Adaptations to deal with this environment have mainly taken the form of additions to the existing Kerbcraft messages:

- walking along country lanes and facing oncoming traffic;
- dealing with road layouts that are specific to the schools;
- dealing with passing traffic on roads with no pavements; and
- a strong focus on 'listening', as this is easier than in urban areas.

A3.8.4.3 Recommendations for good practice

• Work with the school and volunteers to design a timetable to minimise disruption.
- Accept the limitations of the surrounding environment when choosing appropriate training locations.
- Engage the school in recruiting volunteers and managing some administration tasks.
- Consider certificates for volunteers to show the experience and skills gained from Kerbcraft training.
- Volunteers may not be motivated by payment.
- Discuss with the school the idea of off-site parking nearby for parents at drop-off and collection times in order to minimise congestion and dangers at peak times around school.
- Kerbcraft is suitable for rural environments but may require additional specific messages regarding walking safely on country lanes, dealing with a lack of pavements and increasing children's general awareness of traffic-related risks.
- Consider extending volunteer recruitment to the local community by an advertising scheme in, for example, the village post office or pub.

A3.8.5 Sustainability

A3.8.5.1 Co-ordinator/local authority

- As distances are so great across all the schools involved, it is time-consuming for the co-ordinator to travel to all the schools. The local authority would suggest delegating a supervisory role to others in certain areas.
- It is labour intensive to cover only 10 schools in such a big area, so the co-ordinator/local authority would want to expand to more schools in other deprived areas of the local authority.
- The co-ordinator/local authority would also want to expand input to older children in order to maintain the impact.
- The co-ordinator/local authority would consider reducing the number of sessions.
- The co-ordinator/local authority will need the school's support to sustain any future work, but they are conscious of keeping disruption to a minimum in order to keep schools engaged.
- The content and skills would remain as they are currently they are crucial and adaptable for general road safety.
- Less exposure to traffic in rural areas means that children have even more need of these basic skills.

A3.8.5.2 Head teacher/class teacher

- The head teacher/class teacher feel that Kerbcraft could carry on after the pilot period finishes. They would use the current programme as a starting point and try to expand the input to older children in Years 4 and 6. They would want to consider how the school could manage the whole package in terms of staff time, resources, risk assessments, etc.
- The class teacher felt that the programme could easily become a permanent part of school life and did not anticipate any future challenges or problems if it continued to be as well run as it is currently.

A3.9 Scottish case study – summary of key outcomes

A3.9.1 Introduction

A3.9.1.1 Theme of Scottish model school

The Scottish Executive has funded 12 Kerbcraft schemes as part of the National Network Pilot Project. As part of their evaluation of Kerbcraft in Scotland, they requested that one school be selected for inclusion in the case study evaluation.

After some discussion within the evaluation team, it was agreed that the Scottish school chosen would reflect the general qualities of a 'model' Kerbcraft school. In addition to this, there would also be an exploration of how Kerbcraft appeared to fit within the Scottish education system.

A3.9.1.2 Selection of local authority scheme and individual school

- MVA runs an annual competition for Kerbcraft 'School of the Year' schools are nominated by scheme co-ordinators and the award is presented at the National Seminar each year in December.
- The award is judged on evidence presented by the co-ordinator of the outstanding contribution made by the school to their Kerbcraft scheme. Nominations are reviewed by MVA staff who are not associated with the Kerbcraft project.
- A Scottish school won this award in December 2004. The team agreed that this school was suitable for inclusion as a case study school.
- We contacted the scheme co-ordinator to discuss the possibility of visiting the school and meeting with the staff, volunteers and pupils, and a suitable date was agreed.

A3.9.1.3 School background information

- The school is part of a larger health project running across several primary and secondary schools in the area.
- The current class teacher is new to the project, but has been briefed by the co-ordinator and has sufficient information.

A3.9.2 Setting up, management and maintenance

- There were initial problems in recruiting volunteers overcome by the enthusiasm and persistence of the co-ordinator, and helped by building links with the local community centre.
- One child in this year's cohort has Additional Support Needs but is able to participate in training every week.
- The children's behaviour on Kerbcraft sessions is not linked into any school reward systems.
- The co-ordinator used letters home to parents, across the whole school, to initiate interest in volunteering for Kerbcraft.
- The volunteer recruitment followed the standard pattern of introductory meeting, follow-up with those interested, CRB checks and then specific skills training.
- The same volunteers are now in their third year of training.
- Training is done with P2 children (aged five to six at the beginning of the term).
- The co-ordinator has a classroom session with the children and teacher prior to the start of roadside training with volunteers in order to familiarise the children (and the teacher) with the Kerbcraft concept and their trainers.

A3.9.3 Impact on the school, volunteers and community

A3.9.3.1 Impact on the school and children

- Kerbcraft made as immediate impact on the head teacher as it was perceived to be a 'quality' intervention.
- Kerbcraft has a very visible presence in the school, with lots of images, posters, etc., in the foyer and around the school.
- Kerbcraft has been tied into other road safety initiatives for older children in the school the Junior Road Safety Officer scheme operates in the school and the P7 (10–11 year old) children that are involved have also learned about Kerbcraft so that they can make the rest of the school aware of the key messages.

- The head teacher felt that the scheme would have a very positive general impact on the children participating, as it was strongly focused on developing children's self-esteem and concept of citizenship.
- The school is very supportive of the fact that Kerbcraft involves parents regularly and in a position where they can lead activities with children and are not being supervised by school staff.
- Both the head teacher and the P2 class teacher felt that there were no negative aspects to the school's involvement in the Kerbcraft pilot (including no concrete non-financial costs).
- In order to overcome any potential disruption to the school timetable, Kerbcraft has been entirely embraced by the whole school as an integrated part of the curriculum.
- Good organisation and consistent contact by the co-ordinator has reduced any potential classroom disruption.
- Discussions with the children currently being trained confirmed that the children were very comfortable with the volunteer trainers and that they had clearly retained an understanding of many of the key training messages:

'I've been telling them [mum and dad] that you have to cross on a bump and always hold someone's hand.'

'[You shouldn't cross diagonally) because it takes longer on the road.'

'[It's a bad idea to cross beside a parked car because] you can't see if there's cars coming, and you have to be very careful because the car might be reversing or something.'

'You have to wear your yellow top - if it was night-time you'd have to wear it so the traffic can see you. It's so they know you're there, if you don't have it, they won't know where you are.'

A3.9.3.2 Impact on the volunteers

• Volunteers for the Kerbcraft project are now getting involved more regularly in other schools activities. The head teacher commented:

'For some of the parents, Kerbcraft has been the first step to doing anything with any responsibility involved in it outside of their family life, and I think a lot of people need that first step – it helps them to gain that sort of confidence.'

- The volunteers themselves feel that their training skills have developed over the three years that they have been working with the children.
- The co-ordinator confirms this skill development by saying that he now considers them to be properly skilled and professional trainers.
- Three volunteers from other schools in the scheme have gone on to work as school classroom assistants, with the backing of a reference from their Kerbcraft work.

A3.9.3.3 Impact on the community

- Kerbcraft has very high profile in the wider community especially with other primary schools and now with secondary schools, thanks to a local health education initiative among schools.
- The high-visibility branding of the project makes the rest of the children in the school and local people very aware of the existence of the project.
- The co-ordinator has analysed the accident statistics for the area over the time that the project has been running and none of the accidents have involved children in the Kerbcraft age range (all the local schools are taking part in Kerbcraft training and the child pedestrian accident rate across all the school catchment areas is the highest in Edinburgh).

A3.9.3.4 Impact on the parents of trained children

A short questionnaire was conducted to ascertain the impact of Kerbcraft at home. Ten parents of trained children responded. The key outcomes were as follows:

• Half the respondents stated that they had received information from the school/ co-ordinator on their child's Kerbcraft training:

'I know Kerbcraft teaches the children how to cross the road safely ... [it] makes them aware of what's going on around them and how to deal with it.'

- Ninety per cent of respondents indicated that their children talked about Kerbcraft at home and 60% had done some follow-up work with their children on their own.
- Eighty per cent of parents responding said that they allowed their children to play outside unsupervised and 90% lived within easy reach of safe play facilities (e.g. an enclosed garden, play park, etc.). Twenty per cent of parents felt that they had changed their supervision of their child's outdoor play as a result of their involvement in Kerbcraft.

A3.9.4 Success and failure factors

A3.9.4.1 Barriers

- The school is in an area of very low car ownership (8%) so many local children are allowed to play outside unsupervised and are not at all familiar with traffic-related risks.
- The one busy road outside the school has been heavily traffic-calmed and, while now much safer, it presents a slightly 'false' environment for children learning about road safety.
- The volunteers felt that one of the main challenges was to familiarise the children with the more informal training technique where they were expected to solve problems for themselves.
- The scheme is reliant on a small number of volunteers who have been with the project since the start. There is one new volunteer who recently joined the team, but the co-ordinator would have liked a larger group from which to 'pool' people so that long-standing volunteers could have breaks from the commitment.

A3.9.4.2 Facilitators

- The volunteers are now highly skilled and have begun to refine Kerbcraft training and to add their own ways of conveying the key messages to the children (complementary to Kerbcraft ethos and principles).
- The co-ordinator's enthusiasm and persistence totally convinced the head teacher to support the project, and there is now a very strong relationship of trust and reciprocity between the school and the co-ordinator.
- The school is part of a wider community health education initiative involving other local primary and secondary schools, and is aiming to raise awareness of the role schools play in health education for the whole community. This has created a strong positive climate for health interventions in the community generally and particularly in the school.
- There is a strong road safety focus in the school generally, and P7 children take part in the Scottish Executive supported Junior Road Safety Officer scheme.
- The head teacher feels that the scheme is particularly successful as it is targeted at younger children and is an 'active' intervention which gets children out of the classroom and into the streets.
- The timing of the start of the project worked well with the local health education initiative and with a desire in the school to focus on safety and health.
- The co-ordinator felt that the support of the school and volunteers for the project

- especially the 100% backing from the head teacher - has made the scheme such a success at this school.

- The co-ordinator felt that it was essential to have the full support of the senior management within the local authority department where the co-ordinator is based, as this provides the necessary official backing to encourage support from participating schools.
- The co-ordinator commented that it was essential to show consistent enthusiasm for the project when dealing with the school and the volunteers, as this was the encouragement that kept everyone committed to the scheme.

A3.9.5 Sustainability

- Kerbcraft has been successful in this school because it was wholly integrated into the school timetable and perceived as a vital part of the curriculum. This resulted in the children, staff and volunteers perceiving the project as important and valuable within the school.
- The head teacher felt that Kerbcraft could be integrated into a consistent whole school health policy and intervention that would run from nursery to high school.
- The class teacher felt that Kerbcraft could easily be integrated into the school curriculum as it is a well-organised, regular session that is easy to plan for and does not disrupt classroom activities unduly.
- The school supports any continuation of Kerbcraft training after funding is terminated and would be prepared to contribute financially (along with other schools in the area) to maintain the project and the co-ordinator's management of the scheme.
- The co-ordinator is perceived to be an essential part of the success of the scheme and the success of any future project would require either that individual or someone suitably motivated.
- The volunteers felt that the scheme could be improved on in the future by providing scope for training to take place in less familiar environments where the children could experience new road layouts, busier roads, etc.
- The longer the project runs in the school with the same volunteers, the better and more professional the training becomes.

A3.9.5.1 Comments on Kerbcraft and the Scottish Education system

• The head teacher felt that the principles and method of Kerbcraft were in sync with the current ethos of education in Scotland, in that the scheme was taking children out of the classroom, encouraging the development of personal

responsibility and citizenship, and reinforcing self-esteem and self-confidence in children.

A3.10 Skills assessment case study – key outcomes in light of objectives

A3.10.1 Introduction

A3.10.1.1 Theme of the skills assessment school case study

As part of the evaluation study, skills assessments were conducted by an outside testing team in 14 local authorities across England. The assessments involved a programme of visits to a randomly selected Kerbcraft school and a matched control school (where no Kerbcraft training took place). Approximately 15 children were tested individually at the roadside on three occasions over a school year.

The aims of this case study were to:

- assess the impact of the skills assessment process on the school, children and co-ordinator;
- identify any barriers and facilitators to the assessment process in that school;
- explore the general impact of Kerbcraft training on the school, volunteers and community; and
- add to the development of Best Practice Guidelines on the delivery of Kerbcraft in schools, as gathered from all the case studies.

A3.10.1.2 Selection of local authority scheme and individual school

- The school was selected from those which had taken part in the skills testing programme (total n = 14).
- Those schools where there was no Kerbcraft training taking place (for whatever reason) at the time of selection were discounted from the selection list.
- The final school was selected randomly from the remaining 'active' schools on the list

A3.10.1.3 School background information

- The school is set off a very busy main road in a predominantly residential area.
- The school is on the same site as the nursery so there is lots of pick-up/drop-off traffic at key times in the morning and afternoon, leading to parking problems.

- The main road safety issues with the school are the main road, parking outside the school, and drivers not adhering to the 20 mph speed limits around the school.
- The head teacher was not present on the day of the interview.
- Three volunteers are currently working with Kerbcraft, but only one was available for interview.
- The local council road safety department runs its own practical roadside training with all Year 2 children. This comprises one 40-minute session at the roadside.

A3.10.2 Setting up, management and maintenance

- The main recruitment method is a letter home with the child for consent.
- Training is done with Year 1 children.
- Volunteers are asked to commit to 14 weeks of training up front. Volunteers complete CRB forms together at the introductory meeting and then take part in the proper first training session with the children to put skills into practice. The co-ordinator uses a training video as a back-up resource.
- The co-ordinator is always present at the children's training sessions.
- Try where possible to have meeting after a training session with the volunteers, but this depends on the time available for everyone.
- Try where possible to keep children in the same groups with the same volunteers across each skill.
- The children who have behaved or done particularly well are rewarded individually by the class teacher on their return from training (on advice from the co-ordinator).
- The volunteers are given an individual gift after completing training in all three skills (chocolates/flowers/vouchers, etc.).
- The co-ordinator keeps in close regular contact with all the volunteers (by telephone) and with the school on a weekly basis.
- The initial problems in recruiting volunteers were overcome by the enthusiasm and persistence of the co-ordinator.
- The previous year had more volunteers, but this year there are more parents of Year 1 children working, so it has been more difficult to get new volunteers. Fortunately, three of last year's volunteers have stayed on to help.
- The co-ordinator conducts evaluations of the children's behaviour using monitoring forms at the end of each skill's final training session and will

schedule in an extra training session for those children who may require more input.

• The volunteers are not asked to complete any paperwork other than the monitoring forms on the last training session of each skill.

A3.10.3 Impact on the school, volunteers and community

A3.10.3.1 Impact on the school and children

- The class teacher is very impressed with the scheme and reports no problems with disruption. She felt that it was actually useful to have some children out of the classroom for periods of time as it allowed her time to listen to individual children's reading and to concentrate on 'quiet' tasks with smaller groups of children.
- The class teacher has knowledge of the scheme but has not seen it in practice at the roadside.
- The class teacher reported no non-financial costs incurred as a result of undertaking Kerbcraft training. She reported that the co-ordinator managed the scheme very efficiently and that there was no additional workload for her or any of the other school staff.
- The class teacher felt that the Kerbcraft training had directly improved some children's self-confidence as they were becoming more accustomed to working with new people and to being outside a classroom environment.
- Discussions with the children currently being trained confirmed that the children were very comfortable with the volunteer trainers and that they had clearly retained an understanding of many of the key training messages:

'You have to look different ways at junctions – you should never cross at a T junction when a car is moving – when it's behind you, coz it could knock you over.'

'I tell my Dad and sister not to cross diagonally, because it takes longer than going straight.'

'[It's a good idea to wear the yellow tops because] the shiny stuff and the yellow stuff make people stop coz there's kiddies crossing.'

'It's a bright outfit, so if it was dark and you were crossing somebody could see you coz you've got them white things.'

A3.10.3.2 Impact on the volunteers

- The volunteer reports that the training has made a positive impact on her whole family she enjoys it, it has shown her children that their parents can become more involved in the school and it has filtered down to her younger child.
- This volunteer had not been very involved with the school previously and is now helping with school sports activities on a regular basis.
- The volunteers have got to know one another and have built-up new friendships or re-established old friendships.

• One volunteer has gone on to become a part-time pedestrian trainer with the local council, and is helping with cycling training and the local authority's own child pedestrian training programme.

A3.10.3.3 Impact on the community

- This volunteer felt that the programme did not have a very high profile in the local area as there was never any contact with residents living nearby to the school.
- The co-ordinator had organised some advertisement of the scheme in the local paper when training first started in the area.

A3.10.4 Success and failure factors

A3.10.4.1 Barriers

• Have had problems recruiting new parents to the scheme in the last year as more of the parents of this group of children are working during the day and are not available to come in and help with school activities.

A3.10.4.2 Facilitators

- The same group of volunteers have been involved for over a year now and are confident and able trainers.
- The volunteers are viewed as skilled and reliable by the school staff and take part in other school activities.

A3.10.5 Sustainability

• The longer the project runs in the school with the same volunteers, the better and more professional the training becomes.

A3.10.5.1 Comments on the impact of the skills assessment programme on the school

- The co-ordinator reported a very positive impact from the skills assessment team. He contacted the director of the company responsible in order to commend the team's performance.
- The class teacher reported no additional disruption or negative impact as a result of the skills assessment programme. She noted that the co-ordinator was always present on testing days and took charge of the organisation of removing and returning groups of children from the classroom.
- The class teacher also noted that the children reacted positively to the testing situation and that they were obviously being praised and treated well by the testers as they did not feel under pressure or uncomfortable in any way.
- The children themselves reported that they enjoyed the testing experience and that the tests were easy(!). They also noted (after some prompting) that it sometimes helped them to recall some aspects of the testing that they had forgotten.

A3.10.5.2 Recommendations for good practice

• Provide teachers with follow-up materials to reiterate Kerbcraft messages in the classroom.

APPENDIX 4 Co-ordinator/road safety officer survey

A4.1 Surveys of co-ordinators conducted in Tranches 1, 2 and 3

A4.1.1 Personal details

Note: In Tables A4.1 to A4.52, percentages have been rounded up or down – the totals may not add up to 100. In Tables 4.16, 4.24, 4.35 and 4.50, more than one response is possible and, in these cases, total percentages may be more than 100.

Table A4.1: Co-ordinators' gender				
Gender	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3	
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29	
Female	32 (84%)	32 (78%)	24 (83%)	
Male	5 (13%)	9 (12%)	3 (10%)	
No response	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	2 (7%)	

Table A4.2: Co-ordinators' age			
Age	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29
20-29	7 (18%)	12 (29%)	3 (10%)
30-39	15 (39%)	10 (24%)	10 (34%)
40-49	13 (34%)	13 (32%)	10 (34%)
50-59	2 (5%)	5 (12%)	3 (10%)
60-69	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
No response	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	3 (10%)

Table A4.3: Co-ordinators' ethnic origin			
Ethnic origin	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29
White British	33 (87%)	33 (80%)	22 (76%)
Other	5 (13%)	5 (12%)	5 (17%)
No response	0 (0%)	3 (7%)	2 (7%)

Table A4.4: Ethni	city help or hindranc	e?	
Ethnicity	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29
Help	3 (8%)	3 (8%)	1 (3%)
Hindrance	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	2 (7%)
Neither	34 (89%)	38 (92%)	23 (79%)
No response	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (10%)

Table A4.5: Age groups of co-ordinators children			
Children's ages	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29
Primary	10 (26%)	6 (15%)	4 (14%)
Secondary	10 (26%)	12 (29%)	6 (21%)
Adult	6 (16%)	8 (20%)	7 (24%)
No response	12 (32%)	15 (37%)	12 (41%)

Table A4.6: Co-ordinators' highest level of education/qualifications			
Education/qualifications	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29
No formal qualifications	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)
O Levels/GCSEs	15 (39%)	12 (29%)	5 (17%)
A Levels	4 (11%)	3 (8%)	2 (7%)
NVQ	2 (5%)	7 (18%)	2 (7%)
HND/HNC professional	6(16%)	2 (4%)	3 (10%)
Diploma/degree	9 (24%)	17 (41%)	14 (48%)
No response	2 (5%)	0 (0%)	2 (7%)

Table A4.7: Previous employment of the Tranches 2 and 3 co-ordinators			
Previous employment	Tranche 1 <i>n</i> = 38	Tranche 2 <i>n</i> = 41	Tranche 3 <i>n</i> = 29
Management Office Returning to work Education or other work with children Other No response	5 (13%) 5 (13%) 2 (5%) 19 (50%) 5 (13%) 2 (5%)	7 (16%) 8 (20%) 0 (0%) 23 (56%) 3 (8%) 0 (0%)	1 (3%) 5 (17%) 1 (3%) 17 (59%) 3 (10%) 2 (7%)

Table A4.8: Knowledge of the scheme area				
Scheme area	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3	
knowledge	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29	
Yes	22 (58%)	27 (66%)	17 (59%)	
No	16 (42%)	11 (27%)	11 (38%)	
No response	0 (0%)	3 (8%)	1 (4%)	

Table A4.9: Knowledge of the schools in the area				
School knowledge	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3	
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29	
Yes	17 (45%)	26 (63%)	13 (45%)	
No	19 (50%)	14 (34%)	15 (52%)	
No response	2 (5%)	1 (2%)	1 (3%)	

Table A4.10: Previous knowledge of road safety issues			
Road safety issues	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29
Yes	30 (79%)	29 (71%)	24 (83%)
No	8 (21%)	11 (27%)	3 (10%)
No response	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	2 (7%)

A4.1.2 Appointment process

Table A4.11: Information given to co-ordinators before interview			
Information given	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29
Basic job description	22 (58%)	28 (68%)	21 (72%)
Detailed information	4 (11%)	4 (9%)	3 (10%)
Kerbcraft manual	3 (8%)	4 (11%)	3 (10%)
Other	6 (16%)	5 (12%)	1 (3%)
No response	3 (8%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)

Table A4.12: Information received after interview but before training			
Information given	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29
Basic job description	23 (61%)	6 (15%)	8 (28%)
Detailed information	4 (11%)	7 (17%)	7 (24%)
Kerbcraft manual	4 (11%)	20 (49%)	12 (41%)
Other	0 (0%)	5 (12%)	0 (0%)
No response	7 (18%)	3 (7%)	2 (7%)

Table A4.13: Co-ordinators' previous understanding of the Drumchapel scheme				
Previous understanding	tandingTranche 1Tranche 2Tranche $n = 38$ $n = 41$ $n = 29$			
Yes No A little No response	27 (71%) 7 (18%) 2 (5%) 2 (5%)	16 (39%) 5 (12%) 18 (44%) 2 (5%)	11 (38%) 7 (24%) 10 (34%) 1 (3%)	

Table A4.14: Why co-ordinators applied for the post			
Response	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3
	<i>n</i> = 38	n = 41	<i>n</i> = 29
Like working with children	11 (29%)	12 (29%)	8 (28%)
Like organising	8 (21%)	8 (20%)	6 (21%)
Not stuck in an office	6 (16%)	6 (15%)	5 (19%)
Like to try new things	8 (21%)	6 (15%)	6 (21%)
Other	2 (5%)	7 (17%)	3 (10%)
No response	2 (5%)	2 (5%)	1 (3%)

Table A4.15: Whether or not the pay was right for the co-ordinator post			
Response	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29
Yes	25 (66%)	24 (59%)	13 (45%)
No	13 (34%)	16 (39%)	15 (52%)
No response	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	1 (3%)

Table A4.16: The facilities that authorities have provided the co-ordinators

Facilities provided	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3
	n = 38	n = 41	n = 29
Office space Computer Laptop Internet access Mobile phone Other	14 (37%) 11 (29%) 2 (5%) 0 (0%) 7 (18%) 3 (8%) 1 (3%)	10 (24%) 10 (24%) 9 (22%) 6 (15%) 1 (2%) 1 (2%) 3 (7%)	8 (28%) 7 (24%) 1 (3%) 4 (14%) 5 (17%) 3 (10%) 1 (3%)

A4.1.3 Training of co-ordinators

Table A4.17: Did you attend the residential training course?			
Attended training	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29
Yes	(Not asked)	33 (80%)	23 (79%)
No		8 (20%)	5 (17%)
No response		0 (0%)	1 (3%)

Table A4.18: Did you get all you wanted from the course?			
Response	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29
Yes	17 (45%)	20 (49%)	17 (59%)
No	16 (42%)	12 (29%)	6 (21%)
No response	5 (13%)	9 (22%)	6 (21%)

Table A4.19: Do you have a full understanding of the scheme after training?			
Response	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29
Yes	29 (76%)	27 (66%)	18 (62%)
No	8 (21%)	5 (12%)	3 (10%)
No response	1 (3%)	9 (22%)	8 (28%)

Table A4.20: Co-ordinators' views on the organisation of the training course			
Response	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29
Very good	1 (3%)	5 (12%)	3 (10%)
Good	9 (24%)	18 (44%)	18 (62%)
Average	8 (21%)	8 (19%)	1 (3%)
Bad	14 (37%)	2 (5%)	1 (3%)
Very bad	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
No response	5 (13%)	8 (19%)	6 (21%)

Table A4.21: Co-ordinators' views on training course facilities			
Response	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29
Very good	5 (13%)	7 (17%)	3 (10%)
Good	11 (29%)	11 (27%)	13 (45%)
Average	13 (34%)	13 (32%)	5 (17%)
Bad	4 (10%)	2 (5%)	2 (7%)
Very bad	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
No response	5 (13%)	8 (19%)	6 (21%)

Table A4.22: Co-ordinators' views on the presentation of the training course			
Response	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29
Very good	1 (3%)	7 (17%)	5 (17%)
Good	9 (24%)	16 (39%)	10 (34%)
Average	14 (37%)	6 (15%)	7 (24%)
Bad	6 (16%)	4 (10%)	1 (3%)
Very bad	3 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
No response	5 (13%)	8 (20%)	6 (21%)

Table A4.23: Co-ordinators' views on the overall training			
Response	Tranche 2 <i>n</i> = 41	Tranche 3 <i>n</i> = 29	
Very good Good Average Bad Very bad No response	6 (15%) 16 (39%) 8 (20%) 3 (7%) 0 (0%) 8 (20%)	3 (10%) 15 (52%) 3 (10%) 0 (0%) 0 (0%) 8 (28%)	

Table A4.24: Materials supplied to the co-ordinators			
Response	Tranche 2 <i>n</i> = 41	Tranche 3 <i>n</i> = 29	
Kerbcraft manual Training course manual Other comments No response	40 (97%) 38 (92%) 1 (3%) 0 (0%)	24 (90%) 24 (90%) 1 (5%) 2 (7%)	

Table A4.25: Adequacy of training materials supplied to the co-ordinators				
Response	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3	
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29	
Yes	21 (55%)	34 (83%)	25 (86%)	
No	10 (26%)	5 (12%)	2 (7%)	
No response	7 (18%)	2 (5%)	2 (7%)	

Table A4.26: Features of Kerbcraft ranked in importance by Tranche 3 co-ordinators

Features considered	Priority 1 to 4: scores		Total		
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	
Practical training at roadside	17	9	3	0	29
Use volunteers/community involvement	2	7	11	3	23
Dialogue/interaction with children	3	9	7	6	25
The order in which the 3 skills are taught	0	2	4	4	10
A minimum number of 4 sessions for each skill	0	1	1	6	8
Risk assessments	7	2	1	3	13
Children should be aged 5–6 years No response	1	1	2	5	9

Table A4.27: Features of Kerbcraft ranked in importance by Tranche 2 co-ordinators

Features considered	Priority 1 to 4: scores		Total		
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	
Practical training at roadside	29	6	5	1	41
Use volunteers/community involvement	1	10	9	11	31
Dialogue/interaction with children	6	14	11	8	39
The order in which the 3 skills are taught	1	6	4	9	20
A minimum number of 4 sessions for each skill	1	2	5	3	11
Risk assessments	8	3	5	7	23
Children should be aged 5–6 years	1	2	3	2	8
No response					

A4.1.4 Post-training support

Table A4.28: Co-ordinators who contacted MVA for support or with queries				
Response	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3	
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29	
Yes	29 (77%)	24 (59%)	22 (77%)	
No	9 (23%)	17 (41%)	7 (23%)	
No response	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	

Table A4.29: Co-ordinators who were satisfied with help from MVA				
Response	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3	
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29	
Yes	18 (47%)	24 (59%)	18 (62%)	
No	6 (16%)	17 (41%)	2 (7%)	
No response	14 (37%)	0 (0%)	9 (31%)	

Table A4.30: Co-ordinators who asked their road safety officer for help				
Response	Tranche 1 <i>n</i> = 38	Tranche 2 <i>n</i> = 41	Tranche 3 <i>n</i> = 29	
Yes No	25 (66%) 9 (24%) 4 (10%)	25 (61%) 15 (37%) 1 (2%)	14 (48%) 14 (48%) 1 (3%)	

Table A4.31: Co-ordinators who got road safety officer help without having to go elsewhere				
Response	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3	
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29	
Yes	19 (50%)	19 (46%)	11 (38%)	
No	3 (8%)	3 (7%)	2 (7%)	
No response	16 (42%)	19 (46%)	16 (55%)	

Table A4.32: Do you talk with other co-ordinators regularly?				
Response	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3	
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29	
Yes	28 (74%)	30 (73%)	25 (86%)	
No	7 (18%)	11 (27%)	3 (10%)	
No response	3 (8%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	

Table A4.33: How often do you meet with other co-ordinators?				
Response	Tranche 2 <i>n</i> = 41	Tranche 3 <i>n</i> = 29		
About weekly About monthly About quarterly Infrequently Never No response	4 (10%) 4 (10%) 26 (63%) 5 (12%) 2 (5%) 0 (0%)	4 (14%) 2 (7%) 17 (59%) 5 (17%) 0 (0%) 1 (3%)		

Table A4.34: Have other co-ordinators helped you with any queries/problems?				
Response	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3	
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29	
Yes	32 (84%)	32 (78%)	24 (83%)	
No	2 (5%)	9 (22%)	4 (14%)	
No response	4 (10%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	

A4.1.5 Recruitment of volunteers

Table A4.35: Methods used by co-ordinators for volunteer recruitment				
Method used	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3	
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29	
Letter to parent	13 (34%)	11 (27%)	7 (24%)	
Leaflet	9 (24%)	10 (24%)	7 (24%)	
Meetings	7 (18%)	9 (22%)	6 (21%)	
School gate	8 (21%)	4 (10%)	5 (17%)	
Other	0 (0%)	8 (20%)	3 (10%)	
No response	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	

Table A4.36: Most successful methods used by co-ordinators for recruitment				
Method used	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3	
	<i>n</i> = 38	n = 41	<i>n</i> = 29	
Letter to parent	19 (50%)	16 (39%)	19 (66%)	
Leaflet	2 (5%)	3 (7%)	1 (3%)	
Meetings	3 (8%)	6 (15%)	2 (7%)	
School gate	13 (34%)	2 (5%)	3 (10%)	
Other	0 (0%)	13 (32%)	3 (10%)	
No response	1 (3%)	1 (2%)	1 (3%)	

Table A4.37: Do any of the co-ordinators receive money?			
Response	Tranche 2 <i>n</i> = 41	Tranche 3 <i>n</i> = 29	
Yes No No response	21 (51%) 18 (44%) 2 (5%)	16 (55%) 10 (34%) 3 (10%)	

Table A4.38: Were there schools where it was particularly difficult to recruit volunteers?

Response	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3
	<i>n</i> = 38	n = 41	n = 29
Yes	26 (68%)	35 (85%)	27 (93%)
No	6 (16%)	6 (15%)	2 (7%)
No response	6 (16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Table A4.39: Were there schools where it was particularly easy to recruit volunteers?			
Response	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29
Yes	21 (55%)	30 (73%)	24 (83%)
No	11 (29%)	10 (24%)	5 (17%)
No response	6 (16%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)

Table A4.40: Proportion of schools where teachers gavethe names of parents as likely volunteers?			
Response	Tranche 2 <i>n</i> = 41	Tranche 3 <i>n</i> = 29	
All Most Almost half A few None No response	1 (2%) 2 (5%) 7 (17%) 21 (51%) 9 (22%) 1 (2%)	3 (10%) 8 (28%) 3 (10%) 13 (45%) 2 (7%) 0 (0%)	

Table A4.41: Have volunteers been recruited from outside the scheme area?			
Response	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29
Yes	10 (26%)	19 (46%)	11 (38%)
No	23 (60%)	22 (54%)	16 (55%)
No response	5 (13%)	0 (0%)	2 (7%)

Table A4.42: Volunteers with children at the schools where they were working?			
Response	Tranche 2 <i>n</i> = 41	Tranche 3 <i>n</i> = 29	
All Most Almost half A few None No response	7 (17%) 25 (62%) 5 (12%) 3 (7%) 1 (2%) 0 (0%)	4 (14%) 23 (80%) 1 (3%) 1 (3%) 0 (0%) 0 (0%)	

Table A4.43: Proportion of volunteers already working at school

Response	Tranche 2 <i>n</i> = 41	Tranche 3 <i>n</i> = 29
Most	2 (5%)	2 (7%)
About half	12 (29%)	3 (10%)
Some	24 (59%)	23 (79%)
None	3 (7%)	1 (4%)
No response	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Table A4.44: Proportion of volunteers going on to work at school			
Response	Tranche 2 <i>n</i> = 41	Tranche 3 <i>n</i> = 29	
About half A few None No response	2 (5%) 22 (53%) 17 (42%) 0 (0%)	2 (7%) 13 (45%) 14 (48%) 0 (0%)	

Table A4.45: People who expressed an interest in volunteering but did not train children?			
Response	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29
A lot	28 (74%)	14 (34%)	10 (34%)
A few	6 (16%)	25 (61%)	18 (63%)
None	1 (3%)	2 (5%)	1 (3%)
No response	3 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Table A4.46: How volunteers felt on completing CRB check forms?			
Response	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29
Very comfortable	22 (58%)	9 (22%)	3 (10%)
Comfortable	7 (18%)	13 (32%)	13 (45%)
Neither comfortable or uncomfortable	2 (5%)	14 (34%)	6 (21%)
Slightly concerned	0 (0%)	5 (12%)	6 (21%)
Very concerned	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)
No response	7 (18%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Table A4.47: Proportion of volunteers delayed by CRB checks			
Response	Tranche 2 <i>n</i> = 41	Tranche 3 <i>n</i> = 29	
10% or less 20–50% Over 50% No response	32 (78%) 5 (12%) 2 (5%) 2 (5%)	13 (45%) 5 (17%) 5 (17%) 6 (21%)	

Table A4.48: Level of parents' participation in the school community			
Response	Tranche 1 <i>n</i> = 38	Tranche 2 <i>n</i> = 41	Tranche 3 <i>n</i> = 29
Very good	2 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Good	6 (16%)	7 (17%)	4 (15%)
Average	12 (32%)	17 (41%)	14 (48%)
Bad	14 (37%)	13 (32%)	10 (34%)
Very bad	1 (3%)	3 (7%)	1 (3%)
No response	3 (8%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)

A4.1.6 Training of volunteers

Table A4.49: Method of training volunteers				
Response	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3	
	n = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29	
Group	25 (66%)	31 (75%)	18 (62%)	
Individual	6 (16%)	2 (5%)	1 (3%)	
Mixed	5 (13%)	7 (17%)	9 (31%)	
Other	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	
No response	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	

Table A4.50:Proportion of co-ordinators with best practice
policies agreed with head teachers

Response	Tranche 2 <i>n</i> = 41	Tranche 3 <i>n</i> = 29
Behaviour management	36 (88%)	26 (90%)
Emergencies	34 (83%)	27 (93%)
Supervision of children	37 (90%)	22 (76%)
Child/trainer ratios	38 (93%)	26 (90%)
Other	9 (23%)	5 (17%)
No response	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Table A4.51: Proportion of schools providing adequate facilities for volunteers				
Response	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3	
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29	
Adequate facilities provided	25 (66%)	32 (83%)	21 (72%)	
No adequate facilities provided	12 (32%)	6 (15%)	3 (10%)	
No response	1 (3%)	3 (7%)	5 (17%)	

Table A4.52: How many volunteers drop-out before training children				
Response	Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3	
	<i>n</i> = 38	<i>n</i> = 41	<i>n</i> = 29	
A lot	14 (37%)	1 (3%)	2 (7%)	
A few	11 (29%)	23 (55%)	13 (45%)	
None	2 (5%)	17 (42%)	13 (45%)	
No response	11 (29%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	

APPENDIX 5 Head teacher interview schedule

Telephone interview with head teachers

Co-ordinator contact	
School	Head teacher
Interview date	Duration
Interviewer Comments	

Introduction Personal introduction to interviewer.

Gathering views and opinions to feed back into evaluation process for the Kerbcraft programme.

Ask for consent to be interviewed and let participants know that they can withdraw from the interview at any time. If that should happen, any data collected will not be used and will be deleted.

Check consent for interview to be recorded.

Appreciate you giving your time – will take approximately 20–30 minutes.

SECTION A - SCHOOL ETHOS

(General background information)

A1.	How long have you been in post at this school?
A2.	Does the school have a health promotion/health education policy? <i>(if yes, brief details)</i>
A3.	Is the school currently working toward the National Healthy Schools Standard? Has Kerbcraft been included in that documentation/process? <i>(if yes, at which level/stage?)</i>
A4.	Is the school currently involved in any other health promotion/health education work? (prompt: walking to/from school, school travel plan?) (if yes, brief overview)

A5.	Is there anything in particular about the Kerbcraft programme that			
	enhances/builds upon your school ethos?			
	(if yes, brief details)			
A6.	Was Road Safety a special interest area for the school prior to becoming involved in Kerbcraft? <i>(if yes, brief details)</i>			

A7. During the time that the Kerbcraft programme has been running, have the children undertaken any other road safety training initiatives? (*if yes, brief details – prompt – year group/age. Have any of these children also received Kerbcraft?*)

SECTION B – IMPLEMENTING KERBCRAFT IN SCHOOL

B1. How easy has it been :

B1a to find space in school for parents to meet/wet weather activities?

B1b to free up children's time?

B1c to recruit volunteers? (probe as to why difficult/easy)

- B2. What level of support have you received from
 - B2a school staff
 - B2b parents
 - B2c school governors
 - B2d the Kerbcraft co-ordinator

(probe with each as to whether any concerns have been raised)

B3.	What has been your experience of involving parent volunteers within school? <i>(any problems/concerns, is this an accepted approach or was it something new for you?)</i>
B4.	Have you incurred any non-financial costs as a result of delivering the Kerbcraft programme so far? <i>(If yes, what for?)</i>
B5.	Have there been any other issues regarding the implementation of Kerbcraft in your school?

SECTION C – IMPACT OF KERBCRAFT ON SCHOOL

- C1. What impact do you think Kerbcraft has had on your school in general?
- C2. Thinking about specific effects of the programme, do you consider there to have been an impact on:
 - C2a influencing school policies (general culture of safety, specific e.g. parental parking outside school)
 - C2b contacts/relations between parents and school? (positive/negative, can you give an example?)
 - C2c the way in which the school is viewed/used by the wider community? (have links been strengthened, have school facilities become more accessible to community ... give example(s))
 - C2d the number of children who walk to school, or parents attitudes toward children walking to school? *(probe for details)*
- C3a. Has school been subject to an OFSTED inspection whilst participating in the programme? *(If yes, give date, If no, GO TO C4))*
- C3b. Was any reference to Kerbcraft made during the inspection process? *(If yes, details)*
- C4. Do you think you will make reference to the Kerbcraft programme in future inspections? *(If yes, in what respect? If no, why not?)*

SECTION D - SUSTAINABILITY OF THE PROGRAMME

- D1. Has Kerbcraft become part of a wider curriculum on road safety within school? *(Is it viewed as a "project" running alongside other work, or is it an integral part?)*
- D2. Kerbcraft Co-ordinators are currently on three year contracts funded by the Department for Transport as part of a National Pilot study. Some local authorities have managed to find funding for Co-ordinators to remain in post for longer, or for a road safety officer to continue with their role or with a reduced role. However some local authorities will cease to run Kerbcraft. In a hypothetical situation that your authority should cease to be able to support Kerbcraft at your school, would you consider:

D2a Would you consider an existing member of school staff taking on the co-ordinating role?

(Why/why not)

- D2b Would you consider having parents run the scheme within school? (Why/why not)
- D2c If there were to be a consortium of schools established, might you be interested in "buying in" time/skills from a pool of volunteers? (Why/why not)
- D3 Thinking of a scale where 1 is "very little" and 5 is "a considerable amount", how much of your own time and energy have you needed to invest in the programme?
- D4 Using the same scale, how would you rate the benefits of running the programme?

Thank you for your time. Is there anything you'd like to add which we haven't covered?

APPENDIX 6 MVA data

KERBCRAFT EVALUATION

Interviews with MVA staff

Staff member

Date _____ Time start _____ Time finish

SECTION A Personal details

- A1 How long have you been involved with the Kerbcraft programme? *(dates?)*
- A2 In what capacity were you involved? (position/title?)
- A3 Can you give me a brief overview of your main responsibilities? *(key tasks)*

SECTION B History of project

B1 The project has been funded by the DfT. Do you have any personal involvement with the organisation/team members?

If yes

- B2a How frequent are your contacts with DfT?
- B2b Who is/are your main contacts?
- B2c What are the major issues involved?
- B2d How has this process been for you? (approachable, accessible, supportive?)

Originally project was a partnership of three agencies: MVA, UWE, Jacobs Babtie. I'd like to think about your relationship with the other two organisations:

B3 Firstly with UWE. Do you have any personal involvement with the organisation/team members?

If yes

B4a How frequent are your contacts with UWE/representatives?

B4b Who is/are your main contacts?

B4c What are the major issues involved?

B4d How has this process been for you? (approachable, accessible, supportive?)

B5 Now thinking about Jacobs Babtie. Did you have any personal involvement with the organisation/team?

If yes

B6a How frequent were your contacts with Jacobs Babtie/representatives?

B6b Who was/were your main contacts?

B6c What were the major issues involved?

B6d How was this process for you? (approachable, accessible, supportive?)

B7 How did the partnership work in practice? (what went well? Any particular concerns?)

<u>SECTION C</u> Perceptions of the project

C1 Within your role, how realistic/achievable has the timetable of events been?

C2 Have there been adequate opportunities for you to reflect on practice as the work progressed?

(Egs... If not, why not/ what would you have liked?)

C3 Have there been adequate opportunities to change course/amend practice? *(Egs...If not, why not, how might this be improved?)*

C4 I am going to read out four statements and I'd like you to indicate the number of your response to these using the cards provided.

C5 *"I would rate my overall satisfaction at being involved in the Kerbcraft project as..."*

Very high/high/moderate/low

C6 *"I am very clear about the expectations and requirements of my role in relation to Kerbcraft"*

Totally agree/agree/agree in part/disagree/totally disagree

C7 *"Overall the process of working in partnership has been..."*

Highly successful/successful/a reasonable way of working/ generally unsuccessful/not at all successful

C8 *"The project met my personal expectations..."*

Very well/well/reasonably well/not well/not at all

C9 Is there anything/anyone in the set-up or running of the project that impeded your progress? *(probe, expand)*

C10 Is there anything/anyone that has been particularly helpful/useful? *(probe, expand)*

C11 Is there anything you would like to have changed/done differently if you'd had the opportunity?

<u>SECTION D</u> Factors for success/failure, sustainability

D1a From your own perspective, can you define for me what you see as a "successful" Kerbcraft scheme?

D1b	Are you able to	identify any	of the factors that	at contribute to	"success"?
210	1 11 0 1 0 00 10 10		01 1110 100010 1110		

D1c What about things which stand in the way of "success"?

D2 What do you think has been the biggest **challenge** faced by:

D2a co-ordinators in delivering Kerbcraft?

D2b MVA as an organisation in managing all the schemes in the Network?

D2c yourself as a member of the project team?

D3 In terms of sustainability, I'm interested in your views as to how this might be achieved. These were three options which we gave to Head Teachers as a way of sustaining the programme beyond the pilot phase. **Give three options on card.** Which of these would be your own preference and why?

- i) Existing member of school staff to take on the role of co-ordinator
- ii) To have parents run the scheme in school
- iii) Establish consortium of schools in the area and "buy in" time/skills from pool of trained volunteers

D4 Do you have any other ideas as to how the project work could be sustained within schemes/schools?

D5 Some head teachers have suggested paying volunteers to aid recruitment and retention – what's your view on this?

D6 Any other comments?