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SECTION ONE  INTRODUCTION

This report documents the Scottish elements of the evaluation of the National Network of Child Pedestrian Training Pilot Project. The broader national network pilot project ran across authorities in Scotland and England in areas of high deprivation and high child pedestrian casualty rates and was evaluated 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 12 unitary authorities in Scotland in a wide range of different settings and pays particular attention to the processes of delivery and implementation.

Section 2 describes the background to the development of the Kerbcraft programme and its piloting in Scotland and sets out the aims and objectives of the evaluation study. This section also provides an outline of the overall evaluation study across the whole of the national network and presents a synopsis of combined results from schemes across England and Scotland.

A brief background to Kerbcraft in Scotland is given in Section 3, including details of national network programme and the scale of the pilot project in Scotland.

In Section 4 we present the methods and results of the Scottish evaluation component studies: volunteer surveys; school-based case study; co-ordinator and road safety officer surveys and a head teacher survey.

Section 5 presents a commentary and conclusions, Section 6 advises on future delivery of Kerbcraft training and Section 7 provides references.
SECTION TWO  BACKGROUND TO THE EVALUATION STUDY

This project’s aim is to assess the impact of the ‘Kerbcraft’ child pedestrian training programme, which has been disseminated throughout a national network of 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 were preferentially targeted since it is in these areas that the risk of child pedestrian injury is highest. Funding in England was provided by the Department for Transport, and in Scotland by the Scottish Executive. A separate report has been produced for the Department for Transport detailing combined results from across all English and Scottish national network schemes. This report is available from the Department for Transport Road Safety Research website as of early 2008.

Kerbcraft Training

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 practical training in the road environment. The training is progressive, with each skill package building on earlier programmes. 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 4-6 sessions by trained volunteers. A scheme co-ordinator based in the local authority road safety department has responsibility for 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.

Development of the Kerbcraft Model

Competent pedestrian behaviour involves a wide range of complex perceptual, cognitive and motor skills, making safe interaction with the traffic environment possible. Although adults demonstrate considerable competence in applying such pedestrian skills, children do not. Traditional road safety education was centred around knowledge acquisition through classroom-based ‘rote’ learning of rules for crossing. However, more recent research has shown that children require a more active learning process in order for them to develop pedestrian skills. Kerbcraft has a clear focus on skills training and is underpinned by a strong theoretical base drawn from research in social learning theory, child development and health promotion. Practical training at the roadside provides an appropriate context for development of key skills and the interactive nature of the training supports the development of children’s conceptual understanding of the behaviours involved.
Kerbcraft was developed as a package of three skills and was piloted in Drumchapel, Glasgow between 1993 and 1995. The results of that pilot showed that children who had been exposed to the programme displayed significantly safer traffic judgements and behaviours compared with a matched control group of children from the same classes. Moreover, the improvements were robust, with no deterioration when children were tested 2-3 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 per skill, each lasting only half an hour (Thomson and Whelan, 1997).

As an intervention, Kerbcraft promotes the tenets of inclusion and child-centred learning that are now considered central to national curriculum strategies across the UK. From a school perspective, Kerbcraft creates opportunities to enhance parent and community relationships and to make links with key themes within the Scottish and English national curriculum, for example citizenship, well-being and personal safety.

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.

Overall Aims and Objectives of the Evaluation Project

**Aims**

- To assess the impact of the 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 local level.

**Objectives**

- To establish the impact of the 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 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 continued recruitment of volunteers and local sources of funding.
Key outcomes from the overall evaluation study

The overall evaluation met all of the study aims and objectives through a number of different research methods. There were eight strands to the main evaluation study, detailed as follows:

- A skills assessment exercise measuring changes in children’s behaviour at the roadside as a result of training
- A survey of volunteers’ experiences and perceptions of Kerbcraft and their own communities
- A series of case studies providing in-depth information on implementing Kerbcraft in a range of different environments
- A survey of Kerbcraft scheme co-ordinators
- A survey of line managers within each participating authority
- A survey of head teachers involved in the programme
- A cost effectiveness analysis
- Interviews with MVA staff and investigation of other data sources

Results from each of the study strands outlined above 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, before the intervention trained and control groups showed similar levels of construction of ‘safe’ routes (17%). This rose to 28% in trained children immediately after training (Post test 1) and 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 trained but not for 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 controls in relation to moving away from obstructions. The improvements made by trained children in this study, however, were not as great (for each skill) as those observed in the original pilot study in Drumchapel, possibly 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 toward 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 teachers’ survey 43% considered that the Kerbcraft programme had actively improved the relationship between parents and 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 ‘Kerbcraft’ 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 all below £100 per child in all 7 local authorities schemes sampled. Costs lay in the range £28 - £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 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 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 success of schemes included the cooperation 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 RSOs and co-ordinators were more positive with the support they obtained in Tranches 2 and 3. This was facilitated by improvements throughout the project lifespan in the communication and feedback processes between co-ordinators, network managers and the evaluation team. Training and support of co-ordinators was also an important factor. In some areas, co-ordinators added “value” to 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 schools and local/ unitary authorities. A wide range of funding sources was accessed to sustain schemes. 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 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. However, few had continued with the full number of recommended sessions.
SECTION THREE  KERBCRAFT IN SCOTLAND

The National Network in Scotland

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 approximately £30,000 p.a. for the authority to appoint a scheme co-ordinator to set up and deliver training in up to ten schools in their particular area. The co-ordinators were managed and supported by Road Safety Officers within existing road safety departments.

In Scotland, three unitary authorities were funded to start in May 2002 (Tranche 1) with the appointment of co-ordinators and training starting in August 2002. Another three UAs were funded in Tranche 2 (Jan 2003 – Feb 2006) and a further six authorities in Tranche 3 between January 2004 and February 2007.

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

Table 3.1: Schemes and approximate numbers of children trained per tranche across the National Network in Scotland from 2002 to 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tranche</th>
<th>Scottish UAs</th>
<th>Total number children trained in Scotland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (2002)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (2003)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (2004)*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6589</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This figure does not include children trained in the final term of training (Sept 06-Mar 07)

Each scheme co-ordinator had a target of working with approximately 10 schools or 300 children per year and 900 over the project lifetime. This target was based on the numbers 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 worked in very rural areas where their Kerbcraft schools had small numbers of children, but were spread across a very large geographical area. Across the lifespan of the pilot project, approximately 6,589 Scottish children received some training in Kerbcraft skills (this does not include the final term of training for Tranche 3 schemes).

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

Authorities appointed their own co-ordinators, negotiating 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 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, initially through a series of regional networking meetings, national seminars and website facilities provided by MVA, and eventually 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.

The Scottish Evaluation Study

The evaluation of the national network in Scotland as funded by the Scottish Executive covered five of the eight main study themes, and focused on exploring any aspects of managing and delivering Kerbcraft which were in some way different for schemes in Scotland.

The Scottish evaluation study strands were:

- A survey of volunteers’ experiences and perceptions of Kerbcraft and their own communities
- A survey of Kerbcraft scheme co-ordinators
- A survey of line managers within each participating authority
- A survey of head teachers involved in the programme
- An in-depth case study of a ‘model’ Kerbcraft school in Scotland

A skills testing study to inform the first objective was not undertaken in Scotland as the Scottish Executive decided to use its financial contribution for other parts of the evaluation. Results on skills testing were available from the original pilot study in Scotland (Thomson and Whelan, 1997) and those for England would provide sufficient further testing in a range of environments and with different groups of children. The results of skills testing from England have broadly confirmed the original pilot findings and are summarised in relation to Objective 1 on page 4 of this report.
SECTION FOUR RESULTS FROM SCOTTISH EVALUATION STUDIES

The following four sub-sections provide an outline of the methods used to gather evaluation data on Kerbcraft in Scotland; set out a brief summary of the overall study results and then give details of any areas where results from Scottish Kerbcraft schemes have differed in some way.

The four sections cover the following studies:

4A: Volunteer Surveys
4B: Scottish Case Study
4C: Co-ordinator and RSO Surveys
4D: Head Teacher Survey
SECTION 4A VOLUNTEER SURVEYS IN SCOTLAND

Rationale

The ongoing recruitment and maintenance of a pool of well-trained volunteers is crucial to the success of every Kerbcraft scheme, as without them no training can be delivered to the children. This element of the evaluation is designed to contribute to Objective 2 (assessing the impact of the scheme on schools, communities and volunteers) through a survey of volunteers’ experiences of participation in the Kerbcraft programme.

The volunteer surveys aim to gather information from volunteer trainers on 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:

1. To gather qualitative data from volunteers which will feed into both the ongoing management and implementation of Kerbcraft schemes within the National Network

2. To identify and explore the rewards and motivators which encourage participation and the barriers and enhancers for participation

3. To explore potential outcomes for the personal development of volunteers

4. To identify and explore any links between volunteer participation and social capital indices in areas of social and economic deprivation

5. To track the progress of key Kerbcraft training messages from co-ordinators through to the volunteers who implement training directly with the children

6. To use the information to provide guidelines for future volunteer recruitment and sustainability of volunteer participation in the programme

7. To develop best practice guidelines in the management of volunteer recruitment, training and support

Method

The survey methodology involved distributing 2 questionnaires to a sample of volunteers from Tranche 2 of the National Network. Questionnaire 1 (Q1) gathered general information from a broad range of volunteers from all schemes within Tranche 2. A two-part follow-up questionnaire (Q2a & b) 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.
Selection of Scottish Schemes
As the number of schemes in Scotland was significantly smaller than that in England (at the
time of survey initiation there were 6 schemes in total) it was agreed that all current schemes
would be included, and that a 50% sample of schools would be selected for participation in
the study. Thus a total of 28 schools were selected which should have yielded an approximate
maximum of 140 volunteers. Unfortunately, 2 of the 6 Scottish schemes were without a co-
ordinator at the time the survey began, therefore volunteer responses could only be gathered
from the remaining 4 schemes. A total of 84 questionnaires were sent out to Scottish
schemes.

Summary of overall results (English and Scottish schemes combined)

Questionnaire 1: General Survey Response Rates

A total of 495 (Q1) questionnaires were sent out to volunteers in England and Scotland with
the following response rates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number sent out</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>% Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall total</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main results from Questionnaire 1 are summarised below:

- The majority of the volunteers were parents and many were already involved in the
  school in some way.
- Overall, most of the volunteers became involved after receiving a letter home with
  their child. However, in Scotland, almost all of volunteers were asked to participate
directly by the Head Teacher.
- Over 75% of the volunteers received some form of formal training from their scheme
  co-ordinator prior to working with the children. Of those who did not, most had a one-
to-one training session with some roadside experience.
- The key training messages, passed down from the initial co-ordinator training, came
  through strongly for each Kerbcraft skills. However, results indicated that a stronger
  emphasis should be placed on some aspects of Kerbcraft which are ‘Essential’, but
  which volunteers rated as only ‘Important’.
- There were no problems associated with the completion of Disclosure Scotland
  checks.
- The majority of volunteers stated that they wished to continue with Kerbcraft in the
  future. Key motivators were: the importance of the training for local children; their
  enjoyment of working with the children; their desire to make a positive difference to
  their local school.
- Demographic information: the majority of our volunteers were female (93%), aged
  30-39 years old (52%) and were parents; 11% were grandparents. Over 40% were
  working part-time and 15% had no formal qualifications. 54% were drivers and 66%
  owned their own home. Across the UK, most of the volunteers considered themselves
to be ‘White British’, with Pakistani the second largest group in England.

The key outcomes from Questionnaire 2a – Active Volunteers – are summarised as follows:
• 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.

• 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.

• There was no pattern of emergency incidents at the roadside. Although, volunteers seemed to feel that more information and guidance from Co-ordinators on emergency procedures would be useful.

• All volunteers rated the support received from their co-ordinators very highly. The majority felt that both Head Teachers and Class teachers at their schools were also sufficiently supportive of the scheme.

• 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 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 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 benefits listed were seen to be much less important.

The key outcomes from the Questionnaire 2b - ‘Drop-out’ Volunteers - are summarised as follows:

• Almost all (over 90%) of the respondents had trained children in all 3 of the Kerbcraft skills
• 75% of volunteers had received some form of training from their scheme co-ordinator prior to working with the children
• The majority of volunteers (81%) stated that they enjoyed Kerbcraft “a lot” – no one felt that they had not enjoyed their experience of Kerbcraft.
• The majority of volunteers left because of changes in their own personal circumstances which resulted in them no longer having time to participate in Kerbcraft (36%). No one cited a negative aspect of the scheme itself as their reason for leaving.
• The majority of volunteers (72%) feel that they had ample support from their co-ordinators 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.

Discussion of Scottish Scheme results, which differed from the main study sample

Questionnaire 1: General Survey

The results of the general survey were separated out and collated for English and Scottish respondents in order to identify any areas of difference across the survey questions. The results themselves are presented in full in a separate Appendix for the main report. Consideration of the results for Scotland and England in comparison with the overall results and with each other suggests that there were very few fundamental differences between the two groups. Any small differences were to some extent negated by the disparity between the sample sizes for each group as the Scottish respondents were outnumbered by more than 4:1 by their English counterparts (Scotland n = 40; England n = 188). There were however some differences which may be of interest and which are discussed in more detail below.

Question 2 related to the methods of recruitment which co-ordinators employed to successfully attract volunteers. In Scotland it appeared that the most successful by far was a direct request to participate from the head teacher (92%), whereas in England the results were more varied and favoured a letter home from school (52%); informal contact with the co-ordinator at the school (25%) and then a head teacher request (20%).

Question 4 asked volunteers to rank the importance of a number of aspects of Kerbcraft training. Volunteers could rank a number of statements about Kerbcraft on a 4 point Likert Scale as follows: ‘Essential’; ‘Important’; ‘Not Sure’ ‘Not Important’. This question was designed to track the flow of important training messages from the national co-ordinator training courses, down through individual schemes, through volunteers to the children. Across all the statements, Scottish and English volunteers show a very similar pattern of responses. It may be of some interest to note however, that the English volunteers recorded more “Not Sure” and “Not important” responses across all statements than the Scottish group.

Question 5 referred to the CRB/Disclosure Scotland checks which every volunteer had to complete prior to training with the children. The interesting point to note here was a similarity, rather than a difference in responses. When asked whether they received any help with completing their forms, roughly the same percentage of volunteers from Scotland (15%) and England (17%) did not give ANY response to this question. This may indicate a slight reluctance to discuss the help they received, or it may just be a misunderstanding of the question.

Again, Question 6b shows a very similar pattern of results with regard to motivating factors for continued future participation in the scheme, with the same top four responses selected by English and Scottish volunteers. The top four motivators centred on the importance of continued training for the children; the enjoyment that volunteers got from working with the children; a desire to make a difference at their child’s school and the positive impact of being able to help at school when other parents were often unable to.
There were a few differences in demographic details, some of which may be a result of the difference in sample sizes and some of which are likely to be a result of differences in cultural make-up of the broader populations. The English volunteer sample represented a wider age range, although both samples had a majority age of 30-39 years. Given the age of the majority of respondents, slight differences in the spread of qualifications recorded by both groups may well be attributable to differences in the education systems in Scotland and England, as well as to the smaller Scottish sample (the Scottish sample is less varied in its response and the majority of volunteers have ‘O’ Levels or ‘A’ Levels or Scottish equivalent ‘Highers’), whereas the English group is more varied and evenly spread over all the categories. Regional UK variations in the general population’s ethnic background are borne out by the more diverse range of ethnic backgrounds selected by English volunteers, with the two largest groups represented as White British (79%) and Pakistani (12%) and small numbers of volunteers coming from other ethnic backgrounds. By contrast, the Scottish respondents all felt themselves to be White British. Finally, the last question asked volunteers to select a housing category that most closely fitted their circumstances. Choices available were: private rental; housing association rental; LA/council rental and owner occupied. While the pattern of responses was broadly similar, a higher percentage of the Scottish volunteers were in rented properties (42% over all rented categories; slightly higher than in England in each category). This may be an artefact of the smaller and more regionally concentrated sample in Scotland, or it may reflect national and regional differences in the housing stock, with more opportunities for private and housing association renting in Scotland.

Questionnaire 2: Active Volunteer Responses

Much like the General Survey, which preceded it, the response 12 months later from active volunteers to the follow-up survey was very similar for both Scottish and English volunteers. For this survey, the similarity was reinforced as the sample sizes were much more equal, with 12 respondents from Scotland and 22 from England. Where there were differences, these are discussed in more detail below.

Question 1 asks volunteers to rate their enjoyment of Kerbcraft ‘now’ in comparison with when they first started with their project. Fifty percent of volunteers in England stated that they ‘enjoyed it much more now’, whereas only 25% of Scottish volunteers noted a greater enjoyment now. However, this may be because Scottish volunteers enjoyed the project very much to begin with as 42% said they ‘felt the same as before’.

Questions 2, 3 & 4 required volunteers to indicate what they considered to be the 3 most important aspects of each skill from a list of statements, not all of which were required for that skill. Although Scottish and English volunteers showed a similar pattern across the board, it seems that Scottish volunteers placed slightly more emphasis on elements, which were specific to Safe Places (Question 2) than their English counterparts. ‘Being able to find a safe place in any situation’ and ‘identifying as dangerous anything which blocks a view of the road’ shared a joint second billing with 58% of Scottish volunteers selecting those responses in their top 3, whereas they were selected 3rd and 4th by English volunteers over more generic road safety messages. There were no identifiable differences for Parked Cars (Q3) or Junctions (Q4).

In response to Question 7, only one volunteer across both Scotland and England indicated that they had experienced a roadside incident where they had to return to the school as a result of unforeseen circumstances. That volunteer was from the Scottish group and described
an incident with a stray dog that distracted and frightened the children, resulting in the volunteers and co-ordinator deciding it was safer to return to school.

Scottish volunteers reported being aware of more publicity for their schemes than English volunteers (83% versus 41%) and they seem to have been more involved in any publicity organised for their Kerbcraft projects (67% versus 24%).

There also appeared to be more Scottish volunteers who drive regularly (58% in Scotland; 43% in England). However, of those who do drive in Scotland and England, a similar number felt that they were more careful drivers as a result of their participation in Kerbcraft (8/9 in England and 7/7 in Scotland – these numbers are very small, so we are not making any more of this finding).

Finally, with regard to the perceived benefits of participating in a Kerbcraft project, all volunteers identified a similar pattern of responses. However, Scottish volunteers put slightly more emphasis on the social aspects of their experiences and the opportunity for improved links with the school, whereas the English group showed a slight preference for the feelings of value and the rewards/gifts they received from project staff. Many co-ordinators reported that they had offered or had considered offering financial incentives or payment for participation, and some volunteers within the overall network programme were paid for training. There was no direct mention of these incentives by volunteers responding to the survey questionnaires. However, many volunteers interviewed as part of the case studies undertaken in England and Scotland reported that they did not consider payment to be “in keeping” with the spirit of volunteering and were concerned that payment would interfere with receipt of state benefits or would attract volunteers for the wrong reasons.

**Questionnaire 2: Drop-out Volunteer Responses**

There are virtually no identifiable Scottish/English differences in response to this part of Survey 2, and it should be noted that the sample sizes are extremely disparate, with only 7 returns from Scottish volunteers in comparison with 46 from the English group. We would suggest that this negates the importance of any slight differences in the pattern of responses between English and Scottish respondents; therefore we conclude this section without any further discussion.
SECTION 4B SCOTTISH CASE STUDY

Rationale

The Scottish Executive funded a total of 12 Scottish Kerbcraft schemes within the National Network Pilot Project. As part of their evaluation of Kerbcraft in Scotland, they requested that one case study school be included in the evaluation.

After some discussion with the Executive, 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 current Scottish education system.

Method

Selection of local authority scheme & individual school
MVA runs an annual competition for Kerbcraft ‘School of the Year’, to be nominated by scheme co-ordinators and to be awarded at the National Seminar each year in December. The award is judged on evidence presented by the co-ordinator on 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 during the course of the pilot project, and the evaluation team agreed that this school was suitable for inclusion as a case study school. The scheme co-ordinator was contacted to discuss the possibility of visiting the school and meeting with the staff, volunteers and pupils and a suitable date was agreed. All interviews were conducted by the senior evaluation researcher and were tape-recorded and later transcribed for information extraction. The scheme co-ordinator distributed a short questionnaire to parents of trained children to gather information on their understanding of the scheme and on the impact of their child’s participation at home. The main outcomes from all interviews are presented below in light of the objectives that this aspect of the evaluation addresses.

Key Outcomes from ‘model’ case study schools in the overall sample

To provide a context for outcomes from the ‘model’ school in Scotland, a brief summary of the key findings from the two ‘model’ case study schools in England is given below.

- Both schools used close links with parents and the local community to facilitate other health promotion activities.
- Both schools had initial problems recruiting volunteers. Over time, their most successful strategy was to recruit parents through the school, either by 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 facilitated training delivery and in resolving any emerging problems.
- Both schools actively celebrated Kerbcraft achievements for both children and volunteers through social events and 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 which facilitated the delivery of Kerbcraft training.

RESULTS FROM SCOTTISH MODEL SCHOOL CASE STUDY

Setting-Up, Management and Maintenance of Kerbcraft Schemes

• The school is part of a larger health project running across several primary and secondary schools in the area
• Current class teacher is new to the project, but has been briefed by co-ordinator and has sufficient information
• Initial problems in recruiting volunteers – overcome by enthusiasm and persistence of co-ordinator. Helped by building links with local community centre.
• One child had Additional Support Needs but was able to participate in training every week.
• 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/Disclosure Scotland checks and then specific skills training.
• Some volunteers now in their 3rd year of training.
• Training is done with P2 children (aged 5-6 at beginning of term)
• Co-ordinator has classroom session with children and teacher prior to start of roadside training with volunteers in order to familiarise children (and teacher) with the Kerbcraft concept and their trainers

Impact on the School, Volunteers, Community and Parents

Impact on School and Children

• Kerbcraft made an immediate impact on the head teacher as it was perceived to be a “quality” intervention.
• Kerbcraft had a very visible presence in the school, with lots of images, posters etc in the foyer and around the school.
• 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 P7 (10-11 years old) children 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 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.
• The school was very supportive of the fact that Kerbcraft involved parents regularly and in a position where they were able to lead activities with children and were not being supervised by school staff.
• Both the head teacher and the Primary 2 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 was entirely embraced by the whole school as an integrated part of the curriculum.
• Good organisation and consistent contact by the co-ordinator reduced any potential classroom disruption.
• Discussions with children in the current training cohort 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 & 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.”

Impact on Volunteers

• Volunteers for the Kerbcraft project became 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 felt that their training skills had developed over the three years that they had been working with the children.
• The co-ordinator confirmed this skill development and commented that he considered them to be properly skilled 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 co-ordinator.

Impact on Community

• Kerbcraft had a very high profile in the wider community, especially with other primary and secondary schools, thanks to a local school-based health education initiative.
• The high-visibility branding of the project made the rest of the children in the school and local people very aware of the existence of the project
• The co-ordinator analysed the accident statistics for the area over the time that the project was running and none of the accidents reported involved children in the Kerbcraft age range of five to seven years. This was considered a very positive outcome across all schools in the area, as schools in this particular area were selected to receive Kerbcraft training because these wards were among those with the highest child pedestrian casualty rates across the whole authority.

Impact on parents of trained children

A short questionnaire was conducted to ascertain the impact of Kerbcraft at home. Ten parents of trained children responded. Key outcomes were:

• 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 percent 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 percent of parents responding said that they allowed their children to play outside unsupervised however, 90% lived within easy reach of safe play facilities (e.g. an enclosed garden, play park etc.). Twenty percent of parents felt that they had changed their supervision of their child’s outdoor play as a result of their involvement in Kerbcraft.

Factors for Success and Failure

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, 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 recently joined the team, but the co—ordinator would have liked a ‘pool’ of volunteers so that those long-standing could have breaks from the commitment.
Facilitators

- The volunteers were highly skilled trainers and began to refine Kerbcraft training to add their own ways of conveying the key messages to the children (these were complementary to Kerbcraft ethos and principles).
- The co-ordinator’s enthusiasm and persistence totally convinced the head teacher to support the project and a very strong relationship of trust and reciprocity developed between the school and the co-ordinator.
- The school was part of a wider community health education initiative involving other local primary and secondary schools that aimed to raise awareness of the role schools play in health education for the whole community. This created a strong positive climate for health interventions in the community generally and particularly in the school.
- There was a strong road safety focus in the school generally, and Primary 7 children already took part in the Junior Road Safety Officer scheme supported by the Scottish Executive.
- The head teacher felt that the scheme was particularly successful because it targeted younger children and was an “active” intervention, which took 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, 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 was based, as this provided 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.

Sustainability

- Kerbcraft was 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 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 through to secondary school.
- The class teacher felt that Kerbcraft could easily be integrated into the school curriculum as it’s a well organised, regular session that’s easy to plan for and does not disrupt classroom activities unduly.
- The school supported any continuation of Kerbcraft training after funding terminated and was prepared to contribute financially (along with other schools in the area) to maintain the project and the co-ordinator’s management of the scheme.
• All school staff and volunteers felt that the co-ordinator was an essential part of the
success of the scheme and the success of any future project would require either that
individual or someone similarly 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 teaching staff and co-ordinator commented that the longer the project ran in the
school with the same volunteers, the better and more professional the training became.

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. Teaching staff also commented that
the focus on healthy outdoor activities as a context for learning and the inclusion of parents
and community in education was entirely complementary to current thinking in education in
Scotland.

Points of interest arising from other case studies across English Kerbcraft schemes

Kerbcraft in Rural Schools

The major challenge faced was the lack of variety of locations for training, but the scheme
worked well with what was available. The small, close-knit community facilitated volunteer
recruitment. However, volunteers felt more could have been done to publicise the scheme
locally and there were local problems with drivers not adhering to speed limits through
villages and hamlets. However, the scheme co-ordinator was able to adapt 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 and placing a stronger
emphasis on ‘listening’ skills.

Kerbcraft in areas of Extreme Deprivation

Recruitment of volunteers was the biggest challenge in both Kerbcraft schools in this
particular area. This was partially overcome through use of ‘community street wardens’ and
was most successful when wardens were already involved in other school activities. Other
local schools echoed the problem of encouraging parent participation; they often struggled to
get parents to help with any school activity and felt that many parents lacked the confidence
to come forward and get involved. Having said that, there was a core group of parents at this
school who remained committed to the Kerbcraft project throughout its lifetime.
Unfortunately, training was sometimes cancelled during bouts of bad weather, as children
were often not adequately dressed and did not have warm coats or good footwear. The co-
ordinator provided ‘Kerbcraft hats’ for children in these circumstances to attempt to alleviate
this issue.
Kerbcraft for children with additional support needs

While no specific information was gathered on delivering Kerbcraft to children with additional support needs, anecdotal evidence suggests that many schemes successfully include children with a wide variety of needs in Kerbcraft training wherever this was possible. This was only undertaken after discussion with school staff and was incorporated into the risk assessment process. Children were usually accompanied by and/or trained by appropriate school staff (learning support teachers/classroom assistants) who often reported that training appeared to have benefits for many of the children, in particular those with learning difficulties or behavioural management problems.
SECTION 4C  CO-ORDINATOR AND ROAD SAFETY OFFICER SURVEYS

Rationale

The surveys of co-ordinators and Road Safety Officers (RSOs) 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 RSOs and co-ordinators were linked to look at certain issues from the two different perspectives. Here we examine the results of both surveys.

Methods

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

Co-ordinator Surveys

The interview schedules 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.

No telephone interviews were conducted with Scottish co-ordinators. This may have been a result of the later starting date for Tranche 1 co-ordinators in Scotland. However, co-ordinators from two of the three Tranche 1 Scottish schemes completed an initial questionnaire survey in early 2003; two of the three Tranche 2 co-ordinators returned surveys in 2003 and four of the six Tranche 3 co-ordinators completed surveys in 2004.

RSO Surveys

The questionnaire dealt with the RSO’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 RSOs were also asked to comment on the recruitment process for co-ordinators, 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 RSOs took place in February 2003 and covered all three participating Tranche 1 RSOs. The second survey took place in October 2003 and collected information from all three Tranche 2 schemes. The questionnaire for the Tranche 3 schemes was distributed in December 2004, and four of the six Tranche 3 RSOs responded.

Summary of key outcomes from overall survey of co-ordinators (England and Scotland combined)

Key outcomes from co-ordinators

- The co-ordinators from all three tranches were predominantly female; of ‘White British’ ethnic origin, aged between 21 and 61 years. 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 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.

Summary of outcomes from RSOs

Overall the management of the scheme was not seen as onerous to RSOs and they were able to support their co-ordinators effectively. Managers were initially motivated to participate in the scheme as they saw it as an opportunity to undertake practical child pedestrian training. All RSOs felt that the appointment of a suitable co-ordinator was essential to the smooth-running of the scheme and highlighted self-motivation, followed by experience and outgoing personality as the most desirable characteristics.

Many of the recommendations made by the RSOs, 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.

Survey results from Scottish co-ordinators

The numbers of Kerbcraft co-ordinators and associated RSOs in Scotland were very small in comparison with the English cohort (numbers are shown in Table 3C.1 below). As a result of this, the pattern of responses given by Scottish participants did not differ in any readily identifiable way from the overall results, as discussed in the main report, and specific Scottish
responses have not been reported here. The authors would therefore refer readers to the main report (sections 5D: co-ordinator surveys and 5E: RSO surveys) for a more detailed discussion of the overall results from co-ordinators and RSOs.

3C.1: Breakdown of Scottish and English Kerbcraft Co-ordinators and RSOs participating in survey rounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TRANCHE 1</th>
<th>TRANCHE 2</th>
<th>TRANCHE 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All co-ordinators</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish co-ordinators</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All RSOs</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish RSOs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to a later training date there were no Scottish co—ordinators available in post to respond to the first round of survey questionnaires

The available demographic information from co-ordinators and a selection of comments on Kerbcraft from Scottish co-ordinators and RSOs are presented below.

**Co-ordinator Profile**

Kerbcraft co-ordinators in Scotland were predominantly female and aged between 22 years and 50 years (age data is not available for all co-ordinators). Table 3C.2 below shows the gender distribution for all co-ordinators employed by local authorities across the lifetime of all three Kerbcraft tranches.

3C.2: Gender distribution of Scottish Co-ordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tranche</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tranche 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tranche 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tranche 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout Scottish and English national pilot schemes, there were times when co-ordinators left or were absent from their posts for long periods of time. There were a number of reasons for this: promotion within their department; leaving for a permanent post elsewhere; long-term illnesses and other personal reasons. This obviously had a knock-on effect on the amount of training which was delivered to children during these absence periods, as either training had to be covered by another member of staff or was suspended until the co-ordinator returned or was replaced. As the appointment of a dedicated and capable co-ordinator was acknowledged by RSOs as central to the success of any Kerbcraft scheme, the negative impact of prolonged absences has clear implications for management with regard to recruitment, training and support of new staff in future schemes.

**Comments from Kerbcraft co-ordinators and RSOs in Scotland**

In general, co-ordinators and RSOs from Scotland reported very positive views on and experiences of their participation in the Kerbcraft pilot programme. The comments below give a flavour of Scottish schemes along with some of the challenges encountered.
“I am enjoying this pilot very much and feel after so many years working in nursery education that this has to be the best road safety training ever! I hope it will continue for many years.” (Scottish co-ordinator T3)

“Time spent on Kerbcraft is minimal as scheme well documented, co-ordinator can apply it with little supervision, does have unrestricted access to me though should she require assistance”. (Scottish RSO T2)

Talking about the co-ordinator “Appointed person who has performed well as expected, get the benefit in community with continued local press coverage”. (Scottish RSO T2)

“Some schools are positive, welcoming and helpful. Others are awkward and reluctant. [There] appears to be a breakdown in communication in some schools. Sometimes have to follow up return of consent forms – some admin staff don’t return them to Kerbcraft as a matter of course”. (Scottish co-ordinator T2)

In relation to methods used to recruit volunteers “[We used a] local paper article [and] posters in Community Centre”. (Scottish co-ordinator T2)

“Implementing Kerbcraft in the National Curriculum would be a major component to road safety – children will understand the dangers they face on a daily basis.” (Scottish co-ordinator T2)

“Like most other Co-ordinators I would like to see scheme being fully supported by the Dept of Transport/Scottish Executive for another 3 yrs at least, to see if there is a benefit from such a scheme”. (Scottish co-ordinator T3)

“Disclosure Scotland Act causing considerable delay in recruitment of volunteers.” (Scottish RSO T3)
SECTION 4D  HEAD TEACHER SURVEY

Rationale

This section comprises results from a survey of head teachers in Scottish schools participating in the national pilot of the Kerbcraft programme. Results from the overall survey cohort (England and Scotland) can be found within the main report; however a brief summary of the main outcomes is presented below.

A telephone survey of head teachers was undertaken to obtain the schools perspective on the setting up and delivery of the Kerbcraft scheme and the schools perception of the impact on participants. The qualitative data collected was used to inform the process evaluation of the Kerbcraft programme.

The study objectives were:

i) To investigate the setting up, management and maintenance of the schemes exploring reasons for success and failure at the local level.

ii) To determine the impact of the projects on schools, communities and volunteers.

iii) To explore potential means of sustaining the Kerbcraft training programme beyond the national pilot phase.

Method

Selection of schools

In February 2006, co-ordinators of all six Scottish Kerbcraft schemes involved in Tranche 3 were contacted and asked to provide details of those schools currently running the programme in their area. Five of the schemes responded with contact details for 49 schools. The number of schools involved in each area ranged from 8 to 11. The sixth scheme was not running at that stage. School details were fed into an Excel spreadsheet, arranged alphabetically by local authority and within each, alphabetically by school name. The first and third schools within each local authority were selected to be approached for interview. Contact was made with each co-ordinator to determine whether they foresaw any reason not to contact these schools (for example, an upcoming inspection by Her Majesty’s Inspector for Education (HMIE)) and if potential problems were identified, the school was substituted with the next one down on the alphabetical list. Two further schools were selected from the first two schemes with ten or more schools involved (giving a total of 12 schools). Co-ordinators were asked to provide the head teacher name, e-mail contact, school telephone number and address for all schools selected within their scheme.

Development and piloting of the telephone survey

The content of the telephone survey was informed by the objectives within the project proposal, the interview questions used within the case studies and the child development impact sheet. A copy of the interview schedule was sent to schools accompanied by a covering letter addressed to the head teacher explaining the interview process and a background information sheet. (Copies of all documentation can be found in Appendix E of
the main report) The first four interviews arranged within the national survey sample comprised the pilot phase. All interviews were audio-recorded with the permission of the respondent and full transcripts made of each.

The main survey sample
The main survey sample consisted of 12 Scottish schools (including the pilot sites) and included a minimum of two schools from each of the 5 schemes where co-ordinators had provided details. Schools were contacted by telephone and advised of the evaluation. A copy of the background information, the interview schedule and a covering letter introducing the evaluation team and outlining arrangements for interview were forwarded to the school by post or e-mail as they preferred. Head teachers were advised that the Research Officer would contact them in a few days to arrange a convenient date and time for interview. Interview arrangements were made by telephone contact, usually involving the respondent directly, with a minimum of three attempts being made to contact each school. With the permission of the interviewee, each conversation was audio recorded and the recording used to produce a typed transcript of the discussion. Original audio recordings were uploaded and saved in password-protected computer files. Following each interview, an e-mail was sent to the relevant co-ordinator to advise him/her that the interview had taken place and to provide general feedback on their involvement where appropriate.

Summary of key outcomes from overall evaluation (England and Scotland combined)

- 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, Walk to School events. It is inclusive and encourages partnership working.
- The programme encourages 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.
- Recruitment and retention of volunteers can present considerable challenges. Innovative recruitment methods and flexibility in delivery of training can help to overcome the initial reticence of potential volunteers.
- 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 amongst 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), whilst appointing a member of school staff as co-ordinator was less popular (40%).

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.

**Survey results from Scottish head teachers**

Responses from the Scottish sub-sample are presented below. Overall, these correlated well with those from the wider study group (England and Scotland combined).

**Profile of respondents**

No major changes were made to the interview schedule following the pilot phase. Interviews were conducted with nine of the twelve schools (75% of the sample identified). Eight of the interviews were audio-recorded. One school provided a written response to the survey. The duration of telephone interviews ranged between 9 and 23 minutes.

Eight of the respondents were head teachers, one was an assistant head teacher. The length of time they had held their current post was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of time in post</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 4 Years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 9 Years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 14 Years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 19 Years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 + Years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contextual information**

Respondents were asked whether the school has a current health education/health promotion policy and if so, whether this takes the form of a written document. Five reported that they had a written policy, two had a policy about to be written and two had no policy as yet.

Respondents were asked whether the school was currently approved as a health promoting school and whether or not reference was made to Kerbcraft within the supporting documentation for the initiative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health promoting school</th>
<th>Kerbcraft included</th>
<th>Working toward initiative</th>
<th>Not as yet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the nine schools indicated that they had other initiatives taking place which may influence children’s knowledge and road safety behaviour and therefore affect the influence of the Kerbcraft programme. These included:
- Junior RSO scheme (not mentioned by English schools)
- Professionals invited into school (road safety team, police)
- School travel plan
- Streetwise programme
- Walk to school events
- Cycling proficiency (targets older children than Kerbcraft)

Schools were asked if road safety had been a special interest area for them before they became involved in Kerbcraft. Eight indicated that it had been for reasons such as the location of the school (narrow streets, traffic congestion) or because it was seen as an important element of the school health agenda.

Schools were asked to indicate how (if at all) Kerbcraft builds on their school ethos. The responses are categorised below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of school ethos</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parental involvement</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical roadside learning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving outside agency/people</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarising children with own area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforcing safety</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Some respondents identified more than one category)

Only one school reported that they had an HMI visit whilst the Kerbcraft programme was running. Inspectors had spoken specifically to the co-ordinator during their visit. Six of the schools indicated that they had either made reference to Kerbcraft within their school evaluation documentation, or that they now intended to do so.

“I should, shouldn’t I because it is one of the good things we are doing and you have to blow your own trumpet”.

The pupil cohorts targeted by the programme were as follows:

- Primary 1                  1
- Primary 2                  1
- Primary 1 and 2             1
- Not known/stated            6

Setting Up, Management and Maintenance of Schemes

Support for Kerbcraft

Schools were asked a series of questions about the process of implementing the Kerbcraft programme, from inception to their current position within the training. Most reported that when participation in the programme was first discussed, school staff were supportive. One school reported that staff were initially curious to know how the Kerbcraft programme differed from conventional road safety education. The programme was regarded as supporting the school curriculum and appears to have fit well with wider road safety education as children progress through school. The practical approach taken generated enthusiasm and with advance notification of sessions, staff were able to plan their teaching to
accommodate the training. Two schools made particular mention of a lack of adequate supervision from their parent population and believed that the programme helped to address this.

None of the schools had received any objections from parents to their children taking part in the programme. One school had a couple of queries regarding the level of supervision of children outside school. Another school reported that the programme generated positive comments amongst their parents who were often indifferent to school initiatives.

Where School Boards were in place, they had been supportive of the programme. Similarly, Parent Teacher Associations had been happy with the initiative and in one school members of the PTA had trained as Kerbcraft volunteers.

Comments regarding the Kerbcraft co-ordinator were very positive and are listed below:

“Excellent”
“Top class, couldn’t have expected better”
“Super, lovely person. Very good, very efficient”
“Very good”
“Absolutely excellent – has knowledge and background”
“Excellent – very, very good”
“Super, really excellent support”
“Excellent, very well organised, good communication.”
“Fine”

**Delivering the training**

*Finding space in school*

Eight of the schools didn’t have a problem with allocating space for the training of volunteers or as an alternative to outdoor sessions if the weather was poor. Facilities such as the staff room, the medical room or space specifically allocated for parents’ activities had been utilised.

“If you want to make it happen, you can make it happen”.

One school had encountered difficulties as they were sharing a campus with another school and space was at a premium.

*Freeing up pupil time*

All of the schools reported that they had no particular difficulties in freeing up pupil time to enable them to participate in training. Teaching staff were praised for their flexibility and several schools mentioned that the value of the programme outweighed any inconvenience caused. Providing that staff were given advance notice of sessions, they were able to accommodate these within their planning. Conducting sessions at the start or end of the day also enabled parent volunteers to drop off/collection their own children at the same time.

*Recruiting volunteers*

The issue of recruiting volunteers generated much comment from schools. Although all schools had recruited and retained sufficient volunteers to enable them to run the programme,
several expressed a wish to have had greater numbers. Three schools mentioned that their volunteers were drawn from those individuals who usually helped out with school activities. The length of time taken to obtain Disclosure Scotland clearance, and parents with other commitments (for example working parents or those with younger children to care for) were cited as the major barriers to recruiting volunteers. One school indicated that some potential parental volunteers lacked the self-confidence to participate. Some schools reported that a small core of volunteers had stayed with the programme throughout, whilst in others, individuals had come and gone.

“Those you get are dedicated, the more they do, the more they enjoy it. They get into a routine”.

In one school, two of the initial volunteers had gone on to obtain paid work, necessitating the recruitment of replacements.

Resource implications
The majority of schools indicated that from their perspective there had been no cost implication in running the programme, or that it was so incidental that they were happy to absorb this. One of the schools identified minor costs associated with obtaining Disclosure Scotland checks for the volunteers.

General comments on implementation
General comments were invited regarding the implementation of the scheme. Five schools had nothing further to add. The comments received from three schools are reproduced below.

“No problems – volunteers have become part of the school furniture”

“Been very happy and hope it continues”

“If it worked out fine. Sessions changed depending on the weather”

One school reported on a recent complaint from a resident about car parking outside his home (staff had parked there for children to practice crossing skills). The incident had upset the co-ordinator.

Impact on Schools, Communities and Volunteers

General impact
Schools were asked about the general impact (if any) which they felt Kerbcraft had. The specific points raised are highlighted below. It was clear from the discussions that as most of the schools are running several interventions which could impact on road safety, it is not possible to directly determine the effect of the Kerbcraft programme in isolation. In addition, no attempt was made to capture feedback direct from the participants prior to speaking to the school representative and indications of the impact therefore relate to the perceptions of that individual and are in the main anecdotal.

- It was hoped that the programme had raised the importance of road safety amongst those involved.
• Difficulties in measuring the effectiveness of the programme at school level were acknowledged. One school indicated that they were seeking road accident statistics to support the programme.
• Anecdotal observations of children crossing roads at the start and end of the school day suggested an improvement in safer behaviour.
• Children benefit from the attention they receive whilst working with adults in small groups.
• Pupils enjoyed taking part in the programme.
• The perceived value of training taking place in the “real” road environment.

“One thing I really like about Kerbcraft is teaching children to cross between parked cars”

Two of the schools felt that it was too early to draw conclusions about the impact of the programme.

Impact on school policies
Schools were asked whether Kerbcraft had any specific effect on school policies. Six schools indicated that it was not possible to say at this stage. Three schools indicated that they would consider including Kerbcraft when reviewing their Health and Safety documentation.

“We were remiss. It should be there, it is a major part of the infants’ working week”

Two schools raised the point that they are reluctant to include Kerbcraft in long-term planning or policy because of the uncertainty surrounding future funding and provision.

Relationship between parents and schools
Four schools indicated that they considered Kerbcraft to have improved the relationship between parents and school. Four schools thought that there had been no change, one was not able to say.

One school reported that as part of the programme one of their parent volunteers had assisted in delivery of training at another school. This was perceived as a positive outcome for the individual involved as well as for the school to which they belonged.

Impact on way in which school is used/viewed by wider community
Six schools reported that they had received no feedback and were not aware of any change in the community perception of the school. Three schools indicated that there had been general interest or curiosity expressed by local residents when seeing the children out and about.

“People smile when they see the children in their little jackets”

Impact on children’s mode of travel to and from school and on parental attitudes to walking
Schools acknowledged that several factors influence the decision as to whether a child walks to/from school. These include:

• The nature of the school catchment area and how feasible it is for young children to walk the distance from home to school.
• Decision remains largely that of the parent and can depend on his/her time commitments after taking/collecting the child.
• Schools located in socially/economically deprived areas where car ownership is likely to be lower will result in higher numbers of children walking.
• Other initiatives aimed at promoting walking are operative in school, for example Walk to School Week, Junior Road Safety Officer Scheme.

The children targeted by Kerbcraft are aged 5-7 years and are likely to be accompanied to school by an adult. None of the schools interviewed indicated that they had seen any change in mode of travel as a result of the Kerbcraft programme.

Rating of respondent’s involvement and benefit of scheme to date
Respondents were asked to use a five point scale (1 = very little, 5 = a considerable amount) to indicate how much of their own time and effort they had to invest in running Kerbcraft. All respondents rated their level of involvement as 3 (mid-scale) or below. Specifically, five rated as 1 (very little), three respondents rated as 2 and one respondent as 3.

Using the same scale, respondents were asked to rate the benefits of running Kerbcraft to date. All of the respondents rated the benefits of the scheme as 3 or above (toward the higher end of the scale). Specifically, one respondent rated it 3, two respondents rated it 4 and six respondents rated it 5 (the maximum score). Where respondents rated between scores e.g. 2/3, the higher rating was taken for level of involvement and the lower rating for benefits of the scheme.

Factors for Success and Failure of Schemes

Factors for successful implementation of schemes
• School plays an active role in supporting and promoting Kerbcraft.
• Teaching staff are given advance notice of arrangements for pupil training sessions to enable them to plan their classroom time accordingly.
• Kerbcraft is seen as an opportunity to assist in delivery of other school-based initiatives, such as the School Travel Plan and the Health Promoting School programme.
• Kerbcraft fits in with the progression of road safety education in school.
• Role of the co-ordinator is key to the success of the programme. Particular qualities which schools value are previous experience in road safety, good interpersonal skills and an individual who is known to the school/community.
• Recruitment and retention of sufficient volunteers to enable programme to operate effectively.
• Provision of a welcoming environment in school for volunteer training to take place.

Barriers to successful implementation of schemes
• Insufficient volunteers recruited and/or lack of commitment or poor retention of volunteers.
• Length of time taken for Disclosure Scotland disclosures may cause delay to programme and reduce interest shown by school and/or potential volunteers.
Sustainability of Schemes

Five of the schools viewed Kerbcraft as an integral part of the wider school curriculum on road safety. Four schools saw it as a project which runs alongside everything else.

“We have come to know and love it”

Respondents were given three options as to how training might continue when the current pilot funding ceases and asks for their opinion on these.

Option 1 – Co-ordinator role taken on by member of school staff
Four schools reported that they would consider this option. Enabling factors included:

- Possibility of redeploying non-classroom based staff

“Time commitments, need to look creatively at how it would continue”

Five schools said that they would find this difficult or not possible. Barriers to this approach included:

- Lack of staff capacity/limitations on staff time owing to curricular pressures.
- Programme has better impact if run by professional with road safety expertise.

“…think it should be taken on by road safety in each area”

Option 2 – Parents running the scheme within school
Four schools reported that they would consider this option. Factors to be taken into account include the provision of adequate training to enable parents to fulfil their roles, and selection and participation of parents with the appropriate skills required.

“Could be very good or very bad depending on parents involved”

“If I chose and vetted the parents I’d be quite happy”

It was suggested that the scheme could be run by parents with a reduced input from the co-ordinator, enabling him/her to attend more schools on a less frequent basis. This type of approach had been used by one respondent in a previous school to deliver cycling proficiency training and had been well received.

Five schools did not see this approach as working for them. Barriers identified included:

- Lack of volunteer reliability – responsibility would then fall back on school staff.
- Programme needs professional involvement to carry weight.
- Concern about other parents views on this – volunteers would need to be accompanied by a professional
- Concern about the quality of the programme delivered year on year.

Option 3 – School consortium – buying in time/skills for a pool of volunteers
This proved to be the most popular option with seven of the schools considering this a possibility. Provisos were that there was funding available and the costs were reasonable,
that volunteers had received adequate training and that the programme fitted within the school development plan.

Individual comments included:

- Feeder schools could work together – benefits of collaboration
- Costs could be apportioned pro-rata amongst schools within consortium
- Good to work with parents from outside own area

Two schools reported that they would not find this model workable. The reasons stated included:

- The programme should be sponsored by the local authority or the government
- Uncomfortable about using volunteers from outside the immediate school community – also too mean to pay!
SECTION FIVE      COMMENTARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This report has shown that there are few differences in the manner in which the child pedestrian training programme was delivered and in the way it was received in Scotland, compared with England. Road Safety Officers and co-ordinators found it operable in a range of challenging environments (including across a large rural area) and it was generally well received by the schools, volunteers and children involved. The key ingredients for the successful implementation of the programme were similar to those identified in the broader study: the quality of the co-ordinator, the supply of volunteers and the co-operation of schools.

The programme clearly reflects the ethos of the Scottish education system and was readily combined with existing initiatives, such as the Junior Road Safety Officer scheme, to reinforce general road safety messages across the whole school. The Scottish curriculum encourages schools to undertake health education initiatives which promote partnership between schools and the local community and Kerbcraft has provided an opportunity for many schools in Scotland’s most deprived areas to develop better community partnerships. Feedback from Scottish schemes and participating schools suggests a strong desire to sustain Kerbcraft in Scotland in the future, and that there are a number of alternative strategies for consideration including: making central funding available; schools consortium funding of blocks of training from authority personnel and provision of support and training for schools to undertake the scheme themselves.

The evaluation of the national child pedestrian training programme, in both Scotland and England, 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 (which was only funded in a sample of English schemes) confirm the earlier findings of the (Scottish) Drumchapel pilot scheme, but this time in a larger and more disparate sample.

The overall 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.
SECTION SIX
FUTURE DELIVERY OF KERBCRAFT TRAINING

• The behavioural gains children achieved were observed when the programme was delivered in line with current recommendations relating to the amount of training received: 4-6 Safe Places sessions; 4 Parked Cars and 4-6 Junctions sessions.
• The process evaluation confirmed the importance of including a “practical” roadside element within child pedestrian safety training. Schemes that are conducted solely indoors will not have the same impact on children’s skills and understanding of crossing roads.
• 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 study recommends training according to the current adult-child ratios for each skill to maximise the learning outcomes for all children involved.
• Anecdotal evidence has shown that children with moderate learning or behavioural difficulties can participate in and will benefit from inclusion in Kerbcraft training. Inclusion of children with special needs/additional support needs should always be arranged in agreement with the head teacher; included in the risk assessment process and sensitively monitored and supervised by the scheme manager/co-ordinator. The study recommends that children with additional/special needs are accompanied by their designated classroom assistant/learning support teacher or a familiar adult when training.
• The Kerbcraft programme has highlighted the importance of delivering training at each stage of the intervention – to co-ordinators, to volunteers and to pupils. Co-ordinators should be aware of individual differences in learning style and need for support in adults and children and leave sufficient time within their training timetables to accommodate appropriate support for volunteer trainers and adequate training sessions for children.
• Schools are likely to be more amenable and supportive toward road safety training when this reinforces current educational and curricular links. Co-ordinators who developed strong personal relationships with school staff and who showed their own enthusiasm for the project found schools more willing to support and engage fully in the Kerbcraft programme.
• Challenges relating to ethnicity, deprivation and rurality/physical environment can be overcome and examples are provided in the report of this. 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 keen and returning 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. Other means of providing supported training to schools include charging schools for volunteers training and set-up time.
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