**Road Safety Evaluation Fund**

**Funding Application Form**

The road safety evaluation fund is open to all road safety partners and organisations (both public and professional associations), registered charities and university departments across Scotland. Private commercial enterprise, Community Interest Companies and not for profit businesses will be considered for funding providing that it can be demonstrated that the schemes or initiatives proposed for retrospective evaluation are for charitable activity and for the public benefit and meet the road safety evaluation fund criteria.

Evaluation is at the heart of all we do, providing clear evidence of the effectiveness and the road safety impact schemes or interventions are having in Scotland.

Funding is subject to the Road Safety Framework Funds being made available each financial year.

**Retrospective Evaluation Funding Criteria**

The criteria for a successful application are as follows:

* The road safety initiative must be running for a period of 2 years or longer.
* The road safety initiative must be evaluated by an independent evaluator.
* The road safety initiative should support Scotland’s Road Safety Framework’s commitments and have developed approaches, knowledge or learning around Road Safety.
* The road safety initiative has clear objectives and long-term outcomes and a good understanding of the Road Safety issues to be addressed.
* The proposal should state clearly how it demonstrate road safety benefits to the public.
* There should be a clear indication of costs for retrospective evaluation .
* The proposal should include a clear programme and timetable for evaluation containing the achievement of the project objectives and broader impact.
* \*The agreement for Transport Scotland to publish the evaluation.

**Limitations**

Funding will not be issued where:

* The application is deemed to have a clear profit motive.
* The application is deemed to be focused on exploitable \*\*intellectual property (IP) and the public benefit is not clear
* Applications are of a party political nature or likely to be in breach of laws relating to equality and opportunity.

**For further information contact the Road Safety Policy Team on 0131 244 6345 or e-mail on** **roadsafety@transport.gov.scot**

**Fully completed application forms should be returned to** **roadsafety@transport.gov.scot**

\* Requests for further dissemination of the work in professional journals or at conferences will be determined on a case by case basis.

\*\* Ideas and concepts are termed Intellectual Property (IP)

|  |
| --- |
| Road Safety Evaluation Fund Application  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of Applicant(s) |  |
| Name of Applicant(s) Organisation |  |
| Contact E-mail Address  |  |
| Contact Phone Number |  |
| Details of Scheme/Initiative |
| Name of Initiative(s) to evaluate  |  |
| Location(s) of Initiative (key sites) |  |
| Start date of the Initiative (Project must have been running for 2 year or more) |  |
| Name of the Independent Evaluator  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Provide details of the Road Safety Framework (RSF) commitment(s) which your project relates to – see annex A - commitments for the Priority Focus Areas at end of document. |
|  |
| Provide a history and overview of the scheme/initiative (s) to be evaluated - Max. 1000 words |
| Details should include:* The Road safety issues that were / continue to be addressed
* The main aims, objectives and long-term outcomes
* Has the scheme/initiative been altered or developed since starting
* What was the benefit to the public regarding road safety
* For schemes/initiatives funded through the Road safety Framework Fund, provide a summary of the evaluation undertaken at the end of the funding period
 |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Evaluation Programme & Timescale |
| Provide a programme and timetable containing of a clear description of the methodology you will use to deliver the evaluation. Outlining the initial baseline for which you are measuring effectiveness, including targets and milestones throughout, which are key points in the evaluation. This should also contain the achievement of the project objectives and any broader impact. Provide details of the expected timescale of the evaluation to be completed. |
|  |
| Costs for Evaluation  |
| Evaluation Funding requested | £ |
| Please note - For auditing purposes an invoice will be requested if funding is approved  |

|  |
| --- |
| Closing statement -Max. 100 words |
| Outline why you are applying for evaluation funding, together with any further relevant information.  |
|  |

**Annex A - Road Safety Framework Commitments for Priority Focus Areas**

To meet the targets, the Framework set out 96 commitments, whose achievement would denote the extent of Framework delivery. Outlined below are the commitments for the Priority Focus Areas.

|  |
| --- |
| Priority Focus Area - Speed |
| **Overarching Outcome - Speed** |
| Priority 1 | * (RSF) 19: Continue to publicise and educate people about the risks associated with speeding.
* RSF 20: Continue to raise awareness of speed limits and their purpose, including those that apply to different types of vehicle on the different categories of roads.
* RSF 71: Encourage local authorities to implement any changes indicated by their review of speed limits and continue to monitor networks in order to identify changes where these may support casualty reduction.
* RSF 74: Encourage local authorities to introduce 20mph zones or limits in residential areas and areas of towns or cities with a high volume of pedestrians and cyclists as set out in the 2015 Good Practice guide on 20mph Speed restrictions.
 |
| Priority 2 | * RSF 21: Continue to support the Safety Camera Programme.
* RSF 72: Consider if the introduction of a Speed Awareness Scheme focused on speeding would be an appropriate contribution to road safety in Scotland.
 |
| Priority 3 | * RSF 69: Support the voluntary use of Intelligent Speed Adaptation (ISA) and other technologies designed to encourage compliance with speed limits, through engagement with employers and the commercial sector.
* RSF 70: Further develop the evidence base to support consideration of a pilot in Scotland to test out the effectiveness of speed limiting technologies.
* RSF 73: Provide information on the benefits of lower speed driving in relation to fuel efficiency, health impacts and road safety
 |
| **Overarching Outcome - Motorcycles** |
| Priority 1 | * RSF 76: Provide support for motorcyclists, e.g. through advanced rider training schemes and raise awareness of bad or dangerous riding behaviour, through safety awareness initiatives such as Operation Zenith
 |
| Priority 2 | * RSF 77: Through RSS, support targeted publicity campaigns aimed at motorcyclists.
* RSF 92: Consider the needs and vulnerabilities of motorcyclists in developing motorcycle-friendly roads and roadsides where this may support casualty reduction, while ensuring that motorcycle safety is fully considered when other traffic calming schemes are introduced.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Priority Focus Area - Age |
| **Overarching Outcome - Pre-drivers** |
| Priority 1 | * RSF 79: Seek to influence young people’s attitudes to road safety and future driving behaviour before they get behind the wheel and investigate the usage and delivery by schools of pre-driver educational intervention and event training resources such as and including “Get into Gear” in supporting their effectiveness.
 |
| Priority 2 | * RSF 80: Support outcomes-based evaluation of pre-driver interventions with a view to further developing a guide to organising pre-driver events for senior secondary school pupils.
 |
| Priority 3 | * RSF 29: Support the promotion of and encourage take up of the safe road user award and evaluate the uptake and completion of the course.
 |
| **Overarching Outcome - 17-25 year old drivers** |
| Priority 1 | * RSF 09: Continue to look for innovative ways to target younger drivers with appropriate messages, including effective social media platforms, about safe driving to increase their awareness and understanding of their vulnerability and the dangers they face due to age and inexperience.
 |
| Priority 2 | * RSF 60: Encourage younger drivers to undergo post-test training, by engaging with the private sector including the insurance industry to explore incentivisation, and to support national coordination of the use of outcomes-based evaluation of post-test training.
 |
| Priority 3 | * RSF 61: Encourage initiatives which lead to qualifications and safer driving attitudes and behaviours and explore flexible delivery and certification approaches to increase uptake.
 |
| **Overarching Outcome - Older drivers** |
| Priority 1 | * RSF 83: Support initiatives to raise awareness amongst older drivers and their families, of their vulnerability and ways in which they can address this in order to make informed choices about safe driving.
 |
| Priority 2 | * RSF 95: Investigate and support ways to promote and facilitate initiatives relating to further accredited or certified training for older drivers including incentivisation to do this.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Priority Focus Area - Vulnerable road users |
| **Overarching Outcome - Cyclists** |
| Priority 1 | * RSF 27: Ensure that all road users receive appropriate education and training to encourage safer cycling in the road environment, including journeys to and from school and in residential areas.
 |
| Priority 2 | * RSF 28: Continue to monitor and develop Bikeability resources for dissemination to those responsible for co-ordinating the Bikeability programme.
* RSF 93: Ensure cyclists are considered in new road and maintenance schemes, through the implementation of the Trunk Road Cycling Initiative and the standards and advice contained in “Cycling by Design 2010”, where the (re-) design of identified higher risk road locations such as junctions may contribute to the reduction of casualty numbers.
 |
| Priority 3 | * RSF 78: Encourage the wearing of correctly fitted helmets.
 |
| **Overarching Outcome - Pedestrians** |
| Priority 1 | * RSF 74: Encourage local authorities to introduce 20 mph zones or limits in residential areas and areas of towns or cities with a high volume of pedestrians and cyclists as set out in the 2015 Good Practice Guide on 20 mph Speed Restrictions.
 |
| Priority 2 | * RSF 75: Investigate whether alcohol is playing a greater part in pedestrian casualties and, if it is, consider what we can do to reverse the trend.
* NEW: Conduct further research to enhance the evidence base for elderly pedestrian casualties which may allow consideration of further measures that will help to reduce casualties, taking into account the impact of an ageing population.
 |
| Priority 3 | * RSF 24: Encourage the implementation of the guidance for Scottish roads authorities on designing streets, focusing on the needs of pedestrians, and investigate the levels of its adoption and usage.
 |