

ETHNOS

RESEARCH AND
CONSULTANCY

**WORKING WITH COMMUNITIES TO REDUCE
ROAD TRAFFIC INJURY INEQUALITIES IN LONDON**

EVALUATION OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

ETHNOS



ETHNOS

RESEARCH AND
CONSULTANCY

**WORKING WITH COMMUNITIES TO REDUCE
ROAD TRAFFIC INJURY INEQUALITIES IN LONDON**

EVALUATION OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

ETHNOS

Marie-Claude Gervais
Natalia Concha
ETHNOS Research & Consultancy
www.ethnos.co.uk

November 2008

Acknowledgements

ETHNOS would like to express its gratitude to the London Road Safety Unit at Transport for London.

We would also like to extend our thanks to the road safety professionals and the partner organisations who took part in the demonstration projects, shared their views and experiences with us, and otherwise worked to ensure that the evaluation would capture relevant lessons from the projects.

Finally, we would like to thank all the community members who took part in the demonstration projects and enabled us to learn from their experience.

Disclaimer

The views expressed in this report are those of ETHNOS. They may not necessarily reflect those of the London Road Safety Unit at Transport for London.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0.	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1.	Background	1
1.2.	Aims and objectives of the LRSU programme of work	2
2.0.	APPROACH TO THE EVALUATION	3
2.1.	Aims of the evaluation	3
2.2.	Theory of change guiding the evaluation	3
2.3.	Evaluation plan	5
2.4.	Data sources	6
2.5.	Evaluation criteria	6
2.6.	Reflections on the evaluation process	8
3.0.	THE DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS	10
3.1.	Selection of the demonstration projects	10
3.2.	Overview of demonstration projects	10
3.3.	Variations between projects	12
3.4.	LRSU support to projects	13
4.0.	FINDINGS	14
4.1.	Introduction	14
4.2.	Road safety and wider benefits	14
4.3.	Partnership	21
4.4.	Community engagement	25
4.5.	Sustainability	28
4.6.	Value for money and added value	29
5.0.	OPERATIONAL FACTORS AND SUCCESS FACTORS	31
5.1.	Introduction	31
5.2.	Operational factors	31
5.3.	Success factors	36
5.4.	Conclusions	36

TABLES

Table 1: Theory of change for “Community Engagement to Reduce Road Traffic Injury Inequalities” Programme	4
Table 2: Overview of seven demonstration projects	11
Table 3: Road safety benefits of demonstration projects for the participants	18
Table 4: Social capital benefits derived from the projects	19

APPENDIX

Appendix 1: Description of the demonstration projects	ii
---	----

1.0. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background

The London Road Safety Unit (LRSU) is responsible for implementing London's road safety plan and seeing that London achieves the Mayor of London's road casualty reduction targets.

Despite large and sustained casualty reductions over recent years in London, not everyone has benefited equally from road safety improvements. People from minority ethnic backgrounds and people living in deprived communities continue to be disproportionately affected by traffic injuries¹. Current road safety approaches may not be reaching these communities. Given that nearly 40% of Londoners are from black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) backgrounds and that there are large areas of deprivation in inner London, it is urgent to devise targeted and tailored interventions to reduce road traffic casualties in these groups.

The current LRSU programme therefore aims to support road safety professionals in their work to reduce road traffic injury inequalities in London. It builds upon a considerable body of evidence of good practice in public health and other sectors, which demonstrates that community-based work is often necessary to reach and engage people who do not access mainstream services. It also integrates lessons from, and complements, the work carried out as part of the national Neighbourhood Road Safety Initiative (NRSI) to reduce road traffic casualty rates in deprived areas. The NRSI's main focus was "to develop a holistic approach to road safety in disadvantaged areas by encouraging partnership working to undertake complementary programmes of work that would directly or indirectly improve the road safety of all road users in the community"². The NRSI can therefore be "regarded as a regeneration initiative with a strong road safety component"³. The current LRSU programme focuses less explicitly on area regeneration, and more directly on working with specific minority ethnic and deprived communities that may be especially hard-to-reach, in order to reduce road traffic injury inequalities.

The focus on communities requires that road safety professionals develop the necessary skills to support this new way of working. Indeed, recent research found that while enthusiasm and commitment are high amongst road safety practitioners, the resources and skills necessary to develop community-based interventions based on multi-agency partnerships are often lacking⁴. The LRSU therefore undertook to fund a number of demonstration projects and to provide them with opportunities to develop their skills and expertise in working with communities. The demonstration projects were supported by new Guidelines on Working with Communities to Reduce Road Traffic Injury Inequalities in London, and by a dedicated Community Development Specialist within the LRSU who offered one-to-one help and advice to individual projects. They

¹ Edwards, P.; Green, J.; Roberts, I; Grundy, C, and Lachowycz, K. (2006) *Deprivation and Road Safety in London: A report to the London Road Safety Unit*. London: LSHTM. And Steinbach, R., Edwards, P., Green, J., and Grundy, C. (2007). *Road Safety of London's Black and Asian Minority Ethnic Groups: A report to the London Road Safety Unit*. London: LSHTM.

² Hayes, M.; Towner, E.; Towner, J.; Pilkington, P. & Ward, H. (2007) *Widening the Reach of Road Safety: Emerging practice in road safety in disadvantaged communities*, Child Accident Prevention Trust, University of the West of England and University College London; p.3.

³ *Idem*, p.3.

⁴ Edwards *et al.* (2006)

were also evaluated by an independent agency to ensure that road safety professionals received ongoing feedback on their activities throughout the life of the projects, that their activities and experiences were systematically documented, and that the wider road safety community in London will be able to learn from their experiences.

1.2. Aims and objectives of the LRSU programme of work

The LRSU aims to provide London road safety practitioners with practical guidelines and support to carry out community engagement initiatives, in order to improve road safety for communities who are most at injury risk and would benefit from interventions tailored specifically for them.

This aim is underpinned by the following objectives:

- to carry out primary research to identify social groups and geographical areas at risk;
- to review the literature on community engagement with ethnic minority and deprived communities, both within and outside the context of road safety;
- to develop draft Guidelines on Working with Communities to Reduce Road Traffic Injury Inequalities in London;
- to fund and support seven community engagement projects to reduce injury inequalities;
- to evaluate the projects in order to draw key lessons;
- to review the Guidelines based on the learning acquired through the evaluation; and
- to develop and deliver training to London road safety practitioners around community engagement to reduce ethnic and economic inequalities in road traffic injuries

The current report focuses exclusively on the generic findings of the evaluation of the seven community engagement projects. It discusses mainly the overall experiences of the projects, with a view to identifying what are the key barriers and success factors which road safety professionals may need to take into account in planning future community-based work. It aims to integrate the lessons across the seven demonstration projects⁵.

It should be stressed that the current report only covers the work of the borough teams in relation to the one year demonstration projects that were funded as part of the LRSU programme and makes no reference to the rest of the work carried out by road safety teams.

This final report based on activities carried out until the end of July 2008.

⁵ However, each demonstration project also received bespoke interim and final evaluation reports which covered the issues specific to each. These individual reports identify the evidence on which the evaluation is based, document all the activities conducted by road safety professionals and their partners, their capacity, the difficulties they faced and how these were overcome. These reports were intended for internal use only.

2.0. APPROACH TO THE EVALUATION

2.1. Aims of the evaluation

The aims of the overall evaluation are:

- to document the activities carried out by the community engagement projects;
- to provide feedback to projects;
- to identify the barriers and success factors in each project;
- to test out and revise the Guidelines based on the findings of the evaluation;
- to support the development of training for road safety professionals.

2.2. Theory of change guiding the evaluation

A theory of change is a tool to help service planners, deliverers or evaluators think about and make explicit their assumptions about the change that is expected to result from interventions^{6,7}. In this case, the development of a theory of change is used by the evaluators to focus on key components of the demonstration projects that are expected to produce longer-term reduction in road traffic injuries among people from BAME and deprived communities in London.

Having a clear theory of change in mind from the outset is particularly useful in the case of interventions where real impacts, such as reductions in road traffic casualties or in injury severity among people from BAME backgrounds and/or in areas of deprivation, are unlikely to be evidenced over the lifetime of the demonstration projects because:


- it takes time for interventions to achieve their full impact;
- the number of people exposed to the interventions is too small to have a measurable impact on casualty figures and other relevant statistics;
- it is difficult to isolate the impact on the programme itself from other factors; and
- the real impacts may be indirect, for instance through the influence of the people exposed to the interventions on their families and peers.

Thus, the evaluation of the programme needs to be based on assumptions regarding the impact which the demonstration projects are likely to have (all other things being equal and over an extended period of time) on knowledge, attitudes, skills, behaviours among the project participants and their wider community, as well as the impact that the planning and delivering the interventions is likely to have on road safety professionals. This is a key function of the theory of change in evaluation research. The evaluators developed the following theory of change for this programme:

⁶ Fulbright-Anderson, K., Kubisch, A. & Connell, J. (Eds.) (1998). *New Approaches to Evaluating Community Initiatives*, Vol. 2. New York: The Aspen Institute.

⁷ Sullivan, H., Gillanders, G., Goss, S. & Steele, J. (2006). *Developing a 'Theory of Change' to Evaluate Local Public Service Agreements*, HMSO: DCLG.

Table 1: Theory of change for “Working with Communities to Reduce Road Traffic Injury Inequalities in London” programme

Programme components	Intermediate effects	Outcomes	Impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> primary research to identify ethnic groups and geographical areas at risk literature review on community engagement with ethnic minority and deprived communities, to identify good practice draft Guidelines on Community Engagement to Reduce Injury Inequalities piloting of seven community engagement projects to reduce injury inequalities evaluation of the projects review of the Guidelines based on evaluation findings development of capacity among RS professionals in relation to community engagement and inequalities: training and experience dissemination of good practice among RS professionals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> greater sensitivity to the issue of ethnic and economic inequalities, and increased motivation to tackle inequalities among RSOs better insights into the causes of inequalities in RS identification of possible target groups and areas identification of potential approaches development of project management and community engagement skills among RSOs identification of partners and good working relations with partners access to new communities and long-term mechanisms to carry on engagement 	<p>target audiences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> greater awareness of road safety in general and road traffic injury inequalities increased awareness and knowledge of RS: road layout and signs, in-car safety (overcrowding, seatbelt use, speed), pedestrian skills (green-cross code, using adequate road crossings, managing busy or complex roads, looking after young children or siblings, etc), cycling and motorcycling skills better awareness of own lifestyle factors that contribute to putting oneself or others at risk greater familiarity with and trust of statutory agencies in groups where this is often severely lacking enhanced self-esteem, feeling of achievement and social recognition some ownership of road safety issues in local communities new social networks development of a wide range of transferable skills, including project management, advocacy, communications, research <p>RSOs and partners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> new ways of working and skills reach into communities innovation and applicability of resources developed wider dissemination engagement structures to facilitate long-term access to services lasting partnerships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More people in ethnic minority and deprived communities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> are aware of and knowledgeable about RS have adequate RS skills behave safely on the road are empowered to take ownership of road safety RS professionals are better able to engage communities around inequalities Project partners are better informed about road safety and have greater capacity to engage local communities <div style="text-align: center; margin: 10px 0;">  </div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px; text-align: center;"> <p>The number of casualties and the severity of injuries among BAME people and in deprived communities decrease and the inequalities gap closes</p> </div>

2.3. Evaluation plan

The evaluation was planned and delivered as follows:

Phase I: Start up

The main activities carried out by ETHNOS during Phase I were:

- to prepare and deliver a presentation to London Road Safety Officers on “community engagement” to clarify expectations of road safety teams interested in submitting a bid;
- to gather evidence pertaining to the bidding process: LRSU guidance, submissions from projects, scoring sheets, etc.;
- to take part in the selection panel and in the decision to fund projects or to invite them to resubmit their bids;
- to give a presentation on the evaluation framework and requirements to funded projects; and
- to carry out an initial round of visits to funded projects, in order to clarify the nature of each project, discuss community engagement and development in the context of each project, reiterate the aims of the evaluation and the role of ETHNOS, explain reporting mechanisms, discuss possible performance indicators, and discuss potential evaluation strategies for each project.

Phase II: Development of instruments of data collection

The main activities carried out by ETHNOS during Phase II were:

- to produce logbooks for projects to document project management and community engagement activities, achievements, difficulties encountered, capacity development needs, lessons, etc.;
- to develop an interview schedule for monthly telephone or face-to-face interviews with project leads to track progress; and
- to work with relevant projects to create or advise on tailored surveys, questionnaires, topic guides, observations schedules according to the nature of their activities.

Phase III: Tracking of activities and data collection for formative evaluation

The main activities carried out by ETHNOS during Phase III were:

- to document progress through monthly telephone or face-to-face interviews;
- to request documentation from projects: bids/revised bids, minutes of meetings, logbooks of activities, Equality Impact Assessments, performance indicators, timetable of activities, surveys, etc.;
- to attend and assess community engagement activities, when informed and invited;
- to attend Steering Group and management meetings, when informed and invited;
- to analyse the evidence collected from projects and to invite projects to supply any missing information;
- to prepare and deliver a presentation on the generic findings of the interim evaluation to road safety professionals, academics and stakeholders;
- to produce detailed interim individual evaluation reports for each of the seven demonstration projects;

- to produce a detailed interim generic evaluation report that covers cross-cutting issues experienced from the projects; and
- to meet with all the projects to discuss their interim individual evaluation reports.

Phase IV: Production of final evaluation reports

The main activities carried out by ETHNOS during Phase IV were:

- to revise interim progress reports based on interim evaluation meeting with road safety teams;
- to conduct a final focus group discussion with representatives of all projects about their experience of community engagement;
- to analyse new evidence collected individually from projects;
- to continue to invite projects to supply any missing documentation;
- to produce final reports for each project and to circulate these to LRSU for feedback and input;
- to revise final evaluation reports and circulate these to the boroughs for their road safety units, partners and their local authorities; and
- to invite projects to provide written feedback where considered necessary

Throughout the evaluation, ETHNOS has produced detailed monthly progress reports to the LRSU, documenting all its activities.

2.4. Data sources

The evaluation is based on evidence from three sources:

- the demonstration projects: this includes such evidence as submissions for the bidding process and later revisions, performance indicators, completed logbooks of activities, timetables, notes of meetings, resources developed, video documentation of consultation events, evaluation of community engagement events, etc.
- ETHNOS: this includes monthly interviews with each project, detailed notes of meetings with projects, visits to projects, observations at training sessions or engagement events, evaluation questionnaires, etc.
- LRSU: this includes bidding guidance, data on inequalities, training workshops on Equality Impact Assessments, meetings with LRSU, minutes of meetings, etc.

2.5. Evaluation criteria

Each community engagement project has received a bespoke evaluation that focuses on their distinct aims and objectives, methods and resources, target audiences and performance indicators. However, all evaluation activities were guided by a common evaluation framework, which was broadly derived from the criteria set out in the bidding guidance and detailed in the Guidelines. These were:

- **road safety and wider benefits**

The evaluation looked for good use of evidence to identify the target audience, intervention, area, both at project inception stage and throughout the life of projects. The aim was to

ensure that the proposed road safety intervention met identified needs in an appropriate fashion.

The evaluation considered the road safety benefits derived from the projects (e.g. increases in knowledge, awareness, skills as vulnerable road users; greater use of seat belts or car seats; greater respect for driving speed limits; shifts in modes of transport towards healthier and more sustainable options). It also considered the wider social capital benefits derived from the projects⁸. In the context of the demonstration projects, social capital refers to such things as the skills and abilities, social networks within and between communities, understanding of wider social norms and expectations, trust of statutory agencies, capacity development in community and voluntary sector organisations, etc. that accrue from taking part in community engagement activities.

The evaluation looked at the number of people from the target audience who were involved in the intervention, as well as at the depth of engagement carried out with them. It also sought to determine if the intervention is likely to have long-term positive outcomes for the target communities.

- **community engagement**

The requirement of engaging communities around road safety stems from research evidence of inequalities by ethnicity and deprivation levels, from the legal duty to be proactive in addressing discrimination and in promoting good relations between communities, and from recognition that mainstream education, training and publicity (ETP) approaches do not always reach into and succeed with at risk groups.

The evaluation looked for evidence that projects were working closely and productively with communities either to raise awareness and knowledge of road safety and injury inequalities, to identify local road safety issues and needs, to change attitudes, behaviours and social norms around road safety, or to empower people to take ownership of road safety issues and to drive the agenda for change in their community. It looked at the adequacy of community engagement activities (methods used, depth, breadth and scale of intervention) and their likely impact on the target audience.

- **partnership working**

Most road traffic injury inequalities are caused by a combination of factors and have repercussions across many areas of people's lives. Some Road Safety Officers may not have all the tools necessary to reach into at risk communities and to deliver tailored ETP without the support of partners who know the communities well. It is therefore important to create sustainable partnerships to address road traffic injury inequalities. The criteria used to evaluate this dimension focuses on the relevance and quality of the partners, the extent to which partners had complementary skills and resources, the quality of the working relations between partners, the economies or inefficiencies found in the partnership, the impact of the partnership (in terms of capacity, reach, outcomes), and the anticipated sustainability of the partnership.

- **sustainability**

The evaluation was looking for evidence of sustainability in terms of, for instance, enhanced capacity of road safety team (new ways of working and skills, understanding of inequalities,

⁸ Social capital is a term used to capture the non-economic resources individuals and communities have to enhance their wellbeing (Putnam, 2001).

reach into communities), enhanced capacity in the target communities (greater awareness, knowledge and skills around road safety, new social networks, greater confidence and empowerment), innovation and applicability (originality and likelihood of project being rolled out elsewhere), dissemination (launches, articles, conferences, resources), mainstreaming of relevant learning and activities (through changes in working practices and organisational structures), access to new or matched funding, and embedment in local strategic partnerships and community networks.

- **value for money and added value**

Value for money and added value are notoriously difficult to measure, especially in relation to small scale interventions where performance indicators are largely qualitative. ETHNOS planned to assess value for money and added value in terms of a loose internal benchmarking process, by comparing the performance of the seven demonstration projects in relation to all the above criteria. However, even this approach could not be fully implemented, as there was often too little information about the outcomes and impacts of the demonstration projects by the end of the evaluation period. Many projects did not deliver all their planned work during their first year of funding and carried their work over to the coming year. And some projects did not have any outcome or impact assessments linked to their activities. In this context, robust assessments of value for money and added value cannot be made.

The main aim of the evaluation was to capture learning in a systematic way to inform the development of future community engagement work. This is intended to support road safety professionals in their efforts to tackle injury inequalities in London. ETHNOS sought to capture such learning by identifying the strengths and weaknesses of projects, the difficulties they encountered, the reasons why some projects were more or less successful at planning, facilitating or delivering community engagement, the organisational context that may have accounted for different outcomes, and any other aspects deemed relevant to the aims of the evaluation. This will then be used to feed into revised Guidelines that will be disseminated to all road safety practitioners in London and be accompanied by relevant training.

2.6. Reflections on the evaluation process

- **Collaboration with the evaluation**

Although all demonstration projects were aware that collaboration with the evaluation was a condition of funding, not all projects were equally supportive of the evaluation process. The majority of projects understood the importance of the evaluation, were diligent in documenting their activities throughout, willingly submitted project information to ETHNOS, and reported having learned a great deal from the process of taking part in the evaluation (through formal and informal meetings with other projects, discussions of performance indicators and working protocols, discussions of their individual evaluation reports, participation in workshops and in the final focus group discussion). A few were less willing or able to collaborate with the evaluation. This is not uncommon. However, it means that the quality and quantity of information submitted were variable.

- **Capacity and its impact on the evaluation**

The variable level of collaboration with the evaluation is largely related to capacity issues. As discussed later, all Road Safety Officers found the demonstration projects much more time-consuming and demanding than they had anticipated. Most projects lacked capacity in one form or another (e.g. staff, money, time, managerial support, project management skills,

community engagement experience). In these circumstances, it is not surprising that some RSOs should have prioritised delivering on their main community engagement work, at the expense of delivering on evaluation-related activities. This limited the value of the evaluation.

Some of the requirements of the evaluation may also have been too onerous. All RSOs felt that the completion of logbooks of activities was too much of a burden. To reflect this, the logbooks were dropped from the evaluation plan in February (although one borough carried on completing them). Equally, some RSOs also felt that the provision of feedback on the draft Guidelines and their participation in monthly telephone interviews were too time-consuming. However, the evaluation team took the view that the validity and robustness of the evaluation would have been compromised had these components been abandoned.

- **Gaps in the evaluation**

There is a necessary trade-off between, on the one hand, gathering high-quality, exhaustive information and, on the other, not burdening the projects with the evaluation. ETHNOS sought to maintain a reasonable balance between these conflicting requirements. While we repeatedly asked all projects to facilitate meetings with project participants for us to evaluate, this did not always take place. Similarly, while we asked most projects to meet their project partners and attend their steering groups meetings, this did not always take place. In our judgement, it would have become counter-productive to make any further requests from the projects that did not comply with these requirements.

In retrospect, we believe there would have been some value in conducting a focus group discussion with the line managers of the RSOs involved in the demonstration projects. This would have yielded valuable information on the pressures which community engagement projects have put on the wider road safety teams, and on the strategies that can be enacted by managers to address these pressures.

This report highlights the need to put in place evaluation processes that match the capacity of the projects themselves, and to be sensitive to the constraints under which RSOs need to deliver their new work.

- **Working protocols between LRSU and ETHNOS**

The evaluation would have benefited from having clearer working protocols concerning its relationship with the LRSU. In particular, there was much ambiguity about the extent to which ETHNOS and the Community Development Specialist were expected to liaise to exchange information about the projects. This created difficulties and gaps in evidence which could have been avoided through clear working protocols and two-way reporting mechanisms.

- **Scope of the evaluation**

Another lesson from the evaluation concerns the need for greater clarity on the precise scope of future evaluations. The current report leaves out most considerations of the role of the LRSU itself in relation to the demonstration projects, as the evaluation aimed mainly to support the development of the Guidelines. However, ETHNOS believes that future evaluations would benefit from examining how the LRSU's own processes impact on the long-term success of community engagement work to reduce injury inequalities in London.

3.0. THE DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

3.1. Selection of the demonstration projects

All London boroughs were informed about the LRSU programme and received an invitation to bid for funding for community engagement projects to reduce economic and ethnic inequalities in road traffic injuries. In addition, all London boroughs were invited to attend a short presentation by ETHNOS at the Pan-London Road Safety Forum to find out more about the LRSU programme. The LRSU held a further workshop on 23 May 2007 to discuss in detail the bidding process and the expectations of the projects. This workshop reiterated expectations from projects and drew on the expertise and experience of Mike Hayes (NRSI and Child Accident Prevention Trust) and ETHNOS on community engagement with people from minority ethnic backgrounds and people living in deprived communities. The LRSU offered to support interested boroughs by supplying them with evidence on casualties among people from black and minority ethnic backgrounds at borough level, based on analyses of STATS 19 data.

Nine boroughs submitted proposals. The proposals were assessed by a selection panel comprising:

- Janet Kirrage, Claudia Farley and Clive Saunders (TfL)
- Corrie Pegg (GLA Transport)
- Natalia Concha (ETHNOS)
- Jennette Arnold (London Assembly Member/Observer)

The selection panel chose to fund seven demonstration projects. Proposals submitted by three boroughs were accepted without change. Other boroughs were invited to make more or less substantial amendments and to resubmit.

3.2. Overview of demonstration projects

Appendix 1 contains more information on the seven demonstration projects funded to do community engagement work. However, for ease of understanding, a broad overview of the projects - which highlights their target audience and their main partners, activities and outputs – is provided in the table below.

Table 2: Overview of seven demonstration projects

Brent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target: Mixed BAME children from deprived areas • Partners: Local schools and Spearfish • Activity: Theatre in Education, drawing workshop and competition on road safety • Output: Mural on schools site
Camden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target: Black Caribbean and black African children, and children from deprived areas • Partners: Supplementary Schools / Youth Centre • Activity: Research on pedestrian injury inequalities, community consultation, photography of hazards in the road environment, promotion of citizenship and literacy skills, certificate design competition • Output: Report on pedestrian injury inequalities, presentations at two road safety related events at Camden Council, road safety awareness and transferable skills
Hackney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target: Black African parents and grand-parents • Partners: Artikal Films and BEN TV • Activity: Community consultation, production of a documentary style film and broadcasting on television • Output: Television programme and DVD on road safety, planned dissemination in local community organisations
Hammersmith & Fulham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target: BAME children from deprived areas: White City Estate • Partners: QPR Football Club and schools • Activity: Production of workbooks on sports and road safety, cycle training theory • Output: Education and training of children & young people using the workbooks
Haringey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target: Muslim families • Partner: London Islamic Cultural Society at Mosque • Activity: Travel Surveys, Theatre in Education, drawing competition, leaflet production, in-car safety training • Output: RS leaflets and presentation to community at Mosque to raise awareness of road safety in Haringey
Hounslow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target: Somali families in deprived areas • Partners: ILYAS, Groundwork, Sure Start, PCT, Housing Association, Primary Schools, Youth Officers and others • Activity: Community consultation, pedestrian skills, in-car safety and motorcycling skills, RS awareness in schools • Output: Road safety awareness, knowledge and skills, and engagement structures to promote community development
Southwark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target: Black Caribbean and black African youth in deprived areas • Partner: Community Youth Limited • Activity: Consultation in school, DVD on road safety, dissemination • Output: DVD on road safety, transferable skills, planned engagement in local schools

3.3. Variations between projects

There were considerable differences between the projects in terms of the issues which they sought to address, the nature of their interventions, their target audiences and geographic areas/neighbourhoods. All projects worked with some deprived communities. Because of the nature of ethnic and economic inequalities in road traffic injuries in London, most interventions focused on black children and their families. Some targeted all black people, some distinguished between black Caribbean and black African people and worked with either or both groups, and some focused on specific communities (e.g. Somalis). One project was inclusive of a wide range of nationalities, as it focused on the Muslim community in Haringey. Hounslow worked with women whose ability to understand, speak or read English is very limited. Southwark targeted young black people who are socially and economically marginalised and some of whom are excluded from schools.

Most projects had an additional focus on specific places: Hounslow targeted Somali families in the TW4 area of the borough; Hammersmith & Fulham worked with young people living on the White City Estate; Brent worked with three local schools that are co-located; Haringey focused on the Wightman Road Mosque.

The nature and scope of the projects varied a great deal too. In Hackney, for instance, there was one main intervention (the production of a television programme) with a single target audience (black Africans who were mainly Nigerians). By contrast, in Haringey, the project included several interventions (theatre in education performances on road safety, travel surveys of parents and pupils at the mosque, involvement of children in designing a road safety leaflet and dissemination of leaflet to other mosques, provision of in-car safety training) with different sections of the local Muslim population, and a final presentation of this work on road safety to adults at the mosque.

The quality and range of the partnership differed from project to project. For instance, in Southwark, there was a single community partner, Community Youth Limited, which has considerable experience in working with local deprived black youth. This “hands-on” partner had all the skills to engage youth at different phases in the project and at different depth, and to help the road safety team develop its own capacity in relation to the target audience. By contrast, in Hounslow, the partnership was extremely broad ranging, including many statutory organisations (Sure Start, a public library, a housing association, youth workers, a local primary school, local PCT staff) as well as ILYAS, a community sector partner, and some volunteers. Apart from in-depth involvement from ILYAS, the rest of the partners were less involved, but all worked together to engage the local Somali community around their respective strategic aims. Some projects also developed partnerships with small community-based organisations that themselves had limited capacity to support their road safety work, despite their high commitment to tackle inequalities.

The projects differed also in relation to the amount of staff, time and resources they could allocate to the project. With the exception of Brent (which received £7K) and Haringey (which received £16K), all other projects received the maximum amount available for the demonstration projects (£20K). In terms of staff, there were equally important differences. For instance, in Brent and in Camden, four or three people were involved part-time in the project. This enabled staff to share the load and to draw on each person’s strengths to plan and deliver their community engagement work. By contrast, in Hammersmith and Fulham, there was only one part-time member of staff to manage a complex community engagement project (as well as other workload). Such organisational matters impact on what can reasonably be expected of the projects.

Above and beyond such measurable resources, the project teams differed markedly at the beginning of the project in their project management skills and experiences, as well as in their

confidence in working with people from minority ethnic and deprived communities. A few projects involved road safety professionals who were used to working in partnership (outside of schools) and to focus on disadvantage. Partly related to the above, the project teams differed in the quality of the bids they submitted: some had already devoted a considerable amount of thought and were ready to start work as soon as their bid was selected and funding was allocated; others had to spend up to four months on project preparation after the official start date. Generally, and understandably, some project teams had limited experience in project management, as the bulk of their work focuses on road safety delivery. Generally, too, project staff who were themselves from minority ethnic backgrounds were more at ease with the idea of targeting specific communities. They shared the commitment to equality and equity which underpins the community engagement programme as a whole, and were highly motivated to reduce road traffic inequalities through community engagement methods.

This variation between demonstration projects needs to be borne in mind when evaluating the projects. Each one faced its own challenges, with its own set of resources, and needed to find its own response to them.

3.4. LRSU support to projects

The demonstration projects had access to support from the LRSU. This came in the form of:

- statistical evidence on injury inequalities by ethnicity at borough level;
- draft Guidelines on Working with Communities to Reduce Road Traffic Injury Inequalities in London;
- workshops on:
 - bidding guidance
 - community engagement
 - Equality Impact Assessments (EqIA);
- on-going support from a dedicated Community Development Specialist.

Not all projects have availed themselves equally of the above opportunities.

4.0. FINDINGS

4.1. Introduction

This section discusses the projects in relation to the key evaluation criteria described above. For reasons discussed in relation to the theory of change, the evaluation focuses more on processes than on outcomes and impacts. It relies primarily on documentation produced by the project teams and on the views and experiences of the project leads, as well as our own observations at project management meetings and community engagement events.

4.2. Road safety and wider benefits

- **Use of evidence to identify the target audience, area and intervention**

One of the main achievements of the programme has been to promote a better understanding of ethnic and economic inequalities among road safety professionals and their partners. Some Road Safety Teams had experience of dealing with inequalities and a few had actively addressed this issue prior to engaging in the current programme. However, most RSOs who took part in the demonstration projects either had limited knowledge of inequalities, or were aware of the problem but unsure as to how to address it. The demonstration projects therefore provided a welcome opportunity to focus explicitly on inequalities and to try out new ways of working.

As a condition of funding, all the projects had to base their intervention on evidence of need in their local area. The very process of putting the bid together afforded an important opportunity to learn more about inequalities. It convinced many Road Safety Officers of the need for targeted interventions. Now, RSOs working on the demonstration projects recognise the scale of these inequalities and believe that targeted, tailored, community-based programmes are useful or necessary to address inequalities.

“People in deprived communities have more than their fair share of road casualties and all other sorts of accidents. You have to engage with the community that you’re trying to reach. It’s something that Road Safety Officers should be doing all the time if they are going to reduce inequalities, because some groups are not hearing the message.”⁹

“For us, when we looked at deprivation and accident figures, we clearly saw that there is a need for these kinds of projects, for working with the communities directly. We took it on with open arms really.”

“Our local authority needs to do more engaging with the community, not just perhaps using the schools to deliver their messages, going out there meeting different kinds of people, getting used to different communities, and not having that fear of the unknown about the community we’re going to be helping.”

“Working with the communities has opened our eyes because it has enabled us to think more in terms of deprivation or equalities, where perhaps we weren’t doing that in the past. And one of the things that has become

⁹ Quotes throughout the document are from the RSOs who took part in the demonstration projects. They are extracted either from individual telephone or face-to-face interviews or from the focus group discussion held at TfL’s offices at the end of the demonstration projects (July 2008).

apparent is that, for instance, we provide cyclist training with children, which is our way of reducing fatalities and casualties on the road, but then it's become apparent there are a lot of children in our borough who don't have a bicycle and that's your deprivation coming through. You might just have thought in the past: 'Well, it's just one of those things', but now we're beginning to think: 'Actually, this is a bit of an issue.' We have a challenge and we may need to shift our priorities, and this work has highlighted that."

However, there is very little robust information to guide interventions. The paucity of evidence concerns three distinct aspects:

- evidence of ethnic and economic inequalities;
- evidence of risk mechanisms or causal factors; and
- evidence of solutions or effective interventions to reduce road traffic inequalities.

The knowledge gaps are considerable in relation to all the above, although they are greatest in relation to the last two types of evidence. To partly make up for the lack of evidence, as well as to support project teams in putting their bids together, the LRSU provided a data set to all interested boroughs on ethnic inequalities in road traffic casualties at local level. This is useful evidence, but it clearly needs to be supplemented by local knowledge to lend itself to tailored interventions to address the specific causal factors involved in creating higher risks of road traffic injuries in target communities. We are not aware that any of the road safety teams have looked at evidence of either risk mechanisms or causal factors, or of solutions and effective interventions to reduce road traffic injuries in deciding on the specific intervention which they wanted to carry out with their target audience¹⁰.

The problems linked to lack of local evidence have been addressed differently by the various boroughs. Hounslow involved a range of statutory and community partners to identify *which* specific black community was so highly represented in local casualty statistics, and to hypothesise about the factors that may contribute to inequalities. Having identified the Somali community, it also ran a consultation session with Somali women to explore the environmental and lifestyle factors perceived to account for inequalities. Camden, Southwark and Hackney chose to involve their respective target audiences themselves in generating evidence on the causes of inequalities in the local community themselves. Haringey opted to survey children attending religious schools at the mosque and their parents on their travel arrangements. There is little use of evidence in Hammersmith & Fulham.

More guidance may be required in the Guidelines on how to generate evidence for the purpose of community engagement, but it is also clear that some road safety professionals may need to access research expertise in their borough to support their community engagement work (see section below on "Project management and research capacity").

- **Concerns around targeting ethnic groups**

There was some reluctance, at least at the beginning of the programme, to targeting minority ethnic groups. The reasons for this include:

- a belief that it is illegal to target people on the basis of their ethnicity¹¹;

¹⁰ The under-utilisation of evidence seems partly related to the organisational culture of road safety professionals, who seem to rely almost exclusively on STATS 19 data to guide their work.

¹¹ These concerns were first voiced by road safety professionals at a "bidding guidance" workshop (05/07). As noted in the minutes of the meeting: "There was a degree of unease amongst road safety practitioners in relation to targeting communities, especially minority ethnic groups, rather than areas,

- a belief that mainstream approaches will reach the greatest number and will have the greatest impact on the reduction of road traffic injuries;
- lack of ease and confidence in working with the target audiences; and
- substantive concerns over the wisdom of disclosing the reality of road traffic injury inequalities to people who are already vulnerable.

“I just don’t feel comfortable with that at all. It’s like putting everyone in the same basket, but to me, it’s not because you are black or whatever that you have more accidents.”

“If you do spread your work very widely, you should catch most people in it. So if you deliver pedestrian skills training to all the schools in the borough, then you should reach most people and everybody will at least get something of a good message. But if you concentrate on targeting, then you’re certainly going to lessen that effect. So the big question for us is: ‘What is the most effective way to reduce casualties?’”

“I don’t think we had the confidence to do this work. That’s why you have to have partners or members of your own team that have the confidence, perhaps because they are from those communities themselves.”

“It is clear that there is a need for targeting communities at risk. Of course there is. But I am not sure that we necessarily need to tell young people who are already vulnerable, who already have so many issues in their lives, that, again, they are doing something wrong, because that’s how it will be perceived. It’s easy to get into victim-blaming and that’s the last thing we would want. Can you imagine if the local media got hold of that?”

While these concerns are understandable, by not focussing directly on *inequalities*, projects restrict their ability to generate information that is rich and relevant. The issue at hand is not why do young black pedestrians have road traffic injuries, but why they have *more road traffic injuries than others*. Experience from Southwark, Camden, Hounslow and Hackney, for instance, shows that it may be more productive to engage people directly on the issue of *inequalities* (although this requires sensitive management) because it forces people to engage with the issue of “disproportionality” rather than merely with generic causes of injuries on the road. In these projects, the participants did not seem to feel overly burdened. On the contrary, awareness of inequalities triggered deeper reflection and greater motivation to take part in the road safety intervention.

The case for targeting will need to be made strongly both in the Guidelines and in training workshops. RSOs need to be mindful of the fact that minority ethnic groups (in common with all socio-cultural categorisations) are not uniform, and that individuals have multiple identities

specific locations, unsafe road behaviours, etc. The GLA said that it was important to raise the profile of road traffic inequalities in the black communities [...] ETHNOS also stated that to target diverse communities – in terms of ethnicity, faith, deprivation, age, gender, disability, etc – is in fact compliant with the current and prospective legislation and guidance on equality and diversity issues [as demonstrated by the statutory requirement to carry out EQIAs]. *Not* to target communities in greatest need, and *not* to be proactive in assessing the needs of target communities, can lend local authorities open to legal challenge. [...] Mike Hayes, from CAPT/NRSI and some RSOs also made the point that RSOs effectively target all the time, whether this is children in schools, accident hot spots or drink drivers. Thus, from this perspective, it was understood that targeting minority ethnic communities in need is simply an extension of current practice, rather than something entirely novel.” Yet, such concerns endured for a long time among a few of the participating road safety officers.

and group memberships which are more or less salient in different contexts and subject to change. No one likes being pigeonholed and treated simply as a member of a category, rather than as an individual. However, the evidence is robust that people who either self-identify as “black” or who are identified as such by police officers in Stats 19 data are more likely than others to be involved in collisions. This reality needs to be addressed. Concrete examples on how to do this sensitively may be required. Partnerships with organisations that have a detailed and sophisticated understanding of specific communities are invaluable.

- **Equality Impact Assessments (EqIA)**

ETHNOS suggested at the beginning of the programme that road safety professionals should carry out Equality Impact Assessments (EqIA) to help them identify potential inequalities in their local area. The bidding panel accepted this recommendation and the LRSU Community Development Specialist organised for Equality Works, a consultancy and training company, to deliver EqIA workshops for all demonstration projects to attend.

Although some RSOs were unhappy with this additional project management requirement, the process of attending the workshops and of conducting their own EqIA has been valuable in sharpening their awareness of inequalities. However, the EqIA documents also indicate that RSOs could benefit from further training, to clarify what is meant by “target equality group” and by “high” or “low” impact in the context of a road safety intervention.

Critically, since the demonstration projects are themselves best understood as “mitigating measures” to ensure that people from deprived and minority ethnic communities do not miss out on road safety ETP programmes, it would be more meaningful for the road safety units to carry out EqIAs on the whole of their activities. Ideally, the EqIA should also include elements of community consultation to help determine funding priorities and support interventions across the entire road safety unit. The LRSU may wish to conduct their own EqIA and to explore ways of promoting this across all boroughs. A new section in the Guidelines dedicated to the EqIA process will be included.

- **Road safety benefits for the project participants**

All the projects produced (or are expected to lead to) some road safety benefits. In some cases, such as with the Somali community in Hounslow and the Muslim population in Haringey, the benefits were considerable since, in both cases, the knowledge base on road safety was low, there were no engagement structures in place to carry out road safety ETP programmes, and the target audiences would have been hard to reach through mainstream approaches. It is also expected that the road safety awareness gained by the participants will spread through the wider community.

In other cases, the road safety benefits are expected to be considerable, such as in Southwark and in Hackney, for much the same reasons, but the key part of the community engagement or wider dissemination have not taken place during the one year lifetime of the demonstration projects and it is therefore impossible to assess the road safety benefits that will accrue from the project for the wider community. In other cases, the road safety benefits are not expected to be very significant, because the depth of engagement remained limited and the number of people involved is rather small.

The table below summarises the main road safety benefits¹² of the seven demonstration projects for the participants.

¹² The table distinguishes between general “awareness” (which can also include knowledge and attitudes) and “skills” (which involves changes in abilities or behaviours). In-car safety includes elements of both. The classification is based on the aims and performance indicators identified by the projects

Table 3: Road safety benefits of demonstration projects for the participants

Projects	Awareness of road safety	Awareness of inequalities	Pedestrian Skills	Cycling/ Motorcycling Skills	In-car Safety
Brent	√				
Camden	√	√			
Hackney	√	√			
Hammersmith & Fulham	√		√	√	
Haringey	√	√			√
Hounslow	√	√	√	√	√
Southwark	√	√			

All the demonstration projects aimed to raise general awareness of road safety in their target audience. This took place in different, more or less sustained ways. For instance, both Brent and Haringey involved theatre companies in delivering general road safety awareness to pupils, in either mainstream or religious schools. Haringey also delivered a comprehensive road safety awareness session to some 150 adults and children attending their local mosque. Camden, Hackney, Haringey, Hounslow and Southwark involved their target audience in seeking to identify – either through individual interviews, focus group discussions or travel surveys – what the main road safety issues are and what the main causes of road traffic injuries in people’s community and local area are.

Most of the projects also focussed on raising awareness of inequalities in road traffic injuries. As mentioned above, experience from Southwark, Hounslow and Hackney shows that it is productive to engage people directly (but sensitively) on the issue of inequalities, as this generates deeper reflection and greater motivation to think carefully about what may cause these inequalities.

Two projects sought to develop pedestrian skills (rather than to promote awareness or increase knowledge alone). In Hammersmith & Fulham, young people were provided with a workbook which draws parallels between the skills required either as a footballer or as a rugby player, on the one hand, and those required as a vulnerable road user (the focus is predominantly on pedestrians), on the other hand. The knowledge and skills included: looking and listening for oncoming traffic, being aware of dangers on the road, planning a safe journey, crossing in safe places and at safe times, being visible at all times, etc. These were then implemented through sport training sessions (delivered by Queens Park Rangers FC staff), which were meant to draw attention to road safety issues. In Hounslow, a small group of Somali women was taken on local roads to learn such skills as how to cross safely between parked cars, how to manoeuvre on the road with pushchairs and young children, and how to negotiate small roundabouts.

Hammersmith & Fulham delivered cycle training theory as part of the road safety content included in the sport training sessions. Haringey had originally planned cycle training but was postponed due to lack of resources, as well as evidence from the project’s Travel Survey that “few pupils were interested in cycling to mosque”. Hounslow offered some motorcycling training to a small group of four young people from different ethnic backgrounds at a youth centre in Southall. This training session brought together five trainers, three youth workers and the lead RSO. It involved showing the DVD resource “Dangerous Games” to the target

themselves, as well as the projects’ assessment of their achievement (confirmed by a range of data analysed for each project as part of the evaluation).

audience, followed by a Q&A session and information on the motorcycling equipment required to stay safe on the road. The low attendance for this training session is indicative of limited interest in motorcycling training, of the difficulties in working with “drop-in” centres where attendance is not regular, and of the importance of having good links with the target communities to recruit for such events.

In-car safety training sessions were organised in Hounslow and Haringey. The session in Haringey was exemplary. The lead RSO had promoted the event in local mosques, nurseries and community centres, and used a community venue with ample parking space (the African Caribbean Centre) to carry out the training. The event was well attended, with a steady flow of people from the target audience coming in to check that their car seats were properly fitted. The lead RSO used this opportunity to distribute resources (including packs for children and young people) and to deliver brief talks on in-car safety. Refreshments and biscuits were offered, and play mats with road designs were put out for young children to use while parents had their car seats checked. A raffle was organised (with car seats as prizes) and used to gather details on attendance. A local councillor, a professional photographer and the local press were invited to witness and report on the events in the Haringey local authority magazine, thereby raising the profile of road safety within the local authority and ensuring greater dissemination of the road safety message in the wider local community. The event was also attended by another RSO from Haringey, the mosque’s Liaison Officer and the LRSU Community Development Specialist.

Above and beyond the development of road safety awareness, knowledge and skills, one of the most important road safety benefits derived from the projects is that project participants (and RSOs, see below) have developed a better awareness of the structural, socio-economic, cultural and lifestyle factors that may contribute to road traffic injury inequalities.

- **Wider social capital benefits from the projects**

While the focus of the demonstration projects was firmly on road safety, the processes of community consultation and engagement have generated wider social capital benefits for all projects. The most notable of those are the development of generic skills and abilities and of new social networks for the project participants, increases in community awareness around road safety and inequalities (beyond that of the project participants themselves), and new engagement structures (mainly in the form of partnerships), potentially leading to long-term community development. The table below identifies the main social capital benefits¹³ derived from the projects.

Table 4: Social capital benefits derived from the projects

Projects	Generic skills	Social networks	Community awareness	Engagement structures	Community development
Brent			√		
Camden	√	√	√	√	
Hackney			√	√	
Hammersmith & Fulham				√	
Haringey		√	√	√	
Hounslow	√	√		√	√
Southwark	√	√	√	√	

¹³ The classification is based on the aims and performance indicators identified by the projects themselves, as well as the projects’ assessment of their achievement (confirmed by a range of data analysed for each project as part of the evaluation).

The generic skills which have been developed by the projects participants in Camden, Southwark and Hounslow include research skills, basic project management skills, oral and written public communication skills, digital media production skills, basic understanding of decision-making processes and social policy at local authority level, and access to statutory and voluntary sector provisions available in local service centres (such as English language classes, public health education and health checks, housing advice and support, help with benefits claims, access to crèche facilities, etc).

In addition, many projects created opportunities for social networks to develop, to become stronger and, potentially, to last beyond the life of the projects. This was the case among pupils of the supplementary schools and youth centres in Camden, among the pupils and adults who attend the madrassah and other activities at the local mosque in Haringey, among the Somali women who took part in the year-long community development project in Hounslow, and among the children who met in the process of creating their digital media resources in Southwark. It is unclear how many of those will endure and what the strength of the networks will be, but significant impacts on self-esteem, confidence and resilience can sometimes be triggered by a single new contact or positive experience, especially among people who have fewer opportunities and resources.

Most projects also had built in a programme for wider dissemination of road safety messages in the community. In Brent, this will be achieved through the creation of a permanent mural illustrating pedestrian skills based on drawings and ideas provided by school pupils. This will be seen by all road users in the local community. In Camden, this has been achieved through the involvement of parents, carers and guardians in the survey on road safety carried out by pupils in the supplementary schools and youth centre, as well as through presentations in the Town Hall and, eventually, some coverage of the project in the local press. In Haringey, a wide range of activities contributed to raising community awareness among the local Muslim population: the production of leaflets on road safety by children and young pupils at the mosque, the conduct of travel surveys among pupils and parents, the delivery of in-car safety training in the local community, a presentation on road safety at the mosque, the distribution of safety vests and other resources, etc. In Hackney, community awareness can be expected to have been raised through the broadcast of a television programme on road safety targeted at the black African community on Ben TV; through the promotion of the short DVD entitled "Inroads" on a local radio station and a leaflet which was distributed to churches, community centres, local shops and Council buildings in Hackney. There were also plans for the dissemination of "Inroads" to a large number of community centres elsewhere in London. And in Southwark, there was a significant programme of engagement of pupils in some 30 primary and secondary schools in deprived areas to disseminate the DVD produced by the young people at Community Youth Limited. There was also some promotional work planned with local radio stations and the local press. However, the evaluation does not have evidence of when these activities are scheduled to take place.

All projects (with the exception of Brent) also developed new partnerships which offer excellent engagement structures to access and work with groups that would not otherwise be reached by road safety professionals. This will be discussed in greater detail under "Partnership Working" and "Sustainability".

Finally, the demonstration project in Hounslow focussed primarily on putting in place good engagement structures with a view to long-term community development and capacity building in the local Somali community. While the road safety benefits of the project may not be sizeable in the short-term because the number of Somali women and young people who attended the road safety events was small, it is expected that significant long-term benefits will accrue from the approach adopted by the road safety team in Hounslow. The Somali community was far removed from the statutory sector and had limited capacity in the community and voluntary sector, making it difficult to engage on any issue linked to

inequalities (e.g. housing, health, education, employment, etc.). The road safety project has succeeded in working productively in partnership with key local agencies and in raising the profile of road safety among key partners, which is a considerable achievement.

“We set up a women’s group, which tends to be the mothers of the children that we wanted to get to. And in doing that, we were kind of ticking people’s [partners’] boxes about a whole lot of lifestyle issues, health issues and other issues. Road safety almost sneaked in towards the end, once the group was well established, because the women would not have come just for road safety. And the other benefit we reaped was that the main deliverer was a member of the community who was running this group, and she actually got a lot of personal development from the project. She is much better placed now to do further work in the community.”

4.3. Partnership

- **Relevance, range and capacity of partners**

The choice of partners was highly relevant in all interventions. The main partners included a range of statutory partners (e.g. local schools, Sure Start, Primary Care Trusts, emergency services, Travellers Education Services, Refugee Integration Services, Emergency Services), community and voluntary partners (e.g. supplementary schools for black children, mosques, ILYAS Somali Organisation, Community Youth Limited), and private sector partners (e.g. QPR FC, a black TV company, mural artists and graphic designers).

However, statutory resources available at borough level were under-utilised. Indeed, there was little awareness among participating RSOs of the resources that exist at borough level. These include, but are not restricted to:

- Borough Consultation Teams;
- Community Cohesion Teams;
- Diversity and Equality Strategies;
- Race Equality Schemes;
- Local Strategic Partnerships and Community Strategies;
- BAME Housing Strategies;
- Connexions; and
- Youth Offending Teams.

Similarly, there was little awareness of the policy frameworks relevant to road safety teams and in relation to which RSOs could make significant contributions, whether these are in the fields of transport (PSA on disadvantage, road safety bill), regeneration (Neighbourhood Renewal Fund, Local Area Agreement (children and young people block), Respect Agenda, Local Transport Plans), Education (Every Child Matters (Stay Safe), PSHE and citizenship curriculum), or Community Policing (police community support officers and neighbourhood policing, and community strategies). The evidence on the benefits of multi-agency or partnership working to reduce inequality (in relation to road traffic inequalities and other areas of public health) is strong. Notably, it was one of the key lessons from the NRSI evaluation.

“I think local authorities should do more to make people in the various areas of work more aware of what other people do. I think quite a lot of time is wasted seeking out appropriate partners and I think it actually needs to be a more top down thing so people have a clearer idea of where the PCT sits or the Children’s

Services or whatever, particularly if you are looking for a fairly high level partner. I don't think we know enough about what we do within."

As a result of this lack of awareness of the wider resources and policy frameworks relevant to this work, as well as the limited timescale of the demonstration projects, most participating RSOs did not engage statutory partners. Instead, nearly all projects chose to work exclusively with community partners which, almost by definition, have much less capacity to support them.

The draft Guidelines were clear and exhaustive on this issue, but most RSOs did not have them or read them at the time of planning their interventions or developing their partnership.

- **Experience of partnership working**

All projects saw the critical importance of having a good partnership in order to engage hard to reach communities to reduce injury inequalities. Most project teams were positive about their experience of partnership working, although some felt that establishing, maintaining and documenting the work of the partnership was time consuming.

"As Road Safety Officers, most of us don't necessarily have the skills and the networks to get into some of these communities. So you have to inspire others to buy into your agenda through these partnerships that you've created, and then you can end up with a very good product. If you can inspire partners to work with you, then the doors just fly open."

"You need to deliver this through partners, but I found it a lot of work to keep the partners working well together. You need to communicate with everyone all the time and it takes up a lot, a lot of your time."

The partners involved in the various demonstration projects differed a great deal in their capacity. Some had extensive experience of working both with the target audience and the statutory sector; others had little experience of working with the statutory sector and had limited resources (besides access to and knowledge of the communities) to contribute to the interventions. This created operational difficulties and often introduced delays in delivery.

The experience of taking part in the demonstration projects indicates that RSOs need to be mindful of the level of capacity and the specific complementary skills they will require from partners before creating the partnership and putting in place working protocols.

"We could never have done this without our partners. But you need to choose people with skills that you don't have, and I would suggest that you should be really careful to partner with people and organisations that can actually help you with a lot of the paper work and all the logistics around project planning and delivery."

"With hindsight, I think I should have thought more about what they [partners] could bring to the project. What could they bring? What could they take responsibility for, so that I wouldn't have to be there every single step of the way? I would choose partners who have more work capacity to work on this kind of thing."

Road Safety Officers also commented on the need to find partners that share a common agenda and to incentivise them in order to attract them and to keep them on board.

“I think it’s not a bad idea to dangle a carrot in order to get in. It can be School Travel Plans, cycling, anything. But there needs to be something in it for them.”

“You have to think about where they [partners] are coming from. Do your research and ask yourself: ‘What do they want from the project? ‘What’s important to them? What do they want to hear about? Why should they be involved?’ And maybe focus on that aspect in the beginning.”

Two projects did not establish or sustain productive working relations with their partners. The result in both cases was a much reduced capacity to reach into and engage the target communities, and therefore low sustainability and poorer value for money and added value.

“We were hoping that by having [these two statutory partners], they would link us into those communities. But they turned up on the Steering Group meeting and that was it. They couldn’t commit themselves any further, so that left us without those connections.”

“The schools weren’t happy to have parents come in to talk about road safety issues in school, so we were very, very limited. So we haven’t actually got to the community as such. Without these partners, it’s been almost impossible to engage with the wider community.”

The level of satisfaction with the partnership depended largely on the commitment and capacity of the partners, and the production of clear working protocols and communications. Soft skills, such as good inter-personal communication, flexibility and leadership, were all critical to the success of partnership working. Only a few projects had project plans and explicit arrangements with their partners. The guidance on partnership working contained in the draft Guidelines was not followed by most projects. In light of the evaluation findings, the revised Guidelines may need to be more explicit and to give examples of “Project Plans” and associated allocation of responsibilities (including responsibilities linked to communications and reporting within the partnership).

There were few inefficiencies in the partnerships (in terms of duplication of roles and responsibilities, or of lack of capacity in the partnership as a whole), reflecting the adequacy of the selected partners.

- **Models of partnership**

The Guidelines discussed four potential models under partnership arrangements - steering groups, consultative forums, multi-agency panels and multi-agency teams – but many of the projects remained unclear about the ways in which partners could or should be involved. Many projects did not have a steering group at all, leaving themselves highly vulnerable to lack of perceived relevance from the target audience and to greater difficulties over dissemination and further engagement. Some projects believed that they had a “steering group”, but this comprised of delivery partners rather than advisors to the project. This form of partnership therefore more closely resembled a multi-agency panel than a steering group. Some projects had “ad hoc” and sporadic consultative forums, but none of these have a

lasting structure that could support the RSOs over other projects (despite positive contacts and relationships being developed).

The current discussion in the Guidelines is clear. However, the Guidelines would benefit from concrete examples based on the projects and from greater discussion of the benefits of having, at minimum, a steering group. Confusion over the role of steering groups and other forms of partnership should also be addressed through training.

Evidence from the demonstration projects strongly suggests that the existence of a project steering group which includes representatives of the target communities should be a condition for future funding.

- **Impact on ways of working**

Partnership working involving BAME and/or deprived communities appears to be different to the traditional ways of working of most RSOs. Prior to taking part in demonstration projects, most RSOs were almost exclusively involved in *delivering* road safety education by working with schools. Now, as lead partners in a wider partnership, their role is shifting towards one of planning, managing and facilitating road safety delivery based on input from the communities themselves and from partner agencies, whilst keeping firm control over road safety delivery.

“You just need to tap into these people and get them to sign up to your message. It’s not you who delivers everything. You’re just enabling other people out there and inspiring them to deliver. That’s the way I see it. It’s a big change.”

This requires an additional skills set, in particular project management skills which have yet to be developed in some cases. It seems to have triggered a degree of resistance to what some RSOs see as the dilution of their professional expertise. However, once the transition is made to this way of working and such concerns are overcome, most projects see the value of partnership working and believe that all partners gain through the process of working together to reduce injury inequalities. This shift needs to be described in the revised Guidelines, and the new skills which project planning and management require need to be developed among RSOs through training.

- **Sustainability of partnerships**

The level of sustainability of partnerships is highly variable across projects. In some projects, it is clear that the partnership will not subsist beyond the life of the current project, either because the partnership was always intended to be project-specific and time-bound, or because relations between partners are not conducive to further collaboration. In other projects, the partnership will endure beyond the life of the project. For instance, there are plans in Hammersmith & Fulham to continue to work with QPR FC to deliver further joint road safety and sports training to local youth. In both Hounslow and Haringey, the capacity of the community and voluntary sector partners was greatly developed through participation in the demonstration projects. In Hounslow, road safety has been embedded in local strategic partnerships.

Across projects, the evaluation has identified a number of factors that help improve the sustainability of partnerships. There include having:

- partners with complementary skills and areas of expertise
- partners that have something to contribute to, and gain from, working together

- a realistic timeframe and adequate lead-in times
- a clear, shared vision and purpose
- terms of reference
- a detailed Project Plan
- SMART performance indicators
- a flexible and tolerant working culture which recognises the complexities inherent in group working
- open and frequent communications
- documentation of all activities and audit trail, and
- transparent and fair financial dealings

This will be included in the Guidelines, together with some examples and templates where relevant.

4.4. Community engagement

As expected, the nature and scope of community engagement differed across and within individual projects. The draft Guidelines discussed community engagement in terms of the relative “depth” of engagement of the projects. On a spectrum from “shallow” to “deep” forms of community engagement, there was outreach into communities, followed by community consultation, community participation, and then community development and empowerment. The demonstration projects exemplify all types of community engagement. They were used with different aims, which included:

- raising awareness of road safety and injury inequalities in targeted communities;
- generating evidence on causes of inequalities;
- facilitating community-driven solutions; and
- creating long-term engagement structures.

- **Raising awareness of road safety and injury inequalities in targeted communities**

Some of the projects aimed to raise awareness of road safety and of injury inequalities in various minority ethnic and deprived communities. Road Safety Officers were keen to reach into these groups to disseminate their road safety messages.

“When we told [black African residents] about the facts of road safety in the borough, some people were actually saying: ‘I’m really astounded. I had no idea and I have no idea why this is the case’. That was quite a boost from our point of view, because that’s what we wanted to do: raise people’s awareness of what is happening.”

This penetration into at risk communities is indeed an important function of community engagement, and it is perhaps all the more important with communities that have little awareness and understanding of road safety in London and whose behaviours and skills may not be adapted to this environment. This largely accounts for the decisions to carry out this type of engagement in Hounslow, Hackney, Camden and Haringey. However, as discussed in the draft Guidelines, “shallow” and “top-down” approaches remain somewhat limited in their anticipated impact because they neither give communities a say in identifying the issues that matter to them, nor generate a long-term, personal relationship with community members (or indeed organisations) around the road safety agenda. While there is a role for such approaches, their impact is likely to be short-lived. Other initiatives should be developed to sustain and embed impact over the longer term.

Interestingly, where the community engagement activities tapped into the views of parents of children and young people, it is clear that parents are worried about road safety for their children. This seems to be as pressing a concern for parents as their children being “mugged” or victims of “stranger danger”. This suggests that there is scope to work with parents to promote road safety.

- **Understanding the causes of inequalities**

Many projects built into their activities some element of community consultation (in the form of interviews, focus group discussions and surveys). They aimed not only to educate the communities about road safety and injury inequalities, but also to *learn from them* about perceived road safety and lifestyle issues in the community/area, causes of inequalities, information and support needs, and possible solutions to reduce various types of road traffic injuries. This approach generated rich information, especially in relation to the lifestyle factors that are linked to road traffic inequalities in the target groups and areas. While it is impossible to determine with any certainty the validity of the views reported by project participants or to generalise from these views, the findings give some indication of the kind of information that consulting communities can yield.

The most common lifestyle factors identified by participants across the demonstration projects were:

- **lack of awareness and knowledge of road safety among adults, which puts adults, children and young people at risk**
 - adults themselves do not always use the roads safely.
 - adults/parents are not able to teach appropriate road safety skills to children and young people.
 - this is especially true among adults from recent migrant communities that come from countries where the road lay out and patterns of road use are very different (e.g. Nigerians in Hackney, Somalis in Hounslow, many Muslims from various countries in Haringey).
- **limited parental ability to supervise children and young people**
 - black boys and girls, in particular, commented on the fact that they are expected to go to school on their own or to take younger siblings with them from a young age because their parents are unable to accompany them.
 - some adults (especially in the black Caribbean and black African communities) also reported that they had lost the ability to restrict and discipline children.
- **carelessness on the streets among pedestrian boys and girls**
 - many young black people discussed not looking out for oncoming traffic, listening to music, talking on their mobile phones, running on the road, crossing in unsafe places, etc. They reported that these problems are exacerbated when young people are in groups. They also reported being particularly careless if they are “in a hurry” (e.g. to get into school, to catch a bus).
- **poor in-car safety**
 - overcrowding in cars appears to be common, especially in the Asian and Somali communities, due to a number of factors, including larger family sizes, car pooling to transport adults and children, and a general preference for driving over alternative modes of transport (itself linked to fear of crime).

- non-use of car seats (especially among older children) and use of improperly fitted car seats were both common in all communities.
- non-use of seat belts (especially among rear passengers) was common in all communities, but exacerbated either in cases of overcrowding or when children are not present in the car (as there is no need to role model).
- **greater exposure to risk**
 - Somali participants reported that in their communities, women were less likely to drive due to a number of factors, including the fact that they could not afford a car, did not speak English well enough to take their driving test, did not have the confidence to drive in London, were prevented by spouses from driving, etc. This, combined with the fact that women were almost always responsible for accompanying children on their school journeys and after-school activities, as well as for food shopping, meant that female adults and all children spent more time on the road as vulnerable road users.
 - young people (especially boys in the black Caribbean community) reported that they spent much time outdoors (especially on street corners), “hanging out” with friends, away from parents. They reported that they could not afford cinemas, restaurants, pubs and clubs.
- **less safe environments**
 - across all groups, participants were more likely to reside in areas where car traffic is heavy and fast, and where there are few safe recreational areas for young people. This is linked to deprivation. However, there were important differences between boroughs, with some boroughs (as well as some areas within a single borough) being thought to be much safer and “greener” than others.
- **less road safety education and knowledge**
 - some adults also argued that children from deprived areas may have more limited access to road safety education and training than their more affluent counterparts.

The very process of taking part in discussions and of generating this information was positive for community members. Indeed, in-depth and sustained thinking in relation to road safety is expected to yield more enduring changes in knowledge, attitude and behaviours than awareness raising through traditional public education methods. Importantly, it supports RSOs in the development of programmes and interventions that are based on a greater understanding of the perceived needs of minority ethnic people and those living in deprived communities.

The findings reported above are consistent with the model included in the draft Guidelines on the causes of road safety inequalities. This model therefore requires no adjustment in light of findings from the community engagement projects.

- **Facilitating community-driven solutions**

Some of the demonstration projects involved their target communities in generating their own responses to identified problems. The project in Southwark was exemplary in this respect. Using evidence generated through interviews and brainstorming with young black people, consultation in a local school, interviews with young black people who have been victims of collisions and with statutory agencies (a fire fighter and a Road Safety Officer), as well as the community partner’s in-depth knowledge of deprived black youth in Southwark, the project involved the target audience in creating original scripts, characters and sound tracks for a DVD on road safety. The project in Camden also involved young (mainly) black people in

generating their own solutions to road safety issues locally. Some of the young people who had taken part in researching road safety issues, causes and solutions through surveys of peers and parents, also made recommendations to key road safety fora in Camden.

- **Creating long-term engagement structures**

All the partnerships that endure beyond the life of the demonstration projects constitute potential engagement structures. However, the exemplary case here is the demonstration project in Hounslow. As discussed above, this project focussed primarily on putting in place good engagement structures with a view to long-term community development and capacity building in the local Somali community. This kind of approach is especially necessary with new communities that are far removed from the statutory sector and have limited capacity in the community and voluntary sector, thereby making it difficult to engage on any issue linked to inequalities. The Road Safety Officer, led by an excellent line manager, readily understood the need first to build a strong partnership in order to then engage the community on road safety. It was clear that road safety would not be perceived as a priority by the target audience and that much ground work needed to be done before road safety could even be discussed. This capacity building work, however, only generates long-term pay-offs.

Some project leads commented on the gains for the community and voluntary sector as well. It is clear that these community partners have considerably developed their capacity through working with the RSOs on their various community engagement projects.

“I think the partners that we worked with have probably themselves gained some skills out of doing it.”

“I think the other benefit that we reaped was that the main deliverer of what we were doing was a member of the community who was running this group. She actually got a lot of personal development from what we were doing and it encouraged her to deliver the project on our behalf quite a lot. It raised her own status within the community.”

“We’ve actually employed full time now the person that was the community liaison for the project at the mosque. He’s got this experience and now he can run whole sections of the project. It’s a huge help. It’s been really good for him too.”

Overall, there was a mix of “shallow” and “deep” community engagement projects, as well as “top-down” approaches (interventions that are designed, planned and/or delivered by RSOs and their partners) and “bottom-up” approaches (interventions that are designed, planned and/or delivered by the target audiences themselves based on needs which they have identified through consultation).

4.5. Sustainability

One of the unsung achievements of the RSOs that took part in the demonstration projects is that, for all the difficulties they faced, none of the projects collapsed. Indeed, most have successfully applied for future funding, building on the experience and skills gained through the demonstration projects.

The majority of projects show some evidence of sustainability. This is manifest in a number of ways, including: much better awareness of the importance of road safety and road traffic

injury inequalities among road safety teams, partners and target communities; better understanding of the need for and the nature of community engagement in relation to key target groups; some mainstreaming of learning and activities; professional development; the development of interventions that have the potential to be replicated elsewhere in the capital or with other local communities; some sustainable partnerships; some examples of good dissemination (in the form of leaflets, official launches, articles in local papers, resources to be rolled out by the end of the projects); and access to a broader funding base (e.g. some projects have successfully bid for additional funding from their community/voluntary partners, from the Department for Transport and from TfL for the next round of community engagement projects for a three year period).

“What this project has done, is given us the opportunity to stand back and think about how we would actually have inequality as our focus, and it really has been a new way of working for us. And I hope that what we’ve started to do will be sustainable because that seems to be, I think for us, that seems to way forward really.”

“I’ve learned a lot about different communities as well. I’ve learnt other ways of working from them as well, so it hasn’t just been one way. It’s been hard work but I think we have learned an enormous amount as a team.”

“We have very different constraints on us in local government. So the constraints may have been known by myself, but I didn’t transfer those constraints across to my partners, so they weren’t aware that there was such a rigid environment. They were always trying to sprint ahead but were getting into trouble. I would approach things differently, be clearer from the start now.”

“RSO1: Now we have this DfT project to run over three years. We are pacing ourselves and every quarter, we’re meeting up with the people from DfT to say what’s been going on with the project, what we’ve done and what we’ve achieved. We set a target, we’re finding out how much money we’ve spent, what’s left to spend... It’s totally different to the TfL project.

RSO2: I think that’s been a big issue, project management. I think most of us did not have that experience of having project management meetings set out, having clear targets, clear performance indicators at the beginning... It’s been a steep learning curve!”

The main threats to sustainability identified by the end of the evaluation are: over-reliance of some projects on individual project leads or partners, usually associated with high workload; lack of capacity of current partners and likely disengagement of partners; lack of motivation of project leads to take the work forward at the end of their demonstration project; lack of planning for dissemination of resources; lack of involvement of statutory partners at borough level; lack of appropriate support for RSOs from their line managers; and general lack of strategic focus on sustainability.

A new section dedicated to sustainability in the Guidelines will be necessary.

4.6. Value for money and added value

The evaluation cannot quantify value for money and added value in relation to the demonstration projects. Generally, the outcomes of community engagement programmes are difficult to measure in terms of casualty reductions - and therefore to quantify in economic

terms - because they are indirect, complex and occur over long periods of time. In this case, they are particularly difficult to assess because many of the demonstration projects had not completed all their work by the end of the evaluation, because the impact of some engagement activities on the project participants was not assessed, and because the projects focussed not only on road safety benefits, but also on wider social capital benefits.

However, to put in context the value of the demonstration projects, it is useful to note that the average cost of a collision is estimated at nearly £90K¹⁴. If one bears in mind that the maximum value of the demonstration projects was £20K for a year, that the projects all targeted minority ethnic and deprived communities that are known to be at disproportionate risk of road traffic injury, that all projects will have delivered either all or most of their activities in the near future, that the Road Safety Officers have greatly improved their understanding of inequalities and developed new ways of working to address those, that some educational and engagement resources have been produced and could be rolled out elsewhere, that some lasting partnerships and community engagement structures have been established, that new funding (both from TfL and the DfT) has been secured, that the lessons from the evaluation will contribute to new Guidelines on Working with Communities to Reduce Road Traffic Injury Inequalities in London, and that training to the wider road safety community in London will be offered based on lessons from the demonstration projects, it seems reasonable to conclude that funding the projects represents good use of public money¹⁵. In the long term, it is anticipated that these projects are likely to reduce injury inequality as well as improve road safety overall across London.

To maximise the value of the projects, however, there needs to be strong leadership to drive the injury inequalities agenda through all local authorities. Some of the local authorities that experience the highest levels of deprivation and that have the highest concentrations of black and minority ethnic populations were not part of the demonstration projects. Significant reductions in inequalities can only be expected if these boroughs are on board. Transport for London and all Road Safety Units across London should also carry out Equality Impact Assessments to ensure that resources are deployed where they can make the greatest impact on the reduction of injury inequalities, as well as general improvements to road safety.

Further, there is a need to develop cross-boroughs and London-wide partnerships around injury inequality reductions. Strategic lead on this issue should see road safety become an integral part of relevant strategic frameworks in the capital, including (though not restricted to):

- the Mayor's Health Inequality Strategy
- the Mayor's Spatial Development Strategy (the London Plan)
- the Mayor's Children and Young People Strategy
- the Metropolitan Police's Safer Neighbourhood Strategy

¹⁴ Department for Transport (2004) Highways Economic Note No 1 (HEN1): 2004.

¹⁵ In light of the above considerations, it was sound to allocate more funding to enable the demonstration projects to carry on with their community engagement work, develop their expertise further and broaden their remit. However, it may have represented better value for money had the funding decisions been made after the findings of the evaluation had been delivered.

5.0. OPERATIONAL FACTORS AND SUCCESS FACTORS

5.1. Introduction

In addition to assessing the performance of individual projects in relation to the main criteria discussed above, the evaluation also identified a number of operational factors (that is, factors linked to the implementation of the demonstration projects) that appear to help or hinder projects in their attempt to reduce injury inequalities and improve road safety in London.

5.2. Operational factors

- **Clarity of expectations**

Despite clear expectations set out in the “bidding guidance” document prepared by the LRSU, all projects have been taken aback by the workload associated with community engagement work. This suggests that the bidding guidance could have been better attuned to the operational and capacity constraints of road safety professionals and could have engaged more directly with these. Generally, the expectations of projects in relation to community engagement are reported as being disproportionate when compared to expectations of projects funded through the LIPS mechanism.

All projects were given draft Guidelines to provide support and guidance on all aspects of community engagement work. The Guidelines were distributed on November 1, 2007, which may account for the fact that they were not used at project planning stage by those projects that started early. However, even projects that started later and that were in need of much guidance on community engagement did not make full use of the document. Thus, the Guidelines do not seem to have helped to either ease concerns or provide a useful steer. The general feedback, systematically sought through face-to-face interviews with all the project leads and many other RSOs at the Interim Report stage, is that the Guidelines were thought to be clear and comprehensive *once people read them* (indeed, one RSO promoted the Guidelines at a ROSPA conference) but that the format deterred some people from even opening the document. The project leads made recommendations to ETHNOS mainly in terms of the format and style (with the hope that the document will be shorter). However, the projects made very few recommendations to improve the core structure or substance of the Guidelines. Discussion with LRSU will be needed to clarify the way forward.

- **Workload and timescale**

Community engagement is always time and resource intensive. Identifying suitable partners, sorting out procurement issues, establishing a Steering Group, getting access to the communities, establishing a relationship of trust, planning community consultation and participation events, designing materials, showing enough flexibility to be responsive to the constraints of under-resourced partners and hard to reach communities, keeping in frequent contact with all stakeholders, dealing with administrative responsibilities linked both to normal project management and to the requirements of the evaluation, and so on, all take a considerable amount of time, resources and skills. This had to be achieved in addition to the normal workload of participating Road Safety Officers, by professionals with little or no experience of community engagement work, and through partnerships with organisations that themselves often had little capacity to support them. The one year timeline does not match the expectation of partnership working, community engagement and capacity building.

“We weren’t prepared for the amount of work that was coming our way. The commitment of hours and work that came with the project, I don’t think we were prepared for that. That has been the big downfall for all of us, and the amount of meetings, and the EQIA and the paperwork... The whole thing over all, how many hours it brought on top of your working hours: it’s been too much.”

“If you add up all the hours that you put in towards it, the resources, the time of your working day, I don’t think we calculated that when we were putting in the bid.”

“Some things are out of your hands, when you are waiting for the community to do it and you have no control over it. You’ve got to allow for that as well, to understand that people have got commitments. So you allow for that. And then you can’t go around saying: ‘Oh you haven’t done that’ because you’re not employing them, they are doing that on a voluntary basis and you’ve just got to accept that.”

The absence of a clear start date for the projects was perhaps unavoidable, but it was also undesirable. It meant that some early community engagement activities were not evaluated, that opportunities for “pre-post” evaluation were lost, and that projects have had a different period of time over which to deliver their work.

The lifecycle of the projects and the evaluation in relation to the next round of funding was not carefully thought through either. Projects have applied for future funding from TfL to carry on their work over the next three years, and decisions over funding allocations were made without regard for the findings of the evaluation.

- **Project management and research capacity**

The traditional role of Road Safety Officers consists primarily in delivering road safety education and training programmes. However, when road safety education is delivered through community engagement projects, the role of the RSO shifts from one that mainly focuses on delivery, to one that mainly focuses on project management (while retaining full control over the delivery role).

Moreover, in many cases, given the paucity of evidence in relation to the factors that cause road traffic injury inequalities in the target groups, community engagement also requires basic research skills, such as how to carry out and analyse a focus group discussion or a survey. Currently, these skills are not found among many Road Safety Officers and it is unclear whether road safety units can access them within their borough. The projects that have had a more considerable element of community consultation through focus group discussions (consultation on the causes on inequalities among the Somali community in TW4) and through surveys (the Travel Surveys in Haringey and Child Injury Inequality Survey carried out by young people in Camden) all required outside help with various aspects of data collection, data analysis and reporting. However, the findings are very informative and could provide solid foundations for future engagement work.

- **Attitudes to working with communities to reduce inequalities**

The RSOs involved in the demonstration projects had different attitudes to working with communities to reduce inequalities. A few Road Safety Teams already targeted disadvantaged groups prior to starting their demonstration project and had experience of

working with communities to reduce inequalities. Some teams espoused the principles of community engagement and the focus on inequalities from the very beginning. They were motivated and started early on. They felt that there was a need for targeted and tailored community-based interventions on road safety. They were either already at ease with working from the communities (often because they were themselves from a minority ethnic background) or happy to develop their expertise and skills in this field. Other project leads only came belatedly to see the value of community engagement in their work.

A few RSOs did not perceive the need for the new or different ways of working, felt that this was imposed on them by TfL and the GLA, and that it constituted a case of “political correctness”. These concerns were eventually overcome. They are best addressed through recourse to evidence.

A few RSOs expressed concerns over the perceived dilution of their professional expertise if they need to work closely with, or even rely on, people who are not “road safety” experts (other than schools and the police). These concerns can be best addressed through clarifying the division of labour that makes partnerships most productive. As mentioned earlier, some project leads also had strong reservations over the targeting of people from minority ethnic communities and, to a lesser extent, people living in areas of high deprivation. All such attitudes impacted on the work of Road Safety Officers in the different boroughs.

- **Impact of casualty reduction targets**

According to some RSOs, one of the major obstacles to the promotion of community engagement with people from minority ethnic backgrounds is that the numbers of people involved will often be perceived to be too small to have a measurable impact on statistics and the achievement of targets. In a culture that is driven by targets around casualty reduction, it was difficult for RSOs to get the requisite buy-in from senior managers for this type of work. The organisational culture around performance management by targets underlines the importance of linking with other strategic agendas at local level, so that performance can be measured by criteria other than (or additional to) reductions in casualty figures.

“We are target driven, so our targets are to reduce the number of casualties in our borough, and although, certainly the minority group that we were working with had more accidents than they should have done in proportion to the number of population they are, it’s actually a very, very small number of residents in the borough. So you are kind of driven on the one hand by the need to reduce the casualties and then by the need to target those most at risk, but the two don’t always tally.”

“I think one of the problems we’ve got is that we are casualty led. Our resources and our manpower depend on that. There are probably more things people would like to do, but we haven’t got those resources to have the luxury of experimenting or dipping our toe into a larger sea. We’re very much driven or measured on what we are already doing. And so really I don’t think the problem lies with us. It lies at a higher level with those people whose policy is to give you money for looking after the needs of the majority.”

Some RSOs argued that TfL itself sent conflicting messages, driving community engagement, on the one hand, but refusing to allocate appropriate resources to it, on the other.

“I don’t think any of us could have done the project without the funding and I think there’s no point in championing something unless there’s proper funding behind it. If they really take this seriously, TfL needs to get some money behind this.”

“I felt the first year funding when they did put out £20K, I thought that was very minimal compared to other projects. And their requirements were much greater than for anything else that we apply for through LIPS. It doesn’t make sense to me.”

“In the bidding application, TfL should put in funding for staffing levels and I think that would be a great advantage for all of us.”

- **Support and buy-in from senior managers at borough level**

Road Safety Officers cannot be expected to drive change through road safety units without internal support and buy-in from senior managers in their borough. Greater coherence and support are necessary to develop the project management and research capacity described above, to identify interventions and resources that would have the greatest impact on the reduction of inequalities (through an EqIA) and to pool borough resources.

Some projects benefited from excellent line managers who ensured that the workload associated with the community engagement would be redistributed across the entire team, who lobbied with senior managers and policy colleagues to establish community engagement on a firmer footing at local authority level, who ensured that relevant staff would access training and that the work carried out for these projects would get the visibility and recognition it deserves.

“Road Safety Officers are expected to deliver what’s quite a complex project on top of everything else that they do and there was no scope within the funding to employ someone else to take on a bit of their work or something like that. So the rest of the team have had to try and work together to clear some time for the RSO in our borough to spend more time on this project.

I: Have colleagues been resentful of this?

No, as it happens, everyone put their shoulder to the wheel. As it happens, it’s been good for everybody. But I think as the manager of the person who was managing the project, I’d now look much earlier at the workload and make the adjustments... The project has asked too much of everybody I think. So I would have looked sooner at workload and tried to reorganise the team earlier.”

Some projects operated with line managers that gave them limited support, direction, access to resources or to promote their work.

“Without managers around you perceiving that what you do is important, you’ve got to battle your way through.”

Some RSOs also called for some degree of restructuring of the road safety function at local authority level to facilitate joint working towards common or complementary road safety goals.

“I feel that within road safety and sustainable travel teams, there are some very highly motivated people but they do need to understand, or we do need to share

ideas and share work so that we become more clever at what we do because otherwise it just seems to me that we're treading on each other's toes working to the same gain....I hate to say it but initially, this was kick started by TfL actually. They were the ones who put this big divide there, they never looked at ways of integrating road safety with travel, so that's our challenge now."

"I'm very fortunate because in our borough, they're all part of my team and it has brought enormous benefits because the School Travel Plan agenda, for instance, fits with a lot of things the schools want to do in terms of health, exercise and all sorts of things. So schools are keener for you to go in and it's really smoothed the paths of working with schools. But of course, road safety then helps you to achieve, maybe train more people who are going to cycle, to learn... There are actually loads and loads of connections but you need the teams to work together and I know that it isn't always easy. It depends on the structure. Every local authority is different but we should learn what works best and apply that."

- **Promotion of community engagement among local authorities by TfL**

Finally, some RSOs felt that TfL could do more to promote community engagement and the innovative work which RSOs who took part in the demonstration projects have done. Especially in the teams where lead officers have had little contact with their line managers, there is a feeling that the considerable efforts committed to community engagement have not been recognised internally.

"[It would be good for] TfL to support the kind of work that we've done and to bring that towards others, like for instance, praise our work to our employers, our council, because nobody's going to know. We've done a whole load of work and nobody really knows. Our own borough sometimes aren't interested but when someone else comes up to you and says: 'Well your borough's done this', then they pay attention. If TfL could give an award or celebrate or do something to reward the kind of work that we've been doing, that would be a big help."

"I think it has actually increased our visibility and status as a team. A lot of our partners know about road safety now and include us in things. We are part of really interesting groups now, so that's been really important. Because it's interesting and different, members have wanted to hear about it. I've been to lots of committees and told people about what we're doing, so again, it means that they look to see what we're doing hopefully in future and ask us to talk to them on things in the future. It has to be good overall for the work that we're doing."

"TfL really set the tone for what the council does and they can say that community engagement should have a higher profile and make sure it's backed up with funding and that senior people see the point of it."

5.3. Success factors

Having worked with the seven community engagement projects over a number of months, ETHNOS has identified a number of critical success factors. These are:

- having a clear set of project aims and objectives, and a clearly defined target group, based on evidence of need;
- developing realistic but exhaustive performance indicators to ensure focus throughout the life of the project;
- recognising the value of community engagement as a new way of working to tackle inequalities and being committed to this approach;
- having a good understanding of socio-economic, cultural and lifestyle issues linked to deprivation and ethnic minority communities, or being willing to develop this understanding;
- establishing a solid partnership with people or organisations that have complementary skills and for whom the project adds value in terms of their existing agenda;
- having a solid Steering Group in place to ensure that the perspectives of the target audiences are fully represented, and to provide guidance and advice on all aspects of the project;
- having diverse teams of Road Safety Officers to facilitate access and engagement in diverse communities;
- having appropriate and timely support (from within local road safety teams, from the boroughs or from TfL) to overcome emerging issues;
- starting small, with projects that are manageable in size and realistic in their ambitions, and building on success before widening the remit of the project;
- delivering through partners that have good access to and are familiar with the target communities but keeping tight control of road safety messages;
- having a good balance between “top-down” and “bottom-up” approaches, so that interventions benefit from the accumulated expertise of road safety professionals but are also driven by ideas that come from the communities themselves;
- allowing for a sufficient amount of lead-in time before interventions start in order to build trust and secure good relationships, as well as to plan logistics;
- having strong people skills to overcome differences in organisational cultures and personalities;
- putting in place excellent communications and reporting mechanisms, with clear action plans throughout the life of the project;
- having buy-in from senior managers and other council staff to allow road safety professionals, where necessary, to focus specifically on road traffic injury inequalities by allocating resources accordingly; and
- having access to long-term funding to embed inequalities in the boroughs’ ways of working.

5.4. Conclusions

Overall, projects which committed to community engagement achieved significant developments in project management skills, access to minority ethnic and deprived communities that had previously been hard to reach, delivery of targeted road safety provisions, shifts in organisational structures and resources, and access to a broader funding base. However, more research evidence, time, resources and training are needed to support community engagement projects, and organisational changes may be required in boroughs and centrally within TfL to facilitate the shift towards community engagement. Although the seven demonstration projects funded were all led by Road Safety Officers, the lessons from the evaluation are relevant to all road safety practitioners, including engineers.

These lessons confirm what the extensive literature in public health and community development has established: working closely with minority ethnic and deprived communities is time-consuming but it offers the best prospect of reducing inequalities in road traffic injuries, when this engagement is based on sound evidence and makes full use of the expertise of road safety professionals and partners. This requires a new focus specifically on inequalities, in addition to the overall promotion of road safety, and related changes in ways of working. It also requires a strong political will from key stakeholders. Transport for London, in partnership with the boroughs and a broad range of statutory partners, has a major role to play in continuing to drive this agenda in the capital.

APPENDIX 1: DESCRIPTION OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

Brent: “Let’s Enjoy Travelling Safely in Brent”

The challenge: Brent is the second most ethnically diverse borough in England, with 71% of residents being from black and minority ethnic backgrounds at the time of the last Census (2001). It is also one of the most deprived boroughs in the country (ranked 53 out of 354 local authorities). As elsewhere in London, Stats 19 statistics show that young pedestrians from minority ethnic backgrounds are at disproportionate risk of road traffic injury in Brent.

The target audience: The Brent Accident Prevention Team chose to work with children aged between 4 and 11, who are from a range of minority ethnic backgrounds (mainly black Caribbeans, black Africans, Eastern Europeans, Somalis and Travellers of Irish heritage) and who attend schools where a large proportion of pupils are entitled to free school meals.

The partnership: The partnership for the intervention includes three schools (Our Lady of Lourdes (Roman Catholic) Primary School, Stonebridge Primary School and Stonebridge Pupil Referral Unit) as well as Spearfish, a company specialising in painting murals. Taken together, the schools provide access to some 500 pupils of mixed ethnic backgrounds.

The intervention: The intervention consisted in developing road safety awareness among pupils and the wider school community by painting a mural based on children’s artwork. The mural will remain as a permanent feature in the schools’ environment and the local area. Activities included:

- involving Junior Road Safety Officers in leading school assemblies on road safety, giving their input into a theatre production on road safety, and taking part in Steering Group meetings over the life of the project
- exposing pupils to a theatre production performed by Theatre in Education
- engaging pupils in producing art work on various road safety issues through workshops led by an artist
- exhibiting the art work and selecting best drawing to inspire a large-scale mural on the school perimeter
- producing and launching the mural

The outcome: All school children have accessed road safety messages and a small group of Junior Road Safety Officers have championed road safety in the school community. The mural will raise awareness of road safety in the wider community around the school.

Contact details: Debbie Fowler, Accident Prevention Manager: Debbie.Fowler@brent.gov.uk
Deborah Bonner, Senior School Travel Plan Officer: Deborah.Bonner@brent.gov.uk
Sally Hennessy, Senior Road Safety Officer: Sally.Hennessy@brent.gov.uk
Alison Bennett, Accident Prevention Officer: Alison.Bennett@brent.gov.uk

Camden: “Camden Child Injury Inequality Project”

The challenge: Camden has a large minority ethnic population: 47% of residents were from black and minority ethnic backgrounds at the time of the last Census (2001). It is also one of the most deprived boroughs in the country (ranked 57 out of 354 local authorities). As elsewhere in London, Stats 19 data show that young pedestrians from minority ethnic backgrounds are at disproportionate risk of road traffic injury in Camden. Analyses of Stats 19 data also reveal that three-quarters of road traffic injuries suffered by school age pupils do *not* occur during the school journey.

The target audience: The Camden Public Safety Team worked mainly with boys and girls aged 11 to 15 years-old from black Caribbean and black African backgrounds, or from deprived areas.

The partnership: To extent its reach into the target communities and reflect the pattern of injuries locally, the Camden Public Safety Team chose to work with Supplementary Schools and Youth Centres which attract many young people at risk of road traffic injury but do not normally benefit from road safety education. They partnered with four community and voluntary sector organisations: the Mandela Supplementary School, the Somali Community Centre, the Centre for Ethiopians in Britain and the Samuel Lithgow Youth Centre.

The intervention: The intervention consisted of involving young people in carrying out research with family and peers into the causes of road traffic injury and inequalities. Activities included:

- working closely with partners to ensure that young people have the guidance and support they need to complete their research
- designing and overseeing the administration of the survey
- analysing survey responses and producing a detailed research report
- organising two events for young people to present their research findings and recommendations to the “Staying Safe” sub-board of Camden’s “Children and Young People’s Partnership” and other stakeholders

The outcome: The project has increased awareness of road safety and injury inequalities among young people at risk in Camden. It has also enhanced the Camden Public Safety Team’s understanding of road safety issues in this target group. Over a few months, the project has involved 62 young people in carrying out research with a total of 236 young people and 53 parents, as well as in reporting on their findings to relevant policy audiences. Project participants have developed many transferable skills (e.g. to listen, to probe, to record and to present complex information). Excellent working relations have been maintained with project partners. Young people have also derived wider social capital benefits from taking part in the project, and understood how they can influence ideas, social policies and local/regional decision-making.

Contact details: Belita Clahar, Public Safety Team Manager, belita.clahar@camden.gov.uk
Fiona La Crette, Road Safety Officer, fiona.lacrette@camden.gov.uk
Bev Cain, Road Safety Officer, Bev.Cain@Camden.gov.uk

Hackney: “Inroads”

The challenge: Hackney is the second most deprived borough in England. It has a very large black and minority ethnic population, with 56% of residents being from minority ethnic backgrounds at the time of the last Census (2001). As elsewhere in London, Stats 19 data show that black people are overrepresented in casualty figures (all severities) in Hackney. Black child pedestrians are at particularly high risk.

The target audience: Although casualty figures do not distinguish between black ethnic groups, population estimates in Hackney show that the largest share of black people is from black African (especially Nigerian) origins. The Road Safety Team in Hackney therefore decided to work with black African parents, with the intention of reaching their children through them.

The partnership: The partners for the project are Artikal Films (an independent media production company) and BEN TV (a British television channel aimed mainly at expatriate Africans living in Europe).

The intervention: Hackney worked with Artikal to produce a television programme on road safety issues and injury inequalities for black African parents to be aired on Ben TV. The programme includes interviews with parents and teachers, and shows young people taking risks on the roads. It compares and contrasts the road experiences and the road safety needs of people in African countries and in Hackney. Activities included:

- carrying out a consultation event on the causes of injury inequalities in the black African community in Hackney
- overseeing the production of the draft programme
- consulting community members on the validity and relevance of the draft programme
- overseeing the production of the final programme
- airing the programme on BEN TV in July 08 and September 08
- producing 200 copies of the DVD resource based on the television programme
- promoting the DVD resource on a local African radio station several times during a month
- producing road safety leaflets to be distributed to council buildings, churches, community centers, and other local shops in Hackney
- planning the distribution of the DVD resource to relevant community organisations

The outcome: “Inroads”, a tailored television programme and educational resource on road safety issues among black African people in Hackney, has been produced, aired and could now be disseminated widely in Hackney and elsewhere in London. Awareness of road safety in the black African community is expected to increase following exposure to the programme.

Contact details: Maryann Allen, Team Leader Road Safety: maryann.allen@hackney.gov.uk
Sandra Agbabiaka, Road Safety Officer: sandra.agbabiaka@hackney.gov.uk

Hammersmith & Fulham: “Roadwise Rangers”

The challenge: Hammersmith & Fulham has a large minority ethnic population: 42% of residents were from black and minority ethnic backgrounds at the time of the last Census (2001). It is also one of the most deprived boroughs in the country (ranked 59 out of 354 local authorities). As elsewhere in London, Stats 19 data show that young pedestrians from minority ethnic backgrounds are at disproportionate risk of road traffic injury in Hammersmith & Fulham.

The target audience: The project targets young people from different ethnic minority backgrounds aged 11-14 years living in the White City Estate. The White City Estate is the most deprived and ethnically diverse part of the borough. It also has the highest incidence of child road traffic injuries.

The partnership: The partnership includes Queens Park Rangers Football Club, local schools and a graphic designer.

The intervention: The “Roadwise Rangers” project consists in developing a tailored road safety educational resource which links road safety and sporting skills, in order to make road safety more relevant and appealing to young people. Activities included:

- involving young people in a “Roadwise Rangers” buddy scheme
- involving young people in consultation about the design and content of sports-based workbook and in providing feedback on draft artwork to ensure relevance for target audience
- involving young people from four local schools in a competition to draw their key concerns in relation to road safety
- involving a graphic designer to produce art work based on consultation findings
- carrying out three “Roadwise Rangers” activity days involving sporting and road safety activities (including cycle training theory), based on the workbook
- distributing QPR caps and medals to members of “Roadwise Rangers”

The outcome: An educational resource on road safety issues that appeals to young people has been produced, and a lasting partnership with Queens Park Rangers FC has been established, through which future road safety interventions can be delivered.

Contact details: Valerie Springer, Road Safety Officer, valerie.springer@lbhf.gov.uk

Haringey: “Raising Road Safety Awareness in Haringey’s Ethnic Communities”

The challenge: Haringey is one of the most diverse and economically deprived local authorities in England: 55% of the local residents were from minority ethnic backgrounds at the time of the last Census (2001). Most of them are from South Asian (Pakistani, Bangladeshi), black African (Somali, Ethiopian, Kenyan, Nigerian), North African and Middle Eastern countries where Islam is a dominant religion. Haringey is also one of the most deprived boroughs in the country (ranked 18 out of 354 local authorities). Stats 19 data provide no information on specific ethnic groups or on religion. However, national data sets consistently show that Muslim communities tend to experience high levels of deprivation, linked to poor educational achievements, low employment rates, lack of fluency in English, refugee status, etc. It is likely that many have distinct needs in terms of road safety education and skills.

The target audience: The project targets Muslim families who attend two supplementary schools at a local mosque in Haringey.

The partnership: The project partners are the London Islamic Cultural Society, Box Clever Theatre Company and the African Caribbean Centre in Haringey.

The intervention: The project involved raising awareness of various aspects of road safety in the Muslim community in Haringey. Activities included:

- presenting a performance of Theatre in Education around road safety to children
- producing maps of all casualties in Haringey in 3 years and presenting of the maps to some 200 children
- conducting travel surveys of pupils and parents to identify road traffic patterns in the local community, in order to identify future road safety education and training needs
- involving children in identifying key road safety issues and road safety messages, in order to produce leaflets on road safety for the mosque community, conducting an award ceremony for the pupils who designed the best leaflets, and distributing these leaflets to various mosques
- delivering in-car safety promotion and awareness training sessions with parents at a local community centre (the African Caribbean Centre) in Haringey
- delivering a final presentation covering all aspects of the project to children and their parents at the mosque
- distributing safety vests at the mosque’s final sports day

The outcome: Road safety awareness and knowledge in the Muslim community in Haringey have increased. In-car safety has improved for many families. Children have been involved in long-term road safety projects. Road safety leaflets that are tailored to the Muslim community have been designed and disseminated in the borough. They may be taken to other mosques throughout London. A lasting partnership has been established with the local mosque and links are being created with other mosques. The project developed sufficient capacity in the Haringey Road Safety Team for them to secure DfT funding for a large-scale, two year community engagement programme.

Contact details: Halema Uddin, Road Safety Officer, Halema.Uddin@haringey.gov.uk

Hounslow: “TW4 Somali Engagement Project”

The challenge: Hounslow has a large minority ethnic population: 44% of residents were from black and minority ethnic backgrounds at the time of the last Census (2001). The borough as a whole ranked 105 out of 354 local authorities, but this conceals areas of very high deprivation. A sophisticated data analysis identified that the Somali community is a greater risk of road traffic injury than others. The Road Safety Team in Hounslow analysed Stats 19 data using the *residence of the casualty* (rather than the location of the collision) to identify where the communities most involved or injured in collisions live. Hounslow identified that people living in the TW4 area were at greater risk of road traffic injury than other Hounslow residents. The Road Safety Team then looked at the PLASC data produced by local schools in the TW4 area and found that a large number of school pupils spoke Somali. This confirmed the need to work more directly and intensively with this community to reduce injury inequalities.

The target audience: The project targets the Somali community (children, young people, mothers and carers) in the TW4 area of the borough.

The partnership: The partners in this project include a local community organisation working with Somali families (ILYAS), a broad range of statutory agencies - Hounslow Homes, Sure Start, library services, youth workers, the Beavers primary school and the local Primary Care Trust - as well as volunteers.

The intervention: The project mainly aimed to create long-term community structures through which all partners can reach the Somali community to carry out development work. The road safety components of the project included:

- holding road safety awareness sessions at the centre, over several weeks, including both classroom-based and outdoor practical sessions on: motorcycling training for young boys, pedestrian skills training for women, general road safety and in-car safety for parents, etc.
- leading a consultation event on the lifestyle and environmental factors that contribute to the over-representation of Somalis in road traffic injuries in TW4
- leading assemblies on road safety in a local school
- overseeing the production of a ceramic mural on road safety in a local school

The outcome: This project raised awareness of various aspects of road safety and enhanced pedestrian and motorcycling skills in a hard to reach community where such awareness was extremely low and skills were lacking. It linked excluded Somali families with local services and created a robust, high-capacity partnership to support future engagement with the Somali community. It also raised the profile of road safety in key strategic partnership at local level.

Contact details: Fatima Ahmed, Senior Road Safety Advisor,
fatima.ahmed@hounslow.gov.uk

Southwark: “Saving Lives”

The challenge: Southwark has a large minority ethnic population: 48% of residents were from black and minority ethnic backgrounds at the time of the last Census (2001). It is also one of the most deprived boroughs in the country (ranked 26 out of 354 local authorities). As elsewhere in London, Stats 19 data show that young pedestrians from minority ethnic backgrounds are at disproportionate risk of road traffic injury in Southwark, with those living in the small east to west corridor of Walworth, Peckham & Camberwell being at greatest risk.

The target audience: The project targets black young people who are either excluded from school or at risk of exclusion.

The partnership: Southwark opted to partner with Community Youth Limited, a community-based voluntary organisation that provides digital media skills training to at risk black youth.

The intervention: The project consists in engaging black boys and girls around road safety through participating in a digital media training course to learn different media and IT components on how to develop a DVD on road safety. The activities included:

- brainstorming the main road safety issues among the target audience
- producing draft scripts and rough sketches of the characters and plot for the DVD
- training two 14 year olds in singing and recording sound tracks for the DVD
- training youth team in media design and production
- consulting children from a primary local school to test out the characters and the different elements of the DVD
- providing continuous feedback on various aspects of the DVD (characters, scripts, tone, music, road safety issues, etc) through consultation with young people
- interviewing the target audience in relation to road safety
- interviewing road traffic injury victims from the target audience
- producing leaflets and posters for the project
- involving local artists in the DVD production with specific lines on the script
- disseminating at a later stage the DVD resource to young black boys and girls in local schools to raise awareness of road safety and of injury inequalities

The outcome: This project raised awareness of various aspects of road safety in a hard to reach community where awareness was low and risk taking was high. It produced an excellent road safety DVD that is tailored to meet the needs and preferences of black youth in South London. The dissemination of the road safety DVD in local schools is expected to have a significant positive impact on the target audience. The resource could be rolled out elsewhere in London. The project also developed valuable transferable skills in the young people who were involved in producing the DVD, thereby contributing to community development.

Contact details: Gareth Tuffery, Principal Road Safety Officer,
Gareth.Tuffery@southwark.gov.uk
Vivienne Harris, Road Safety Officer, Vivienne.Harris@southwark.gov.uk