



The **TRAFFIC SNAKE GAME NETWORK**

D5.1 Evaluation and Monitoring Plan

Author: Sabrina Ishfaq, WYG

Status: Final

Date: 12 June 2014



Co-funded by the Intelligent Energy Europe
Programme of the European Union

Content

1.1	What is Traffic Snake Game?	3
1.2	Evaluation and Monitoring Guidelines	3
1.3	MaxSUMO and TSG Network	4
1.3.1	Introduction to MaxSUMO	4
1.3.2	MaxSUMO within TSG Network	4
1.4	Report Structure	4
4.1	Evaluation for IEE Common Performance Indicators	9
4.2	CPI Data Collection Methodology	9
4.3	MaxSUMO Incorporation	10
5.1	Tools	11
5.1.1	Measurement Forms	11
5.1.2	NFP and Local Implementer Feedback Forms	12
5.1.3	Progress Spreadsheet	12
5.1.4	MaxEVA	13
5.2	Reporting	13
5.2.1	Annual Reports	13
5.2.2	Final Report	14
6.1	Quality Assurance	15
6.2	Communication	15
6.2.1	Management Meetings/Regional Teleconferences	15
6.2.2	EU Regional Workshops	16
6.2.3	Webinars	16
6.2.4	National Events	16

1. Introduction

1.1 What is Traffic Snake Game?

The Traffic Snake Game Network (TSG Network) establishes an effective EU-wide and long-term support network to replicate, transfer and expand the uptake of the Traffic Snake Game as a successful proven tool for changing the travel behaviour of primary school children and their parents.

TSG Network wants to do this by shifting the journeys by car to more sustainable journeys, such as walking, cycling, public transport (bus, train, tram and metro) and car sharing. By doing so, the network wants to achieve the following objectives:

- To build a professional, international and sustainable Traffic Snake Game Network with at least 20 National Focal Points throughout the 28 European member states.
- At least 3 European cities in each participating country that actively join and support the Traffic Snake Game for schools in their area; hence at least 60 cities throughout the project lifespan.
- At least 1,200 schools in the participating cities that realise at least 15% increase of sustainable trips and matching CO2 reduction (minimum average of 60 active schools per country over the course of 3 years is targeted).

TSG Network monitoring and evaluation will report on the outputs and outcomes in terms of modal shift, percentage of sustainable trips and energy savings before, during and after the implementation of the project. TSG Network will make use of the MaxSUMO evaluation methodology, which offers an opportunity to effectively plan, monitor and evaluate mobility projects and programmes aimed at behavioural change. Further information about the MaxSUMO methodology is available in section 2.

1.2 Evaluation and Monitoring Guidelines

Evaluation covers both project impacts and processes associated with implementation. Monitoring and evaluation tasks are on-going activities, to be started before the first TSG campaign is played. Baseline data on Common Performance Indicators (CPIs) is to be collected in the project's start-up phase.

Interim evaluation results will be used to steer the project. For example, the TSG Network project involves different types of meetings, to be held several times per year; Each meeting round should be evaluated and results used to refine the organisation of future campaign events. Final evaluation results inform the projects' continuity and legacy phases.

1.3 MaxSUMO and TSG Network

1.3.1 Introduction to MaxSUMO

MaxSUMO provides a useful guide and tool for evaluating and monitoring mobility projects. The MaxSUMO methodology allows for single measures as well as multiple measures and activities to be evaluated. The MaxSUMO methodology was chosen by the TSG Network due to it being an EU approved methodology and also for its online tool MaxEVA, which includes detailed data collection requirements for robust monitoring.

In addition, it is important to demonstrate that the project has been successful and to justify the funding invested and to understand why certain results can be seen. By using MaxSUMO's online tool MaxEVA, it is easier to share results with other mobility practitioners and supports knowledge sharing and best practice more widely.

1.3.2 MaxSUMO within TSG Network

This report has been written in accordance with the guidelines of the MaxSUMO methodology. All evaluation and monitoring tasks and processes are in line with the guidance and all tools made available will be used for monitoring and recording any data.

The MaxEVA online tool will be utilised for data collection. At the end of the project all countries will have provided baseline, during and after campaign data and this will be added to the tool. In addition to this data, all dissemination activities will also be recorded and the information and results will be used to complete the project's annual reports.

Further information of how the tool will be utilised is included in section 5 of this report.

1.4 Report Structure

This report includes:

- Section 2 sets out the evaluation of specific project objectives
- Section 3 elaborates on the methodology for collecting data on the IEE common performance indicators (CPIs)
- Section 4 sets out the different tools to be used for evaluation and monitoring as well as reporting
- Section 5 sets out the data collection timeframes and methods
- Section 6 includes management of quality assurance and the communication channels to be used

2. Evaluation of Project Objectives

The Description of the Action (DoA) for the TSG Network defines specific objectives and associated outputs, impacts, indicators, targets and means of monitoring. These have formed the basis of the monitoring and evaluation plan set out below. The following deliverables are referred to in the plan along with additional monitoring and evaluation tasks:

- Monitoring and Evaluation Report, D5.1
- Monitoring and Evaluation progress and feedback forms, D5.2
- Year 1 Monitoring Results Report, D5.3
- Year 2 Monitoring Results Report, D5.4
- Final Results Report, D5.5
- EU regional workshops, national events and consortium meeting feedback

The table below includes a list of objectives and evaluation tasks related to each work package and deliverable.

Work Package	Task	Monitoring & evaluation method / Reporting / Quality assurance	Responsibilities	Resources required	Timescale
WP1 Project Management	1.4 Quality Management Ensure that all of the outputs/deliverables of the project are delivered to the highest standard.	Language & quality checks on all presentations and deliverables	Language Check Quality Check	WP1 and WP5. Primary time from WYG but also all core partners to assist in quality management	All through project
	1.4 Ensure the projects aims and objectives are addressed and tasks are carried out in accordance with quality management within WP5	Updates to be collected in core meetings and consortium meetings Regional Network calls in the form of meeting minutes	Mobiel21 to provide meeting minutes at core and consortium minutes All Core partners to produce meeting minutes of Regional network calls		
WP2 Communication and Dissemination	2.4 Project communications	Language check all promotional and marketing materials.	All partners to send any English language documents to WYG for language check	WP2 and WP5	All through project
WP3 NFP Support Services	3.1 Marketing Strategies and tools; marketing plan, campaign tools (TSG basic and TSG 2.0),	Language checks on deliverable reports		WP3	M3-5
		Feedback questions on campaign materials to be included in feedback forms to NFPs and local implementers	WYG to produce feedback forms/online surveys and carry out analysis.	WP5	M11, 22 and 36 with yearly evaluation reports.



Work Package	Task	Monitoring & evaluation method / Reporting / Quality assurance	Responsibilities	Resources required	Timescale
	2.1 NFP Empowerment Includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EU regional workshops - Webinars 	Each workshop and webinar to be evaluated through online surveys.	All partners to issue questionnaires/surveys Signed attendance list for all events		After each workshop and Webinar
WP4 Campaign the Campaigner	4.1 NFP's organise annual national network event <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - national action plan - national events 	General NFP monitoring and progress to be assessed through individual action plans	WYG to produce action plan templates	WP4 and WP5	M4 Events guide & action plan
		Evaluation of events to be carried out through feedback forms/online surveys.	WYG to produce feedback forms/online surveys		M6-34 Annual report on national workshops
	4.2 NFP's support local implementers	The progress of each NFP will be recorded in a template document which will be used to inform WP5	WYG to produce template document/excel to record NFP progress		M6 Long-term development plan
	4.3 Build-up long term development	Template of activities/plan for each NFP to be included in the long term development plan	WYG to include monitoring tasks within plans and assess their progress		M35 Annual status reports on long term development

Work Package	Task	Monitoring & evaluation method / Reporting / Quality assurance	Responsibilities	Resources required	Timescale
WP5 Evaluation and Monitoring	Task 5.1 Monitoring and Impact Evaluation	Development of a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan	Keeping progress and monitoring the deliverables, activities, interventions, number of NFP persons in non-participating countries contacted and cities reached	WP5	M4 D5.1 M5 D5.2
		Collection of data relating to website and social media	Adding tools to monitor website with DTV and keeping track of social media through analytics	WP3 and WP5	All through project. Results in Final Report M36
	5.2 Quality Assurance of the monitoring process	A process and impact evaluation to take place using the MaxSUMO methodology	WYG will translate the evaluation plan into an easy reference guideline and conveniently arranged online evaluation forms	All WPs	All through project
	5.3 Support data collection and analysis of results	Hands up survey data before/during/after. A minimum sample of 30% of participants per country	WYG to monitor and analyse hands up survey data. Data to be recorded on a progress spreadsheet	WP5	After each campaign within annual reporting M11 and M22 Final Report M36

Evaluation of Project Objectives

4. Common Performance Indicators

4.1 Evaluation for IEE Common Performance Indicators

The Executive Agency for Competitiveness and Innovation (EACI) requires all IEE projects to utilise quantifiable Common Performance Indicators (CPIs) to demonstrate the extent to which project activities impact on intended target groups, both within projects, and beyond until 2020. The CPIs cover:

- the sustainable energy investments triggered
- renewable energy production, primary energy savings
- reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

CPIs are set out in the funding proposals. EACI then requires each funded project to provide an updated, elaborated set of CPIs in its initial phase and to report on final figures at the end of the project. CPI elaboration will be led by WYG. All countries that have joined the network will be required to send detailed baseline data by end of June 2014.

4.2 CPI Data Collection Methodology

4.2.1 Methodology

The TSG Network chose to use a bottom-up methodology to measure the impacts of the campaign. Baseline data each campaign can be assessed via the pre-measurement questionnaire that schools are required to complete. This is a hands up survey conducted in all schools that implement the campaign. Also a few weeks after the campaign a final hands up survey will be held and the data from the various surveys will allow the campaign impacts to be measured. The post campaign surveys will provide insight into the long term impacts of the Traffic Snake Game.

The estimation of the short term impacts is included below along with the calculations used.

Assumption	Per Country	Project total
Minimum schools	20 Year 1	360 Year 1
	40 Year 2	720 Year 2
	60 Year 3	1,080 Year 3
Number of children reached	3,000 Year 1	54,000 Year 1
	6,000 Year 2	108,000 Year 2
	9,000 Year 3	162,000 Year 3

<p>Above assumption is based on the findings of the CONNECT project and discussions with the NFPs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • average of 6 active classes per school • average 25 pupils per class • 20 schools x 6 classes x 25 pupils = 3.000 children per year (repeat for year 2 and 3) 		
Estimation of car kilometres saved during the campaign weeks	15%	5%
Estimation of car kilometres saved as retention effect after campaign	7%	7%
Average number of km during the project per year	27,000 km saved per year	486,000 km saved per year
<p>Assumption based on the CONNECT project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • average trips distance in primary schools is 3 km • 3.000 children * 6 km (two ways) * 10 campaign days * 15% = 27.000 less car km/year 		

Estimation of Short-term Impacts

4.2.2 Country Specific Baselines

In order to ensure accurate estimations, country specific data has been collected from each partner. During this exercise, it became apparent there is very little ‘reliable’ data which can be used for the calculation of country specific estimations.

Traditionally (through the CONNECT project), an EU average was collected to create the formulas for calculating CPIs. For this project, country specific data was thought to be more accurate however, there are a number of gaps in this data which will mean that the impacts of the TSG Network will be most likely measured using an EU average and potentially country specific impacts where data is more readily available or reliable.

A **Common Performance Indicators** report will be submitted in month 4 with further country specific data included. For further information please refer to this report.

4.3 MaxSUMO Incorporation

By using the MaxEVA tool, this project will be collecting and recording the necessary data required to ensure it is MaxSUMO compliant. Please see section 5 of this report for more information on end of project results and CPI calculations.

5. Data Collection and Reporting

This section will outline the methods of data collection to be used throughout the project lifetime. It will include detailed information of the different tools for measuring project impacts and include a reporting schedule.

Below is a schedule for data collection over the course of the project:

Evaluation Type	Collection Timeframe		
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
EU Regional Workshops Feedback	May 2014	Jun 2015	Jun 2016
National Event (each NFP)	Oct 2014	Oct 2015	Oct 2016
TSG Basic and Deluxe (EU Mobility Week)	Nov 2014	Nov 2015	Nov 2016
TSG Basic and Deluxe	Jun 2015	Jun 2016	Nov 2017
Local Implementer Feedback	N/A	N/A	Dec 2016
NFP Feedback	N/A	N/A	Dec 2016
MaxEVA data entry	N/A	N/A	Jan 2017

Data Collection Schedule

5.1 Tools

5.1.1 Measurement Forms

The Traffic Snake Game will rely heavily on data collected from schools to measure the effect of the campaign in the countries playing. Measurement forms have been created to collect 'baseline', 'during' and 'after' data. The forms include both class and school measurement.

The class forms will record class data completed by individual teachers. This data will include hands up survey results of a single class along with the class name/number. The school measurement forms will record the full schools data and should be completed by the person responsible for implementing the campaign within the school. Data recorded on the school

forms will include whole school hands up survey results along with school and pupil information.

An example of each form is included in **Annex 1**.

5.1.2 NFP and Local Implementer Feedback Forms

It is essential to carry out qualitative analysis of the TSG network. This will be done through feedback forms and personal contact. All NFPs and local implementers will be required to complete feedback at key stages of the project.

The feedback forms will gather the personal experiences of the key people involved in implementing the campaign. Some sample questions are included below:

Local Implementers:

- What elements of the TSG campaign did you like?
- What elements of the TSG campaign did you not like?
- What challenges/barriers did you face when implementing the TSG campaign in schools?
- What would have assisted you to better implement the campaign in schools?
- Did you receive any positive comments from teachers/schools?
- Did you receive any negative comments from teachers/schools?
- How do you think the campaign can be improved?
- Do you think this improvement will benefit the campaign as a whole or is this specific to your area/region/schools?

NFPs

- What was the main challenge for you as an NFP to get local implementers to take up the TSG campaign?
- As an NFP, what was your experience of implementing the campaign more widely?
- Did you need to change/modify the campaign in any way to meet the needs of the local implementers?
- Which elements of the TSG campaign were the most attractive to local implementers?
- What elements of the campaign were less attractive? Do you think these elements discouraged participation?
- Did you find being part of a network useful?
- In what way could the network have provided you with more support?

5.1.3 Progress Spreadsheet

A progress spreadsheet has been produced for collecting and recording NFP specific data. The progress spreadsheet is designed to keep an updated account of local implementers

playing the TSG campaign, the names of schools participating, how many pupils reached as well as hands up data results for schools (before, during and after).

The aim of this progress spreadsheet is collect the hands up survey data and forward the results to the NFPs to measure the success of the campaign on an annual basis. Data will be collected twice a year in November and in June, a month or two after the campaigns are played to give NFPs time to collect the data. It is up to NFPs to decide how this data will be collected. Ideally, if a NFP is liaising directly with schools the NFP should collect the data. If local implementers are involved, it would be most practical for the NFPs to send the spreadsheet to them for completion.

In order to get a good idea of the success of the campaign, the progress spreadsheet includes an average figure for the 'during' data in order for a comparison to be made with the before and after data. The progress spreadsheet can be viewed in **Annex 2**.

5.1.4 MaxEVA

As stated in section 2 of this report, the MaxEVA tool will be used to record the final project results. The tool will be completed three months prior to the project end date and will include a total of all the NFP results (not individual NFP results) in order to assess how successful the project has been overall.

It may be that the MaxEVA final results will differ when compared to the consortium results due to the CPIs used. Although MaxEVA allows projects to customise their CPIs to calculate outcomes in terms of modal shift, percentage of sustainable trips and energy savings before, during and after the implementation of the project; the tool may have some restrictions, which cannot be overridden or accommodated by the TSG Network project. Final reporting will therefore include MaxEVA calculated results and results based on the TSG Network project's own CPIs.

5.2 Reporting

5.2.1 Annual Reports

Annual reports will be produced in December during the lifetime of the project. The annual reports will include the results from each of the NFPs and will generally be used as a tool to check progress throughout the project and to make use of these results for dissemination activities. If results are seen to be very successful and demonstrate a strong shift to more sustainable modes of transport, these will also be used for marketing and promotion activities. If the results are not seen to be successful, the core consortium members will discuss the issues with the NFPs and record them in the annual reports.

Generally, it is up to the NFP to decide how the information within the annual reports will be used.

5.2.2 Final Report

The final report will be completed at the end of the project and include a summary of the results from each year of the project. This report will also include feedback collected from both the NFPs and the local implementers. An overall evaluation of the project will be undertaken including consortium, campaign, city/region and user level.

Within this report, likely future impacts of the project will also be calculated to demonstrate how the campaign could reduce solo car trips, CO₂ and air quality emissions and contribute to energy and fuel savings.

6. Quality and Assurance

6.1 Quality Assurance

All partners will be expected to ensure the quality assurance of outputs in this project. All NFPs have been trained in how to collect monitoring data to ensure there is a consistent approach and the quality of the data that will be used to evaluate and assess the impacts of the project can be assured.

As native English speakers, all language checks will be undertaken by WYG. In addition, as stated in section 1 and 2, MaxSUMO methodology will be adopted and this will ensure the quality of the work produced within the projects lifetime.

6.2 Communication

As this is a large network to manage, communication will be key to ensuring evaluation and monitoring milestones are met at the scheduled times. Each core partner will be responsible for 3-4 countries and their NFPs. The following guidelines should be incorporated in the early stages of the project to ensure data is collected on time.

6.2.1 Management Meetings/Regional Teleconferences

A particularly important element of evaluation and monitoring is reporting via bi-monthly regional NFP teleconferences and core partner meetings/teleconferences. These have two key functions:

- I. enable some impact/process evaluation to take place within these meetings rather than setting onerous requirements for form filling and other written reporting
- II. allow regional partners and other core partner members to monitor project activities and associated evaluation tasks are actually taking place, to required standards.

Progress reports on evaluation need to be routinely included on the agendas of Steward-NFP teleconferences and MC meetings/teleconferences, as follows:

Regional NFP - Core Partner teleconferences

- progress in implementing TSG campaign
- impact/progress of national network events
- progress in recruiting local implementers
- impact of results and dissemination.

Core Partner meetings / teleconferences (in addition to the above issues):

- impact/process evaluation of EU regional events
- progress in arranging webinar events, and impact/process evaluation of events
- impact/progress in annual results and data collection
- impact/process of TSG 2.0
- Future of network.

6.2.2 EU Regional Workshops

The TSG Network will organise many EU regional workshops in each year of the project, with a total of around 9 envisaged during the project lifespan. Feedback from each of these events will be collected and analysed within one month of the final EU regional meetings. An example of a feedback form is included for year 1 workshops within **Annex 3**.

6.2.3 Webinars

Webinars will be carried out with NFPs as part of on going training. After each webinar, WYG will request feedback from NFPs and results will be included in the final end of project report.

6.2.4 National Events

TSG Network will organise a number of national events each year, with a total of around 57 envisaged during the project lifespan. To aid monitoring and evaluation, it will be important for meeting organisers to ensure advance notification of events within the project consortium. These will be recorded within the national events guide however feedback will be collected from each event by WYG as part of WP6. An online event calendar will be produced and disseminated for NFPs to record their event dates.

7. Annex

ANNEX 1: MEASUREMENT FORMS

See separate attachement TSGN_D5.1_annex 1_Measurement forms

ANNEX 2: PROGRESS SPREADSHEET

See separate attachement TSGN_D5.1_annex 2_Country collection

ANNEX 3: EU REGIONAL FEEDBACK

Event Feedback Survey

Thank you for taking a few minutes to complete this survey about the EU National Workshops. Your response will help us to plan future events effectively. We appreciate your feedback.

* Required

Which EU Regional Workshop did you attend? *

- Szentendre, Hungary
- Madrid, Spain
- Leuven, Belgium

Please tell us the average distance pupils travel to school in your country *

- 1 km
- 1.5 km
- 2 km
- 2.5 km
- 3 km
- Other:

Please tell us the average number of pupils per class in your country *

- 15
- 20
- 25
- 30
- Other:

Please include weblinks for sources used to collect information for the above questions *

Overall, how satisfied were you with your Regional Workshop? *

1 2 3 4 5

Very Dissatisfied Very Satisfied

How satisfied were you with the registration process and pre-workshop contact? *

1 2 3 4 5

Very Dissatisfied Very Satisfied

How satisfied were you with the workshop being structured as two half days? *

1 2 3 4 5

Very Dissatisfied Very Satisfied

Were you satisfied with the venue? *

1 2 3 4 5

Very Dissatisfied Very Satisfied

Were you satisfied with the catering and facilities? *

1 2 3 4 5

Very Dissatisfied Very Satisfied

Please tell us how satisfied you were with the presentations: *

	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Welcome, M21	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
TSG Explanation, M21	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Training National Practitioners & Brainstorm, DTV	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Run TSG on national level, DTV	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Partners and Sponsors, WYG	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Evaluation, WYG	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Quiz	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dinner	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

What did you like the most about the workshop? *

What did you like the most about the workshop? *

What can we do to improve future workshops? *

Additional comments or suggestions

Name (Optional)

Email (Optional)

D5.1 Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

The sole responsibility for the content of this document lies with the authors. It does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Union. Neither the EASME nor the European Commission are responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained herein.