

Evaluation Plan:

Purpose: The purpose of this evaluation plan is to provide guidance on how to evaluate a funding policy for active transportation similar to the one the Nashville Area MPO adopted. (Urbanized areas of 50,000 residents or more have MPOs. Regional planning may also be conducted by other organizations.) The plan covers both processes and outcomes. The purpose of this evaluation plan is to determine the reach, extent of implementation, acceptability, and effectiveness of a funding policy similar to the Nashville Area MPO's Active Transportation Funding Policy. Throughout the plan, suggested evaluation questions are paired with potential data to be collected and a corresponding data source (a complete list of potential data sources appears below. A list of other relevant evaluation questions is available in the Evaluation section of the Center TRT website.

Evaluation Questions: This evaluation plan likely includes many more evaluation questions than will be feasible to answer. Similarly, it may include questions that are less important for your particular context or lack questions that should be prioritized for your context. Center TRT recommends working with your stakeholder group to prioritize the evaluation questions you will seek to answer.

Design: The evaluation is a pre- and post-test design with no comparison group.

Data collection: A variety of data collection tools are referenced throughout the evaluation plan. Some links to suggested tools are provided below. Additional data collection tools will need to be created to apply to your context. These same tools also appear in the lower section of the Center TRT Logic Model.

Process evaluation data sources and data collection tools:

- Active Transportation Program Project Proposals
- Census data, including of High Health Impact Areas
- Online TIP map (progress of current and new projects)
- Local transit authority ridership logs and ridership demographics data
- Annual Bicycle and Pedestrian Count Program data – see Technical Memo #3B for instructions
- Road use data (where planned technological improvements would be implemented)
- Web analytics software (such as Google Analytics) – logging Facebook fans, unique website visitors, etc.
- Communications log/Communications plan
- Project submission log
- Notes from project evaluator discussions

- Results of surveys and public input events
- Stakeholder interviews (surveys may be appropriate instead) – To be conducted with jurisdictions submitting projects, project evaluators (MPO staff and members of BPAC), MPO partners, etc.
- Survey of MPO jurisdictions
- MPO Budget
- Adopted Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
- State DOT Quarterly Reports

Short-term (1-3 year) outcome data sources and data collection tools - Several links to data collection tools are available below. These are not tools that the Nashville MPO has necessarily used, but may be useful for evaluating this type of initiative.

- Bike and pedestrian infrastructure inventories
- Descriptions of new (funded) bike/pedestrian projects
- Census data
- Land use data
- Pedestrian Data Environment Scan (PEDS) – available here: <http://www.activelivingresearch.org/node/10641>.
- Systematic Pedestrian and Cycling Environmental Scan (SPACES) – available here: <http://www.activelivingresearch.org/node/10617>.
- Environmental Supports for Physical Activity Questionnaire – available here: <http://prevention.sph.sc.edu/tools/environmental.htm>.

*Can pay a fee (approximately \$1000/question) to have a question added to the BRFSS survey.

PROCESS EVALUATION

This section addresses the inputs needed for the intervention, the reach of the intervention into the intended population and the implementation of the intervention components and main elements.

Evaluation Questions	Data to be Collected	Data Collection Method
<p>Inputs</p> <p>Are the appropriate stakeholders identified for the current step in the policy process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • those who will collaborate in developing and advocating throughout (collaborators), 	<p>-Agencies and individuals identified who need to be involved at each step in developing, enacting, and implementing/maintaining the policy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of stakeholders who have agreed to participate for each phase of policy process

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • those who will enact (decision makers), • those who will benefit directly (recipients) • those who will implement and maintain the program/policy (implementers) <p>What administrative structures are in place to coordinate activities at each stage in the process of developing, enacting, implementing, and maintaining the program/policy?</p>	<p>-Description of extent to which all the stakeholders that you identified as needed are represented</p> <p>-Description of the population you expect to benefit</p> <p>-Depiction of the administrative structures (planning committees, meetings schedules, etc.) and the communication procedures (agendas, minutes, listservs, etc.) used</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative and communications documents & trackers
<p>Reach</p> <p>How many people are within reach of the built environment changes funded by the Active Transportation Program?</p> <p>How representative of the entire Nashville Area population are those in reach of the built environment changes (living/working in affected neighborhoods) funded by the Active Transportation Program?</p> <p>What is the potential reach of the education and awareness activities funded by the Active Transportation Program?</p>	<p># of people with access to (living and working in affected neighborhoods) bike/pedestrian projects funded by Active Transportation Program</p> <p>Demographics (race, income, etc.)</p> <p># (potential) of participants in education and awareness programs/activities conducted by NMPO</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Population data from census • Project data from online TIP map • Annual Bicycle and Pedestrian Count Program data – see Technical Memo #3B • Census data • Project proposals re: participation • Once implemented: Measure reach through attendance records from educational sessions and/or events (Safe

<p>What is the potential reach of the 10% of USTP funds flexed to public transit?</p> <p>How representative of the entire Nashville Area population is the potential reach of the 10% USTP funds flexed to public transit?</p> <p>What is the potential reach of the 5% USTP funds used for technological improvements?</p> <p>How many people were reached by the MPO's use of online tools (such as Facebook, Twitter, their website, etc.)?</p>	<p># (potential) of transit riders reached by transit changes funded by Active Transportation Program</p> <p>Demographics of transit ridership reached by changes funded by ATP compared to demographics of Nashville</p> <p># of users of roads, sidewalks and other infrastructure with technological improvements funded by ATP implemented</p> <p># of visitors to website/Facebook fans/Twitter followers</p>	<p>Routes to School events, bike safety training, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transit authority ridership logs • Census data • Transit authority ridership demographic data • Road use data where planned technological improvements would be implemented • Annual Bicycle and Pedestrian Count Program data – see Technical Memo #3B • Web analytics software • MPO communications records
<p>Activities & Outputs</p> <p><i>Throughout Process & implementation – MPO</i></p> <p>How did the MPO engage the public and its partners (such as non-profits, health organizations, and other transportation organizations)?</p> <p>How did the MPO raise awareness about the connection between health and transportation?</p>	<p>Description of public/partner engagement process</p> <p>Strategies used/description of process used to raise awareness about transportation-health connection</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning process records/notes • Stakeholder interviews • Stakeholder interviews

<p>What strategies did the MPO use to advocate for the new funding strategy for promoting active transportation?</p>	<p>Description of process used by MPO to advocate for new funding strategy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder interviews
<p>What proportion of roadways project proposals submitted for the RTP included bike/pedestrian elements?</p>	<p># roadway projects submitted that included bike and/or pedestrian elements/# of total roadway projects submitted</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project submission log • Proposal scoring documents
<p>How many roadways projects with bike/pedestrian elements were included in the adopted RTP?</p>	<p># of roadway projects with bike and/or pedestrian elements included in adopted RTP</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopted RTP
<p>What proportion of projects submitted to the Active Transportation Program was funded?</p>	<p># of projects funded/# projects submitted to Active Transportation Program</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project submission log • Proposal scoring documents
<p>To what extent did project evaluators agree in their assessments of projects?</p>	<p>Qualitative assessment of agreement among project evaluators</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project scoring documents • Notes from project evaluator discussions
<p>Was the implementation process (call for projects, scoring, and funding decisions) acceptable to the MPO's stakeholders?</p>	<p>Stakeholder reports that the implementation process was acceptable</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder interviews (or surveys)
<p>Was the implementation process (call for projects, scoring, and funding decisions) feasible for the BPAC, MPO staff, and Executive Committee?</p>	<p>Stakeholder reports that implementation process was feasible</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder interviews (or surveys)
<p>Are the perceived benefits of the Active Transportation Funding Policy worth the costs to the MPO?</p>	<p>-Reported benefits of new funding policy -Financial or other costs of funding</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder interviews (or surveys) • Reports from stakeholders

<p>What media coverage did the MPO receive regarding the 2035 RTP, TIP, Active Transportation Program, and/or new focus on bike/pedestrian infrastructure?</p> <p>What outreach and marketing materials were developed and disseminated?</p> <p>What online tools and strategies (such as Facebook, Twitter, and website) did the MPO use to disseminate its message and/or publicize its work?</p> <p>How many public/stakeholder comments did the MPO receive throughout the policy development and implementation phase?</p> <p><i>Implementation – State Department of Transportation</i></p> <p>Did the State Department of Transportation coordinate with local jurisdictions to get funded projects constructed on time?</p>	<p>policy</p> <p># and type of media coverage about 2035 RTP, current TIP, Active Transportation Program, new focus on bike/pedestrian</p> <p># and type of outreach/marketing materials developed and disseminated</p> <p># and type of online tools used</p> <p># and type of comments/input received</p> <p># and % of projects constructed on time</p>	<p>and jurisdictions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPO Budget • MPO communications log • Google alerts • MPO communications log • MPO communications plan • Results of surveys and/or public input events • State DOT quarterly reports
---	--	---

OUTCOME EVALUATION

Short-term outcomes (1-3 years)

The focus in the sampling on outcome measures should be purposeful sampling around (nearby) the projects funded by the Active Transportation Funding Policy since the impact of new infrastructure is likely to be quite localized around the actual environmental change.

Evaluation Questions	Data to be Collected	Data Collection Method
Outcome 1: Awareness of importance of active transportation and of supportive infrastructure for biking/walking		
How did attitudes and awareness about active transportation	Change in attitudes/awareness about	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions about attitudes/

<p>change following initiation of educational, promotional, and changes to the built environment (e.g., policy implementation)?</p>	<p>active transportation and health as important interrelated issues at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline • Follow-up 	<p>awareness asked when the Environmental Supports for Physical Activity Questionnaire is administered (see outcome 4 in short-term outcomes)*</p> <p>*Suggest conducting data collection through purposeful sampling of individuals in affected neighborhoods, particularly those at greatest risk of inactivity/obesity.</p>
<p>Outcome 2: Improved infrastructure for biking and walking</p>		
<p>Did infrastructure for biking and walking improve after implementation of the Active Transportation Funding Policy?</p>	<p># of bike lanes (on roads) and greenways at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline • Follow-up <p># of <i>miles</i> of bike lanes (on roads) and greenways at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline • Follow-up <p># of sidewalks (on roads) and greenways at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline • Follow-up <p># of <i>miles</i> of sidewalks (on roads) and greenways at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bike and pedestrian facilities inventories • Descriptions of new (funded) bike/pedestrian projects

<p>Did the quality of infrastructure for walking/biking improve after implementation of the Active Transportation Funding Policy?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow-up <p>Scores for pedestrian/bike infrastructure of specified area at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline • Follow-up 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian Data Environment Scan (PEDS) • Systematic Pedestrian and Cycling Environmental Scan (SPACES)
<p>Outcome 3: Increased transportation options for all users</p>		
<p>Did the number of (active) transportation options increase for all users after the implementation of the Active Transportation Funding Policy?</p> <p>Did the number of (active) transportation options increase in High Health Impact Areas (census tracts with higher than average poverty rates, minority populations, and zero-car households) after the implementation of the Active Transportation Funding Policy?</p>	<p># of active transportation options (bike, walk, mass transit) available within (specified distance)* from residential areas at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline • Follow-up <p># of active transportation options available within (specified distance)* of High Health Impact Areas at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline • Follow-up 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Census data • Land use data • Map of funded/ constructed projects
<p>Outcome 4: Perceptions of the built environment/infrastructure for physical activity and/or active transportation</p>		
<p>Did perceptions of the built environment and/or infrastructure for physical activity/active transportation improve from baseline to follow-up?</p>	<p>Scores from the Environmental Supports for Physical Activity Questionnaire at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline • Follow-up 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Supports for Physical Activity Questionnaire (could add questions about attitudes/awareness – see outcome 1 in short-term outcomes – at the same time as administering this survey)*

		*Suggest conducting data collection through purposeful sampling of individuals in affected neighborhoods, particularly those at greatest risk of inactivity/obesity.
--	--	--