



Appendix I:

Section 4: Methodology for case studies

The case study examples that are included in this document are considered a 'first round'. We set out to provide case studies to illustrate implementation examples of good practice and a more detailed analysis of lessons learned to assist those considering implementing the strategy in their own setting. However the reality is that many programmes have not been examined with respect to their effectiveness and it is even less likely that they will have been evaluated using a rigorous research design that includes a comparison group and a look at behavioural and injury outcomes. As a result many programmes could not be included as case studies in this version, but it is anticipated that as more programmes receive adequate evaluation additional examples can be added.

Case studies were sought and selected based on the following criteria:

- Example programme addresses issues of priority within Europe (based on injury burden).
- Example programme met our definition of good practice.
- Example programme corresponds with one of the good practices identified.

- Example programme has been implemented and evaluated (both process and outcome evaluations completed) in a European setting and found to be effective.

In addition to the selection criteria, where possible we also attempted to select case study examples that reflected a range of resource intensities (e.g., a range of costs to implement) and implementation levels (e.g., national, regional or local). Case studies were also selected to try and reflect the efforts from as many areas of Europe as possible. Case study examples were sought in a snowball approach through various sources including members of the European Child Safety Alliance and other child injury prevention and safety promotion experts. In addition, internet searches and selective reviews of the recent literature were used to identify additional potential case studies.

For each potential case study selected, a contact person was identified and a research associate contacted him or her to ascertain that the potential case study met the inclusion criteria. Once this was established, available documentation was examined and a standardised interview was conducted that sought and summarised the following information:

- Implementation level (at what level was the strategy focussed – national, regional or local?)

- Strategy approach (which of the 3 E's was used – education, engineering, enforcement or a combination?)
- Setting of intervention (where did the intervention take place?)
- Target audience for the intervention (at who was the intervention aimed?)
- Resource intensity – an indication of the resource intensity required [€ = up to €20.000/year, €€ = €20-90.000/year, €€€ = €100-299.000/year, €€€€ = €300-999.000/year, €€€€€ = €1.000.000 plus/year]*
- Background for the initiative (including rationale, driving force, timeframe and major partners)
- Aim & objectives of intervention
- Key steps / actions in intervention
- Evaluation of intervention
- Lessons learned (including barriers and facilitators, advice to countries and issues around transferability)

*The resource implications provided should be interpreted carefully. First they do not include in-kind support which in many cases far outweighs the actual budget spent on the implementation of a strategy. Second although the resource intensity estimates provided come from the project personnel themselves, it is important to remember that costs vary by country for many things such as people's time, printing of resources, etc. As a result the resources required when looking at transferring a strategy from one setting to another may vary from what is reported here.





- References
- Contact information for intervention

Following each interview, the case study was written up in a consistent format, which included the addition of the evidence statement supporting the strategy. Case studies were then returned to the contact for confirmation and clarification before being added to the guide. Of note, three of the cases studies - Safe Road to School in Faro, Portugal; Bicycle Helmet Campaign, Denmark and Child Resistant Packaging for Chemicals, Netherlands - are enhanced expansions of case studies originally collected for the WHO for the Children's health and environment case studies summary book⁹³

Finally it is important to note that the cases studies included in the following section are an initial attempt to illustrate examples of existing good practice. The European Child Safety Alliance invites submission of additional case study ideas that meet the criteria described above for inclusion in future editions. Please forward case study ideas to secretariat@childsafetyeurope.org



Safe Road to School in Faro Portugal

IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL	Regional
APPROACH	Education, Enforcement
SETTING	Schools, community
TARGET AUDIENCE	Community, children 6 to 16 years old, parents, police
RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS	€€€
EVIDENCE BASE:	Community-based intervention combining information dissemination on child passenger restraint safety with enhanced enforcement campaigns leads to increased use. ^{1,2,3}

Background

Safe Road to School is a road safety programme with several features:

1. Educational programme held by APSI (Portuguese Association for Child Safety Promotion) and police officers, where rules related to safety of pedestrians and passengers were taught to children at school. General Directorate for Environment also provided educational programme on other environmental threats aside from injuries, such as exposure to air pollution and noise.
2. A school-based interactive workshop with primary school children, to highlight the importance of restraint system use. The session includes debates, games and videos of crash tests.
3. Simulations of action after the accident with rescue and treatment teams at secondary school.
4. Secondary school students walk with police to the hospital in order to visit and talk with road accident victims. Along the route, police have the opportunity to highlight safety hazards.
5. Representatives from Rehabilitation Centre for Handicapped and Disabled visited students at secondary schools illustrating life after injury.
6. Evening information session with parents in which the

programme is explained and the crash videos are shown. Parents are informed of legislation around safety seats and seat belts, the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, and that enforcement activities will begin in a week. Parent attendance is encouraged by including a student concert or another event in conjunction with the information session.

7. A one-day enforcement campaign by police officers and students as they supervise the school gates before and after school. Fines are €120. Police officers continue spot enforcement after the one-day event.
8. A road safety weekend exhibition in a public space (shopping centre). The exhibition includes prevention, rescue and treatment team exhibits such as:
 - Restraint system use exhibition
 - Simulation crashes with and without seat belts.
 - Crashed cars with the stories behind the crash.
 - Simulations of post-crash rescue and treatment.
 - Pictures, stories, etc. prepared by children admitted to hospital after a crash.
 - Representatives from the Rehabilitation Centre for Handicapped and Disabled illustrating life after injury.

Local press covered all activities thereby improving contact with the general public and decision makers. The programme was extended to other cities with the aim of national coverage.

The campaign originally took place in seven primary schools (children from 6 to 10 years old) during the 2001-2002 school

year. In 2002 it was extended to secondary schools (children from 10 to 16 years old), one school every year reaching a total of 11 schools and 6 000 students. A total of 1,800 children visited the road safety exhibition in the first day and 100,000 people during the weekend.

Policy Background/Driving Force

Road crashes are the largest cause of child injury death in Portugal. Although passengers account for 50% of deaths, 80% of children in cars travel without using seatbelts on their way to primary school in Faro. Despite existing legislation, enforcement is poor.

Partners

- Portuguese Association for Child Safety Promotion (APSI)
- Local police
- Rescue teams and paramedics
- General Directorate for Transport
- Rehabilitation Centre for Handicapped and Disabled (Existir)
- General Directorate for Environment
- Local Government of Faro



- Faro Hospital (Paediatric and Orthopaedic Departments)
- Shopping Centre (Forum Algarve).

Aims & Objectives

To promote road safety awareness and raise the use of restraint system among primary and secondary school children

Evaluation

Seat belt and safety seat use was monitored in 2001 at the seven primary schools involved in the original campaign. An observer at the school during the morning commute collected data one week prior to the beginning of the programme and one week after the one-day enforcement. Restraint system use increased from 20% to 89% in the participating school population. One-day police and student enforcement at seven primary schools resulted in 243 reports of inadequate protection of children in cars.

Spot enforcement of seat belt use continued and one year after the campaign, restraint system at the participating schools remained high at 90%.

In 2002, data collection in secondary schools indicated a pre-programme seatbelt use of 91% in front seat and 15% in the rear seat. This time, additional data collection was added one week after the information session, but before enforcement. Seatbelt use in the rear seat went from 15% to 16%. One week after the enforcement this rear seat use of seat belt jumped from 16% to 85% and in the front seat to 100%. This showed the importance of a combined approach of education and enforcement to obtain behaviour change.

In 2003, 2004 and 2005 the programme was implemented in other secondary schools. Pre-programme data showed 90% use in front seat and 70% at the rear seat, raising the latter to 89% after the information sessions. Spot enforcement of seat belt use continued in the city.

Key Steps

- Before beginning the programme, police officer training on child safety is crucial. This training is provided by APSI and consists of two main components:
 - o Raising awareness on the importance of enforcement of safety legislation in supporting the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child's, which specifies safety as a fundamental human right.
 - o Information on child restraint systems and road security.
- Training occurs informally with police officers individually or in small groups.
- The support of teachers in participating schools is essential. A meeting is planned with teachers in order to describe the campaign and their role. Teachers also agree to build road safety into the curriculum as much as possible.

Lessons Learned

Barriers

- Encouraging parents to become involved. The first parent session included only 10 parents in a school with 400 students. Subsequent sessions had improved attendance since efforts were made to combine the information session with other activities, such as concerts or plays.
- People were not accustomed to receiving tickets for not using seat belts or safety seats, therefore, they resisted and argued with police. Police had to be trained to counter these arguments.
- Difficulties were encountered in engaging other people already working in road safety in the city

Facilitators

- The development of a close and trusting relationship between APSI, the local hospital and the police.
- A committed police team. Police officers already had a relationship of trust and friendship with school children.
- Supportive schools and teachers.
- Involvement of parents in information sessions
- There was no specific funding for this campaign. It was made possible by partners' generous donations of time and in-kind resources.
- The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child provided justification for enforcement to angry parents receiving fines.

Advice to Countries/Transferability

- Attempts have been made to expand the campaign to other cities in Portugal. In some cases, this has been successful and seems to be related to the commitment of the school police team.
- The campaign had considerable in-kind support and donated time from different groups, including the police and APSI, thus resource implications in different contexts are difficult to estimate.



References, Additional Information

1. Towner, E., & Dowswell, T., Mackereth, C., & Jarvis, S. (2001). What works to prevent unintentional injury amongst children? An updated systematic review. London: Health Development Agency. Available at www.hda.nhs.uk/downloads/pdfs/prevent_injuries.pdf
2. Turner, C., McClure, R., Nixon, J., & Spinks, A., (2005). Community-based programs to promote car seat restraints in children 0-16 years – a systematic review. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 37, 77-83.
3. Viscusi, W. K., Cavallo, G. O. (1994). The effect of product safety regulation on safety precautions. *Risk Analysis*, 14(6), 917-930.

Contact

Name: Elsa Rocha
Address: Associação para a Promoção da
Segurança Infantil
Vila Berta, 7 – 1o dto
1170-400 Lisboa, Portugal
Tel: +351 21 887 01 61
Fax: +351 21 888 16 00
E-mail: apsi@apsi.org.pt
URL: <http://www.apsi.org.pt/>

