



RTTA Program Evaluation Framework

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Introduction..... | 3 |
| 1.1 Purpose..... | 3 |
| 1.2 Background..... | 3 |
| 1.3 Scope..... | 3 |
| 1.4 Governance standards and ethics | 3 |
| 2. Evaluation Framework..... | 3 |
| 2.1 This Framework | 4 |
| 2.2 Governance | 5 |
| 2.3 Evaluation Principles | 6 |
| 2.4 Evaluation Approach | 6 |
| 3. Review | 7 |
| 4. Supporting Information..... | 7 |
| 5. Approval | 8 |

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose

This RTTA Program Evaluation Framework aims to guide rigorous and robust program evaluations that will inform decision making, planning and practice to enhance road safety in Western Australia. It specifies parameters for the conduct of evaluation of programs funded by the Road Trauma Trust Account (RTTA). It is based on the [Program Evaluation Guide](#) published by the Department of Treasury and evaluation documents published by the Commonwealth Department of Finance.

1.2 Background

Performance in the road safety portfolio is complex. Credible and systematic evaluation is imperative to understand what works and why, to improve service delivery, implementation of programs and enhance government accountability.

Evaluation of road safety programs, interventions and initiatives is assessed against the elements of a road safety system described in the WA Road Safety Framework, which is delineated in the [Driving Change Road Safety Strategy 2020-2030](#), and general measurements that indicate progress, as set out in the Road Safety System Outcomes Framework.

1.3 Scope

This Framework applies to all road safety projects, programs and interventions where the Minister for Road Safety makes a determination consistent with section 12(6) of the *Road Safety Council Act 2001* (RSC Act). The Framework applies to programs undertaken by the Road Safety Commission (Commissioner), but does not encompass the Commission itself.

1.4 Governance standards and ethics

Evaluations adhere to the statutory functions of the Council and the accountabilities of the Road Safety Commissioner (Commissioner). It provides meaningful information on the results achieved from the use of public resources and is a cornerstone of government's accountability to Parliament and the public.

Evaluations must be conducted ethically and may require formal ethics review. Ethical considerations pertaining to evaluations are set out in the [Australasian Evaluation Society's \(Society\) Guidelines for the Ethical Conduct of Evaluations](#). The Society's [First Nations Cultural Safety Strategy](#) and the Productivity Commission's [Indigenous Evaluation Framework](#) should be used to guide work with Indigenous people.

2. Evaluation Framework

Evaluation is defined as the systematic and objective process of drawing conclusions about activities, characteristics and outcomes of programs, strategies and initiatives. It is used to determine the appropriateness, effectiveness and efficiency of each intervention, for the purposes of continuous improvement, accountability and decision-making. This Framework sets out the components of evaluation, while also functioning as a tool to assess whether the evaluation will be useful, viable, ethical and accurate.

An evaluation helps to answer questions such as:

- Has the intervention or program achieved its stated objectives and outcomes?
- Are there unintended outcomes?
- Was it efficient / did it represent good value for money?
- Are there better ways of achieving these objectives and outcomes?

Evaluation has many benefits. These include:

- Improvements to road safety interventions developed and implemented by key stakeholders in the road safety system.
- Informing policymakers and key stakeholders of the degree of success of road safety interventions and programs
- Building community capacity and engaging key stakeholders
- Disseminating empirically and statistically valid information for the development of evidence-based interventions or refinements to existing interventions.
- Improved ability to achieve government priorities
- More efficient resource allocation through budget process and targeted allocation of grants
- Programs, interventions and initiatives are effective and meet community expectations.
- Indicates the extent to which the objectives of an intervention or initiative and anticipated benefits have been realised.
- Builds public trust in government agencies, the Road Safety Council (Council) and the Road Safety Commission (Commission).

2.1 This Framework

This Framework comprises three inter-dependent elements:

- Governance – oversight by the Council and/or the Commissioner
- Evaluation principles
- Evaluation approach.

There is no ‘one size fits all’ and every evaluation will be different; this Framework establishes the parameters that underpin evaluation. Evaluations may be undertaken by Commission staff, expertise procured from an external entity, or undertaken in partnership with an external entity.

Governance

Council considers evaluation findings and makes informed decisions about road safety directions, priorities and recommendations for allocation of RTTA monies for Ministerial consideration

Advice to Council from the Road Safety Commissioner
Management of the RTTA by the Road Safety Commissioner consistent with the RSC Act and the FMA

Evaluation Principles

Fit for purpose

Useful

Credible

Transparent

Evaluation Approach

Evaluation Plan

Evaluation Schedule

Consultation and Engagement

2.2 Governance

The Council and the Commissioner both have responsibility for evaluation of the effectiveness of programs, projects and interventions funded by money from the RTTA.

Road Safety Council

The Council is an advisory body tasked with monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of road safety programs and initiatives funded from the RTTA. The evaluation findings are used to inform future funding decisions. Responsibility for evaluation is set out in the RSC Act.

Proposals to the Council seeking money from the RTTA should include an evaluation plan. This will specify the intended program results, approach to data collection and methodology, and the resources allocated.

Taking account of the evaluation principles set out in section 2.3 below, the Council will consider the robustness of the evaluation plan, and will track and monitor the progress of program evaluation annually. Findings of evaluations will enable the Council to make informed decisions when considering variations in costs, scope and scale of the program, as well as set priorities for funding in the outyears.

Under this Framework, the Council may decide how each project or program will be evaluated. These initiatives may be evaluated by an external entity with specific expertise, by an independent consultant, by the Commission or member agency.

Road Safety Commissioner

The Commissioner assists the Council to consider the effectiveness of road safety programs and initiatives and may lead the evaluations or work in partnership with external entities to manage the evaluations.

The Commissioner is responsible for the management of the RTTA as a Special Purpose Account under the *Financial Management Act 2006*. This entails assessing whether projects, programs and interventions have delivered value for money, as set out in the *Program Evaluation Guide* published by the Department of Treasury.

2.3 Evaluation Principles

This Framework establishes a principles-based approach for the conduction of evaluations. It enables those responsible for the successful delivery of results to determine or assist fit for purpose evaluation plans for specific programs or interventions delivered in specific contexts.

Key principles are:

Fit for Purpose

Evaluation should be built into program or intervention design and the decision to evaluate and the type of the evaluation is determined on a case by case to ensure the overall approach is fit for purpose. The timing and scale of effort and resources allocated to evaluation need to be commensurate with the project being evaluated.

Useful

Evaluation results and findings must be able to functionally inform program administration and decision making and where possible align with annual budget process.

Credible

Evaluation must be based on well-designed methodologies and robust and rigorous evidence.

Transparent

To support continuous improvement and decision making, evaluation findings will be transparent by default unless there are appropriate reasons for not releasing information publicly.

2.4 Evaluation Approach

The approach to evaluation encompasses timeframes, data integrity, engagement and continuous learning. The *Evaluation Guidelines* set out the different approaches and methodologies, as well as templates for relevant documents.

Evaluation Schedule

An Evaluation Schedule covering the financial year and two out years is prepared annually. The Schedule will be reviewed and updated by the Commission and reported back to Council annually.

Evaluation Plan

An Evaluation Plan should be prepared and submitted by agencies with proposals seeking money from the RTTA. It should describe what is being evaluated, why, when, how and who is involved. Detailed description of the Evaluation Plan requirements is set out in the *Evaluation Guidelines*.

Engagement and Consultation

Where appropriate, stakeholders should be consulted and engaged in the evaluation process. An evaluation stakeholder is anyone with a stake in a program or activity and its evaluation.

3. Review


The Council will consider the effectiveness of this Framework every two years.

4. Supporting Information

Supporting documents and information:

- Road Safety System Outcomes Framework – Appendix 1
- RTTA Administration Framework
- Road Safety Governance Charter
- Guidelines for the Management of RTTA Appropriations (to be developed)
- Evaluation Guidelines (to be developed)

5. Approval

| Version No | Role | Name | Signature | Approval Date | Next Review Date |
|------------|--------------------------|---------------|--|---------------|------------------|
| 1.0 | Road Safety Commissioner | Adrian Warner |  | June 2024 | June 2026 |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Outcomes Framework

Road Safety System

Operating Environment
Outcome
Indicator Statements
Measurement Areas
Dynamic Layers

External Factors: Environmental and Contextual

| | | | | | | |
|------------|------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------|---------------|------------|
| Population | Technology | Environment | Mobility Patterns | Economics | Vehicle Fleet | Road Users |
|------------|------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------|---------------|------------|

Measurement Areas

| | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Population demographics and distribution | Technology availability and uptake | Environmental factors associated with risk | Road network, usage and congestion | Investment and economic climate | Vehicles on the road | Number and type of road users |
|--|------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|

What success looks like

A well-functioning road safety system that works in an integrated way to prevent and minimise the impact of crashes

The elements of a safe transport system

| Road Users | Roads and Roadsides | Speed | Vehicles and other modes of transport | Post Crash Response |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| The extent to which road users are competent in and aware of safe road choices and choose to make them | The extent to which roads and roadsides elicit safe mobility and if a crash occurs, are designed to minimise the severity of the outcome | The extent to which speeds set are appropriate to the road environment | The extent to which modes of transport chosen have safety features that reduce the risk of crashing and mitigate the risk of death or serious injury should a crash occur | The extent to which emergency services respond to crashes in a timely manner, victims are supported, and crash investigation findings are utilised to improve the system |

Measurement areas that indicate progress

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| Driver training and licensing | Safety of newly constructed roads and roadsides | Speed limits appropriate to road and road usage | Availability of vehicles with safety features | Crash response |
| Educational and awareness activities | Road and roadside upgrades to improve safety | Speed limits understandable and credible | Fleet composition and safety | Post crash support system |
| Attitudinal monitoring | Application of road safety treatments | Speed limits appropriate to the mode of transport | Standard and recommendations for vehicle design and personal protective wear | Understanding of crash factors (behavioural) |
| Behavioral monitoring | Local government road safety plans | Speed limits enhance the safety of all road users | Safe vehicle and mobility device choices | Understanding of crash nature (type of crash) |
| Enforcement | Human centered design | | Safe modal shifts | Learnings from crashes used to prevent future crashes |

Degree of reduction in injuries and fatalities

Specific Measures

Specific measures (outcome, safety performance and output) related to the measurement areas are developed for each program of activity

Data

Data elements related to measures are available, or there is a plan for collection

Explanatory Notes

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Purpose</p> | <p>The outcomes framework is a high level document to accompany the Driving Change – Road Safety Strategy for Western Australia 2020 – 2030 and its action plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The framework is designed to provide the “frame” through which we can look at the different initiatives and see how they fit together to contribute to the overarching objective of the Road Safety Strategy. • The document is intended to aid in explaining how programs /projects / actions / activities / initiatives fit together and why we are doing them. It also helps with the decision making process when determining IF we should be doing them. |
| <p>Operating Environment <i>External Factors: Environmental and Contextual</i></p> | <p>The environmental and contextual factors are things we need to know about our operating environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In some cases these will form the denominators for metrics we use. For example population allows us to look at Killed and Seriously Injured (KSI) per 100,000 of population, mobility patterns picks up vehicle kilometres travelled. • Others are there for context such as economics - may be looking at unemployment rates which can impact peoples ability to replace vehicles with newer vehicles which tend to be inherently safer. |
| <p>Outcome <i>What success looks like</i></p> | <p>A statement conveying the overall intent of the strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Driving Change Strategy aims to reduce the numbers of people killed, severely or seriously injured by 50-70% by 2030. • To do this it takes a systematic approach which involves a holistic view of the road network and interactions among various types of road users, roads and roadsides, travel speeds and vehicles. • This framework summarises the intent of the strategy as developing <i>A well-functioning road safety system that works in an integrated way to prevent and minimise the impact of crashes</i> |
| <p>Indicator Statements <i>The elements of a safe transport system</i></p> | <p>The Indicator statements are developed from the Priority areas of Driving Change. They are worded as <i>the extent to which</i> the statement for each priority area is true. Several different components may go into the indicator statement as defined in the measurement areas below which directly relate to these indicator statements.</p> |
| <p>Measurement Areas <i>Measurement areas that indicate progress</i></p> | <p>Measurement areas identify the areas which contribute to the indicator statement. They provide a logical grouping for specific measures which will be used to monitor each programs /projects / actions / activities / initiatives success.</p> |
| <p>Dynamic Layer <i>Specific Measures and Data</i></p> | <p>The dynamic layer is the lowest level of detail where specific measures and data come into play. These will be developed as an evaluation plan is created for each program /project / action / activity / initiative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within an evaluation plan, the objective is described and how we measure success is identified through a program logic. • Data collection plans are developed and the measures, including development of a baseline and ongoing monitoring • From these evaluation plans a catalogue of measures used in projects will be created. This will help improve consistency across projects |
| <p>Usage</p> | <p>The Outcomes Framework is designed to be used in conjunction with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dynamic Layer Measures and Data document (catalogue of existing measures and data sources) - Road Safety Commission Evaluation Guide (based on the WA Treasury Program Evaluation Guide) |

Author

The Outcomes Framework was created by the Analytics and Insight directorate of the Road Safety Commission with input and review from the researches at the Western Australian Centre for Road Safety Research.