

11th October 2017:

Cycling Scotland's submission to the 2017 review of the National Standard for Cycle Training, on behalf of the Bikeability Scotland Delivery Group (BSDG).

The stated purpose of the National Standard is to 'get more people cycling, more often and with less risk'. Is the National Standard fit for this intended purpose in your view? Yes/No/Partly/Not sure

- *Of 66 responses collected by Cycling Scotland, 48 agreed the NS was fit for this intended purpose.*

Why do you say this and how do you think it could be made fit for purpose?

- *The NS is supported by a clear breakdown of learning outcomes, and suits a variety of ages, levels and abilities.*
- *However, Cycling Scotland recognises feedback that cycle training alone is not sufficient to create a safer cycling environment, and in many instances, is not sufficient in removing personal barriers to increased cycling.*

What do you like about the current National Standard? Why do you say this?

The National Standards helps promote a level of consistency backed up by best practice, with a clear set of outcomes. Scottish users also recognise that the skills developed in the national standard go beyond cycling and promote safe use of road and other infrastructure.

What do you dislike about the current National Standard? Why do you say this?

Scottish users recognise a lack of awareness of the National Standards. This is interpreted in two ways:

- *There is confusion between the 'National Standards' and Bikeability programmes and resources based upon the National Standards. This is repeatedly expressed through calls for Bikeability for older ages and different audiences, when other National Standard-aligned training products exist*
- *There is general lack of awareness / understanding of the National Standards for Cycle Training by other road users*

Several of the verbs used, e.g. 'understand', are challenging to demonstrate. Any update to the standards should look to replace these with verbs of action.

Are there any National Standard outcomes that instructors currently find difficult to teach/deliver? If so, which ones are they and how could a revised National Standard address this issue?

Scottish users have referred to a number of different outcomes, with no common consensus. Examples include:

- *Level 3, particularly outcome 4 can be difficult to deliver dependent on geographic location*
- *Level 2, outcome 16 is also hard to demonstrate depending on location*
- *Some users cite difficulties with teaching left-hand life savers to younger children*
- *Teaching road positioning to younger, slower children is difficult in busier areas*
- *The terminology of 'primary' and 'secondary' position is often confused*

All outcomes should be clearly demonstrable, and therefore 'understand' should be replaced with 'demonstrate / explain / describe' etc.

NATIONAL STANDARD SUPPORTING GUIDANCE

Which of these guidance documents do you use?

- ***Bikeability Delivery Guide***
- ***Bikeability Plus Delivery Guide***
- ***Good Practice Guide for Disability Cycle Training***

- **National Standard Instructor (NSI) Course**
- **National Standard Assistant Instructor (NSIA) Course**
- **National Standard Instructor Trainer (NSIT) Course**
- **None of the above**

For each of the guidance documents that you DO NOT use, please say why you do not use it.

In Scotland all instructors are issued with copies of the Bikeability Scotland Instructor Guides, Instructor Prompt Cards, and Cyclist's Guide for Levels 1 and 2. Each trained Cycle Training Assistant (1 day course with follow-up mentoring) receives the CTA handbook including National Standards in appendices. Each trained Cycle Trainer (4 day course mapped to NSI outcomes) receives the Cycle Trainer Manual, a copy of Cyclecraft, and Level 3 resources.

Are there any other materials, guides or manuals you use to deliver Bikeability? Please list which ones.

Scottish Instructors also referenced the following as useful resources:

Highway code, British Cycling resources, Bikeability Scotland videos, Youtube videos on Cycling Games, Youtube videos from Global Cycling Network, Cycling UK community topics, Tales of the Road road safety resources.

What revisions (if any) do you think need to be made to each of the supporting guidance documents?

There was little awareness in Scotland of the 'Good Practice Guide for Disability Cycling Training'. Users that were aware suggested it should focus on all-ability and inclusive cycling rather than just disabilities. Others felt the guidance is too generic and would benefit from increased content on good practice, potentially involving other organisations such as the National Autistic Society, blending teaching techniques with core cycle training.

Cycling Scotland commissioned FABB Scotland to provide comment on the resource. Through their 'Blazing Saddles' project, FABB Scotland are recognised as the leading experts in all-ability cycling within Scotland. FABB provided the following response:

Fabb/Blazing Saddles was unaware of this document. We approach disability awareness and inclusion as a "learning by doing" practical process as opposed to "learning by reading" which may make people apprehensive about working with disabled people.

Having read the document, we accept that there is a lot of useful information that may help those wishing to deliver more inclusive cycling services. We would, however, argue that at 95 pages long, it is unlikely that anyone would read this "cover to cover" and by using it as a reference only guide some of the main areas to consider may be inadvertently overlooked or missed.

We therefore found the Guide to be too descriptive and felt it might become a barrier to inclusion as opposed to a constructive "How to" Guide. While there is a need to prepare people for the adjustments they may have to make when including disabled people there is a very fine line between too much description of what is required and preparing non-disabled people to feel able to take on this inspiring, innovative and inclusive cycling challenge.

Adjustments to Training Methods

Fabb has many years' experience of delivering disability awareness workshops. Our experience when delivering to "outdoor activity" target audiences is to make the workshop more practical than theory based. When we attended the pilot training delivered by British Cycling we felt Fabb could have delivered a similar programme in partnership with cycling experts in Scotland. As a result, the cost of delivering this training would be reduced due to using local experts and increase the number of courses available throughout the year to Instructors and Coaches across Scotland.

We therefore suggest replacing the National Standards Guide with a mixture of practical and online training programmes. Both of these styles will test the knowledge and understanding of how to deliver inclusive cycling to all ages and abilities.

Fabb can provide more advice and guidance on this innovative way of testing knowledge and understanding which requires participants to score 80% or more to attain a certificate of competence.

Additionally, we recommend that all Bikeability and similar level courses include a compulsory element where all Instructors and Coaches of these courses, new and existing, attend a practical session on use of adaptive

bikes and adjustments that may be required to include disabled people in mainstream provision. We suggest this be followed up by an online “test”. Equally, we feel this review is an opportunity to incorporate this into current training courses similar to Bikeability.

Make It Simple!

- *We would advise that by over-complicating the needs of disabled people by being too descriptive and prescriptive creates barriers to inclusion. Blazing Saddles’ programme is very simple and as a result:*
- *Highlights the needs for clear communication with the people involved through face-to-face participation;*
- *Demonstrates how to include people with disabilities into mainstream provision by considering how to make reasonable adjustments that make it easier for disabled and non-disabled people alike – by meeting in the middle;*
- *Provides simple solutions to overcoming barriers to inclusion and when it appears complicated talks to the people concerned to alleviate stress and anxiety;*
- *Puts the safety of disabled people at the forefront of our services without making it a barrier to participation;*
- *Share information of any strengths and weaknesses across the Blazing Saddles’ network of independently run cycling hubs to improve delivery of service provision across Scotland.*

We therefore advise that any review of Bikeability Levels 1 and 2 alongside the National Standard outcomes should be clear, simple and succinct.

OTHER POTENTIAL CHANGES TO THE NATIONAL STANDARD AND THE SUPPORTING GUIDANCE

In what other ways do you think we should be looking to revise the National Standard and / or the supporting guidance?

The presentation of some standards could be well supported by images.

At level 2, there are a small number of instructors in Scotland who suggest that the National Standards are based on riding strategy rather than a manoeuvre. This would focus on core skills like observation, positioning, and control, e.g. “identify an appropriate riding position in a variety of circumstances”. The BSDG recognises that this could present significant implementation challenges.

Finally, do you have any other comments or suggestions about the revisions that you feel need to be made to the National Standard and/or the supporting guidance?

Within the Bikeability Delivery Guide, it is stated that “Bikeability is the public face of the National Standard for Cycle Training, published by the UK Department for Transport, which deals with the underlying competencies and technical administration of cycle training. This training guide provides advice for instructors on how to deliver training for all of the National Standard learning outcomes for level 1, 2 and 3”.

As the National Standard is applicable for cycling at all ages and stages, we recommend that Bikeability is considered as ‘a public face’ interpreted for school-age children. This would avoid confusing the Bikeability brand and resources with cycle training for other audiences.

This confusion is reflected in the responses to the National Standard Review submitted to Cycling Scotland by instructors familiar with the Bikeability Scotland delivery model and resources.

On behalf of the Bikeability Scotland Delivery Group, Cycling Scotland remains committed to a quality-assured training programme that recognises the need for flexibility in delivery approaches, to reflect local conditions.