

INFO BRIEF

What Makes a “Biking” School? How Some Schools Have Pulled Ahead in Cycling Rates



Pedestrian and Bicycle
Information Center
www.pedbikeinfo.org

Introduction

The Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center's analysis of the 2017 National Household Travel Survey (NHTS) noted that only 1.2% of students in grades K to 8 usually biked to school. While the NHTS data offer a national-level measure of student travel, a smaller-scale look can provide further insight. There are some parts of the country, measured at the core-based statistical area (CBSA)—a geographic area that consists of one or more counties anchored by an urban center with a population of at least 10,000 people and connected via commuting patterns—that have exceptionally high bike-to-school rates. Investigating how places with much higher than average walking or biking rates have instituted robust walking and biking to school practices provides an opportunity for more places to replicate those practices (Brookshire et al, 2019). Based on data from the School Travel Database maintained by the National Center for Safe Routes to School, Northern California was identified as one such region. Looking more deeply, multiple schools in Santa Clara County, California, that consistently reported to the School Travel Database yielded cycling rates greater than ten percent. Fifteen K-8 schools representing a range of cycling rates from this county were selected to explore which factors are associated with more cycling while holding other characteristics that could impact cycling outcomes equal. All schools in the study (both with low biking rates and high biking rates) were located in residential neighborhoods surrounded by 25-mph school zone speed limits serving relatively affluent students, the majority of whom were students of color. The California Bay Area also enjoys predominantly fair weather. Nonetheless, communities in other areas, especially those with schools in residential areas, can learn from what sets these "biking" schools apart.

Bicycling infrastructure, resources, policies, and attitudes can all play a role in the likelihood that a child will bike to school. This research brief asks the question, what factors are associated with high rates of cycling to school at the individual school level? This study intends to expand the body of knowledge about replicable ways that teachers, administrators, Safe Routes to School coordinators, and community leaders can facilitate active transportation.

Fifteen K-8 schools in Santa Clara County, California, were selected from a total of 103 CA-based schools that had collected Student Travel Tally data maintained by the National Center for Safe Routes to School within the past three years. Four of the fifteen schools selected were identified as demonstrating "positive deviance" from the average cycling rate. "Positive deviance" in social theory represents outlier cases displaying more beneficial outcomes than the average, despite facing similar challenges and having similar access to resources. This research also employs the lens of "social practice theory" to consider how social, economic, and cultural factors interplay to produce positively deviating trends in school-level cycling participation. Specifically, the team borrows from Shove's and colleagues' (2012) three elements model of social practices. This model suggests that social practices result from the interplay among:

- "materials" (technology, and objects);
- "meanings" (images, symbols); and
- "competencies" (skills, procedures).

In the context of cycling, for example, the presence of bike racks (materials) might alter impressions of cycling as a viable school commute option (meanings), which might result in strengthened knowledge about cycling (competencies). Additionally, this research integrates other factors that directly relate to cycling, such as school cycling policy, local infrastructure, and dedicated cycling staff.

Table 1. Bike participation rates in 2017 among positive deviance and control schools in the study sample.

	\bar{x} AM Bike Participation	SD	\bar{x} PM Bike Participation	SD	Total number of trips
Positive Deviance	14.2%	2.0%	14.0%	2.7%	4312
Control Group	2.8%	2.4%	2.5%	1.8%	8010

Methodology

The team investigated factors that contribute to varying cycling rates in 15 schools in Santa Clara County, California. Information about school cycling rates were accessed from the National Center of Safe Routes to School’s 2017 Student Travel Tally. Of the 15 study schools, four were identified as having “positive deviance”, with cycling rates more than two standard deviations above the mean for both trips to school in the morning ($M = 2.64\%$, $SD = 3.07$, $N = 103$ schools) and trips home from school in the afternoon ($M = 2.55\%$, $SD = 3.01$) (Table 1). The 15 schools are listed in Appendix 1.

The study sample includes schools that vary widely in the proportion of students who regularly ride a bike between home and school. The statistical approach used in this analysis to select positive deviants controlled for students’ grade, as well as other factors that might explain differences among schools, such as school-level demographics and grades served. More than half of all school populations were students of color, and there was a study cohort average of 17% Free and Reduced Price Meal Program participation. None of the schools were charter or magnet schools, and a majority of positive deviance schools were middle schools (three of four), while middle schools represented a minority of control schools (four of 11).

The research team evaluated schools using a bike school culture rubric comprised of 13 indicators rooted in social practice theory (Shove et al., 2012). This rubric was divided into two sections: (1) school-level social biking practices; and (2) district-/municipal-level policies and physical environment characteristics surrounding each

school. Researchers at the University of North Carolina Highway Safety Research Center and Arizona State University developed the rubric through an iterative process that included piloting the rubric with a sample of school travel experts, modifying rubric elements based upon expert feedback, and repeating this process a few times before administering the rubric in the present study. Due to the research team’s distance from the study locations, all rubric elements had to be measurable through satellite imagery, internet searches and phone interviews. Each indicator was worth zero to four points, depending on the extent to which the school satisfied qualifications for each indicator. The total possible score for all sections was 52. See Appendix 2 for an example of a completed rubric.

The team employed Google Maps, the school website, and interviews with school representatives to determine rubric ratings. Google Maps satellite imagery and street view were used to identify road features and building orientation and to measure bike parking. The school website provided information about school policy, cycling promotional activities, and school travel information. Semi-structured interviews with school representatives, when available, addressed bike education, resources, activities, and champions. See Appendix 3 for an example list of interview questions. Two schools responded to the team’s request for an interview. A local Safe Routes to School Coordinator and county department of health representative were also interviewed for further information about local geography and resources.

Key Findings

The team collected valid data on eight variables for the 15 study schools—four positive deviance schools and 11 control schools. Data were recorded for: (1) bike parking; (2) cycling infrastructure; (3) school policy; (4) building orientation; (5) traffic calming; (6) school zone segmentation; (7) grant program participation; and (8) grades served (see: Table 2, Table 4).

Bike Parking

In social practice theory, bike parking can serve as both a “material” and “meaning”, indicating that cycling is both common and supported. **The area in square feet devoted to bike parking was observably higher in schools with positive deviance compared with bike parking at control schools** (Table 2). That is, the mean area (in sq. ft.) of bike parking is more than five-times as high for positive deviance schools compared with control schools. In this study, the relationship between bike parking and biking to school remains unclear. If the bike parking was introduced before there was a high cycling share, it may have conveyed that cycling to school is expected and accommodated. If bike parking was introduced after cycling rates rose, it may be an effect, rather than a cause.

Cycling Infrastructure

Like bike parking, cycling road infrastructure may serve as both a “material” affordance and a symbol of “meaning” regarding the social appropriateness and desirability of cycling in an area. In this study, cycling infrastructure included cycling or mixed-use trails, on-road bike lanes, or road markings indicating cycling in the area. Dedicated cycling infrastructure was not meaningfully associated with higher biking

participation among positive deviant schools (Table 4). In fact, only one positive deviance school had any road infrastructure dedicated to cycling within two blocks of the school, whereas seven schools in the control group were served by on-road cycling facilities, including three of these schools served by a separated trail leading to their campus boundaries.

School Policy

School policies can encourage or restrict behavior, as well as portray “meaning” by stating the official attitudes of an institution. Promotive or descriptive policies may imply that the school supports or accommodates cycling to school. Students in schools with prohibitive policies may be limited in their ability to cycle. **The presence and tone of school policies related to cycling were observably different between positively deviating and control group schools.** For example, three positive deviance schools made some reference to cycling to school in their policies, with one school including “promotive” language (Table 4). Only one control school had a promotive or descriptive cycling policy. Three control schools had “prohibitive” policies. Examples of promotive, descriptive, and prohibitive language can be found in Table 3. Six control schools made no mention of cycling in their policies.

Building Orientation

Continuous, protected sidewalks or bike lanes leading to a school entrance uninterrupted by parking lots and driving lanes enhance safety and demonstrates that a school accommodates walking and cycling. Specifically, this study considered whether sidewalks or bike lanes (1) continuously and directly connected from off campus to the school entrance, and (2) if this infrastructure was separated from driving

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of bike parking area on school campus by group.

^a Control group unknown n = 5

	\bar{x}	Min	Med	Max
Positive Deviance	3,750 ft ²	1,200	4,500	7,500
Control Group ^a	642 ft ²	50	650	1,500

Table 3. Examples of school policy tone.

Tone	Examples
Promotive	<p>[First item under <i>Traveling to School</i>] "Bicycle Safety: We encourage all children and parents to walk or ride to school safely."</p> <p>"We suggest walking, private transportation or riding bicycles with helmets to get to school."</p>
Descriptive	<p>"If you use the bicycle area, be sure to lock your bike to the racks provided."</p> <p>"All bicycles must be licensed according to the city code."</p>
Prohibitive	<p>"Students in grades 4-5 may ride a bicycle to school if the parent feels that the child is able to ride it safely."</p> <p>"Students who violate this policy will have their bike/scooter/skateboard confiscated and returned to them at end of the day."</p>

lanes by a buffer of any kind. Position of the school building relative to the street was not meaningfully associated with cycling rates in this study. Three positive deviance schools had direct and non-separated pedestrian or bicycle access leading to the school entrance from off campus. Control schools showed a roughly even split among direct and separated, direct and non-separated, and indirect and non-separated access. This may indicate that an accommodating environment for cycling and walking at the front of the school entrance serves as both a "material" and "meaning"—that safe entrances facilitate cycling and convey that safety for vulnerable road users is important.

Traffic Calming

Traffic calming near school zones increases safety for young cyclists. Because cycling road infrastructure near schools in this study was not ubiquitous, slow and observant driving behavior is particularly important for the safety of cyclists sharing driving lanes. All schools in this study had a 25-mph school zone speed limit in 2017, adhering to a California state law establishing a maximum speed of 25-mph within 500 feet of a school when children are present. Posted speed limit therefore did not meaningfully influence the different outcomes observed between positive

deviants and control schools in this case. Most schools also had 25-mph speed limits for roads directly adjacent to the school at all times. Two control schools had posted speed limits of 35- or 40-mph within one block of the school, and one control school had a posted speed limit of 15-mph. Interestingly, in 2018, the City of Sunnyvale established a 15-mph school zone speed policy. The other cities in this study have yet to pass such a policy. While this did not impact 2017 cycling, it seems to indicate Sunnyvale is proactive about road safety near schools.

Zone Segmenting

Highly trafficked roads may present a real and perceived threat to children cycling to schools. Additionally, in the absence of pedestrian bridges, large freeways often restrict pedestrians and cyclists from crossing, rendering home-school routes longer and less convenient. A school zone was considered "segmented" if it was bisected by an arterial road or highway with six or more lanes. The impact of segmenting was inconclusive. All four positive deviance schools were bisected by a six-lane road, one of which had restricted crossing access. Four of the control schools were bisected by restricted access roads, representing both six- and eight-lane roads. Six control schools had no significant road segmenting.

School Travel Grant Seeking

From 2015 through 2017, the Santa Clara County Health Department administered a *Vehicle Emissions Reductions Based at Schools* (VERBS) grant. The grant funded bike rodeos, in-class on-bicycle safety education, “Walk and Roll” events, and walking and cycling incentives to county schools who opted into the program. Some schools who were not grant funded still chose to participate in Safe Routes to Schools programs at the city level. The Student Travel Tally used to determine positive deviance was collected in 2017, at the conclusion of the grant program.

Among the positive deviance schools, all four participated in Safe Routes to School

programming, and three of those schools received VERBS grant funding. Among the control schools, two of the schools received grant funding, two of the schools participated in programming without funding, and seven of the schools did not participate in Safe Routes to School programming. Safe Routes to School programming may have served to provide “meanings” surrounding cycling, as well as helped school communities develop “competencies” through programming that teaches students safe cycling skills. As schools opted into this program, participation may have both contributed to increases in cycling to school and served to reinforce positively deviating schools’ cycling identities.

Table 4. Proportion of schools possessing cycling-related attributes outlined in rubric for assessing bike school culture.

Variable	Attribute	Positive Deviance (n=4)	Control Group (n=11)
Cycling Infrastructure	Separated Trail	0	3
	Class 2 (on-street facilities designated for bicyclists using stripes and stencils, may include painted buffer)	1	4
	None	3	4
School Policy	Promotive	1	1
	Descriptive	2	0
	Prohibitive	0	3
	No Reference	1	6
	No Policy/Unknown	0	1
Building Orientation	Direct Separated	0	4
	Direct Non-separated	3	4
	Indirect Non-separated	1	3
Traffic Calming	25-mph School Zone Speed Limit	4	11
Zone Segmenting	6 lanes	3	0
	6 lanes, restricted access	1	2
	8 lanes, restricted access	0	2
	None	0	6
	No Zone/Unknown	0	1
Safe Routes to School Participant	Yes – Grant received	3	2
	Yes – Non-grant	1	2
	No	0	7

Administrative Champion

Bicycling “champions” within a school administration do a variety of things to encourage bicycling. They can implement cycling “materials”, convey “meanings”, and build “competencies”. While information about administrative champions was not collected for individual schools in this study, interviews with health department and Safe Routes to School personnel in Santa Clara County provided anecdotal evidence about the importance of administrative support in achieving high cycling rates. In the county, school principals, parent coordinators, or PTA members provided substantive support for promotional bicycling programming. For instance, participation in the county’s VERBS grant was voluntary and thus, principals and parent leaders needed to opt in to implementing programs. After grant funding concluded in 2017, parent coordinators and parent volunteers filled the role of continuing additional grant-funded activity. Principals and parent coordinators also can continue the legacy of strong cycling culture and programming after leadership changes.

Conclusion

Factors that contribute to student cycling at the individual school level are varied and complex. In this study, **the size of bike parking, cycling promotive school policies, and participation in grant-funded promotional programming** emerged as clear distinctions between positive deviance and control schools. Greater levels of bike parking may have reflected both demand for cycling resources and a willingness and ability to provide them or it may have been constructed and then increased bicycling followed. Control schools in this study were more likely than their high-performing peers to employ prohibitive cycling policies or to forgo such policies altogether, indicating the absence of a robust social practice around cycling at control schools. Positive deviance schools were also more likely than control schools to actively seek Safe Routes to School and other promotional grant funding.

All these factors relate to a difficult-to-measure quality of “openness” of a school community in its support for cycling. This requires not only a passive acceptance, but an active effort to provide cycling “materials” and institute programming that fosters “competencies” and “meanings” surrounding cycling to school, which together can help create cycling-oriented school identities (e.g., “we are a biking school!”). While all schools in the study represent a specific local environment and demographic—they are located in residential areas with 25-mph speed limits, with a fair climate and relatively affluent student population—communities and schools in other areas can still learn from what set these positive deviants apart.

These conclusions are consistent with a study conducted by the National Center for Safe Routes to School (2012), which assessed three schools with high walking and bicycling increases between 2007 and 2009 and three schools that did not increase walking and bicycling over the same time period. This prior study found that frequent walking and cycling activities, supportive school policies, in-school program leadership from principals as well as strong parental support, differentiated positive deviance schools from control schools. The consistency of these observations across time and location lend further strength to the importance of these factors in school cycling rates. Given the health and community benefits associated with bicycling to school, programs and funding should be made available to open cycling opportunities to diverse groups of students and schools. Once roadway infrastructure and speeds are sufficient for safe biking, the next step is to ensure that schools have the means to accommodate bicycling with interventions such as providing bike parking and bike skills programming. These elements represent important steps to growing participation in cycling to school in an equitable way and making cycling a central part of schools’ social practices.

References

Brookshire, K., LaJeunesse, S., & Pullen-Seufert, N. (October 2019). Who is Walking or Biking to School: Patterns from the 2017 National Household Travel Survey and Future Directions. Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center. Chapel Hill, NC.

Evenson, K. R., Motl, R. W., Birnbaum, A. S., & Ward, D. S. (2007). Measurement of Perceived School Climate for Active Travel in Children. *American Journal of Health Behavior*, 31, 86-97. doi:10.5993/AJHB.31.1.9.

National Center for Safe Routes to School (2012). Shifting Modes: A Comparative Analysis of Safe Routes to School Program Elements and Travel Mode Outcomes. Chapel Hill, NC.

National Center for Safe Routes to School. Safe Routes to School Data Collection System. <http://saferoutesdata.org/>

Shove, E., Pantzar, M., & Watson, M. (2012). *The Dynamics of Social Practice*. London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd.

Spotswood, F., Chatterton, T., Tapp, A., & Williams, D. (2015). Analysing Cycling as a Social Practice: An Empirical Grounding for Behaviour Change. *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour*, 29, 22–33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trf.2014.12.001>.

Appendix

Appendix 1. Student Travel Tally data for positive deviance, control schools.

School	Positive Deviance	City	School District	AM Bike Share	PM Bike Share
Cumberland Elementary	Yes	Sunnyvale, CA	Sunnyvale	12.0%	10.3%
Sunnyvale Middle	Yes	Sunnyvale, CA	Sunnyvale	12.7%	12.7%
Cupertino Middle	Yes	Sunnyvale, CA	Cupertino Union	16.3%	16.5%
Peterson Middle	Yes	Sunnyvale, CA	Santa Clara Unified	14.8%	14.7%
Fairwood Elementary	No	Sunnyvale, CA	Sunnyvale	2.0%	1.8%
C. B. Eaton Elementary	No	Cupertino, CA	Cupertino Union	3.1%	3.3%
L. P. Collins Elementary	No	Cupertino, CA	Cupertino Union	0.7%	0.5%
Sierramont Middle	No	San Jose, CA	Berryessa Union	1.8%	1.9%
Easterbrook Discovery School	No	San Jose, CA	Moreland	1.9%	1.8%
Guadalupe Elementary	No	San Jose, CA	Union	2.0%	1.8%
Chaboya Middle	No	San Jose, CA	Evergreen	0.4%	0.4%
Lakewood Elementary	No	Sunnyvale, CA	Sunnyvale	1.4%	1.5%
Columbia Middle School	No	Sunnyvale, CA	Sunnyvale	3.4%	3.3%
Cherry Chase Elementary	No	Sunnyvale, CA	Sunnyvale	7.9%	5.9%
West Valley Elementary	No	Sunnyvale, CA	Cupertino Union	6.6%	5.7%

Appendix 2: Completed Bike School Culture Rubric for Sunnyvale Middle School

Rubric for Assessing Schools' Bike School Culture

Inspiration: (Shove, Pantzar, & Watson, 2012; Spotswood, Chatterton, Tapp, & Williams, 2015)

Background and purpose

The team conceptualizes schools' "bike school culture" (BSC) as an arrangement of school-afforded activities surrounding biking to and from school. Toward measuring the BSC construct, the team borrows from Shove's and colleagues' (2012) three elements model of social practices. That is, social practices are comprised of "materials" (technology, physical objects that afford biking); "meanings" (images, symbols); and "competencies" (skills, know-how, procedures). Together, these elements are dynamically integrated by skilled teachers and school administrators through **regular and repeated performance**. Applying a social practice theory lens to the measurement of BSC we begin to see how biking-relevant materials (e.g., bikes, bike racks, bike lanes) interplay with school-embedded meanings (e.g., manifestations of how normal, desirable, and expected biking to school is for different groups of students [and staff]). In turn, these BSC -related materials and meanings integrate with the collective competencies of staff, parents, and students (e.g., biking-associated skills and know-how).

The rubric presented here is an attempt to operationalize social practices affiliated with biking to school, as well as to identify the school-level policies and procedures, school zone elements, and school building orientations that facilitate or inhibit biking to school.

School: Sunnyvale Middle School

Date: January 22, 2020

School-level Social Biking Practices (w/ corresponding school administrator interview questions (Q#))

	Data Source(s)	0	1	2	3	4
Materials – technologies, tangible physical objects						
Bikes and bike parking Q1	Satellite imagery Interview with school admin	No bike parking present	Bike racks for up to 10 bikes available	Bike racks for 11-50 bikes available	Bike racks for 50+ bikes available	Bike racks for 50+ bikes available, AND racks are located within 150 feet from school's entrance
Bike trailer/ storage of bikes Q2	Interview with school admin	No bike trailer/ storage and no bikes reported	A few bikes and no bike trailer/ storage	Bike trailer/ storage with only a few bikes in disrepair	Bike trailer/ storage and several bikes in good shape	More than one bike trailer/ abundant storage space with lots of bikes in good shape
Bike paths (on and leading to school campus)	Satellite imagery EPA Smart Location Calculator: slc.gsa.gov/slc/	No accommodations for bikes on roads or trails within two-block radius of school	On-street bike lanes or sharrows within two-block radius, with road speeds 30mph+ OR 3+ lanes traffic	On-street bike lanes or sharrows within two-block radius, with 25mph+ road speeds and only two lanes traffic	Separated bike paths run adjacent to the school, but do not lead directly toward school's entrance	Separated bike paths lead to the school campus and continue toward the school's entrance

	Data Source(s)	0	1	2	3	4
Meanings – symbolic meanings, ideas and aspirations						
Student biking participation	Student travel tally	Almost no students bike to school	< 2% of students bike to school	2-5% of students bike to school	6-10% of students bike to school	More than 10% of students bike to school
Staff biking participation Q3	Interview with school admin	Almost no staff members bike to the school	< 1% of staff bike to the school	1-3% of staff bike to the school	3-5 staff bike to the school	More than 5% of staff bike to the school
Bike-promoting activities Q4	Interview with school admin	No activities have taken place to promote biking	Activities to promote biking have been planned, but have not yet occurred	One isolated activity (e.g. Bike to School Day) to promote biking has occurred	Several activities to promote biking have occurred a few times a year	Activities to promote biking (e.g., frequent biker programs) occur at least monthly
Home-school bike travel information Q5	Interview with school admin	No home-school bike travel information (e.g., neighborhood-bike routes, where to find bike parking, etc.) provided	Home-school bike travel information provided to NEW families one time during the school year	Home-school bike travel information provided to NEW families before the start of the school year/ immediately after longer breaks	Home-school bike travel information provided to ALL families one time during the school year	Home-school bike travel information provided to ALL families before the start of the school year/ immediately after longer breaks
Competencies – skill, know-how, and technique						
Bike education Q6	Interview with school admin	Bike safety education is not part of the school's curriculum	Bike safety messages are promoted to students (e.g. posters, announcements) but not as part of formal curriculum	Bike safety is taught to students, but only during promotional events	Bike safety is taught to fewer than half of the students as part of the PE curriculum	Bike safety is taught to at least half of the students as part of the PE curriculum
Bike trains Q7	Interview with school admin	The school does not operate a bike train	1 or 2 staff participate in a bike train that operates only during a promotional event or month	Several staff participate in bike trains that operate only during a promotional event or month	1 or 2 staff participate in a bike train that operates at least monthly	Several staff participate in bike trains that operate at least monthly
Total biking score:			15	Total possible score:		36

Related Literature

Evenson et al. (2007) developed a "perceived school climate for active travel" scale. A survey of 4th and 5th grade students provided data for this validation study. Authors reveal a 3-factor model measuring constructs of (1) encouragement; (2) praise; and (3) perceived importance of active school travel.

Supportive Policies and School Zone and Building Orientations

	Data Source(s)	0	1	2	3	4
Bike/walk policy Q8	Interview with school admin School website School social media sites	Schools has no policy related to promoting safe biking or walking to school	School has a <i>descriptive</i> biking and walking policy and a few staff and parents know about it	School has a <i>descriptive</i> biking and walking policy and all staff and parents know about it	School has promotive biking and walking policy and a few staff and parents know about it	School has <i>promotive</i> biking and walking policy and all staff and parents know about it (e.g., earlier dismissal for students who bike or walk to school)
Bike and pedestrian school building orientation Q9	Satellite imagery/Street view Interview with school admin	There is no pedestrian infrastructure at front of the school and walkers are mixed with car drop-off/pick up zones and bus zones	There is some pedestrian infrastructure at the front of the school, but driving lanes or parking impedes efficient route to entrance	Pedestrian infrastructure at front of school is complete, but has no buffer between driving lanes or parking	Pedestrian infrastructure at the front of the school is separated from all traffic and leads directly to school entrance	Pedestrian AND cycling infrastructure at the front of the school is separated from all traffic and leads directly to school entrance
School zone traffic calming	Satellite imagery/Street view	School zone speed limit 25mph+	School zone comes with 20mph-25mph posted speed limit	School zone comes with 15mph posted speed limit, limited traffic calming devices	School zone has 15 mph posted speed limit; marked crosswalks with yields or stops at all school-front crossings	School zone has 15 mph posted speed limit; marked crosswalks with yields or stops at all school-front crossings; and one or more traffic calming devices (e.g., raised midblock crossing, speed humps, chicanes, SBLs)
School Wellness/ATS Champion Q10	Interview with school admin	No school wellness leader has been established	A school wellness leader has been established	A school wellness leader has been established and is recognized by students, staff, and families	A school wellness leader has been established; is recognized by students, staff, and families; and communicates regularly with them	A school wellness leader has been established; is recognized by students, staff, and families; communicates regularly with them; and promotes biking and walking to school
Total policy and orientation score:			10	Total possible score:		16

Appendix 3. Bike School Culture Interview Record sample

Bike School Culture Interview Record (Corresponds with Bike School Culture Rubric)

Date of interview:

Interview start time:

Interviewee Name:

Interview end time:

School Name and Location:

- Q1. On average, about how many bikes do students and staff park on campus each day?
- In relation to your school's front entrance, where is the school's bike parking located?
- Q2. Does your school have a bike trailer or place to store bikes to be used to teach student on-bike safety skills?
- About how many bikes does your school have on hand for teaching bike safety?
And what condition are the bikes in?
- Q3. About what percentage of school staff would you say regularly bike to work?
- Q4. What kind of activities, if any, does the school do to promote biking to school?
- How often are these promotional activities done each year?
- Q5. Does your school provide families with information about biking between home and school?
- Which families (for example, families newer to the school or all families) receive this home-to-school biking information?
 - When do the families receive this home-to-school biking information?
At the beginning of the school year? Other times of year?
- Q6. Is bike safety taught at your school?
- Which grades are taught bike safety?
 - Is the bike safety training part of your school's PE classes or taught during specific times of year?
- Q7. Does your school operate a "bike train"—a group of students who bike to school together under adult supervision?
- Do any staff participate in these bike trains?
 - How often do the bike trains run? Once a year; a few times a year; all year round?
- Q8. Does your school have any policies about biking or walking to school?
- Would you say that most staff know about the school's biking/walking policies?
 - How does your school share biking/walking policies with parents?
- Q9. To what extent, if at all, are student bikers and walkers separated from cars and buses during drop off and pick up times?
- Q10. Does your school employ a school wellness staff member?
- How often does this school wellness person interact with students and other staff?
 - What about with students' families? How often does the school wellness person interact with them? And to what extent does the school wellness person promote biking or walking to school?
- Q11. Is there anything else you would like to share about your schools' stance on biking to school?



www.pedbikeinfo.org

730 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., Suite 300

Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27599-3430

pbic@pedbikeinfo.org

888-823-3977

SUGGESTED CITATION: Szufliita, L., LaJeunesse, S. and Pullen-Seufert, N. What Makes a “Biking” School? How Some Schools Have Pulled Ahead in Cycling Rates. Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center, Chapel Hill, NC: 2020.

DISCLAIMER: This material is based upon work supported by the Federal Highway Administration under Cooperative Agreement No. DTFH6116H00029. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the Author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the view of the Federal Highway Administration or the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

Since its inception in 1999, the Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center’s mission has been to improve the quality of life in communities through the increase of safe walking and bicycling as a viable means of transportation and physical activity. The Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center is maintained by the University of North Carolina Highway Safety Research Center with funding from the U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration.