**FHWA Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation University Course**

**Module: 20 – Leadership in Implementation**

**Assignment: Pitching an Intervention: In-class Competition**

*This activity was developed by Dr. Tabitha (Tab) Combs of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill*

**PURPOSE**

The purpose of this exercise is to get students thinking holistically about designing for pedestrian and bicyclists, and learning how to succinctly communicate such designs and the rationale behind them to uninformed elected/appointed leaders. This exercise takes the form of a game, in which students teams compete against each other, tournament-style, on behalf of their design recommendations.

**PROCESS**

The basic premise: the students are employed by municipal government as planners or engineers. The municipality was rewarded a grant to improve pedestrian and/or bicycle safety and access at any known hotspot/conflict zone in the community. **The amount of the grant is up to the instructor, but it should be a modest sum**.

Students should be pre-assigned to teams. Note that the game is designed for 8 teams and 2 officials and to take place within a 75-minute class period, but can be adapted to accommodate other arrangements. Students should come to class with laptops or tablets with internet access.

Teams face off in pairs (dyads), with members of the losing team becoming entry-level staffers on the winning team.

Supplies needed:

* Laptops/tablets
* Tracing paper and markers/pens
* 1-2 ‘elected officials’
* Prizes (enough for at least half the class; more should the victors want to share)

Game play proceeds as follows:

**Phase 0 – 4 min**

Working in teams, students must first identify a location in need of an intervention, and then convince an ‘elected official’ (e.g., another staff member or advanced graduate student) that their location is worthy of the town’s limited grant funds.

Alternatively, the instructor can pre-identify study areas/hotspots and assign them to teams at the start of the competition.

**Phase I (round of 8 prep) – 12 min**

1. 6 min: Teams identify the infrastructure/design safety failures presented by their hotspot from the perspectives of people traveling by foot and by bicycle.
   * + What, why, for whom are they failures?
2. 6 min: Teams select the worst of the identified failures, and prepare 3-minute pitch to explain why it’s a problem, for whom, and recommend (but not yet begin design for) an infrastructure-based solution.
   1. Parameters:
      * Must stay within existing ROW
      * Must be politically feasible and defensible
      * Must be context-sensitive

**Phase II (round of 8 judging) – 16 min total (8 per dyad)**

1. Teams square off in dyads; each team takes 3 minutes to explain why their problem is the worst and pitch preliminary fix
2. Judges choose team with the strongest argument; may offer feedback

**Phase III (round of 4 prep) – 16 min**

1. Losing teams join forces with winning teams to form Super Teams (winning team-members are the leaders; losers are assistants)
2. Super Teams develop design solutions to “fix” the worst failure
   1. Not looking for engineering drawings!
   2. Same parameters as before
3. Teams prepare 3-minute pitch to support/sell their idea.

**Phase IV (round of 4 judging) – 8 min**

1. The two Super Teams on each side square off against each other; each team has 3 minutes to sell their design solution
2. Judges choose the Super Team with the strongest argument (not necessarily the best solution); the winning team becomes their sides’ “Champion.”
3. The losing Super-Teams become the town council (they, along w/ the judges, will vote to select the eventual winning team)

**Phase V (round of 2 prep) – 6 min**

The two finalists/Champions take a few minutes to prepare their final 3-minute pitches

**Phase VI (found of 2 judging) – 8 min**

Champions compete against each other; town council & judges vote via show of hands for an overall winner

**Phase VII (wrap up & debrief) – 5 mins**

Present awards & debrief the activity