

An Active School Transportation Plan for Alberta July 2017

In recent decades, childhood overweight and obesity has emerged as a significant challenge for public health in Canada (1, 2). Unhealthy weights put children at an increased risk for premature onset of chronic conditions, such as high blood pressure, musculoskeletal disorders, type 2 diabetes, heart disease, stroke, and cancer, as well as weight gain into adulthood (1-3). The economic impact of obesity on healthcare spending and loss of workforce productivity is also substantial, with estimated direct and indirect costs totaling between \$4.6 and \$7.1 billion annually (1).

Inactive, sedentary lifestyles are a risk factor for unhealthy weights. Within Canada, only 9% of 5-17 year olds meet recommended daily physical activity levels (4). This can be attributed, in part, to physical and social environments that fail to support active living (5). Given the large amount of time children spend at school, school communities have an important role to play in addressing physical inactivity (6). Exposing students to active and healthy school environments can help to foster health-enhancing behaviors, which have the potential to carry on into adulthood (7).

Comprehensive school health is an internationally recognized model that recommends taking a holistic approach to student wellbeing, where positive health behaviours are encouraged both in and beyond the classroom setting (8). One component of a comprehensive approach is promoting physical activity through active school transportation (AST) (8). Research suggests that when children participate in AST, such as walking or riding a bicycle to school, they incorporate physical activity into their daily routine and achieve higher activity levels than those who travel by vehicle (9-12). Despite the benefits, relatively few children consistently engage in active travel modes. In fact, self-report data demonstrates that only 25% of Canadian students aged 5-17 actively commute, while 58% rely on inactive transportation (13).

An array of determinants influence decisions to be physically active (14). In the context of AST, common barriers to physical activity can be viewed through a social-ecological lens (15-17). Individual level factors, including the age, gender, and socioeconomic status of a child, parent schedules, and perceptions of AST, all play a role in influencing behaviours (17-25). At the school level, school location and openness of staff to get on board with AST initiatives can further impact transportation mode (17, 26). Finally, the built environment, including distance from school and other aesthetic/design factors, alongside wider community policies that impact school siting decisions and catchment areas, may affect AST decision-making (16-22, 24, 25). Evidently, to overcome challenges and ensure success, an AST strategy must target multiple levels. Although programs and initiatives currently exist in Alberta, they are often voluntary or adhoc in nature, impacting the effectiveness and reach of such programs.

Promoting Active School Transport (AST):

A comprehensive approach is required to improve AST rates in Alberta. At the individual and school level, it is necessary to shift attitudes, beliefs and culture around transportation. Currently, we live in a "car-centered" society that emphasizes the convenience of motorized vehicle use (25). Decisions around whether to drive to school or take AST are influenced by parental values around the benefits of AST (18), as well as scheduling and trip chaining factors (e.g. planning school drop-offs alongside work schedules or dropping children off at more than one school) (23-25). Parental decision-making is further influenced by safety concerns, such as traffic and child maturity and ability to travel safely (24). Notably, parents who regularly drive to school have reported that they would permit walking if their child was not alone or if traffic danger was reduced (23). To promote AST, it is therefore worthwhile to address environmental safety concerns and knowledge gaps (27), while developing travel skills. At the wider environmental level, AST should be supported by the development and cultivation of physical surroundings that are conducive to active living choices. In this regard, factors characteristic of a walkable neighbourhood are positively associated with children walking to school (20).

The School Travel Planning Model:

Active and Safe Routes to School Canada has developed a School Travel Planning (STP) model, based off of international best practice (28). The approach emphasizes community engagement and inter-sectoral collaboration among school-based champions and community-level professionals, for the purpose of identifying and overcoming active transportation barriers in elementary schools (23, 29).

Although the STP model encourages context-specific action plans, efforts can be categorized into common themes. Within schools, initiatives often span educational initiatives and promotional activities (e.g. Walking Wednesdays) (21, 23, 29). Moreover, to address environmental and safety concerns, infrastructure improvements are often made within school vicinities (e.g. installing four-way stops, removing physical barriers, repairing walkways, increasing school zone signage), alongside the enactment of enforcement measures to ensure adherence to traffic and parking laws (23, 29).

Research has demonstrated STP's potential for altering school transportation habits (21, 23). However, studies have identified challenges related to this approach, such as lack of resources and time constraints (15, 17, 23). With this in mind, top-down support is required to assist school communities in STP's implementation, recognizing that schools have different assets and needs regarding AST.

Benefits to Action:

- Active transportation is a mechanism for increasing physical activity. Alongside improved fitness, health, and reduced likelihood of disease onset, physical activity has been positively associated with enhanced academic performance and psychological well-being in children (30).
- Active transportation promotes a cleaner and more sustainable society through decreasing vehicle use and
 emissions (31-33). Importantly, AST can help improve air quality around school zones, where vehicle accumulation
 and idling during peak hours leads to increased air pollution (34). In addition, establishing active transportation
 networks can reduce traffic speed and congestion, plus improve walkability of streets, thus helping to mitigate
 public safety concerns (31).
- Using the STP model to promote community action and collaboration around transportation barriers has the
 potential to yield many benefits. For starters, establishing a multidisciplinary STP committee can generate an
 increased ability to problem solve and lead to increased project coordination to avoid duplication (15). Involving
 practitioners outside the school may also generate movement support and credibility across the community (15).
 Finally, it alleviates school staff from having to shoulder full responsibility for school AST (15).

Considerations:

In the realm of school physical activity, Alberta is considered a policy innovator (35). In 2005, the Daily Physical Activity (DPA) policy was adopted to ensure that students receive a minimum of 30 minutes of physical activity per day (36). Although it sets out very important objectives, implementation of the policy has been met with challenges (36). For example, in a culture that prioritizes academic achievement, DPA can be difficult to attain when it is not scheduled beyond PE class (35). In that regard, AST may better enable school communities to achieve DPA goals by encouraging physical activity during student commute time.

Cost-benefit analyses (CBA) show that implementation of the STP model is cost-effective in Canada (37, 38). A CBA provides an overall ratio, which represents the amount of benefits returned for each dollar invested (38). A recent CBA study from Canada yielded a ratio of 2.4, with hypothetical 3 and 5-year implementation periods receiving ratios of 4.5 and 6.3, respectively (38). This highlights the fact that benefits of AST are likely to accrue over time.

Certain populations may experience greater barriers to AST. For example, students attending rural schools experience barriers, such as distance, lack of adequate sidewalks or bicycle lanes, and schools located by high-speed roads (21, 26,

39). Despite this, the STP model has shown an ability to alter AST behaviours in areas that contain rural environments (38). More specifically, the STP approach allows for adaptations to common AST strategies to best suit the school context at hand. For instance, rural solutions may entail variations of a walking school bus, such as remote drop-offs and walk to school bus stops (40). In addition, high school students may be at a disadvantage when it comes to AST, as they are more likely to live farther from their school site than elementary school students (20). Encouragingly, the STP model has been recently adapted to high school settings, with a greater focus on student engagement and leadership (41).

Further of note, a recent survey of the Alberta public and policy influencers demonstrates support for action surrounding the provision of AST programs (42). Of survey respondents, 94% of policy influencers and 96% of the general public indicated that they would "somewhat" or "strongly" support programs that encourage walking or biking to school (42). The majority of respondents also support broader policies that promote active transportation in the wider community (42).

Finally, in 2016, a private member's bill was introduced that called for all schools to implement and maintain a policy that promotes active transportation (43). Although the bill died in the legislature, it helped generate important discussion and bring the issue of AST onto the public agenda. Future advocacy should highlight the need for a more comprehensive policy that sets out specific objectives and action required by schools, communities and other relevant stakeholders.

APCCP Priorities for Action:

• Advocate for a comprehensive, provincial Active School Transportation plan in Alberta, which includes uptake of the School Travel Planning model.

References:

- 1. Canadian Institute for Health Information, Public Health Agency of Canada. Obesity in Canada: A joint report from the Public Health Agency of Canada and the Canadian Institute for Health Information. Ottawa2011 [cited 2017 June]; Available from: http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/hp-ps/hl-mvs/oic-oac/index-eng.php.
- 2. World Health Organization. Childhood overweight and obesity. 2017 [cited 2017 June]; Available from: http://www.who.int/dietphysicalactivity/childhood/en/.
- 3. World Health Organization. Why does childhood overweight and obesity matter? 2017 [cited 2017 June]; Available from: http://www.who.int/dietphysicalactivity/childhood consequences/en/.
- 4. ParticipACTION. Are Canadian kids too tired to move? The 2016 participACTION report card on physical activity for children and youth. 2016 [cited 2017 June]; Available from: https://www.participaction.com/sites/default/files/downloads/2016%20ParticipACTION%20Report%20Card%20-%20Full%20Report.pdf.
- 5. ParticipACTION Advisory Group. Active Canada 20/20: a physical activity strategy and change agenda for Canada- creating a culture of an active nation. 2012 [cited 2017 June]; Available from: http://www.activecanada2020.ca/sections-of-ac-20-20/download-pdf-document.
- 6. Veugelers P, Fitzgerald A. Effectiveness of school programs in preventing childhood obesity: a multilevel comparison. American Journal of Public Health 2005 95(3):432-5.
- 7. Macnab A, Gagnon F, Stewart D. Health promoting schools: consensus, strategies, and potential. Health Education. 2014;114(3):170-85.
- 8. Alberta Healthy School Community Wellness Fund. Developing healthy school communities: handbook. Edmonton, AB: School of Public Health, University of Alberta; 2014 [cited 2017 June]; Available from: http://www.wellnessfund.ualberta.ca/~/media/abhealthyschools/Wellness Fund Handbook 2015-English.pdf.
- 9. Davison K, Werder J, Lawson C. Children's active commuting to school: current knowledge and future directions. Prev Chronic Dis. 2008;5(3):A100.
- 10. Sirard JR, Alhassan S, Robinson TN. Changes in physical activity from walking to school. Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise. 2006;38(5):S82.
- 11. Southward EF, Page AS, Wheeler BW, Cooper AR. Contribution of the school journey to daily physical activity in children aged 11–12 years. American journal of preventive medicine. 2012;43(2):201-4.
- 12. Pabayo R, Maximova K, Spence J, Vander Ploeg K, Wu B, Veugelers P. The importance of active transportation to and from school for daily physical activity among children. Preventive medicine. 2012;55(3):196-200.
- 13. Active Healthy Kids Canada. Is Canada in the running? How Canada stacks up against 14 other countries on physical activity for children and youth. 2014 [cited 2017 June]; Available from:

 http://www.rbc.com/community-sustainability/ assets-custom/pdf/AHKC-2014-Short-Form-Report-Card-English.pdf.
- 14. Bauman A, Reis R, Sallis J, Wells J, Loos R, Martin B. Correlates of physical activity: why are some people physically active and others not? The lancet. 2012;380(9838):258-71.
- 15. Macridis S, García Bengoechea E. Adoption of safe routes to school in Canadian and the United States contexts: best practices and recommendations. Journal of school health. 2015;85(8):558-66.
- 16. Mammen G, Stone M, Buliung R, Faulkner G. Putting school travel on the map: facilitators and barriers to implementing school travel planning in Canada. Journal of Transport & Health. 2015;2(3):318-26.
- 17. Mammen G. School travel planning in Canada: a holistic examination of program impact on active school travel: University of Toronto; 2016.
- 18. Stone M, Larsen K, Faulkner GE, Buliung RN, Arbour-Nicitopoulos KP, Lay J. Predictors of driving among families living within 2km from school: exploring the role of the built environment. Transport Policy. 2014;33:8-16.
- 19. Larouche R, Chaput J-P, Leduc G, Boyer C, Bélanger P, LeBlanc AG, et al. A cross-sectional examination of socio-demographic and school-level correlates of children's school travel mode in Ottawa, Canada. BMC public health. 2014;14(1):497.
- 20. Mitra R, Buliung R. Exploring differences in school travel mode choice behaviour between children and youth. Transport Policy. 2015;42:4-11.

- 21. Mammen G, Stone M, Buliung R, Faulkner G. School travel planning in Canada: identifying child, family, and school-level characteristics associated with travel mode shift from driving to active school travel. Journal of Transport & Health. 2014;1(4):288-94.
- 22. Mitra R. There's no such thing as bad weather, just the wrong clothing: climate, weather and active school transportation in Toronto, Canada Canadian Journal of Public Health 2012;103(3):35-41.
- 23. Buliung R, Faulkner G, Beesley T, Kennedy J. School travel planning: mobilizing school and community resources to encourage active school transportation. Journal of school health. 2011;81(11):704-12.
- 24. Faulkner G, Richichi V, Buliung R, Fusco C, Moola F. What's quickest and easiest?: Parental decision making about school trip mode. International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity. 2010;7(1):62.
- 25. Loitz C, Spencer-Cavaliere N. Exploring the barriers and facilitators to children's active transportation to and from school from the perspectives of practitioners. Journal of Physical Activity and Health. 2013;10(8):1128-35.
- 26. O'Loghlen S, Pickett W, Janssen I. Active transportation environments surrounding Canadian schools. Canadian Journal of Public Health. 2011:364-8.
- 27. Raine KD, Muhajarine N, Spence JC, Neary NE, Nykiforuk CI. Coming to consensus on policy to create supportive built environments and community design. Can J Public Health. 2012;103(Suppl 3):S5-S8.
- 28. Green Communities Canada. Review of international school travel planning best practices Peterborough, ON2010; Available from: http://www.saferoutestoschool.ca/downloads/Intl STP Best Practices Update 2010.pdf.
- 29. Metrolinkx. Stepping it up: final report Toronto 2012 [cited 2017 June]; Available from: http://www.metrolinx.com/en/projectsandprograms/schooltravel/SteppingltUpReportENG.pdf.
- 30. World Health Organization. WHO information series on school health. Promoting physical activity in schools: an important element of a health promoting school. France2007; Available from: http://www.who.int/school youth health/resources/information series/en/.
- 31. Transport Canada. Active transportation in Canada: a resource and planning guide. Ottawa: Transport Canada 2011 [cited 2017 June]; Available from:

 http://www.fcm.ca/Documents/tools/GMF/Transport Canada/ActiveTranspoGuide EN.pdf.
- 32. Frank L, Greenwald M, Winkelman S, Chapman J, Kavage S. Carbonless footprints: promoting health and climate stabilization through active transportation. Preventive medicine. 2010;50:S99-S105.
- 33. Haines A, Alleyne G, Kickbusch I, Dora C. From the Earth Summit to Rio+ 20: integration of health and sustainable development. The lancet. 2012;379(9832):2189-97.
- 34. Active & Safe Routes to School. Ideal free school zone. 2017 [cited 2017 June]; Available from: http://www.saferoutestoschool.ca/idle-free-school-zone.
- 35. Olstad DL, Campbell EJ, Raine KD, Nykiforuk CI. A multiple case history and systematic review of adoption, diffusion, implementation and impact of provincial daily physical activity policies in Canadian schools. BMC public health. 2015;15(1):385.
- 36. Policy Opportunity Windows Enhancing Research Uptake in Practice (POWER UP!). Alberta daily physical activity policy for schools (n.d) [cited 2017 June]; Available from: http://abpolicycoalitionforprevention.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/albertas-dpa-policy-for-schools.pdf.
- 37. Metrolinx, Green communities Canada, University of Toronto. The costs and benefits of school travel planning projects in Ontario 2014 [cited 2017 June]; Available from:

 http://www.metrolinx.com/en/projectsandprograms/schooltravel/Costs and Benefits of School Travel Planning Projects EN.pdf.
- 38. Green Communities Canada. School travel planning benefit-cost report for Toronto and Wellington-Dufferin-Guelph. 2016 [cited 2017 June]; Available from: http://www.saferoutestoschool.ca/sites/default/files/Benefit-Cost-Final%20Report-Feb22%2016-Final%20website%20version.pdf.
- 39. Robertson-Wilson JE, Leatherdale ST, Wong SL. Social—ecological correlates of active commuting to school among high school students. Journal of Adolescent Health. 2008;42(5):486-95.
- 40. Safe Routes to School National Partnership. Rural communities: best practices and promising approaches for safe routes. 2017 [cited 2017 June]; Available from: http://www.saferoutespartnership.org/sites/default/files/resource_files/rural_communities_best_practices_an_d_promising_approaches_for_safe_routes.pdf.

- 41. Stuckless J. High school pilot project 2010-2012. Ottawa: Green Communities Canada; 2012 [cited 2017 June]; Available from: http://lin.ca/resources/ottawa-high-school-travel-pilot-project-2010-2012.
- 42. Policy Opportunity Windows Enhancing Research Uptake in Practice (POWER UP!). Knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs (KAB) survey. Edmonton, AB: School of Public Health, University of Alberta; 2016.
- 43. Shepherd D. Bill 209: active schools week act. 2016 [cited 2017 June]; Available from: http://www.assembly.ab.ca/ISYS/LADDAR files/docs/bills/bill/legislature 29/session 2/20160308 bill-209.pdf.