



Forest Research

“Assessing the contribution of forestry grants to equal access for disabled people to recreation goods, facilities and services in Scottish Forests”

Evaluation framework

Simon Bell

OPENspace: the research centre for inclusive access to outdoor environments

Edinburgh College of Art and Heriot-Watt University
Lauriston Place
Edinburgh EH3 9DF

November 2007

INTRODUCTION

This is an evaluation framework and toolkit for assessing the contribution of forestry grants to equal access for disabled people to recreation in Scottish forests. Forestry grants have long been an important mechanism for providing public benefits and have evolved over the years to deliver different mixes of economic, social and environmental benefits. These grants, along with newly emerging schemes, must take account of the need for woodland recreation goods, facilities and services to meet the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 and 2005 and also should contribute to the objective within Scottish Forestry Strategy to make woodlands more accessible to all sections of society.

According to these acts, disability includes physical impairments such as mobility, which includes other disabilities than the need for a wheelchair (walking difficulties for example), visual impairments (blindness and partial sight), hearing impairments (deaf or deafened people) and mental impairment (learning disability and mental health problems such as Alzheimer's sufferers).

THE EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

This evaluation framework consists of a methodology and toolkit to assess the contribution of forestry grants to increasing access by disabled people to woodland recreation. It presents a series of steps, each with a set of questions to be asked or information to be completed. A simple scoring system is used to assess the situation at each step followed by a final overall assessment. A field sheet is appended for use during the assessment. A field visit, interviews with staff and users and, if necessary, examination of information held on file are the main elements of the approach. Some basic knowledge of what makes a woodland accessible to disabled people is also needed, so anyone undertaking the assessment should make themselves acquainted with the guidance assembled for this and preferably have some experience and training in the subject.

The methodology and toolkit can be used at two levels. If a large-scale assessment of the whole of the grant scheme is needed, where comparison of schemes across Scotland is to be used for policy evaluation and development, the scoring system can be used by itself as this will provide such a picture. However, this is a somewhat blunt instrument because the special aspects of individual cases cannot be taken into account. At the level of an individual project evaluation the qualifying comments are extremely useful and allow the assessor to modify the overall assessment given by the scoring in order to take these nuances into account.

The toolkit is aimed at evaluating every project undertaken with grant money to improve access, whether there was a specific objective to improve access for disabled people or not.

The general approach to evaluation advocated by DEFRA has been adopted so that the methodology and toolkit follow recommended best practice.

Appendix 1 contains the main elements of this methodology and describes the development of the toolkit in relation to the Scottish Forestry Grant Scheme recreation stream 'S7' (SFGS S7). It is assumed at this stage that subsequent grant schemes, although different, will also be able to be evaluated using the same, or modified, toolkit. The framework follows a logical set of steps starting with the objectives of each project within the grant programme, an assessment of the baseline situation before the project took place (without which any assessment of the results is meaningless), an assessment of the inputs of resources that were used to carry out the project followed by the outputs such as the quantity of facilities and numbers of new users and finally the outcomes in terms of the effect the project had on the intended target audience.

The method of evaluating a project is as follows:

- *Interviews* with woodland officers, woodland owners and managers looking at the whole project and their expectations beforehand, experience of the funding system and their experiences of implementation and the subsequent use of the area. This should be carried out on site with as many people together (site managers, project officers, woodland officers etc) at the same time so that discussions about the way the project was developed can be used to explore some of the questions more deeply. The field sheet should be emailed to the relevant personnel beforehand so that they can see what is being asked and be prepared to provide the relevant information (see APPENDIX 3).
- *Assessment* of the woodland in question and a simplified audit of the facilities/information etc provided and paid for by the grant. Information about costs of implementation will also be needed, both any capital expenditure and running/maintenance costs, with an assessment of the contribution of the grant to this. Interviewees should be able to provide this if they have had the field sheet beforehand. The assessor should be able to make some judgement as to whether the facilities provided meet any of the standards appropriate for accessibility (see comments on training needs above).
- *Interviews* (ideally on site) with representatives of the target user type(s) to see what impact the project has had, if any on their visiting habits and quality of life. If this is difficult to achieve on site or by visiting people, the questionnaire which forms part of the field sheet can be detached and sent to users or groups representing users for their response. The woodland manager should be able to provide names and contact details of any specific groups who have been involved in the project or who are known users or representatives of users. It will probably not be practical to find other users who may not be part of a group or not known to managers unless they happen to be visiting the site on the day of the visit. Disabled tourists who may have used a site will also be very difficult to contact unless surveys have taken place on the site as part of another visitor evaluation, for example.

- *Desk evaluation* of documentation associated with the project, the grant application process and any participation/involvement with the target user group, consultation stages and the follow up inspections as grant money was paid, if any. This should not be necessary in most instances as the interviews and assessment of the woodland should be sufficient, but when the interviews fail to provide the right evidence or where documentary proof is needed then the files should be made available. In circumstances where staff involved in the project have moved or left since the grant was paid, and are unavailable for interview, the files may become the chief source of evidence.

In order to be able to aggregate the project level data to look at the programme as a whole it is necessary to introduce some consistency into the data collection, which is why standardised checklists or sets of questions for use in interviews have been developed. These are presented below.

In order to measure the different aspects a three level system of scoring is to be applied. Using letters can be better than numbers because there is a tendency to try to add numbers together to produce aggregate scores and this can be misleading. Using the letters as follows allows the overall picture to emerge without too much emphasis being placed on numbers.

A = High, B = Medium and C = Low

The field sheet (see APPENDIX 3) comprises the questions with a space to tick the relevant box and also room to add comments.

Using the Toolkit

There are two ways of applying the toolkit – to a single example of a project funded under SFGS7 or to the programme as a whole.

1. To a single project

In this case the field sheet for assessment is completed but much more attention is paid to the comments and specific circumstances of the project in the evaluation. For example, if the scoring suggests some key shortcomings in the project there may be good reasons why these could not be addressed that can only be understood during discussions or examination of files and recording this in the comments section.

2. To the programme as a whole

In this case the purpose of the evaluation is to test the success of the programme of grants. The details of individual cases are not as important as the pattern of success or failure of the grant scheme as a whole. For this assessment a sample of grant schemes should be chosen, probably a stratified random sample taken from each Forestry Commission conservancy. A statistician can advise on the number of samples depending on the total number of cases to be assessed. A tabulation of the results from the summaries of the scores should be used to compare the cases and to assess

the overall performance of the programme. The absence of numerical scoring removes the possibility of calculating averages but numbers could be substituted solely for the purpose of producing graphs showing the proportions of cases that meet each level for each stage of the assessment.

THE EVALUATION TOOLKIT

The following sections present the different steps of the evaluation framework together with the standard sets of questions and an explanation of why these are chosen and how they should be evaluated, using the scoring system and qualifying comments.

Step 1. Objectives of the project

The starting point is to find out what were the objectives of the project *in relation to providing access for disabled people*, who was involved and the level of input by disabled people in the initiation and running of the project. It should be possible to find this out from the interviews and the information kept on file, assuming it was stated in a formal way. The ranking of the scores in this section are intended to place greater weight on schemes where the aims were more than meeting the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Acts at a basic level.

1. What was the intention of the owner based on the level of modification and work undertaken in providing for disabled access?

General access complying with the legislation	C
Minor additional works to improve access for disabled people	B
A major new site or major modification to provide significant new opportunities for disabled access	A

2. Were disabled people included in the development of the project?

Benefits can be gained for members of disabled groups by being involved in the development and implementation of a project as well as by being able to use the woodland afterwards. Moreover, access projects carried out with their involvement are likely to be more successful in meeting their needs.

The access is being provided with no input from disabled people	C
Access is being provided with some limited input from disabled people	B
Disabled people from a range of groups have been involved and have given advice	A

3. What are the aims of the project with respect to providing access for disabled people?

The project includes disabled access but only as a secondary aspect	C
Access for disabled people is provided as an integral part of a larger project	B
Providing access for disabled people is central to the objectives of the project	A

The general spread of scores here will provide a sense of the aims of the project and the importance of providing access for disabled people. This assessment needs to be supported by an understanding of the particular circumstances of each project, which may affect the general strength of the aims and commitment. In particular, the baseline conditions and the assessment of demand for access, the status of involvement in management by disabled groups and so on are likely to have an effect on the objectives, so these cannot really be seen in isolation from the next step. Where the answers to any of the questions are not clear cut, comments and notes should be used to help to form a more rounded judgement.

Mainly As – strong aims related to access for disabled people

Mainly Bs – aims include access for disabled people but not as a high priority

Mainly Cs – aims for disabled people are a low priority of the project as a whole, although basic compliance with DDA is important as an element

Step 2. Assessing the baseline

The assessment of the baseline conditions is necessary before any evaluation can be carried out, since an evaluation needs to compare a new situation with a previous one. In Appendix 1 the main criteria of SFGS 7 are described. One element of this is that there should have been an assessment of demand for each grant application for funding over £10 000. Baseline measures of the state of the woodland and facilities for which the grant was applied are also necessary. Ideally, these should have been part of the case for the grant application and if so this information should be available from the files. The main aim here is to show that the project has made some positive achievements and for that it is necessary to know what the situation was beforehand. For example, if the woodland was already well used and accessible by disabled people and the grant expenditure has not increased this or made much difference to who uses it, or improved the visitor experience, then the money may not have been well spent. Conversely, if there was a low demand yet money was spent and no one extra uses the woodland then this may also show poor value for money. Clearly, a high demand, improvement of access, increased use by disabled people or a significantly improved quality of experience for existing users will show a

positive benefit, hence the need for the baseline assessment. There are several aspects to be considered in the assessment of the baseline:

4. What did the assessment of demand show (if there was one)?

Evidence will be needed to show if there was a specific local demand for disabled access over and above the legal requirement to provide it. This may be provided by interviewing managers in discussion with representatives of disabled groups. A low level of demand for disabled access suggests that provision of much more than basic access would not be justified.

No assessment was carried out	N/A
Low level of demand articulated by members of the disabled community	C
Moderate level of demand articulated by members of the disabled community	B
High level of demand articulated by members of the disabled community	A

5. What was the level of use of the woodland beforehand?

This should be easy to ascertain. Where the land became accessible due to the Land Reform Act then no previous use is to be expected but the new open access status should be taken into account.

No use or no access or formerly not permitted (before the Land reform Act)	A
Low to moderate level of use limited to able-bodied people	B
High level of use but mainly limited to able-bodied people	A
High level of use but problems identified by or for disabled users	B

6. How close is the woodland to a settlement?

The rationale for this question is that woodlands closer to where people live are potentially more accessible, an important factor for disabled people.

Further than 5 km from a settlement	C
Between 1 and 5 km from a settlement	B
Within or under 1 km from a settlement	A

7. What is the population of the area where the woodland is located?

This question affects the potential demand since the number of disabled people is usually proportionate to the overall population. Lower population therefore generally means lower demand.

In a remote area with few people	C
In an area of moderate population (small towns)	B
In an area of high population (large towns or close to large urban centres)	A

8. What is the tourism use in the area where the woodland is located?

The rationale for this question is that where the woodland is not close to a settlement but where there is high tourism use the need for access by disabled people may still be significant. The higher the tourism use, the greater are likely to be the numbers of disabled tourists.

In an area with low tourism use	C
In an area of moderate tourism use	B
In an area of high tourism use	A

9. What was the state of the woodland before the grant application?

This question relates to the overall quality of the woodland. Signs of anti-social behaviour are unwelcoming and deter many people but especially disabled people from visiting. Improvement to the woodland to make it more welcoming and to increase the quality of the visitor experience may require significant work.

Unmanaged, unkempt, with presence of litter and signs of anti-social behaviour	A
Low level of management, some litter and signs of anti-social behaviour	B
Moderate level of management, generally free of litter	C
High level of management, felt safe and welcoming	C

10. What was the assessment of the amount of work needed to make it physically accessible for disabled people?

This question looks at the existing state or accessibility of the site and what was needed to bring it up to some sort of acceptable level for use by disabled people, for example meeting the main requirements of path gradient, surfacing, width, crossfall etc. The scoring reflects the greater effort to be expected from carrying out more extensive work, notwithstanding the fact that often a number of small things can make a significant improvement (mainly removing barriers).

Only a small amount to bring the site up to standard	C
Moderate work needed in limited places to make it physically accessible	B
Extensive work needed to create or upgrade paths and other access facilities	A

11. What was the assessment of the amount of information provision work needed ?

This question reflects the importance of information provision to disabled visitors and the value for money to be gained from having to provide more.

Small amount of supplementary information to add to what is provided	C
Moderate amount of information provision needed to add to what was already provided	B
Completely new and comprehensive information provision needed	A

12. What was the assessment of the degree of woodland management work needed ?

This question also reflects the importance of woodland management to the visitor experience and also the value for money of carrying out greater amounts of management work. Woodland management includes thinning to open the woods, trimming of path edges, clearing of viewpoints etc.

Minimal because it is already well managed	C
Moderate because the wood needs some work to make it more welcoming	B

Extensive work on the trees and on cleaning it up to make it welcoming and comfortable	A
--	---

13. What was the assessment of the degree of construction work needed?

This questions looks at the value for money of any construction work to create path facilities for example. Expensive work in difficult terrain may be harder to justify in value for money terms. Not all sites may need this as the grant money may be for information provision or addition of elements to improve the quality of the visit such as the installation of benches.

No access improvement work was included in the grant application	N/A
Expensive and difficult due to the terrain, materials, need for excavation etc	C
Moderately expensive due to some terrain limitations or some level of pre-existing facilities	B
Inexpensive because of good terrain or pre-existing facilities	A

The answers to these questions should be fleshed out with more detailed information in respect to the project being evaluated. For comparison purposes the overall spread of scores should be evaluated and then the qualifying factors taken into account.

All As – the baseline suggests a high level of demand in a very suitable woodland with disabled access treated as a high priority. Expected to produce good value for money.

Mainly Bs with some As – the baseline suggests a good project candidate with a few weak aspects but a good prospect for value for money.

All Bs – the baseline suggests a good project candidate with some concerns for its viability or value for money.

Mainly Bs with some Cs - the baseline suggests a marginal candidate with some serious concerns for value for money.

Mainly Cs – a doubtful candidate because of several factors. Unlikely to produce good value for money.

These scores are for guidance and to help comparison. There may be very good reasons why a candidate project was felt to be worth funding and these need to be identified by examining documentation or talking to the people involved.

Step 3. The resource inputs

The inputs are the resources put into the project. They can include the grant money, other funds, time of volunteers and material in kind. In assessing the contribution of the grants there is the question of the way the grant money contributes and the gearing effect it has to generate greater outputs than the face value of the cash itself. The idea here is that if the grant money has succeeded in gearing more funds – perhaps matching funds from other organisations or sponsors, or if it has facilitated or attracted other contributions in kind then the value for money is much greater. Each question therefore explores this issue in different ways.

14. What part of the project was covered by the grant application?

The expectation is that the project should not be relying on the grant alone to do the work.

The grant is the main source of funding (over 50%)	C
The grant covers a significant part of the requirements of the project (between 25 and 50%)	B
The grant is a small element in a much larger project (less than 25%)	A

15. How much of the project was covered by other funds?

The more the grant was part of a bigger pot then the better the value for money. However, it should also be the case that there should not be double funding of the same work with grant and other money. The assessment of this factor needs to ensure that the other funding only became available as a direct result of the grant money being approved, otherwise there will be no gearing effect.

Very little other funding was available for the project specifically because of the grant	C
Funds of a similar amount to the grant were available from other non-competing sources and at least partly were available because of the grant	B
Funds greater than those provided by the grant were available (but not for the work that the grant was able to cover) at least partly because of the grant.	A

16. How much resources in kind were available?

Resources in kind (including timber from the woods) may in some cases be considerable and worth quite a sum of money, helping to increase the gearing effect of the grant. In order that gearing took place it is necessary to ascertain that these resources would not have been offered in the absence of the grant.

Little or no materials of other resources in kind were made available because of the grant	C
Useful supplies of materials and/or equipment were available as a result of the grant approval	B
Much of the materials and equipment were donated or supplied from other sources as a result of the grant approval	A

17. How much time was given by volunteers to the project?

Volunteers' time may also be considerable and valuable in money terms if the hours they worked were fully costed, so the more they do the more gearing there is. To assess this it is necessary to find out if the volunteer time input depended on the availability of the grant or if it would have been expended in any case, in which case there will be no gearing effect.

There was little volunteer involvement because of the grant	C
Volunteers were involved in several aspects and gave significant amounts of time. The volunteer time was given because the grant was available.	B
The project was largely carried out by volunteers. This work only took place because the grant money was available	A

18. How significant was the grant to ensuring that the project went ahead?

This is a more general, summary question about the overall viability of the project and the role of the grant in ensuring that it went ahead. It may be that without the grant other funds would not have become available (matching funds for example).

The project would have gone ahead but the grant was the main source of funding and so the possibilities were limited	C
The project was able to lever other resources as a result of the commitment of grant funding	B

The grant was used as a lever for many other resources and as a result became a modest element of the project	A
---	---

The results of this assessment should show how important the grant was to the project as a whole as well as to the realisation of the project. Was the grant the main means of funding the project or was it a catalyst to something much bigger.

Mainly As – the grant was a small element of the project, which was supported by other resources and by community support. The gearing of the grant was very high so that the potential impact per £ spent was significant. The high level of community involvement may have helped to create social capital and may have other indirect outcomes for the project

Mainly Bs – the grant was used to obtain some gearing but it was needed to ensure that the project could be realised. Without it the project may have failed. A degree of community involvement and other resources may have helped to build up some social capital.

Mainly Cs – the grant was the sole or main source of funding and the project was undertaken with little or no community involvement. While providing some benefits there was little or no gearing to increase the value per £ spent.

Step 4. The outputs

The outputs are the services and facilities that are delivered by the programme or project and measures of the people benefiting from them. The output measures can be quantity – the amount or number of facilities and services, the take-up of the facilities and services or the access to the facilities and services, in this case the types of people who use the facilities and services. Qualitative output measures are also required, such as the standard of the facility or the information.

The outputs are, of course, dependent on the objectives and the inputs. In the case of accessibility projects the outputs include:

- The facilities that may be developed such as installation of special parking places, lengths of accessible trail, removal of barriers, reduction in obstacles, erection of benches, installation of tapping rails or hand rails etc. These are relatively easy to identify as being for disabled people if they meet certain standards.
- The provision of information such as signs that are designed for blind or visually impaired people, listening posts for deaf people, leaflets aimed at different groups etc. These are easy to assess as being specifically for disabled people.
- Woodland management to make the area more welcoming, easier to wayfind through, safer and generally in a better condition. This might

include litter collection, thinning, management and trimming of path edges, opening of viewpoints, planting trees etc. This is not so easy to identify as having a direct effect on the usability of the woodland for disabled people but in its absence the other facilities may not be taken up by target groups.

- Other services could be considered that are not necessarily provided directly by the grant money and not listed under the SFGS-7, such as guided walks, but which would not be possible without the facilities and information provided through the grant and which have been identified by the survey of demand.

The assessment of the outputs also has to consider the limitations imposed by terrain and other factors in the degree to which the woodland has been developed for accessibility by disabled groups. In this section, because it is possible that the outputs are not of a good enough standard a category of F for fail is also included in some questions. This also relates to value for money and achievement of the objectives.

Access facilities

This section considers the amount, standard and quality of construction of the access facilities. It encompasses a mini-access audit to ensure that the provision meets at least a minimum standard. This section should be completed on site or after a site visit.

19. Proportion of the woodland made physically accessible

While not all disabled people have a physical impairment this, is a common problem and one which also affects many other people who may not be perceived as being disabled. In forests and woods the terrain may be a major factor constraining what can be done. Therefore the proportion of the potential area that can be made generally accessible should be identified and the assessment of physical accessibility limited to it.

A small proportion of the woodland not affected by terrain limitations has been developed to access standards suitable for disabled people.	C
A moderate proportion of the woodland not affected by terrain limitations has been developed to access standards suitable for disabled people.	B
The majority of area of the woodland not affected by terrain limitations has been developed to access standards suitable for disabled people.	A

20. Facilities for different disabilities checklist

Instead of trying to use a basic standard of accessibility covering the entire woodland, such as the Countryside for All standards, the following checklist explores the main aspects needed for basic physical accessibility, so that in cases where there remain some problems there is not complete failure. This checklist is the first stage in assessing the overall quality of provision.. Additional facilities add value to the visitor experience and these are in the second table. Some knowledge on how to assess facilities is needed. This table is designed to inform the response to Q21.

Table of basic physical access requirements

<i>Wheel chair access</i>	All	Some	None
Surface firm and smooth			
Gradients less than 1:12			
Path wide enough to pass or passing places provided			
Cross section level or slightly crowned			
<i>Non-wheelchair mobility impairment</i>			
Benches or perches placed at intervals			
Handrails on steeper sections			
Gaps between boards on bridges or boardwalks no more than 2mm wide			
<i>Blind and partially sighted</i>			
Edge of path is defined			
Edges of steps have colour contrast			

Table of additional access requirements to increase the quality of the experience

<i>Wheelchair access</i>	All	Some	None
Picnic tables have special adaptation			
Railings are at a height suitable for wheelchair users to see over			
Viewpoints are accessible			
Water areas are accessible			

<i>Non-wheelchair mobility impairment</i>			
Benches are located at viewpoints			
<i>Blind and partially sighted</i>			
Tactile elements are included			
Other sensory elements are included			

21. Quality of provision – based on outcome of checklist

Using the above checklist make an overall assessment of what has been provided and score it accordingly.

a) Basic accessibility

The accessibility provisions, despite being targeted at disabled people are inadequate for one or more type of disability	F
The accessibility provisions are only just adequate for all types of disability but may be difficult for some users to negotiate in several places	C
The accessibility provisions are generally well constructed to a good standard with few problem areas	B
The accessibility provisions reach a high standard and provide a good level of access for all	A

b) Enhanced accessibility

The additional facilities, despite being targeted at disabled people are inadequate for one or more type of disability	F
The additional facilities are only just adequate for all types of disability but may be difficult for some users to negotiate in several places	C
The additional facilities are generally well constructed to a good standard with few problem areas	B
The additional facilities reach a high standard and provide a good level of access for all	A

22. Quality of construction

This question looks at the sustainability of the work and the standard of construction of facilities. The idea is that if the work was done to a poor standard and wears out quickly, or washes away in a storm etc. the grant money will not have been used wisely.

The use of materials and quality of construction is poor and is not likely to last	F
The use of materials and the quality of construction are basic but adequate but will need frequent maintenance	C
The use of materials and the quality of construction are good, appropriate for the setting and likely to last with some maintenance	B
The use of materials and the quality of construction are to a high standard, fit the setting and should last many years with low maintenance	A

The results from this assessment should show if the grant money has been well spent, if the provision is likely to endure for a number of years and if the objectives of the project have been met.

Some Fs and Cs – the project has basically failed to deliver satisfactory access despite this being an objective of the grant.

Mainly Cs – the project had reached a basic level but does not really satisfy the objectives.

Mainly Bs – the project has achieved a good result. Major maintenance may be needed after a few years.

Mainly As – the project has met the objectives to a good standard and should have a long life of use without needing major maintenance.

Information provision

This section considers the suitability of the information provision made as part of the grant scheme. Information is one of the ways in which disabled people decide if they are able and want to make a visit. It also has an important role in determining their quality of experience once they are on-site. ***If one of the types of information is not part of the project the question should be ignored.***

23. On-site information

This question assesses how accessible on site information is for a range of disabilities. Some knowledge of criteria for accessible information is needed.

The information is difficult for disabled people to use because of the height of the sign, the use of the text, the absence of consideration of blind people or all of these.	F
The information is basic but meets the needs of several types of disability in terms of the structure, text, symbols and other aspects	C
The information is well thought out and presented in a suitable format for different types of disability	B
The information is very well developed and presented in a form that meets the needs of all types of disability	A

24. Leaflet

Leaflets provided on or off site also need to meet key criteria in their design if they are to be accessible.

The leaflet does not meet the basic needs of an accessible publication (12 point size minimum, sans serif text, colour contrast)	F
The leaflet is just meets the needs of an accessible publication but may be difficult for some people to use	C
The leaflet is good and meets the basic needs of an accessible publication	B
The leaflet is excellent and uses the best practice in the design of an accessible publication	A

25. Web page

Websites are a primary means for disabled people to find out about places to visit but they need to be designed to be accessible.

The web page does not meet the basic needs of an accessible publication (point size, sans serif text, colour contrast)	F
The webpage is just meets the needs of an accessible publication but may be difficult for some people to use	C

The webpage is good and meets the basic needs of an accessible publication	B
The webpage is excellent and uses the best practice in the design of an accessible publication	A

If more than one medium is used the balance of scores should be used. All As means a very good provision of information aimed at all groups, Bs means a reasonably good set of information but with some areas for improvement, Cs means a basic provision with problems for some groups to be corrected.

Woodland management

This section looks not only at the general management of the woodland but also at some specific aspects of benefit to disabled people. The sense of welcome and the quality of the woodland environment are important for both the feeling of safety and security of visitors but also the nature of the experience, for example being able to see an attractive view or get close to water. If the woodland has been well managed, the sense of increased and thought given to the internal landscape so that the recreational experience gained by the improvement in access is good, then the value for money of the grant is likely to be higher than if no woodland improvements had been made.

26. General sense of welcome

The woodland management has made a small improvement to the overall sense of welcome	C
The woodland management has made a significant improvement to the sense of welcome (e.g. through the provision of information boards) from what it was beforehand	B
The woodland management has not only improved the sense of welcome but has considered the wayfinding needs of visitors such as by providing waymarkers and direction signs.	A

27. Internal woodland design

The woodland management has done little to improve existing internal design	C
The woodland management has made an improvement to the internal design along the paths and viewpoints	B
The woodland management has made a significant improvement to the internal landscape along with the introduction of facilities, such as viewpoints, wayfinding, open spaces etc.	A

As means a welcoming and attractive woodland with major improvements made to it, Bs means a reasonably improved woodland and Cs means only a small improvement compared with what could have been done or what was identified as being needed in the baseline assessment.

Take-up and type of people making use of the increased access

This section of the evaluation considers the number and type of disabled people who have taken up the offer of increased access as a result of the facilities, information and woodland welcome provided through the grant scheme. The results of this should give an idea of the value for money of the project as a whole and of the grant expenditure. If the expenditure has been significant yet take up remains low and/or by a narrow range of types of disabled people there might be lower value for money than if greater levels of uptake by a wider range of groups is achieved.

28. Numbers of users

Overall numbers using a site are important and if the assessment of demand suggested a high demand then in evaluating the value of the grant money it is important to assess whether the level of use has correspondingly increased.

Some disabled people use the woodland but not as many as the assessment of demand suggested	C
Disabled people are using the woodland in similar numbers to those identified in the assessment of demand	B
Many more disabled people are using the facilities than were identified in the assessment of demand	A

29. Type of people

While overall numbers of users are important, since disabled people are not a homogeneous group, it is necessary to see if people with particular types of disability are still excluded for whatever reason.

A narrow range of types of disabled people are using the woodland, with some groups being conspicuous by their absence when compared with those identified in the assessment of need	C
A range of different types of disabled people are using the woodland, in line with the types identified in the assessment of need	B
A wide range of different types of disabled people are using the woodland compared to that identified in the assessment of need.	A

The results from this assessment should show if the grant money has resulted in an increase in uptake of access by disabled visitors representing different types of disability. As means that take-up has been more than expected, Bs in line with what was expected and Cs below what was expected and so a poor value for money.

At this point the scores for each separate element of the output assessment need to be added and summarised as in the preceding sections.

All As suggests an excellent set of outputs, especially when compared with the level of inputs.

Mainly As with some Bs a good set of outputs in line with expectations and when compared with the inputs.

Mainly Bs with some As and Cs an acceptable set of outputs when compared to the inputs

Mainly Cs with some Bs and Fs A disappointing set of outputs considering the baseline and the inputs

Step 5. Outcomes

This is the most challenging area to evaluate. While the outputs measure the numbers and types of people who use the facilities this does not tell us about the effects and changes that happen, for example the benefits obtained by those who use them, or the indirect benefits arising from participation in the project process. To find this out requires interviews with disabled people who use the woodland and facilities to see what difference it has made to their quality of life, for example their physical and mental health or feelings of inclusion in community life. The following set of questions can be used to evaluate this. It is not necessary to use statistical analysis because this will not be available to most people likely to use the toolkit. Instead, a simple overview will suffice. The users who are being interviewed should be asked to agree or disagree with the following statements (or state not applicable. An alternative to on-site face to face interviews, is to send the questions to a number of people by post or email, or to ask them over the telephone and then evaluate their response. An attempt should be made to use the same method for all interviewees.

It will be necessary to speak to a number of people from each different disabled type represented in the locality and included in the objectives of the project or identified in the demand survey. As big a sample as possible should be the aim, although in some places it may not be possible to obtain a statistically significant sample. However, as long as this is recognised the assessment of outcome will still be a valuable exercise for feeding back to the managers of the woodland.

very positive, if just over 50:50 slightly positive etc. Alternatively, the different answers can be assessed to see if a pattern emerges, for example the benefit being mainly through taking part in the project, or getting exercise or feeling less isolated. Comments from interviewees would also enable more qualitative aspects to be evaluated.

Step 6. Evaluation summary

The final step is to summarise and produce a report presenting the overall assessment of the project. Four sections need to be summarised and then compared to produce the final result. The outcomes, since there are no scores, are added at the end. The following table should be used to make the basic comparison but this should be considered along with the comments that may qualify the results. The interpretation should be quite straightforward, for example of the Objectives score mainly As, the Baseline mainly As, the Inputs mainly Bs and the Outputs mainly Cs then the result would probably be that the project was a good one for investing grant money, although the level of gearing was not as high as it could have been (comments would reveal why that was the case) but the outputs in terms of the quality of provision and the degree of uptake were not good. If the outcomes also show a lot of No's this would also tend to reinforce the view that the project did not deliver improved access for disabled people and that it did not provide good value for money.

Category	Mainly As	Mainly Bs	Mainly Cs
Aims of the project Q1-3			
Assessing the baseline Q4-13			
Inputs Q14-18			
Outputs Q19-29			

APPENDIX 1 DEVELOPMENT OF THE EVALUATION FRAMEWORK AND TOOLKIT

The DEFRA recommendations for evaluation frameworks has been adopted in this framework and toolkit. This model uses the evidence of inputs, outputs and outcomes. For this several elements of evidence are needed, starting with the **baseline conditions**, which must be established:

- **Aims** of the programme, in this case both of the projects and of the SFGS-7 itself, clearly stated, since the evaluation is against these aims.
- **Objectives**, these being more specifically related to the projects themselves. They should be SMART, though they may not have been articulated in this way for each or any project.
- **Inputs** refer to money and time (resources) that the project spends on different activities, such as creation of trails, provision of information and so on. In the case of the SFGS it is the grant funding that is the input, evaluated alongside other inputs that might also have been made as part of the project as a whole.
- **Outputs** refer to the projects carried out with the resources and what was implemented on the ground in the forest in question, such as trails, information provision or woodland management activities. The data used to measure this could include the number of services offered by the project, the number of people who use the services offered and the access, the type of people who use the service, in this case types of disabled people.
- **Outcomes** refer to the medium-term impacts (i.e. behavioural change) or effects of the project's activities on the target community, in this case disabled people. They can be assessed by quantitative or qualitative indicators.

To be successful, work well and be cost effective, evaluation should be thought of as integral to the project planning from the outset. The life of a project and where monitoring and evaluation fit into a project planning cycle are explained below:

- **Stage 1-** Setting the *aims and objectives*. This should be informed by consulting with all stakeholders involved, from beneficiaries of projects to the funders, to find out if the project is really needed and why, which is known as a 'needs assessment'.
- **Stage 2-** Setting *performance indicators*. This is the stage when project managers decide who should do the evaluation as they can help to design indicators and systems to be most relevant to the final evaluation.

They can also collect the information at the beginning of the project to form a baseline.

- **Stage 3- *Implementing the project*** by delivering the activities and through monitoring making sure that they are working according to plan and achieving the project's aims and objectives.
- **Stage 4- *Reviewing the project*** by evaluating it against its aims and objectives. This should be done by using the information collected through the monitoring (as part of stage 3). Additional research might also be collected at the evaluation stage to fill gaps in monitoring data or to explore emerging issues in more detail.

It is assumed at this point that each SFGS-7 grant receiving project to be evaluated will have fulfilled some or all of these stages whether explicitly or implicitly.

Stage 1, setting objectives should have been carried out in the act of preparing the grant application forms. However, further discussion with the applicants by the woodland officers at the time the grant application was being developed may have revealed other or more specific objectives which need to be identified and recorded as part of the assessment.

Stage 2, performance indicators, can be set for the programme-level evaluation as part of the development of the methodology. Together the quantitative and qualitative data build a picture of the overall outcome of the project. However, it is unlikely that stage 2 was implemented in most or all of the projects that are likely to be evaluated, so information on this will have to be inferred or a proxy developed in discussion with the people concerned in the specific grant application.

Stage 3, implementation of the project should be relatively straightforward to evaluate. This is essentially where the inputs of grants are converted into outputs such as tangible facilities eg. trails, information etc or other services. It is likely that some information exists about the level of take up by the target group, though how quantifiable this is remains to be seen.

The requirements of the SFGS-7

For the project to evaluate the contribution of grants to providing equal access for disabled people the ideal approach is to follow the steps from the DEFRA report and to prepare information for each stage. Before compiling this it is necessary to examine the context of the SFGS-7, what it covers and what it asks for in terms of information that might be useful for setting up an evaluation method. In this section each key requirement of the SFGS-7 is examined for aspects that are likely to need further exploration at the project evaluation stage.

According to the grant booklet the SFGS-7 strand objective is to “improve the social value of woods and forests by developing facilities for informal recreation in a way which is commensurate with likely demand.” In this study it

is the accessibility by disabled people that is the subject of closer evaluation. According to the DEFRA model therefore the aim of the programme is to increase the supply of recreation in line with the demand. For this to be met it is necessary to assess the latent demand. This requires a baseline, an important element of the DEFRA model.

The grants only cover work that meets certain criteria: recreation proposals must fit locally agreed priorities (eg educational and social needs; core path networks) and draw on relevant discussion with – and support from – appropriate bodies (for example Local Authorities, SNH, Local Access Forums, Community Councils and Local Tourist Boards). The scope of the relevant discussion should reflect the size and complexity of the proposed scheme. This information will provide evidence that there was a demand for access before the grant was approved and the scheme implemented. However, access for disabled people must be identifiable within the wider evidence for a demand. This requirement provides part of the baseline, as will become clear in a later section.

In addition, for schemes of more than £10,000 total grant aid, a visitor number assessment and/or clear justification of potential demand should be supplied in support of the application. This could be demonstrated by looking at the potential for visitor numbers by, for example, carrying out site surveys or by the use of people counters. In such cases therefore some information constituting a baseline study should be available. Once again, it will be important to be able to separate out the demand by the disabled community from the general recreational demand. This, where completed, will also furnish part of the baseline data against which to set the evaluation.

The work must accord with the *FC Recreation Guidelines* and include specifications of work being carried out. Planning permission is needed where vehicular routes enter or exit onto a road, or a new car park is proposed. The recreation guidelines do not state in any great detail the needs for access by disabled people. No reference is made to any standards, so that other tool-kits or guidance should have been used to ensure that access for disabled people meets a basic standard.

The grant-aided recreation facilities must use the Walkers Welcome signage. The facilities must also be publicised (for example using information boards and/or leaflets) and will appear on the FC website. In all cases there must be a local contact given in interpretation and publicity material. This general comment must be tested in terms of the specific requirements of disabled people where information provision, both on and off site (e.g. in publicity material and on the web) has been made.

Where the proposals are covered by a Social Inclusion Partnership, the proposals should indicate how they will help achieve the vision and objectives of that partnership. Since disabled people are one of the groups identified as socially excluded there needs to be some additional information explaining how they will be taken into account.

Grants will be available from the year of planting for work which achieves one or more of the following operations:

- Preparation of a recreational management plan or the relevant section of an overall management plan. *At present this is not included in the assessment.*
- Providing or upgrading appropriate routes, stiles, gates, tables, benches and bridges for recreation and small-scale car parking facilities.
- Providing appropriate signs and leaflets, including relevant contact details, safety inspections, litter collections, and assessing visitor numbers.
- Undertaking necessary silvicultural work, e.g. tree safety work, standard net cost of small-scale thinning or felling to improve views.
- Undertaking vegetation management to paths, rides and other relevant open areas.

Each of these activities can form an output to be evaluated. In the management plan there should be specific reference to planning for disabled access. Routes and other facilities should demonstrate design and construction suitable for disabled people in line with demand. The signs and leaflets should also meet the requirements of disabled people. Silvicultural work and vegetation management may provide indirect improvements to access by creating a safer feeling environment, allowing paths to dry out, enabling people with visual impairment to walk along formerly overhanging paths or helping with wayfinding by providing landmarks.

Thus when evaluating the general applications for SFGS-7 which may or may not have specifically mentioned disabled people it will be necessary to tease out those aspects that apply.

APPENDIX 2

PILOTING THE TOOLKIT

This appendix explains the process of developing and testing the evaluation framework for assessing the contribution of forestry grants to equal access for disabled people to recreation goods, facilities and services in Scottish Forests. The process was an evolutionary one and followed several steps:

1. A critical review of evaluation frameworks and approaches to evaluation (as per Appendix 1).
 2. The development of a draft evaluation framework based on the best practice recommendations contained in the critical review.
 3. Comments from the steering committee incorporated into the first draft.
 4. Pre-pilot testing of the draft methodology on two sites.
 5. Modification and refinement of the methodology following pre-pilot testing.
 6. Pilot testing on five sites.
 7. Development of the final version following review of the pilot phase.
-
1. A critical review of evaluation methods and approaches was undertaken by Penny Travlou. She based this on a number of sources including the framework developed for the Countryside Agency, now part of Natural England and related the recommendations to those of DEFRA. This identified several key stages in evaluation, starting with the objectives, baseline, the inputs, the outputs and the outcomes. Included in the report was a discussion of the difference between programme level evaluation, where the comparison of a number of projects needs to be fairly objective, and the individual project evaluation. The current project, to develop an evaluation methodology and tool kit needs to be able to fulfil both levels. The report of this critical review is a separate document but summarised as part of Appendix 1.
 2. The draft evaluation methodology was developed in line with the recommendation of the critical review. It incorporated a phased approach using the steps of objectives, baseline, inputs, outputs and outcomes. The criteria for evaluation in each step were developed to reflect the content of the Scottish Forestry Grant Scheme S7 as well as a number of other aspects. The use of a scoring system to enable comparison and a level of objectivity was introduced. Instead of a numerical system, where there may be a temptation to add numbers together, letters were used. The scoring system was separated for each phase and several questions were developed for each phase so that an overall assessment phase by phase could be determined. The content of the separate questions, which involved the choice of 3 or 4 answers each with a score, was based on the factors considered to be important in providing access and demonstrating effectiveness and value for money, including the gearing effect of funding contributions or materials in kind.

3. The steering group, comprising people with experience of the grant scheme, of management and of the grant receivers, commented on the wording of the questions and the way the scoring system was set up. Some amendments and adjustments were made to the initial draft in readiness for pre-pilot testing.
4. The pre-pilot testing was carried out on two sites, one in central Scotland and one in the Highlands. These were selected from a list submitted by operations managers in the two conservancies. Arrangements were made to meet the managers of the two sites, at Falkirk and Grantown-on-Spey, together with the woodland officers involved. A field sheet had been prepared and sent in advance to all concerned. This included the questions and space for comments but did not include the scoring system. Discussions on site and a visit of the grant-aided facilities enabled the form to be completed except for the section on outcomes, which was designed to be completed by members of disabled groups who were the beneficiaries of the project. Despite the form being sent to relevant groups no forms were returned.
5. Following the pre-pilot testing further clarifications of the wording and scoring system were made and the steering group had the chance to look at the results and to offer some further comments and thoughts. This led to the development of another draft of the evaluation methodology which was used for the pilot testing.
6. Pilot testing on four sites was undertaken by another member of the OPENspace research team, Cath Millington, who had not been involved in the development of the toolkit. This enabled the useability of the methodology and the field sheet to be tested. Cath contacted woodland officers in different conservancies and arranged to visit five sites. She met the woodland officer and in some cases the manager and found the forms relatively easy to fill in and conclusions to be reached. Two forms were also filled in by members of target groups. Although these formed a small sample they did show that the questions were meaningful and that there were some positive outcomes for those involved. There were also some very useful suggestions from both the woodland officers/managers and Cath on clarification of wording in several questions.
7. Following the feedback on the pilot testing the final version of the methodology was developed and made available.

APPENDIX 3

EVALUATION FRAMEWORK FIELD ASSESSMENT SHEETS

Location

Date of assessment

Brief description of the project

Step 1.Objectives of the project

1. What was the intention of the owner based on the level of modification and work undertaken in providing for disabled access?

General access complying with the legislation	C
Minor additional works to improve access for disabled people	B
A major new site or major modification to provide significant new opportunities for disabled access	A

Comments

2. Were disabled people included in the development of the project?

Benefits can be gained for members of disabled groups by being involved in the development and implementation of a project as well as by being able to use the woodland afterwards. Moreover, access projects carried out with their involvement are likely to be more successful in meeting their needs.

The access is being provided with no input from disabled people	C
Access is being provided with some limited input from disabled people	B
Disabled people from a range of groups have been involved and have given advice	A

Comments

3. What are the aims of the project with respect to providing access for disabled people?

The project includes disabled access but only as a secondary aspect	C
Access for disabled people is provided as an integral part of a larger project	B
Providing access for disabled people is central to the objectives of the project	A

Comments

Step 2. Assessing the baseline

4. What did the assessment of demand show (if there was one)?

No assessment was carried out	N/A
Low level of demand but some disabled people in the community	C
Moderate level of demand articulated by members of the disabled community	B
High level of demand from several groups in the community	A

Comments

5. What was the level of use of the woodland beforehand?

No use or no access or formerly not permitted (before the Land reform Act)	A
Low to moderate level of use limited to able-bodied people	B
High level of use but mainly limited to able-bodied people	A
High level of use but problems identified by or for disabled users	B

Comments

6. How close is the woodland to a settlement?

The rationale for this question is that woodlands closer to where people live are potentially more accessible, an important factor for disabled people.

Further than 5 km from a settlement	C
Between 1 and 5 km from a settlement	B
Within or under 1 km from a settlement	A

Comments

7. What is the population of the area where the woodland is located?

This question affects the potential demand since the number of disabled people is usually proportionate to the overall population. Lower population therefore generally means lower demand.

In a remote area with few people	C
In an area of moderate population (small towns)	B
In an area of high population (large towns or close to large urban centres)	A

Comments

8. What is the tourism use in the area where the woodland is located?

In an area with low tourism use	C
In an area of moderate tourism use	B
In an area of high tourism use	A

Comments

9. What was the state of the woodland before the grant application?

Unmanaged, unkempt, with presence of litter and signs of anti-social behaviour	A
Low level of management, some litter and signs of anti-social behaviour	B
Moderate level of management, generally free of litter	C
High level of management, felt safe and welcoming	C

Comments

10. What was the assessment of the amount of work needed to make it physically accessible for disabled people?

Only a small amount to bring the site up to standard	C
Moderate work needed in limited places to make it physically accessible	B
Extensive work needed to create or upgrade paths and other access facilities	A

Comments

11. What was the assessment of the amount of information provision work needed ?

This question reflects the importance of information provision to disabled visitors and the value for money to be gained from having to provide more.

Small amount of supplementary information to add to what is provided	C
Moderate amount of information provision needed to add to what was already provided	B
Completely new and comprehensive information provision needed	A

Comments

12. What was the assessment of the degree of woodland management work needed ?

Minimal because it is already well managed	C
Moderate because the wood needs some work to make it more welcoming	B
Extensive work on the trees and on cleaning it up to make it welcoming and comfortable	A

Comments

13. What was the assessment of the degree of construction work needed?

No access improvement work was included in the grant application	N/A
Expensive and difficult due to the terrain, materials, need for excavation etc	C
Moderately expensive due to some terrain limitations or some level of pre-existing facilities	B
Inexpensive because of good terrain or pre-existing facilities	A

Step 3. The resource inputs

14. What part of the project was covered by the grant application?

The grant is the main source of funding (over 50%)	C
The grant covers a significant part of the requirements of the project (between 25 and 50%)	B
The grant is a small element in a much larger project (less than 25%)	A

Comments

15. How much of the project was covered by other funds?

Very little other funding was available for the project specifically because of the grant	C
Funds of a similar amount to the grant were available from other non-competing sources and at least partly were available because of the grant	B
Funds greater than those provided by the grant were available (but not for the work that the grant was able to cover) at least partly because of the grant.	A

Comments

16. How much resources in kind were available?

Little or no materials of other resources in kind were made available because of the grant	C
Useful supplies of materials and/or equipment were available as a result of the grant approval	B
Much of the materials and equipment were donated or supplied from other sources as a result of the grant approval	A

Comments

17. How much time was given by volunteers to the project?

There was little volunteer involvement because of the grant	C
Volunteers were involved in several aspects and gave significant amounts of time. The volunteer time was given because the grant was available.	B
The project was largely carried out by volunteers. This work only took place because the grant money was available	A

Comments

18. How significant was the grant to ensuring that the project went ahead?

The project would have gone ahead but the grant was the main source of funding and so the possibilities were limited	C
The project was able to lever other resources as a result of the commitment of grant funding	B
The grant was used as a lever for many other resources and as a result became a modest element of the project	A

Comments

Step 4. The outputs

Access facilities

19. Proportion of the woodland made physically accessible

A small proportion of the woodland not affected by terrain limitations has been developed to access standards suitable for disabled people.	C
A moderate proportion of the woodland not affected by terrain limitations has been developed to access standards suitable for disabled people.	B
The majority of area of the woodland not affected by terrain limitations has been developed to access standards suitable for disabled people.	A

Comments

20. Facilities for different disabilities checklist

Table of basic physical access requirements

<i>Wheel chair access</i>	All	Some	None
Surface firm and smooth			
Gradients less than 1:12			
Path wide enough to pass or passing places provided			
Cross section level or slightly crowned			
<i>Non-wheelchair mobility impairment</i>			
Benches or perches placed at intervals			
Handrails on steeper sections			
Gaps between boards on bridges or boardwalks no more than 2mm wide			
<i>Blind and partially sighted</i>			
Edge of path is defined			
Edges of steps have colour contrast			

Table of additional access requirements to increase the quality of the experience

<i>Wheelchair access</i>	All	Some	None
Picnic tables have special adaptation			
Railings are at a height suitable for wheelchair users to see over			
Viewpoints are accessible			
Water areas are accessible			
<i>Non-wheelchair mobility impairment</i>			
Benches are located at viewpoints			
<i>Blind and partially sighted</i>			
Tactile elements are included			
Other sensory elements are included			

21. Quality of provision – based on outcome of checklist

a) Basic accessibility

The accessibility provisions, despite being targeted at disabled people are inadequate for one or more type of disability	F
The accessibility provisions are only just adequate for all types of disability but may be difficult for some users to negotiate in several places	C
The accessibility provisions are generally well constructed to a good standard with few problem areas	B
The accessibility provisions reach a high standard and provide a good level of access for all	A

Comments

b) Enhanced accessibility

The additional facilities, despite being targeted at disabled people are inadequate for one or more type of disability	F
The additional facilities are only just adequate for all types of disability but may be difficult for some users to negotiate in several places	C
The additional facilities are generally well constructed to a good standard with few problem areas	B
The additional facilities reach a high standard and provide a good level of access for all	A

Comments

22. Quality of construction

The use of materials and quality of construction is poor and is not likely to last	F
The use of materials and the quality of construction are basic but adequate but will need frequent maintenance	C
The use of materials and the quality of construction are good, appropriate for the setting and likely to last with some maintenance	B
The use of materials and the quality of construction are to a high standard, fit the setting and should last many years with low maintenance	A

Comments

Information provision

23. On-site information

This question assesses how accessible on site information is for a range of disabilities. Some knowledge of criteria for accessible information is needed.

The information is difficult for disabled people to use because of the height of the sign, the use of the text, the absence of consideration of blind people or all of these.	F
The information is basic but meets the needs of several types of disability in terms of the structure, text, symbols and other aspects	C
The information is well thought out and presented in a suitable format for different types of disability	B
The information is very well developed and presented in a form that meets the needs of all types of disability	A

Comments

24. Leaflet

The leaflet does not meet the basic needs of an accessible publication (12 point size minimum, sans serif text, colour contrast)	F
The leaflet just meets the needs of an accessible publication but may be difficult for some people to use	C
The leaflet is good and meets the basic needs of an accessible publication	B
The leaflet is excellent and uses the best practice in the design of an accessible publication	A

Comments

25. Web page

The web page does not meet the basic needs of an accessible publication (point size, sans serif text, colour contrast)	F
The webpage is just meets the needs of an accessible publication but may be difficult for some people to use	C
The webpage is good and meets the basic needs of an accessible publication	B
The webpage is excellent and uses the best practice in the design of an accessible publication	A

Comments

Woodland management

26. General sense of welcome

The woodland management has made a small improvement to the overall sense of welcome	C
The woodland management has made a significant improvement to the sense of welcome (e.g. through the provision of information boards) from what it was beforehand	B
The woodland management has not only improved the sense of welcome but has considered the wayfinding needs of visitors such as by providing waymarkers and direction signs.	A

Comments

27. Internal woodland design

The woodland management has done little to improve existing internal design	C
The woodland management has made an improvement to the internal design along the paths and viewpoints	B
The woodland management has made a significant improvement to the internal landscape along with the introduction of facilities, such as viewpoints, wayfinding, open spaces etc.	A

Comments

Take-up and type of people making use of the increased access

28. Numbers of users

Some disabled people use the woodland but not as many as the assessment of demand suggested	C
Disabled people are using the woodland in similar numbers to those identified in the assessment of demand	B
Many more disabled people are using the facilities than were identified in the assessment of demand	A

Comments

29. Type of people

A narrow range of types of disabled people are using the woodland, with some groups being conspicuous by their absence when compared with those identified in the assessment of need	C
A range of different types of disabled people are using the woodland, in line with the types identified in the assessment of need	B
A wide range of different types of disabled people are using the woodland compared to that identified in the assessment of need.	A

Comments

Step 6. Evaluation summary

Category	Mainly As	Mainly Bs	Mainly Cs
Aims of the project Q1-3			
Assessing the baseline Q4-13			
Inputs Q14-18			
Outputs Q19-29			

Aims:

Assessing the baseline

Inputs

Outputs

Outcomes

Overall evaluation