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Executive summary

Background and study objectives
The Healthier Scotland Cooking Bus, (hereafter the Cooking Bus) is a mobile kitchen, in the form of an articulated truck, which brings a practical cooking experience to schools and communities across Scotland.

The Cooking Bus was launched in June 2008, inviting schools and other organisations to apply for a visit.

Its key audience was school children, teachers and members of the wider community. The aim of the project was to encourage healthy eating by enhancing cooking skills and participants’ knowledge of nutrition, food hygiene and safety in accessible and sustainable ways.

Cooking Bus objectives, although agreed in 2008, continue to be closely aligned to a number of Scottish Government and partner agency policy priorities, recently set out in Recipe for Success - Scotland’s National Food and Drink Policy (Scottish Government, 2009) and in Preventing Overweight and Obesity in Scotland: A Route Map Towards Healthy Weight (Scottish Government, 2010).

Within these policies there is a focus on reducing health inequalities in Scotland. The Cooking Bus programme aimed to address this by building confidence and skills in healthy cooking and healthy eating, particularly among those who live in areas of multiple deprivation.

This evaluation aims to assess the extent to which the Cooking Bus has achieved its objectives. It covers:

- The development and implementation of the programme.
- Reach of the Cooking Bus.
- Perceptions of delivery and fitness for purpose.
- Impact of the Cooking Bus immediately after a visit as well as up to three years afterwards.
- Cost of delivery since its launch.

Overall, the aim of the evaluation was to make recommendations to the Cooking Bus project board on development and optimisation of this programme and similar initiatives; and on future performance monitoring and evaluation arrangements.

Method and sample
Broadly, two approaches have been taken to meet the evaluation objectives:

1. Quantitative analysis of monitoring data, Cooking Bus staff evaluation forms, feedback survey forms and quantitative financial data.
2. Qualitative, in depth interviews (telephone and face to face) with a quota sample of Cooking Bus stakeholders, staff and target groups of contacts, and participants from schools and communities.

Many of the research objectives have been met by examination of the quantitative data from the feedback forms and other monitoring data that provided information on visits, participant types and numbers. Feedback forms provided ratings on the Cooking Bus experience from the contact’s perspective and covered issues such as the application process, pre-visit planning, Bus facilities, teaching methods, overall opinion of the Cooking Bus and legacy plans for how to sustain its impact after the visit.

However, to gain detailed insight and provide sufficient depth of understanding on how well the programme has achieved important outcomes, such as building confidence in cooking skills through participation in sessions, a qualitative research dimension was also included in the overall study design.

A series of individual or paired in-depth interviews were conducted - face to face or by telephone - with key groups:

- Fourteen stakeholders and Cooking Bus staff.
- Thirty-three contacts - those responsible for applying for and organising the Cooking Bus visit. Twenty-three of these contacts organised visits to a school setting and 10 contacts arranged visits to community groups.
- Sixteen participants– eight secondary school pupils and eight adult community group participants.

Qualitative interviewees were recruited from across Scotland, a range of Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) locations (according to where the Cooking Bus visited) and included respondents visited by the Cooking Bus from each year of its operation.

**Main findings**

The Cooking Bus made 92 visits up to September 2011 and met its target of visiting all 32 local authorities in Scotland. It reached over 11,000 participants, primarily in a school setting.

Meeting targets such as specific ratios of pupils, teachers and community participants proved to be difficult in practice. This was the result of a variety of factors, for example, persistent barriers to encouraging adult participants to attend sessions.

Moreover, marketing of the Cooking Bus had mixed results and this impacted its reach of target groups. For example, applications for a visit were much higher from schools than from community groups.
Feedback on the delivery of the programme was very positive. Visits were rated extremely highly by contacts from both schools and community groups.

Ratings and qualitative statements highlighted the high quality facilities and expertly delivered teaching methods, saying that it was an excellent tool to provide improved knowledge and skills in healthy and safe cooking practices. Contacts and participants from schools and community groups also commented that visits were very professional, well-organised and inspiring.

Stakeholders who were interviewed agreed that the aim of giving participants the skills and knowledge to make healthy food choices remained relevant to Scottish Government policies introduced since the programme implementation in 2008. They mentioned Recipe for Success - Scotland’s National Food and Drink Policy (Scottish Government, 2009) and Preventing Overweight and Obesity in Scotland: A Route Map Towards Healthy Weight (Scottish Government, 2010).

Qualitative evidence indicated that Cooking Bus visits had achieved agreed outcomes - contacts and participants reported that sessions enhanced the knowledge, skills and confidence of individual participants in the set areas of nutrition, food hygiene, recycling, safe food handling and preparation.

Most of the interviewees reported that visits had made some longer term impact (legacy) at an institutional level, for example, the setting up of cooking clubs, more cooking during the school day and healthier menus in community cafes. Visits had also generated some sustained behaviour change in individual participants - continued use of healthy recipes and safe knife skills in cooking. However, legacy plans varied greatly and were inconsistently implemented.

The Cooking Bus programme from June 2008 to July 2011 was delivered within the agreed budget, at a total cost of £1.76 million and an average cost per head of £127.

Evidence indicates that there were opportunities to improve the efficiency, effectiveness and long term impact of the programme, thus enhancing its overall value, for example by conducting additional sessions per visit.

Existing datasets, used here to monitor the programme, were not designed for monitoring and evaluation purposes and there were limitations in how far they could be used in this exercise. This evaluation has identified data needs and appropriate methods of information gathering which, if implemented, will better monitor the effectiveness of the Cooking Bus in future.

**Conclusions and main recommendations**
This evaluation concludes that the Cooking Bus is a high quality facility using teaching methods that were reported to be effective, enjoyable and often inspiring. It can contribute to meeting current Scottish Government policy
priorities by improving participants' cooking skills, nutritional knowledge, understanding of food safety and hygiene, and increased confidence in food handling.

Qualitative and quantitative data provided very positive input on the degree to which intended outcomes have been met, although it was recognised that the conclusions drawn had some limitations. With these and wider learning points from the programme delivery in mind, a number of recommendations have been developed to better plan, deliver and evaluate the Cooking Bus programme in future. These relate to:

- A review of the aims, objectives and outcomes, linking with Scottish Government health policy priorities, in the context of those target groups that would benefit most from the Cooking Bus, to ensure ongoing policy relevance and to provide a framework for future evaluation.
- Developing a marketing and communications strategy to optimise the programmes reach.
- Encouraging more detailed planning by applicants and supporting the implementation of these plans to enhance the immediate and longer term impact of a visit.
- Introducing efficiencies that will lower the cost per head.
- Ensuring appropriate data systems are in place to monitor outcomes.
1. Introduction

This evaluation was undertaken to provide recommendations to the Healthier Scotland Cooking Bus project board in relation to the development and optimisation of the programme.

1.1 Background

The Cooking Bus is a mobile kitchen\(^1\) delivering a Scottish based food education programme. The programme was launched in June 2008 as part of the plan for Healthy Eating, Active Living: An action plan to improve diet, increase physical activity and tackle obesity. (Scottish Government, 2008) and supports the national efforts towards achieving the Scottish Dietary Targets outlined in Eating for Health: A Diet Action Plan for Scotland (Scottish Office, 1996).

The Schools (Health Promotion & Nutrition) (Scotland) Act 2007 (Scottish Government, 2008), which made changes to food provision in schools, and Curriculum for Excellence (Scottish Government, 2009) both highlight the importance of understanding how food can affect health, and the Cooking Bus was identified as a tool for achieving this.

The Cooking Bus continues to be relevant to more recently published health policies from Government and other agencies to improve diet and tackle obesity, including Recipe for Success - Scotland's National Food and Drink Policy (Scottish Government, 2009) and Preventing Overweight and Obesity in Scotland: A Route Map Towards Healthy Weight (Scottish Government, 2010).

The programme aimed to contribute to policy priorities by offering a high quality teaching system and practical cooking experience for those within a school and community setting; and by encouraging healthy eating by improving the cooking skills and knowledge of participants in an accessible and sustainable way. Additional related aims included in the Cooking Bus programme remit were to provide practical education to target groups on food hygiene and safety and on recycling of packaging and food waste.

There is a particular focus in Scottish Government policy on reducing health inequalities in Scotland. The Cooking Bus programme aims to address this by building confidence and skills in healthy cooking and healthy eating among those who live in areas of multiple deprivation.

1.2 Aims and objectives

The evaluation aimed to assess the extent to which the Cooking Bus had achieved its objectives.

\(^{1}\) See Appendix 6 for a visual of the Cooking Bus.
The evaluation objectives were to:

1. **Describe:**
   a) the development and implementation of the Cooking Bus initiative, including facilitating factors and barriers
   b) the ‘reach’ of the Cooking Bus in terms of its target population (i.e. proportion of schools and communities in deprived localities) broken down by Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) quintile, and the numbers and types of visits made.

2. **Explore target group (schools & community groups) perceptions of delivery, specifically:**
   a) the facilities offered by the Cooking Bus and the extent to which these meet the needs of respective school or community groups with regard to learning new, or practicing existing, cooking skills
   b) the teaching methods used on the Cooking Bus
   c) the extent to which the cooking skills have been supported within the school curriculum or within the community setting including ongoing use of the COOKITS.

3. **Explore the perceptions of the short term ‘impact’ on participants, in terms of:**
   a) improved knowledge, skills and/or attitudinal change
   b) improved skills in food handling and preparation skills
   c) improved knowledge of food issues such as nutrition, hygiene and recycling
   d) indications of target group behaviour change - whether there have been changes in dietary behaviour and how much any changes have been sustained.

4. **Assess the economic cost of the Cooking Bus. A cost effectiveness analysis should be carried out to determine the following:**
   a) the annual cost of the Cooking Bus and the expenditure on COOKITS
   b) cost per visit
   c) cost per demonstration.

5. **Draw out learning from the evaluation to inform the future of the Cooking Bus programme.**

6. **Make recommendations for future performance monitoring and evaluation arrangements and identify areas for programme delivery improvement.**

1.2.1 **Development, implementation and reach**

With regard to the planning and implementation of the Cooking Bus programme, this evaluation examined the strategic and policy perspective – the origins, aims, expectations and challenges going forward. Barriers and facilitators to planning and delivering the project were considered, this included a focus on the application process and local partnerships. This evaluation has shown the
Cooking Bus reach of its target population, including the numbers and types of visits made, who was on the Bus and site visits' SIMD profiles.

1.2.2 Target group perceptions of delivery of the Cooking Bus
The evaluation includes feedback about the experience itself, covering a number of key areas:
- The initial application and planning processes.
- The facilities and materials (e.g. leaflets) offered by the Cooking Bus.
- The teaching methods used in continuing professional development (CPD) sessions with teachers, as well as with pupils and community participants
- The extent to which the individual needs of schools or community groups were seen to be fulfilled by those requesting a visit.

1.2.3 Short-term outcomes and longer-term legacy of the Cooking Bus
The immediate outcomes of a visit from the Cooking Bus and the ongoing legacy were key measures in the evaluation of the programme.

The evaluation explored whether programme outcomes were perceived to have occurred as a result of the visit, in particular improved knowledge and skills, or positive attitudinal or behavioural change.

Specifically, analysis of quantitative data and feedback from qualitative interviews looked for evidence of:
- improved skills in food handling and preparation skills
- improved knowledge of food issues such as nutrition, hygiene and recycling
- indications of target group behaviour change
- what extent any changes have been sustained.

A key consideration in the evaluation was the extent to which newly acquired cooking skills had subsequently been supported within the school curriculum or within the community setting, including the ongoing use of COOKITs and other materials. Attention was also given to possible benefits of additional programme support to the sustainability of the Cooking Bus legacy, and the form that this might take.

1.2.4 The economic cost of the Cooking Bus
In considering the cost effectiveness of the programme, a basic economic assessment of the Cooking Bus has been undertaken. This includes the likely ongoing annual cost and the expenditure on COOKITs. Analysis has identified the cost per visit, per demonstration and per participant.

---

See Appendix 7 for a visual of the COOKIT.
1.2.5 Recommendations for future performance monitoring and evaluation
Monitoring performance of the Cooking Bus will continue to be a major part of the programme, and the evaluation considered the degree to which current data collection systems and monitoring and review processes are fit for purpose, suggesting improvements as well as wider recommendations for future monitoring and evaluation processes.

Findings are presented such that they can inform the development and implementation of similar initiatives both strategically and in terms of practical process issues.
2. Research methods

The evaluation used a mixed method approach, analysing existing quantitative monitoring data alongside qualitative interviews conducted specifically for the evaluation. This chapter outlines details of data collection approaches, qualitative sample structure and data analysis methods. It also outlines the limitations of the data.

2.1 Methodology

Broadly, two approaches were taken to meet the evaluation objectives:

1. Quantitative analysis of monitoring data: staff evaluation forms, feedback survey forms from contacts and financial data.
2. Qualitative, in depth interviews (telephone and face to face) with a quota sample of Cooking Bus stakeholders, staff and target groups from schools and communities.

2.2 Quantitative data

2.2.1 Quantitative data collection

The Cooking Bus is delivered by a provider who routinely collects and collates the data that have been analysed in this evaluation. These were:

- Application forms for a Cooking Bus visit - analysed to determine numbers and types of applicants. These forms were also used to provide insight into sources of awareness of the Cooking Bus.
- Feedback forms returned to the provider by the school or community group contacts that had organised the Cooking Bus visit. These provided ratings on such issues as pre-visit telephone discussion with Cooking Bus staff through to teaching methods and overall success of the visit; and open-ended comments about the visit.
- Detailed financial information about the programme, as well as records of the deployment of the Cooking Bus and the number and types of participants at each visit. These data have been used to examine reach and cost-effectiveness.
- Scottish Government information about SIMD quintiles incorporated in the analysis to assess the nature of targeting.

The evaluation included all the quantitative data available at the beginning of the evaluation (mid-November 2011). This included:

- Financial data to the end of July 2011.
- Information about reach to the end of August 2011.
- Feedback forms, where available, to the end of September 2011.

2.2.2 Quantitative data analysis

Post-visit feedback survey forms were processed and data provided as Excel tabulations for analysis. Analysed data have been tabulated and the narrative integrated with qualitative findings.
In line with the targeting objectives, reach of the Cooking Bus in terms of its target population has been analysed by SIMD quintile as a means of identifying coverage.3

The activities of the Cooking Bus can be related to the SIMD data zones by using the postcode of each visit: each postcode falls within a data zone, thus each visit made by the Cooking Bus is allocated to an SIMD quintile. Through this analysis the proportion of visits to postcodes in the lowest SIMD quintile was determined. The number of visitors from schools and from community groups whose postcodes were in the lowest quintile SIMD data zones can also be expressed. While this is acknowledged to be a limited approach in that it does not capture the SIMD of the home postcodes of the people attending the Cooking Bus (using the site location only), it does help to give some indication of visited schools’ or groups’ deprivation level.

As well as measuring reach for community groups and schools in the context of SIMD quintiles the monitoring data for schools was also used to attempt measurement of Cooking Bus reach by free school meal entitlement, in order to achieve a second indicator of deprivation. This did not prove to be a feasible exercise due to lack of data availability and so has not been included in the findings or conclusions. This limited free school meal entitlement analysis is included for information in Appendix 2.

Data from the Cooking Bus provider showed a breakdown of participants in the programme, and these have been presented as a simple measure of reach of school pupils, teachers, community participants.

Criteria for selecting visits, set by the project board, were examined alongside a qualitative analysis of application forms and Cooking Bus staff interview data to evaluate how visits were approved.

Analysis to determine cost effectiveness has been conducted and presented on an annual and overall basis. Financial data has been related to the number of visits made, the number of sessions and the number of participants, to enable cost analyses to be calculated for each. The number of COOKITs distributed, along with their costs, have also been included in the overall cost evaluation.

2.3 Qualitative data
Qualitative research was conducted with a range of Cooking Bus stakeholders, provider staff, school and community group contacts and participants in the sessions. This gave a depth of feedback that ensured that the research objectives could be met.

3 SIMD analysis divides Scotland into 6505 unique geographical areas (data zones) which are internally analyzed on seven criteria (domains) and then ranked from 1 to 6505. Thus, for example, the lowest scoring 1301 data zones form the most deprived SIMD quintile.
Qualitative research primarily took the form of individual in-depth interviews, with a few paired in-depth interviews at the request of respondents, conducted either face to face or by phone. Each interview lasted a minimum of 20 minutes and most lasted 30-45 minutes.

2.3.1 The stakeholder sample
This was drawn from partner organisations that are committed to the Cooking Bus initiative, selected for expert feedback on strategic and high level practical perspectives, planning/designing and implementation, cost effectiveness and ongoing expectations of the programme.

Seven stakeholders were interviewed from the following organisations for strategy and policy perspectives, and for their views on key achievements and challenges:
- Scottish Government: two individual in-depth interviews
- Food Standards Agency Scotland
- Community Food and Health Scotland
- Members of a local authority with a semi-rural/rural catchment – paired interview
- Member of a local authority with an urban catchment

In addition, for perspective on issues such as programme objectives, challenges, delivery, and costing parameters; interviews were conducted with the following Cooking Bus provider staff:
- Chief Executive
- Director of Finance and Administration

2.3.2 Cooking Bus staff sample
Those with a planning, development and delivery role were identified as the Programme Co-ordinator and Curriculum Development Officer. Frontline staff, taking the Cooking Bus across Scotland and delivering cooking sessions, were also interviewed.

Five in-depth staff interviews were conducted with the:
- Programme Co-ordinator
- Curriculum Development Officer
- Cooking Bus Advisory Teacher
- Cooking Bus Food Teacher
- Driver.
2.3.3 Cooking Bus target groups sample
A purposive sample of target groups was drawn up which ensured input from key groups and allowed for important issues, measured by the quantitative surveys, to be explored further and understood in depth.

The contacts sample was drawn from the list of all those who had returned feedback forms and given permission to be re-contacted. They provided comment on all aspects of the Cooking Bus programme experience (as organisers), as well as much of the insight, by proxy, of participants’ experiences and of the post-visit legacy.

Additionally, a sample of secondary school pupils (not primary school pupils, given the additional issues in interviewing this young group effectively) and community group participants provided their views on the experience of the Cooking Bus and its longer term impact.

Contact and participant respondents were chosen according to:
- Setting – school (primary and secondary) and community.
- Location – SIMD with a bias towards the most deprived; a mix of urban and rural; geographic spread.

The evaluation intended to interview an equal number of contacts from a school and a community setting. However, this was not possible given the lower number of community group visits made.

The community sample consisted of:
- Ten community group contacts covering all community group visits made by the Cooking Bus from 2008 to September 2011.
- Adult participants in a Cooking Bus session in four different geographic locations, eight respondents in total:
  - three men aged 50 plus
  - a mother with young children
  - a community officer working in a local authority leisure development services department
  - a primary school teacher interviewed as part of this adult sample for her personal experience of the Cooking Bus
  - two fathers - one with young children and one with teenagers.

All interviews were semi-structured and in-depth, lasting between 30-45 minutes. Five contacts were interviewed face to face and five by telephone. All participants but one was interviewed face to face.

The school sample consisted of:
- Twenty-three school contacts - 15 primary; eight secondary:
  - across a wide geographic spread of Scotland i.e. 19 local authorities, including rural and remote locations
spread over each year of operation of the Cooking Bus from 2008 to 2011

- From a range of SIMDs.

- Eight secondary school pupils:
  - two in each of four different geographic locations – north-east, west, south, central belt
  - four in-depth interviews and two paired in-depth interviews.

All interviews were semi-structured and in-depth, lasting 30-45 minutes (professionals) and 20-30 minutes (pupils). Six were conducted face to face and 17 by phone. All pupils were interviewed face to face.

Discussion guides are available in Appendix 5.

Observed sample:
The Cooking Bus was visited and observed on two occasions – once in a school setting and once in a community setting. One community group contact; one school contact and two adult community participants were interviewed at these visits and are included in the totals above.

2.3.4 Sample recruitment
The appropriate individuals in stakeholder organisations were identified by the evaluation steering group. Cooking Bus staff members were selected according to their roles in delivering the programme.

Contacts from all community groups who were visited had agreed to be re-contacted and, given the small number of visits made, all were selected for interview. School contacts were selected from the list of those who had agreed to be re-contacted, ensuring a spread of: year of visit; SIMD location; urban, semi-rural, rural and remote locations; and local authorities.

The lead researcher invited all selected respondents to participate in qualitative interviews. Secondary school and community contacts selected and invited participants to be interviewed. These respondents were typical of those who had taken part in their Cooking Bus visit e.g. men aged 50+ years who belonged to one of the organised groups based in the community centre which hosted the visit. Again a spread of year of visit; SIMD; location and local authorities was ensured within the participant sample.

Although approval was not required from NHS Research Ethics Committee, contact and subsequent recruitment to the sample followed procedures that ensured all gave informed consent to participate and had been reassured on issues such as transparency of project purpose, anonymity and confidentiality.

Qualitative fieldwork took place mid November 2011 to early January 2012.

---

4 See Appendix 1 for details of spread of interviews across years and SIMDs
5 See Appendix 3 for participant information sheet and consent form.
2.3.5 Qualitative data analysis
The data gathered included detailed, verbatim notes and audio recordings of qualitative interviews. Insight gained from the Cooking Bus research visits was integrated with other data sources.

On completion of data collection, the data was analysed using a thematic analysis approach. The researcher became fully familiar with the data using detailed notes and audio recordings. Concepts and their properties were identified. Data was then coded in order to describe and relate categories and subcategories of concepts. Emergent concepts, patterns and hypotheses were identified and characterised such that they address the research objectives.

Application forms were analysed and thematically coded to explore the reasons why some applications were successful, and why some were not, with a view to providing learning for facilitating the application process and success rate.

2.4 Limitations of the data
2.4.1 Quantitative data sources
It was clear that the Cooking Bus provider held an amount of data and while it was sensible to make use of it in this evaluation, it should be recognised that there are limitations with those data, as they had not been designed for this purpose. Limitations included:
- No data were collected on key outcomes such as improved knowledge of nutrition.
- Some data were incomplete: feedback forms were not returned for 16 visits.
- Some data were inconsistent: differences in Cooking Bus participant numbers were apparent in post-visit staff feedback forms when compared with the provider’s collated information. The provider’s collated data were used in the evaluation.

2.4.2 Analysis of reach
There were notable limitations to the analysis of Cooking Bus reach by SIMD. The SIMD was calculated using the postcode of the site for each visit rather than that of participants. This approach therefore provided a limited indicator of institutional/group reach by SIMD, and did not allow an analysis of participants’ SIMD profile. Data also limited a robust identification of reach by target group (teachers, school pupils and community participants).

2.4.3 Insight into the Cooking Bus experience and legacy
Much of the detailed data about the experience and short and long-term outcomes generated by the Cooking Bus were provided by contacts; this included feedback on behalf of participants. Interviews with a small sample (sixteen individuals in total) of participants augmented this data.
3. Results

This chapter presents findings on:
• the development and implementation of the Cooking Bus
• perceptions of delivery of the programme
• immediate impact on participants against programme objectives
• efforts to sustain the impact of the Cooking Bus
• cost effectiveness.
• .

The analysis has drawn on all available quantitative data as well as data from in-depth interviews with stakeholders, Cooking Bus staff and contacts and participants.

3.1 Development and implementation of the Cooking Bus programme
This section reports on how the programme was set up, how it has operated since 2008 and the barriers and facilitators to this process.

3.1.1 Origins and aims
Outlined below is a brief history of the origin of the Healthier Scotland Cooking Bus.

Having set up several programmes in England and Wales, the provider approached the Scottish Government with a proposal for a Cooking Bus programme in Scotland. A strong fit was recognised between the programmes’ educational ethos and capabilities and a number of the Scottish Government’s policies, plans and priorities.

Funds were secured in 2008 from the Food Standards Agency Scotland (FSAS) and Scottish Government, and the Cooking Bus was ordered and built. A project board was set up and a strategy was developed.

The project board agreed aims and objectives for the Cooking Bus programme. The Cooking Bus would deliver a practical cooking experience using healthy, locally sourced ingredients; and convey key messages on healthy eating, food hygiene, safety and recycling. The overall objective was that participants be given the skills and insights that would enable them to make healthy food choices.

The Cooking Bus programme was also given output targets. It was to ensure the Cooking Bus visited all 32 local authorities in Scotland by the end of 2010, prioritising visits to areas of the highest multiple deprivation where it was felt to be needed most, in line with Scottish Government priorities of tackling inequalities: i.e. to visit SIMDs of under 1,000 (broadly speaking the lowest quintile). Its target group proportions were: 50% school pupils, 25% school teachers and 25% community group participants. In 2011 this targeting was
updated to become 25% school pupils, 50% teachers and 25% community groups.

3.1.2 Cooking Bus aims and current Scottish Government policy
Stakeholders indicated that the Cooking Bus remit contributed to the aims of current policies, introduced since 2008 - primarily those outlined in Recipe for Success - National Food and Drink Policy for Scotland (Scottish Government, 2009). Additionally, the programme was also seen as particularly relevant, by aiming to give participants skills and knowledge to make healthy eating choices, to Preventing Overweight and Obesity in Scotland: A Route Map Towards Healthy Weight (Scottish Government, 2010) which is explicit in its plan to tackle unhealthy weight in Scotland’s population. Links were also suggested by stakeholders between the Cooking Bus aims and the objectives outlined in Improving Maternal and Infant Nutrition: A Framework for Action (Scottish Government, 2011); and in the Health and Wellbeing aspect of Curriculum for Excellence (Scottish Government, 2009).

3.1.3 Awareness-raising and recruitment
Several stakeholders indicated that the Cooking Bus ‘developed organically’ as the programme rolled out and that it had faced a series of challenges.

The first programme task, given its targeting and implementation approach, was to create awareness of the Cooking Bus and generate applications for a visit. Awareness raising methods included sending a letter to all Directors of Education requesting the appointment of a contact for visits by the Cooking Bus to their area; the letter also suggested that Community Health Partnerships were informed of any visit. The Cooking Bus also attended special events, including the Scottish Learning Festival, Gardening Scotland, Tall Ships Race Greenock and the Royal Highland Show. Community Food and Health Scotland promoted the Cooking Bus through their newsletter and personal contacts. Articles were also included in the provider’s magazine, which was circulated nationally to teachers who had subscribed to it. An optional press release was given to successful applicants to raise local awareness before the visit.

Data to measure the success or otherwise of these promotions came from the question: “Where did you hear about Focus on Food?” which was asked at the end of the Cooking Bus application form. It has been assumed that applicants realised the question referred to the Cooking Bus as it was the focal point of the form. Results of this question are presented in Table 1.

Findings in Table 1 indicate that the Scottish Learning Festival was the most mentioned source of awareness of the Cooking Bus. However, after Cooking Bus attendance at three Scottish Learning Festivals (2008, 2009 and 2010) only 31 applications had named it as the source of awareness of the programme.
Table 1: Source of applicants’ awareness of the Cooking Bus/Focus on Food (n, %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Awareness</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>%6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Learning Festival</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet/website/email</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail shot/circular/flyer/brochure</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper/magazine/media</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority/education department (meeting, etc.)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw Cooking Bus at another school/CPD session</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent(s)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Food and Health Scotland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (fewer than 5 mentions each)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 164 responses from all pending and successful application forms (n=162).
Source: Cooking Bus application forms received to 30 Sept 2011

‘Others’ included the Royal Highland Show, HM Inspectorate of Education conference, Gardening Scotland, Dundee Flower and Food Festival, TV, Council for Voluntary Service working club, Healthy Weight Communities, Valvona and Crolla.

Table 2 below indicates that the total number of applications for a Cooking Bus visit had declined sharply in the past two years. These data relate to visit requests that were submitted to the Cooking Bus provider either as completed application forms or in more general ways, such as letters. The total number of applications presented below was therefore slightly larger than the number of completed application forms (used in Table 1 above).

---

6 Total may exceed 100 due to rounding.
Table 2: Cooking Bus applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre 2008</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011 to 30Sept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total - year</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 159 dated applications (excluding 5 undated).
Source: Cooking Bus applications received to 30 Sept 2011.

3.1.4 Cooking Bus branding
A variety of brands appeared on communications and correspondence materials: these included Cooking Bus, Focus on Food, COOKSCHOOL, Healthier Scotland Cooking Bus and that of the Cooking Bus provider. The relationship between the various brands was not always clear to those contacts interviewed.

3.1.5 The Cooking Bus delivery schedule
In any typical month, the Cooking Bus delivered sessions at schools and communities for three weeks and stayed at the provider’s headquarters for one week.

In the week of office time, teaching staff reported on recent visits, planned and organised the next three weeks visits, for example ordering ingredients. They also liaised with contacts to refine objectives, discuss specific needs of participants (e.g. dietary, additional support) and agree menus.

A typical one week visit to a single location, for example a primary school, provided nine teaching sessions in total with each session accommodating up to 16 people. Each session lasted 1½ hours.

In a typical visit, the Cooking Bus arrived on site on Monday morning, when the staff set up and prepared as required for the following week, for example pre-cooking some items. In the course of this preparation they showed the main contact and other people (such as a head teacher and interested parents/carers) around the facility. Three daytime teaching sessions were conducted per day on Tuesday and Wednesday; plus one twilight session on one of these days. There were two more teaching sessions on Thursday morning; Thursday afternoon was spent packing up. The Cooking Bus left either on a Thursday evening or Friday morning.

---

7 The table refers to the year in which the applications were received. In the case of successful applications it does not, necessarily, refer to the year of the visit.
8 A pending application is one that has not yet been visited by the Cooking Bus.
3.2 Reach
The Cooking Bus set out to reach specific target populations. This section outlines the process by which the Cooking Bus tried to achieve this; and the extent to which it met its targets.

3.2.1 Cooking Bus visit selection process
Criteria used by the co-ordinator to review and select applications for a visit involved a prioritisation of the following (in order of importance):

- Schools must show how they will apply learning from the Cooking Bus following the visit. This does not necessarily mean that they must already have a strong existing food and health education programme.
- Applications that are joined up between feeder primary schools and their secondary school partners, local authorities and health promotion co-ordinators.
- Focus on schools in deprived areas (as per the most recent SIMD survey).
- Focus on a geographical spread of schools. Aim is to visit 29 out of 32 local authorities by end December 2009 and all 32 by end 2010.
- Focus on schools in rural areas by encouraging visitors from smaller schools to cluster round the bus.

(Cooking Bus project board, May 2008)

Selection priorities and criteria changed over the course of the programme in response to the profile of applications received. For example, the intention to target those in approximately the most deprived SIMD quintile was revised to include all those from SIMD data zones below 5,000 after insufficient applications were received (broadly the lowest four quintiles).

In 2011 target group profiles were amended to 25% children, 50% teachers (and 25% community participants). A recognition mid 2011 of persistently below-target community group applications prompted increased efforts to meet the target reach of community visits (25%).

3.2.2 Overall reach
Outlined below, in Table 3 are details of the reach of the Cooking Bus. More than 11,000 people participated in sessions on the Cooking Bus. It made 92 visits to schools, events and community groups. Participants from more than 200 schools attended sessions.

---

9 Source: Cooking Bus provider statistics.
Table 3: Reach: participation in the Cooking Bus (n)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All participants</td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>3,728</td>
<td>3,611</td>
<td>2,566</td>
<td>11,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School pupils</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>2,776</td>
<td>2,706</td>
<td>1,911</td>
<td>8,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School teachers</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>1,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community group</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>1,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools represented in</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sessions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cooking Bus provider statistics.

3.2.3 Reach as a proportion of total school populations
Table 4 shows that the Cooking Bus has reached nearly 8% of all schools in Scotland, although logistics (i.e. the capacity per session and sessions per week) meant that only some of these schools’ pupils and teachers were able to attend. This is reflected in the lower reach of school pupils.

Table 4: Reach of Cooking Bus – June 2008 - August 2011 (n, %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Scotland*</th>
<th>Reached by CB**</th>
<th>Reach %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Schools</td>
<td>2722</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School pupils</td>
<td>682,000</td>
<td>8,619</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School teachers</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>1,354</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Scottish Government. Schools FAQs. ** Source: Cooking Bus provider statistics.

3.2.4 Reach of the Cooking Bus to schools by SIMD quintile
There were notable limitations to the analysis of reach by SIMD. The SIMD was identified using the postcode for the visit site and is not necessarily reflective of the SIMD of participants. This approach provided a limited indicator of reach by SIMD, indicated in Table 5.

Table 5 shows that 24% of school visits were to schools in the lowest quintile and 52% to schools in the two lowest, reflecting the profile of applications received and the degree to which these applications also met the other selection criteria. It should be noted that SIMD data were not available for all schools visited (n=5).

Below target application rates from community groups resulted in a commitment to reach them, regardless of location. SIMD was not used as a criterion for selecting which community groups to visit. The SIMD profile of the 11 community groups visited was indicated in Table 5.

---

10 Although the Bus visited 73 schools, participants attended from 207 schools. Attendance of multiple schools at a single visit explains these figures.
group visits was: four in SIMD quintile 1; three in quintile 2; one in quintile 3; two in quintile 4; one in quintile 5.

Table 5: Cooking Bus school visits (2008-11) by SIMD quintile (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quintile</th>
<th>Percentage visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (most deprived)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (least deprived)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: visits to schools with identifiable SIMD quintile, (n=68)
Source: Cooking Bus provider statistics.

3.2.5 Profile of participants reached
Table 6 below indicates that output targets in 2008-2010 set by the project board to reach 50% children, 25% teachers and 25% community participants; (amended in 2011 to 25% children, 50% teachers and 25% community participants) were not met and persist as a challenging issue for the Cooking Bus. In reality, school pupils have consistently been the main recipients of Cooking Bus sessions, at a minimum of 74% of all participants.

Table 6: Profile of Cooking Bus participants (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>3,728</td>
<td>3,611</td>
<td>2,566</td>
<td>11,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School pupils</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School teachers</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community group participants</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cooking Bus provider statistics.

Insufficient applications from community groups is one reason that community participant targets have not been met. Contacts provided qualitative insight into the additional reasons target group profiles were not met and these are outlined in the following sections of the report.

3.2.6 Cooking Bus participation in schools
Primary and secondary school contacts reported in qualitative interviews and feedback forms that they had encountered no difficulties in encouraging pupils to attend sessions. This is likely due in part to the teacher/pupil relationship i.e. pupils follow instructions from teachers. According to both contacts and pupils, it was also because of the intrigue and excitement the Cooking Bus generated on arrival.
Selecting participants for the Cooking Bus varied. Many primary schools focused on older children that were thought able to retain more of the experience than younger pupils. Some schools were also more likely to choose pupils who were currently involved in a health promotion activity or relevant project in school. Secondary school contacts reported in interviews that their secondary school pupils were usually selected to participate in Cooking Bus sessions because they were Home Economics/Food Technology or Hospitality SQA candidates.

The degree of local promotion when a Cooking Bus visit was booked varied greatly and school contacts were not always clear about the purpose of this exercise. Use of the press release issued by the Cooking Bus provider was not consistent across the sample of contacts interviewed.

Evidence from qualitative interviews also indicated that there was inconsistent co-operation and co-ordination between schools in or near to the location of a proposed Cooking Bus visit. Primary schools in particular seemed to have a tendency to concentrate on securing sessions for their own pupils, then for their own teachers (and it is not unusual for a primary school to have fewer than 16 teaching staff in total) while not securing attendance of other teachers or other members of the community.

The secondary school application/participation model varied widely. Those schools which made exclusive applications and retained all pupil sessions often struggled to fill the CPD session with feeder primary staff or community group participants.

Those secondary schools which made themselves the focus for feeder primary involvement allocated sessions to pupils (in P7 transition) and primary teachers; as well as retaining a proportion for their own staff and pupils. These visits were more likely to fill the CPD session.

Evidence from in-depth interviews with school contacts highlighted the importance of partnerships and networking to deliver Cooking Bus sessions to multiple school groups at a visit. Schools tended to want all sessions for their own pupils (in particular) and teaching staff – which had the effect of precluding partnership applications from the start.

The proportion of teachers among Cooking Bus participants has been half of what was originally targeted and a quarter of the new target set in early 2011. This was largely because only one of the nine teaching sessions in an average school visit was aimed at teachers. Furthermore, all sixteen places in the single CPD session allocated per visit were not filled in every case. The exact proportion of unfilled places was unknown as monitoring was not designed for this purpose and therefore not reliable.
As an example of good practice, secondary schools who actively aimed the visit at their feeder primaries successfully targeted and motivated primary school teachers from a number of schools. Secondary school contacts sent their feeder primary schools information about the Cooking Bus visit and the benefits it offered to both pupils and teachers who participated. Each school was invited to take part in the Cooking Bus visit and allocated a share of sessions. However, this active targeting and information provision was not seen by all secondary school contacts as their responsibility. These school contacts did not always see that it was important overall for the programme to meet teacher targets, or their role in it by inviting other local teachers to attend sessions.

3.2.7 Facilitators in reaching community group and adult participants
Under 15 applications were received directly from community groups, and almost all were visited by the Cooking Bus. Interviews with community contacts identified that all successful applicants have had at least one paid employee, or were co-coordinated by local authority or NHS community workers who completed the application form and organised the visit.

To be able to fill the Cooking Bus sessions with local groups it is clear that most cases benefited from a locally well-networked contact or partner, such as a childcare development worker. This contact or partner identified, informed and encouraged local groups to take part. In several cases they themselves produced Cooking Bus promotional materials to inform and motivate potential participants. For example, as one community group contact expressed it: ‘We couldn’t have done it without the contacts she had.’ Local community health officer who co-ordinated involvement of groups

Places on the Cooking Bus were mostly filled by members of established groups like mothers and toddlers group within communities, and local schools were in some instances early partners in some community group applications but in other cases were sometimes approached later in the process primarily to make up participant numbers as it became clear that sessions could not be filled otherwise.

Local authority stakeholders who were interviewed for this evaluation reported that they had played what they saw to be important communication roles in recruiting and coordinating Cooking Bus visits, by recognising the fit between local projects and community groups and the programme and by encouraging or facilitating participation.

3.2.8 Barriers to reaching community groups and encouraging participation
Difficulties in encouraging participation were cited by most community groups visited, and were often mentioned in in-depth interviews by school contacts who had tried to invite community participants.
There were practical barriers to participation. Most sessions were simply not available to adults who work on weekdays. A lack of childcare facilities could also be a barrier although several groups co-ordinated by a local authority officer were offered childcare which encouraged participation in a Cooking Bus session.

Many contacts reported in qualitative interviews that a lack of understanding of what the Cooking Bus offered, as well as emotional barriers such as lack of confidence also played their parts in discouraging participation; they reported:

- a lack of clear understanding by some potential participants of the personal benefits of visiting the Cooking Bus, these adults rejected participation by saying ‘I can cook’
- a misinterpretation of the purpose or tone of the sessions, thinking for example they might be healthy eating ‘lectures’
- a lack of understanding of what is expected of participants (‘Will I have to read something?’); this was closely linked with the lack of confidence of potential participants about simply ‘joining in’ or being involved in ‘education’, especially among those in areas of multiple deprivation.

Local word of mouth comments after the first day or two of the Cooking Bus visit was reported by staff and contacts as appearing to reassure potential participants, so that they became interested and more willing to take part.

There would seem to be a need to provide contacts and those encouraging participation with messages and communications materials prior to a visit, which would fill the knowledge gaps about the Cooking Bus identified in this evaluation.

### 3.3 Perceptions of delivery of the Cooking Bus

The evaluation explored target group perceptions of the delivery of the Cooking Bus programme. Data are presented on the application process and pre-visit preparations; facilities offered, the teaching methods used, and the extent to which these met the overall needs of respective school or community groups with regard to learning cooking skills. Data from school visits and from community group visits were drawn from both the feedback forms and qualitative interviews.

#### 3.3.1 Applying and preparing for a Cooking Bus visit

Pre-visit preparation ratings were collected through the feedback form completed by contacts after the visit.

Table 7 below shows that contacts rated the pre-visit preparations made by Cooking Bus staff very highly.
Most successful applicants, interviewed qualitatively, were very positive about status updates and general communications with the Cooking Bus Coordinator. All contacts appreciated pre-visit discussions to refine objectives, discuss participants, discuss recipes; and were impressed with enthusiastic, open, helpful and flexible Cooking Bus staff, including the driver.

The process of completing the application form was discussed during in-depth interviews with contacts. Opinions ranged from it being ‘very lengthy and detailed, but necessary’ to ‘easier than many forms’. The response partly depended on the experience and confidence of the applicant in form filling. There was also influence from the perceived seriousness of the potential barriers to securing a visit, such as finding a site for the bus, facilities for the driver or class cover for schools. There was also concern over being able to provide ideas for how to sustain the legacy of the Cooking Bus visit. All of these considerations could make applying for a visit more difficult.

Respondents also identified some facilitators to completing the form. They had found the Cooking Bus provider very helpful when personally contacted. Having access to those in local government who could provide advice or assistance on measuring potential sites, providing site plans for the Cooking Bus, and sourcing alternative sites and driver facilities was also seen to facilitate successful application.

Respondents suggested improvements to the application form. Contacts applying on behalf of community groups asked for one that was specifically for

---

Table 7: Pre-visit preparations –ratings (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written instructions</th>
<th>Telephone contact</th>
<th>Planning of workshops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good 5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/ no answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 86 contacts i.e. from 77 schools and nine community groups who organised a visit and returned a feedback form.

Source: feedback forms completed by contacts immediately after the Cooking Bus visit.

---

11 While the Cooking Bus made 73 visits, some were to remote locations where it spent more than a week and visited multiple school sites. Feedback forms were returned by several contacts on these multiple site visits.
them rather than tailored for schools. At the time of reporting this has already been implemented.

Contacts from schools and community groups felt the form could indicate that there was some flexibility in the provision of driver facilities. It was pointed out that this flexibility was often encountered on phoning the Cooking Bus coordinator. Some asked for reassurance that a ‘rough’ site drawing only is required for the application process.

3.3.2 Facilities on the Cooking Bus
Feedback forms rating aspects of the Cooking Bus programme delivery were faxed to the provider by contacts immediately following visits.

Teaching facilities on the Cooking Bus were rated highly by the 86 contacts who returned a feedback form – 98% gave it a top rating of very good.

Contact and participant interviewees who gave in-depth opinions to this study were also very positive about the facilities. A certain ‘wow factor’ was mentioned by many, as was the feeling that it contained ‘everything you could need’ for cooking.

The Cooking Bus was seen as having an extremely well organised and practical layout, some contacts and participants mentioned this was striking and a valuable lesson in itself. It was considered spacious, safe and accessible to move around in. Others reported that the bright, clean, high quality equipment and surroundings made the experience very positive and inspiring. Typical of the comments about the Cooking Bus facilities from qualitative interviews, were:

‘The children were entranced by it [the Bus].’ (Primary school contact)

‘It’s fabulous.’ (Community group contact)

‘Close to perfect’ (Community group contact)

‘Brilliant. I felt very good…like Masterchef in a very clean kitchen.’ (Community group participant)

3.3.3 Materials distributed to participants
All Cooking Bus participants were given the recipes for the dishes they made to take home. There were many spontaneous comments in the interviews that everyone really liked to take home both the dishes and the recipes.

Each participant took other materials away in the branded, biodegradable bag. Several leaflets for example on safe food handling or; on healthy eating were distributed via this bag over the years of the Cooking Bus programme, mainly
supplied by the FSAS. From the in-depth interviews, the recall of distributed materials, in order, was:

- Recipes – all respondents
- Model bus – most primary school contacts
- Eatwell plate – many respondents
- Wooden spoon – several contacts and participants
- Germ watch leaflet – two pupil participants who had found it valuable for exams.

In November 2011 as well as recipes, the bag contained an Eatwell Plate; FSAS pens, pencils and rubbers; a Focus on Food campaign leaflet and a cardboard Cooking Bus model for primary school children.

Cooking Bus staff reported that the method for requesting and delivering leaflets or other materials from partners did not ensure a steady supply. There did not seem to be a systematic approach to providing the most appropriate and beneficial materials to the various target groups.

Exposure to materials inside the Cooking Bus (for example, posters for safe food handling, food waste recycling messages) was recalled by some of the contacts and participants.

The approach to teaching on the Cooking Bus meant the use of written materials was minimal during demonstrations; and no-one suggested this should be changed.

3.3.4 Teaching methods
Teaching methods, including CPD training sessions, were rated very highly in the feedback forms, as indicated in Table 8.

Table 8: Ratings of the Cooking Bus teacher and teaching (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher training sessions</th>
<th>Teaching during sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good 5</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 86 contacts i.e. from 77 schools and nine community groups who organised a visit and returned a feedback form.
Source: feedback forms completed and returned by contacts.
These opinions were reinforced by comments from in-depth interviews with contacts and participants. Cooking Bus teaching staff were seen to be very highly skilled in teaching cooking and to have impressive organisational skills. They were able to change tone and style to meet the needs of different audiences and they easily held the attention of all age groups and skill levels. It was also pointed out that while important lessons were learned, the staff also made the experience very positive and fun. They imparted a great deal of information, especially about healthy eating, expertly and with a very light touch: ‘The children hardly realised they were learning.’ (Primary school contact)

The method of teaching was understood to be demonstration by Cooking Bus teaching staff, followed by participants gaining practical experience. Both participants and contacts all agreed it met their learning needs in an appropriate way.

There were minimal criticisms of lesson content from interviewed contacts and participants, and none included in the feedback forms. Feedback about the Cooking Bus staff was extremely positive. The quotes below were typical:

‘A fantastic team. They were enthusiastic before they started. And they used local suppliers in the town.’ (Community group contact)

‘They didn’t make you look dumb.’ (S5 boy; who had been in S2 at the visit)

[The staff] ‘... are passionate about what they are doing and you can’t falsify that.’ (Primary school contact)

‘They were caring but not patronising.’ (Supported learning school contact)

‘Hot on hygiene and safety.’ (Secondary school contact)

‘They [teachers] told me it was one of the best bits of in-service they’ve ever had.’ (Primary school contact)

‘You were learning without knowing you were learning.” (Community group participant)

3.3.5 Recipes and ingredients
The food prepared on the Cooking Bus was described, invariably, in interviews as being more interesting or exciting than dishes currently cooked or eaten by respondents at home.

Contacts and participants described the dishes as easy to prepare and therefore accessible in terms of skills; though using unfamiliar, not ‘everyday’, ingredients.
The vast majority of those interviewed preferred this to more traditional, familiar dishes or ingredients. The benefits were seen as valuable exposure to new ingredients and new tastes. Respondents reported getting a real confidence boost from cooking something different.

Four contacts (three from community groups) suggested that more everyday, familiar or traditional recipes would be better, arguing that this would meet family tastes and encourage cooking the recipes again at home, as well as underlining affordability and accessibility.

In contrast, none of the school pupils and adult participants interviewed in this evaluation (nor the majority of contacts) agreed with this suggestion. There was no feedback from participants that they would be more likely to cook traditional, familiar dishes at home than the existing Cooking Bus recipes. Adult participants also recalled an emphasis in the Cooking Bus lesson on the flexibility of ingredients such that they could be altered to suit different tastes, for example red peppers could be substituted for tomatoes if unavailable or not to their taste. Suggested improvements or additions to the recipes were made by a few contacts, to encourage mainly parents and adult participants to cook these dishes again at home:

- Include broad costs for the recipes.
- Further emphasise in the lessons the local availability of specific ingredients to demonstrate accessibility.

3.3.6 Meeting the aims of contacts
Overall, the vast majority (94%) of contacts felt that their aims and objectives for the visit, agreed in advance with Cooking Bus teaching staff, and centred on key outcomes such as improved skills in food handling and preparation skills, were met.

This was confirmed by both school and community contacts in in-depth interviews.

Feedback forms provided contacts with the opportunity to rate the Cooking Bus on overall success and coverage of key issues such as safe food handling. Table 9 below shows the high scores achieved by the Cooking Bus on all measures.
Table 9: Cooking Bus post visit ratings (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall success of the Cooking Bus visit %</th>
<th>Coverage of safe food handling, hygiene and personal safety %</th>
<th>Standard of pupils' finished products %</th>
<th>Relevance of Cooking Bus session to school curriculum %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good 5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 86 contacts i.e. from 77 schools and nine community groups who organised a visit and returned a feedback form.
Source: feedback forms completed by contacts immediately after the Cooking Bus visit.

Contacts were invited to comment further in an open-ended question on their perceptions of the Cooking Bus visit. As Table 10 below shows, contacts almost always used this opportunity to praise the Cooking Bus visits, with remarks about motivation and inspiration being particularly noteworthy. Multiple categories of responses were received from contacts.

Table 10: Open-ended comments about Cooking Bus visit (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent/well-received/enjoyable</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivated/inspired pupils</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise for Cooking Bus Staff</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivated/inspired staff</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to do it again/follow up or longer visit</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivated/inspired parents/community</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus excellent facility/state of the art/proper kitchen</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned/gained a lot</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised profile/created a buzz about cooking</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive – healthy eating/ingredients</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 86 contacts i.e. from 77 schools and nine community groups who organised a visit and returned a feedback form.
Source: feedback forms completed and returned by contacts.
3.4 Impact and legacy
Outlined below are the perceptions of the short term impacts on participants of the Cooking Bus, in terms of:
- improved knowledge, skills and/or attitudinal change
- improved skills in food handling and preparation skills
- improved knowledge of food issues such as nutrition, hygiene and recycling
- indications of target group behaviour change.

This section also reports on the extent to which cooking skills were supported within the school curriculum or within the community setting including ongoing use of the COOKITs.

3.4.1 Short-term impact of the Cooking Bus on participants
No direct questions in the feedback form measured the Cooking Bus contribution to key outcomes, such as improved knowledge of nutrition, improved confidence or skills in cooking. All data aimed at evaluating these outcomes therefore came from interviews with contacts and participants.

All those contacts and participants who were interviewed reported that the Cooking Bus had delivered improved knowledge or skills in food handling and preparation and in nutrition, hygiene and recycling.

These respondents indicated other participant outcomes that they felt were equally (or in many cases more) important:
- increased confidence in, and enthusiasm for, cooking
- increased understanding: the memorable Cooking Bus experience made it easier to continue the lessons in class
- increased motivation: the inspiration to try recipes at home, do more cooking in class or get back to basics in cooking e.g. 'I've started cooking again; back to the basics I learned at school' (Participant, adult male).

It was reported by contacts that in some cases taking part in Cooking Bus sessions increased self-esteem; especially for those children with additional support needs and adults (for example long-term unemployed males) in the most deprived locations.

A typical comment on the impact of the Cooking Bus was:

‘Confidence boosting [for pupils and teachers] is the real legacy. “I can do this.”’ (Primary school contact)

3.4.2 Longer term impact on participants
It is worth noting that in the context of this project, 'longer-term' means up to three years at most: from the start of the Cooking Bus programme in June 2008. Moreover, the data available meant that it was very difficult to measure the extent
to which the skills and messages taught on the Cooking Bus had been retained by individual participants and if there had been any attitudinal or behaviour change.

However, in-depth interviews with 16 participants (adults and school pupils) from across the three years of visits, revealed that the most frequently recalled lesson was of knife skills to prepare meals and that these skills were still used routinely. This was an indication of behaviour change resulting from participating in a Cooking Bus session.

Healthy eating messages were also remembered, such as minimal use of salt, what constitutes a portion of fruit or vegetables, and the nutritional content of some foods; as were hygiene and food safety messages such as washing hands and the relevance of ‘use by’ dates. Food waste recycling messages were not salient but were usually recalled when probed.

Around half the participants interviewed claimed to have tried the healthy recipes again, several repeatedly. Several contacts from schools and community group stated that children and adult participants, mainly parents, had reported they had used the recipes from the Cooking Bus at home. These behaviour changes were in line with the intended outcomes of the Cooking Bus.

Contacts often mentioned that an unexpected benefit of the visit was improved and stronger relations with external groups and individuals. This could be between schools and parents: for example, cooking classes following the Cooking Bus visit got some parents ‘through the school doors for the first time’ (Urban Primary school contact). Some community groups who organised visits developed ongoing partnerships with local primary schools. A clear indicator of longer-term impact was the increased cooking in schools and community groups, conducted or organised by teacher and adult participants in a Cooking Bus session. Examples of increased cooking in schools and community groups are presented in sections 3.4.5 and 3.4.6 as case studies.

3.4.3 Sustaining the legacy of Cooking Bus

COOKITs\textsuperscript{12} are kits of cooking equipment that can be used to teach basic cooking skills to groups of up to six people cooking individually. At least one COOKIT was distributed to contacts following each Cooking Bus visit. For limited periods, additional COOKITs were available to contacts and to other school and community groups attending visits for purchase at discounted rates.

The total spend on COOKITs from June 2008 to July 2011, as shown in the spend data from the Cooking Bus provider, was just over £100,000, or about 6% of the total cost of the Cooking Bus programme.

\textsuperscript{12} See Appendix 7 for a visual of the COOKIT.
It is worth noting that the main contacts for Cooking Bus visits did not always know the extent to which COOKITs were being used, for instance when the contact taught at a secondary school but a COOKIT had been given to a feeder primary school or a participating community group.

Those contacts who gave in-depth interviews and who had used a COOKIT were all very positive about receiving one. They particularly mentioned the free or reduced price, the very high quality and the comprehensive nature of the equipment provided.

However, use of COOKITs, as reported in interviews, varied very widely from no use at all (though these respondents were keen to add ‘yet’, suggesting there was still an intention to put them to use), through to several times a term, weekly (often in six week blocks per term in schools), or to several times a week. In community groups, an example cited of this very regular use was for a lunch club. In schools, COOKITs were regularly used in teaching pupils with additional support needs.

In some instances, COOKITs were reported as having clearly been instrumental in helping start some cooking classes, clubs and sessions.

There was little evidence of COOKITs being shared between different groups or schools.

3.4.4 Intentions to support and sustain the Cooking Bus impact

On the feedback form after the visit, contacts were asked about planned activities aimed at ensuring a legacy of the Cooking Bus in their school or local community groups. Responses have been thematically categorised and presented below.

Table 11 shows the intended plans at the post-visit stage were more general than specific. For instance, the most frequently mentioned action (63% of respondents) was to plan more cooking, while 42% aimed to expand their equipment or resources.
Table 11: “How do you intend to develop and sustain the impetus generated by the Cooking Bus visit?” (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More cooking/extra lessons/alter timetable (for cooking)</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy more equipment/resources</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate cooking into other areas/cross curriculum</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents cooking session/workshop organised/planned</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start/continue cooking club</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened partnerships with other schools</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy eating</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking skills (e.g. Bridge, claw)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of COOKITs</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food hygiene/safety</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 86 contacts i.e. from 77 schools and nine community groups who organised a visit and returned a feedback form.
Source: feedback forms completed by contacts immediately after the Cooking Bus visit.

3.4.5 Legacy case studies - schools
To try to evaluate the legacy of a Cooking Bus visit, in-depth interviews with contacts sought to compare the desired long term outcomes indicated at the application stage and which the visit aimed to enhance, with what had subsequently happened.

Longer-term outcomes of the Cooking Bus were inconsistent, and those who tried to sustain a legacy after the visit all acknowledged that this needs time, commitment and hard work.

Individual case studies below illustrate the effort to sustain the legacy of the Cooking Bus experience as well as demonstrating that longer-term outcomes did not always emerge. Data for these case studies are drawn from application forms as well as qualitative interviews with contacts.

School case study 1: A primary school in an urban area of multiple deprivation visited by the Cooking Bus in 2008
The intention, as outlined in the application form, was:
- To help promote healthy cooking to pupils and parents.
- To enhance the Health Promoting Schools programme ongoing in the school.

The legacy left by the Cooking Bus visit was reported in a qualitative interview by the contact:
The Cooking Bus 'Kick started a whole new programme of cooking in the school.' With the help of the school community, funds were raised to add to the COOKIT sent to them after the visit as part of the programme. These paid for a cooker, freezer and dishwasher in the school.

Cooking of the type demonstrated on the Cooking Bus i.e. often hot foods, using healthy ingredients that were available locally, replaced previous ‘cold cooking’ which was described as essentially assembling dishes and not especially healthy.

During Golden Time\(^\text{13}\) since the visit the school had introduced six week blocks of hourly cooking sessions for P4-P7 every term. It had also introduced regular six week blocks of after school cooking classes for six parent and child pairs. These cooking classes had a waiting list.

In the outdoor classroom, children now grew vegetables for use in cooking sessions.

In what the contact described as a ‘very traditional community’, experience on the Cooking Bus had removed barriers to cooking for boys who were now keen to participate in school cooking sessions.

School case study 2: A primary school in an urban area of multiple deprivation visited by the Cooking Bus in 2010

The intention as stated in the application form:

- To give health and wellbeing a focus and priority.
- To demonstrate importance of healthy cooking (no cooking facilities of our own).

The legacy as reported by the contact at interview:

- ‘It worked. We now have a granny who comes in once a week to teach cooking to P6 and P7s.’ (Primary school contact). These lessons were with eight pupils at a time on a two ring cooker in the staff room. (These points illustrate that the legacy was sustained by adults within the community who were not necessarily teaching staff; and that a lack of facilities was overcome.)
- School staff, post-visit, now regularly taught cooking in Golden Time.
- COOKITs were used at least weekly; and to cater for demand for cooking sessions the school purchased an additional COOKIT.
- The Cooking Bus visit, where parents were involved as on-board helpers, suggested it made it easier for the school to talk to parents about healthy packed lunches.
- Following this, the school then developed and introduced a healthy and balanced tuck shop; again facilitated by the Cooking Bus visit.
- The Cooking Bus was seen as prompting teaching staff to continue to expand palates and restricted diets.

\[^{13}\text{Golden Time is a period, usually on a Friday afternoon, in primary schools when pupils are rewarded for good behaviour with fun activities.}\]
School case study 3: A primary school in a rural location visited by the Cooking Bus in 2010
The intention as stated in the application form:
- To give staff training to deliver healthy eating messages.
- No cooking facilities in school.

The legacy as reported by the contact at interview:
- Immediately following the visit one teacher was keen to set up a cooking club; but at the time of interview, the teacher had still to complete the hygiene course and so the club had not started.
- An additional barrier to sustaining legacy was the lack of facilities in the school. It was reported that the school caterers’ regulations would not allow use of the school kitchen for cooking classes.
- Some items from the COOKIT had been used occasionally for making salads.
- At interview this school contact commented that help and advice was required, ideally from the Cooking Bus staff who were seen as experts on how to set up a clean, safe cooking area within their school in order to facilitate a Cooking Bus legacy.

3.4.6 Cooking Bus legacy for community groups
Again, there was mixed longer-term impact; though most had successfully sustained the Cooking Bus legacy to some extent.

Examples of legacy outcomes are given below and illustrate the sorts of activities and organisational changes that the Cooking Bus facilitated as well as the barriers that remained. These outcomes are as reported by community group contacts in in-depth interviews. Intentions were recorded in each group’s application form.

Community case study 1: A visit focused around an urban community centre in an area of multiple deprivation
The intention as stated in the application form:
- Empower people to make healthy choices in their diet.

Legacy reported by the contact:
- Overall the Cooking Bus ‘kick-started a lot of activities’ with the provision of the COOKIT and the on-board experience itself.
- It accelerated the setting up of a planned cooking club.
- An additional COOKIT was used for a new lunch club and 6 week cooking sessions for a fathers group.
- A mother and toddler group in the community had ongoing cooking sessions.

Community case study 2: A visit organised by specialist community services in a rural area.
Intended legacy:
- No legacy plans were given.
Legacy:
- Community cooking sessions were set up as evening classes with the Cooking Bus effectively promoting this and inspiring good attendance.

Community case study 3: A visit focused around an urban community centre in an area of multiple deprivation.

Intended legacy:
- No legacy plans were given.

Legacy:
- Community group catering staff who attended the Cooking Bus had changed the café menu – and continued to change it to be healthier. The Cooking Bus gave them the confidence and insight to do this.
- A healthy cooking course was set up for adult participants; however, a previously unidentified health and safety issue meant the practical element was dropped and consequently attendance declined.

Group D: A visit co-ordinated by a specialist service in an urban area for its members

Intended legacy:
- No legacy plans were given.

Legacy:
- With no facilities, the COOKIT was rarely used.
- Feedback from individual participants to the contact was that long-term impact was in the form of the confidence the Cooking Bus had given them to better manage their diet.

Group E: A visit organised by specialist community services in a semi-rural area

Intended legacy:
- Encourage people to make healthy food choices.

Legacy:
- COOKITs were said to be used ‘all the time’ by local groups.
- Adults in the community groups, having attended the Cooking Bus, now had the confidence where previously they were very nervous about doing some sorts of cooking activities e.g. allowing young children to use knives.

3.4.7 Overcoming barriers to sustaining the Cooking Bus legacy
Contacts were asked for suggestions for overcoming barriers to sustaining the Cooking Bus legacy. These can be classified into practical and strategic ideas.

Practical suggestions to sustain the Cooking Bus legacy included giving advice in setting up a cooking club or cooking classes with limited resources. Contacts usually wanted an expert to look over the school or other venue for advice on what could be created or improved, especially in terms of health and safety.
Additional practical suggestions for keeping up the momentum of the visit were web alerts from the Cooking Bus team with new recipes, tips and additional leaflets as well as sessions broadcast directly to schools via the internet where the Cooking Bus teaching team could continue to inspire.

Suggested changes to the programme that could help to sustain the Cooking Bus legacy included more family sessions with parents/guardians or grandparents and primary school age children to enable learning and healthy cooking practices to continue at home.

Several contacts from both the school and community group settings also suggested that it was reasonable to give priority for visits to those schools or groups who demonstrated a clear commitment to sustaining the Cooking Bus legacy. A typical viewpoint of the contacts is best described by a primary school contact who indicated that at the very least ‘If they leave you with a COOKIT you must show commitment to using it’ (Primary school contact).

It was proposed by several school contacts that the application process should highlight and clarify the expectation that schools would deliver cooking as part of Curriculum for Excellence. It was felt knowledge of this expectation would be a motivating factor to participating in Cooking Bus sessions.

3.5 The economic cost of the Cooking Bus
This section looks at the cost of the Cooking Bus including the expenditure on COOKITs. Costs per visit, per demonstration and per participant have also been calculated.

All costs outlined in the tables include visits to school and community group settings as well as to events. Cooking Bus visits started in June 2008 and financial data were available from this date to July 2011.

Table 12 below outlines the annual cost of the Cooking Bus including and excluding the initial set-up costs. Due to the set up in the summer of 2008 and the timing of the evaluation, data were complete for only two calendar years of the Cooking Bus operation: 2009 and 2010. The Cooking Bus cost just under £500,000 to operate in each of these full years.

Costs included spend on COOKITs, totalling £103,000.
Table 12: Annual cost of Cooking Bus - £000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All set up and running costs</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>1758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running costs only</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>1462</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cooking Bus provider financial data.

Figures in Table 13 below are given both with and without set up costs. Continuing to run the same sort of programme, at the same size, would mean an ongoing cost of approximately £16,000 a visit.

Table 13: Average cost of Cooking Bus per visit - £000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All set up and running costs</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running costs only</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cooking Bus provider financial data.

Table 14 indicates the cost of the Cooking Bus per demonstration. Simply dividing the cost per visit by nine – the number of sessions delivered per typical visit – provided an indication that the cost per demonstration was about £1,800.

Table 14: Average cost of Cooking Bus per demonstration/teaching session - £

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of sessions*</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All set up and running costs</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running costs only</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This assumes nine sessions in a typical one week visit: this was the planned format of a visit but information on the extent to which this was achieved was not recorded formally on any of the post-visit reports provided to this evaluation.

Source: Cooking Bus provider financial data.

The cost per participant, shown in Table 15, was calculated by dividing the cost of the programme by the planned number of sessions and participants. It includes events i.e. both their costs and numbers of participants and gives a running cost per participant attending a session on average of £132.
Table 15: Average cost of Cooking Bus per participant - £

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All set up and running costs</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running costs only</td>
<td>175(^{14})</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cooking Bus provider financial data and participation figures.

It should be noted that as well as offering a venue for visits, the aims of attending events were primarily to raise awareness, and consequently stimulate applications. This differed from school and community group visits' objectives. Cooking Bus participation rates were lower at events. The 11 events visited from June 2008 to July 2011 reached 1200 participants, 109 per event, which compared with an average of 123 participants per weekly visit to schools and other groups. Deploying to special events such as the Royal Highland Show proved more expensive than sending the Cooking Bus to schools and community groups. The exceptional costs (e.g. fees to take part in events) of the 11 visits to events from June 2008 to July 2011 totalled £29,651 or £2,700 per visit. The average visit to e.g. a school is approximately £26,000; so an event costs on average 17% more to attend.

Removing events from the calculation gives the average cost of a Cooking Bus visit to schools and community groups over the total period of the programme of £127 per participant.

\(^{14}\) Includes bulk purchases e.g. aprons, not included in the capital expenditure total.
4. Discussion

This section of the report discusses the results of the evaluation against the evaluation’s stated objectives, considering implications for optimising the Cooking Bus programme and for its future monitoring.

4.1 Development and implementation

4.1.1 Cooking Bus Branding
The evaluation was able to look at the material that had been produced for the promotion of the Cooking Bus and the implementation of the programme. There were four names or logos that were used in this material which could be interpreted as brands, and there had been a lack of consistency in referring to the Cooking Bus in its branding. It seems very likely that a more organised approach will want to consider how the brand could be prominent in all communications. This would have the potential to improve clarity and consistency of message and perhaps also relationship building with target groups.

There seems to be an opportunity in all future communications activity and material to promote one strong brand and message and furthermore, if appropriate, to link the Cooking Bus via this branding to wider organisations or specific policies or initiatives by using a name such as, for example, the Healthier Scotland Cooking Bus. This would perhaps contribute to a broader awareness and understanding of the remit. To understand the value of this activity in future, the marketing team will want to ensure the correct brand name or other communication objective is being monitored. They might also want to consider measuring the press coverage of the Cooking Bus as an advertising cost equivalent (which is the standard measure of editorial coverage of public relations) so that the value of this activity can be better understood.

4.1.2 Recruiting for Cooking Bus visits
The evaluation findings have shown that new applications for a Cooking Bus visit have been in decline for the past two years. To date, this has not affected the number of visits being made as the service provider continues to work through pending applications. However, without increased awareness of Cooking Bus availability and the application process, requests for a visit may continue to decline. This would suggest that consideration of new marketing processes would therefore be useful. Any future marketing activities would be tailored to target groups and recognise their needs e.g. being clear to potential school parent participants about the format of the sessions.

Of course, for schools and community groups to apply for a visit they first had to be aware of the Cooking Bus, know what it offered and see it as useful or relevant to them. However, this evaluation only had one source of information available about applicants' knowledge of the Cooking Bus and application process. This consisted of a single question on the application form, to which
applicants had to state where they had first heard of ‘Focus on Food’, and the analysis of responses has assumed that applicants equated ‘Focus on Food’ with the Cooking Bus. There were no further questions monitoring, for example, applicants’ understanding of the purpose of the Cooking Bus programme. Although the data available to the evaluation in this area was limited, it was possible to draw some qualified conclusions. One of the recruitment and marketing methods was Cooking Bus attendance at events. The data available to this evaluation showed that 19% of the applications made for a Cooking Bus visit by the end of September 2011 mentioned the Scottish Learning Festival as the source of awareness of ‘Focus on Food’. This was the highest single source of awareness recorded. Together with the finding that applicants’ awareness of the Cooking Bus through other events was very much lower, the collected information could not be said to have provided conclusive evidence of their value in raising awareness or encouraging applications. This would suggest the need for some caution and further investigation before committing resources to events attendance as an awareness raising activity.

With very little feedback available about wider promotional efforts, such as requests to local authority Directors of Education to inform partners about the Cooking Bus, it proved impossible to measure the impact of these different communications on providing information about, or encouraging interest in, the Cooking Bus. Moreover, without data it was not possible to see whether the efforts to engage local authority partners reached the people best placed to encourage Cooking Bus applications. The gaps in available evidence of the effectiveness of recruitment and marketing methods between 2008 and 2011 suggest that it would be useful to revise processes to allow recording of awareness and information routes. This would support future evaluation of recruitment and marketing activities and would most likely be best done using a revised application form.

4.1.3 Aligning Cooking Bus and key policy aims
During the period of the evaluation two developments in the policy context for the Cooking Bus were identified by stakeholders: these were Recipe for Success - Scotland’s National Food and Drink Policy (Scottish Government, 2009) and Preventing Overweight and Obesity in Scotland: A Route Map Towards Healthy Weight (Scottish Government, 2010). Stakeholders said that the Cooking Bus was highly relevant to these key new policies. Given these policy updates reported by stakeholders, it might be constructive at this point to review Cooking Bus aims and objectives to make sure they are fully aligned with current and potential future, policy priorities.

It is very likely that other benefits would arise from a review that would agree and document the aims, objectives and priorities of the Cooking Bus in the current policy environment. Such a review could also form the basis for identifying key outcomes and provide a clear, accessible reference for all those involved in planning and delivering the programme. It could also enable monitoring of the
degree to which these outcomes have been achieved. For example, if improved knowledge of nutrition continues to be a key outcome of a Cooking Bus visit, then evidence could be collected of demonstrable immediate improvements, or otherwise, on this point.

As this evaluation engaged with a small number of Cooking Bus participants from both schools and community groups, feedback on behaviour change outcomes was largely given on their behalf by contacts. While this information can be used, it is limited by the degree to which the individual contact had ‘captured’ feedback from participants or observed evidence of some impact on subsequent knowledge or behaviour. It would be worth considering more accurate measurement: this would require a method to get the views of participants themselves, including school pupils. Accurate and systematic measurement of some Cooking Bus outcomes could for example be achieved by using information gathered through a self-completion feedback questionnaire designed specifically for target participants, completed while the Cooking Bus is still on site and collected by staff on their departure. These and other approaches to gathering information on outcomes require further consideration when the outcomes themselves have been confirmed.

In the course of a review, having completed the identification and agreement of intended (and measurable) outcomes, a useful next step would be the explicit identification and prioritising of indicators that can be used to measure 'success'. This evaluation observed variations in the levels and types of reported behaviour change from different contacts. Individual, familial, teaching and curricular changes were all reported, as were new, community group activities and food practice and behaviours. While on the one hand it might be said that any or all of these outcomes were beneficial, this breadth of reported change suggests that there is a need for clearer identification of what the indicators should be, whether there are priority impact areas, and where educational efforts would best be targeted. For example, consideration could be given to whether knowledge or skills improvement, or behaviour change in an individual school pupil is an equal indicator of success to an adult inspired to run cooking sessions in their community, or an institution setting up a cooking club or putting a healthy option on the menu.

4.2 Reach
Overall, marketing and communications have important roles to play in making sure the Cooking Bus meets ‘reach’ goals i.e. by motivating target groups to apply for a visit and in encouraging adult participants (teachers and others in the community) to take part in sessions.

4.2.1 The selection process
The application form gathers the information for selecting visits against priority criteria such as level of multiple deprivation and plans to sustain the impact of the Cooking Bus over the longer term. In future, it will be important to monitor the
degree to which both the selection process and criteria reach the agreed target groups. The information in the application form can be used to facilitate this; but only if the provider states clearly why an application was successful, pending or rejected (which is not currently done). A more defined decision making framework for the selection process, together with the provision of structured feedback to applicants on the reasons for their success or otherwise would not only help monitor the achievement of priority group targets but would also support previously unsuccessful applicants with the ways in which they could update submissions to become successful. It was agreed in 2008 that priority would be given to sending the Cooking Bus to schools and community groups in areas of multiple deprivation. Given the continued focus in current policy to reducing health inequalities, it seems likely that targeting these communities should also continue to be a priority.

4.2.2 Reaching those in socially deprived communities
Limitations to the analysis of Cooking Bus reach by SIMD (i.e. the SIMD was calculated using the Cooking Bus visit postcode rather than those of participants) meant that analysis provided only a suggestive indication of the extent to which reach targets had been achieved to date. In order to get more accurate reporting in future, the postcode and SIMD of all participating schools and community groups could be recorded. To improve on SIMD as a means of indicating level of multiple deprivation would require the use of another criterion that was based on the actual population of a school or community group, rather than on its exact location.

Although we should treat it with caution, SIMD analysis of Cooking Bus visits suggested areas of multiple deprivation were not reached to a greater extent than other areas. This was due to the low numbers of applications coming from deprived areas. In order to meet reach targets in future there will need to be either more applications in total from which to select those in the target groups (as a result of increased or more effective marketing activity generally), or more applications from these particular groups (the result of better targeted marketing activity).

4.2.3 Reaching community groups
Fewer than fifteen applications were received from community groups and as a result targets for community group participation were not met.

Evidence from local authority stakeholders stressed the key communication role played by their local authority officers in recruiting for and coordinating Cooking Bus visits to community groups. These officers had identified local projects, initiatives and community groups and informed them of the benefits of participating in the programme. Similarly, evidence from interviewing community group contacts underlined the importance of having a locally well-networked person, at community level, who was involved in successfully applying for and organising a Cooking Bus visit. Greater effort in identifying and motivating these
people has the potential to improve the targeting and reach of the Cooking Bus among community groups.

Evidence suggested there is also an opportunity to encourage stronger partnership working between schools and community groups as a means of promoting information sharing about the Cooking Bus and the potential also to facilitate joint applications and increase community participation rates.

Comments by some applicants confirmed that the physical presence of the Cooking Bus inspired neighbouring schools or groups to ask for a visit. This impact could be increased by obtaining as much media coverage as possible. Press releases promoting the Cooking Bus were sent to visited schools and groups but were used to varying degrees. Greater clarity about the purpose and use of the press release would potentially enhance local press coverage and therefore local public awareness, which could in turn increase applications for visits as well as individual participation.

Many of the people who were recorded as community participants on the Cooking Bus had taken part in visits organised by and to schools. Of course, schools interact with other members of the community and this has been an opportunity for wider community participation in the Cooking Bus when visiting a location. Encouraging this interaction is potentially one method of improving community participation rates. In particular, it might be a way of reaching people who are not already part of an organised group. A future programme could plan to maximise this interaction through marketing activity in order to help meet any community ‘reach’ targets.

4.2.4 Encouraging increased participation by teachers
The ratio of teachers participating in Cooking Bus sessions did not meet the targets set (teachers were to be 25% of all participants up to 2011, 50% from 2011). Given that since the start of the programme only one of the nine sessions in a typical school visit was intended for teachers, it is unclear how either target could have been met. A review should be certain that the detailed programme and composition of sessions is capable of delivering such targets i.e. a participation target of 25% teachers will obviously require that 25% of all Cooking Bus sessions are provided for and filled with teachers.

The evaluation also identified other issues regarding teacher participation. Schools were generally able to fill all the Cooking Bus sessions for pupils, but it was clear from the records available that some CPD sessions did not operate at capacity. Consideration therefore should be given to ways of emphasising to schools the importance of filling CPD sessions (and that this might involve inviting and motivating teachers from other local schools) and on how to encourage individual teachers to attend. Given that professional participants in the Cooking Bus, including those invited to CPD sessions, invariably reported a very positive experience and claimed they had learned more than they had
expected, it should be possible to communicate the benefits that potential participants could expect from CPD sessions in a way that inspires them to attend. These points would also usefully be borne in mind when considering the types of impact and target groups that might be prioritised in maximising the legacy of the Cooking Bus.

4.2.5 Encouraging adult participation
The evaluation found attitudinal, situational and institutional barriers (Cross, 1981) to adults’ participation in the Cooking Bus. Parents with young children were reported by contacts as being less able to attend due to a lack of available childcare facilities, and this illustrated one situational barrier to which application and visit planning processes could consider and respond to in future. Similarly, it was reported that the majority of sessions being held during the working day made it very difficult for working adults to participate. This is one example of an ‘institutional’ (or delivery-related) barrier to participation that could be considered in the update of the detailed programme and composition of sessions. Better consideration of childcare support by contacts during the planning of visits, as well as (at a programme level) a rescheduling of community sessions to the evening (or out with standard working hours) could improve the accessibility of the Cooking Bus.

In addition, attitudinal barriers were reported in the form of a lack of understanding by adults from both the school and community settings of the format and benefits of participating. Examples such as an expectation that the format would be one of a traditional ‘lesson’, or a fear of a lack of confidence in literacy being exposed, illustrate some of the issues that could prevent adults attending the Cooking Bus. It was found that experience of the Cooking Bus itself, either firsthand or reported locally, reassured the public of the nature and value of taking part in a session. Addressing these barriers would be considered in future communications, by both the Cooking Bus provider with successful applicants, as well as by successful applicants (contacts) with potential participants. Messages which gave insight and reassurance for example, into the very practical nature of the sessions and that teaching was by demonstration, could be sent out ahead of a visit for contacts to use to encourage participation. Posters and leaflets would be possible delivery mechanisms worth considering as would a suggestion to encourage verbal cascading of information, for example, talks at established groups such as Mothers and Toddlers.

Providing childcare, delivering evening sessions, and offering information and reassurance in advance about what to expect of a Cooking Bus session could improve participation and accessibility.
4.3 Perceptions of delivery of the Cooking Bus

4.3.1 The application process
Contacts interviewed in this evaluation reported few difficulties in completing the application form for a Cooking Bus visit, dependent on the confidence and skills of the applicant with regard to planning the logistics and legacy of a visit. However, where problems arose they were usually resolved by telephone discussion with the Cooking Bus provider, or knowing the right local contacts to provide supporting information. To ensure that the application process is made as accessible as possible, information on points such as useful contacts to help with form completion, as well as the level of detail required, would usefully be included in an updated application form. This would likely facilitate form completion and help to prevent any potential applicants from becoming discouraged from applying.

4.3.2 The Cooking Bus sessions
Both the Cooking Bus facilities and teaching methods were very positively received in the feedback forms and qualitative interviews, indicating that no changes to either were desired. High response rates, reporting that the feedback form is easy to complete, and the ability of quantitative, scaled questions to accurately measure these aspects of the Cooking Bus, suggest that this data gathering method can continue to be used with confidence. It also indicates that the faxback mechanism is fit for purpose, although consideration could be given to alternative response routes that would further improve the response rate. However, as feedback forms are completed by one contact per visit on behalf of participants, consideration could be given as to how the accuracy of data on participant responses to the Cooking Bus experience might be improved as well as more systematically collected.

4.3.3 Provision and use of written materials
Written materials, apart from posters on the internal walls, were not used in the Cooking Bus sessions and evidence from this evaluation did not suggest that this approach should change. Participants did, however, take away the recipes of the dishes they had made during cooking sessions and there was some feedback in qualitative interviews that this helped positive behaviour change by encouraging participants to cook these healthy dishes again. Participants were also given literature, relevant to the aims of the Cooking Bus, to take home with them. However, there was no monitoring of the materials distributed or of their value or appeal to participants and data on their impact were very limited. There is an opportunity to match distributed literature with the needs of different target groups, for example, leaflets about how to set up a cooking club for community group contacts. The introduction of a more reliable system for supplying this literature would also be beneficial.
4.4 Cooking Bus impact and legacy

4.4.1 Immediate impact
Qualitative research conducted for this evaluation indicated that participation in the Cooking Bus had a positive impact, meeting the knowledge and skills improvement objectives as understood and agreed by the individual contacts that had organised the visits. However, apart from this qualitative feedback there was no other source for this information. The effectiveness of the Cooking Bus in meeting key aims, for example, of improving knowledge of nutrition, improving cooking skills and confidence in cooking was not monitored on a continuous basis; there were no questions relating to these in the feedback form. The feedback form could be a suitable vehicle for regular data gathering on the extent to which these aims had been met. It could be achieved with the addition of appropriate ratings and with minimal impact on response timescales. Measuring outcomes among participants and not just contacts would also provide more insight into the effectiveness of the Cooking Bus. Questions should be target group appropriate; for example those taking part in CPD sessions could be asked to rate their confidence in sharing their learning with pupils; pupils themselves could be asked how much they believed their knowledge of healthy eating had improved as a consequence of their participation in a Cooking Bus session.

4.4.2 Continued use of healthy recipes and ingredients
As well as introducing participants to healthy ingredients and dishes, it was an aim of the Cooking Bus to encourage behaviour change at the individual, familial and institutional levels; motivating participants to continue to cook and eat healthy dishes after the visit. A discussion emerged in the qualitative interviews around whether the dishes produced, and ingredients used, on the Cooking Bus should be more or less familiar to participants, to encourage cooking them again at home or in class. The majority view was that there was added appeal and confidence building through cooking with more interesting ingredients or dishes. This suggests that the less everyday recipes and ingredients should continue to be used on the Cooking Bus. The evaluation also found that providing the cost of the recipe and demonstrating local availability of ingredients might overcome any concerns about the accessibility of the dishes, and further encourage continued use of these recipes.

4.4.3 Longer-term impact or legacy
Stakeholders and Cooking Bus staff confirmed the widespread recognition at the outset of the programme that, for lasting behaviour change to be achieved, it would be critical for impact to be sustained after the visit. The application form sought an outline from applicants of how they intended to do this; these plans were considered in the selection criteria for applications. Contacts interviewed for this evaluation suggested that commitment to sustaining the Cooking Bus legacy was a reasonable request and that plans for this should be taken into account in securing a visit. This suggests that a greater insistence on providing plans for long term impact will not be resisted or become a barrier to applying for
a visit. However, for those unsure of what might constitute an acceptable legacy plan, such that barriers might emerge, more advice could usefully be given by the Cooking Bus provider. Clearer guidance to applicants on the types of agreed, desired outcomes and the relative importance of each one would help make the selection process for visits more consistent and more likely to result in visits that have the desired longer-term outcomes.

Immediately after a Cooking Bus visit, contacts were asked in the feedback form what arrangements were in place to sustain impact; analysis of their responses showed that these arrangements tended to be more general than specific and this may in part be in response to the examples provided on the form. Completing this question could itself be a good opportunity to direct contacts towards desired legacy plans by offering appropriate options. Options suggested on the forms would benefit from being revised in light of policy review and updated targeting strategies. Pre-existing plans from the application process could be refined after the visit, when contacts have gained more insight into ideal facilities and effective teaching during Cooking Bus sessions. At this stage, contacts would also be well placed to identify any support they might require to implement their plans.

Other than the immediate post-visit feedback, there was no follow-up to determine if any plans had been implemented by schools or community groups. Because of this there was no measure available on the extent to which the legacy of the Cooking Bus had been sustained. This was a substantial gap in assessing the longer-term effectiveness in the Cooking Bus programme and one that should be considered when developing future programme monitoring and evaluation systems.

Data collection to measure legacy could be undertaken through the use of a short form sent out approximately twelve months after the Cooking Bus visit to determine if plans to continue the legacy of the Cooking Bus have been put into practice. If legacy plans were not being progressed, support could be provided at this stage.

One area that follow up exploration of legacy could include is the use of COOKITs, which emerged in interviews as facilitating Cooking Bus legacy. Where cooking clubs and classes were reported to have been set up, the COOKITs were identified as an invaluable aid. However, in some instances other contacts did not know if and how the COOKITs were being used, particularly when they had been distributed to other schools or community groups. This sharing of COOKITs would usefully be taken into account if including COOKITs’ use as a measure of legacy.

---

15 Examples provided in the feedback form were: more cooking in the curriculum; more confidence to develop food as part of Design and Technology; championing Focus on Food Week Tastebud Challenge; developing better resources to support food teaching.
A number of barriers to legacy were identified by contacts, for example a lack of cooking facilities which meant the sort of healthy cooking experienced on the Cooking Bus could not be replicated. Some of these barriers could potentially be overcome with information support before, during and after the visit. For example, guidance on how to equip and set up cooking clubs in schools and community settings could be provided. Supplying this support before a visit e.g. in application guidelines, would help potential applicants better understand what is involved in the various legacy options that could also usefully be outlined at this stage. Providing it during the visit would allow Cooking Bus staff to discuss the information with the contact if appropriate.

The limitations of existing data collection systems have already been discussed with regard to capturing participant feedback. One further limitation of current data collection was also evident when several schools or groups had taken part in a visit to one location. While the contact might know if there had been an organisational change such as setting up a cooking club, they were less be able to comment on the facilitators, barriers and additional needs of other schools or groups. Recording each of the different groups and schools taking part in a visit; and formally identifying an individual from each as a contact would provide more accurate monitoring and measuring of this sort of longer-term impact.

4.5. Cost effectiveness
4.5.1 Improving future cost monitoring of events
The Cooking Bus provider identified additional costs in sending the Cooking Bus to an event, over and above those incurred in a regular visit to a school or community group. Some events, such as The Royal Highland Show, often charged fees. In addition, participant numbers were not always as high as at a regular visit to schools or community groups, resulting in a greater cost per participant.

There was some difficulty identifying what was exclusively an event rather than a community group visit linked to an event. Clearly identifying which visits are to be classed as events is important in deciding how to input costs into the overall financial analysis and allow a more accurate measurement of the cost of these different types of visit against agreed objectives.

4.5.2 Maximising Cooking Bus efficiency
Analysis of the Cooking Bus schedule, as well as interviews with Cooking Bus staff, identified several opportunities to improve efficiency; these essentially involve minimising downtime. The Cooking Bus could be deployed for more weeks in the year, more days in the week (perhaps a weekend day) and more hours in the day. Of course, these suggestions themselves have implications particularly for staffing levels and thus a higher total budget, albeit a more efficient one.
An efficiency that could be pursued at little or no extra cost is to make sure that the Cooking Bus sessions are filled to capacity every time (as is usually the case with the school pupils’ sessions). This would require more effort by the contacts, supported by improved Cooking Bus engagement activities such as communicating the benefits of participation to individuals, as outlined earlier in section 4.2.

4.6 Future monitoring and evaluation of the Cooking Bus
It has been recognised earlier in the report that quantitative data sources used in this evaluation were not designed for this purpose and therefore did not always record the required information in the most appropriate way. Specific data shortcomings and the means of addressing these in future monitoring and evaluation have been discussed in more detail earlier in this report.\(^{16}\)

In summary, accurate and effective monitoring in the future would require that:

- Data collection methods are designed to monitor the agreed aims and objectives of the programme, for example the immediate impact of the Cooking Bus on knowledge of nutrition; implementation of legacy plans.
- Data collection methods are designed to capture the level of achievement of outcomes for the programme, applicants, and participants. This would usefully consider the immediate and longer-term legacy of a Cooking Bus visit.
- Recorded data are fit for purpose, for example, updating existing systems to allow future evaluation of the actual Cooking Bus reach of those living in areas of multiple deprivation.

\(^{16}\) See 4.1.2 – effectiveness of recruitment and marketing methods; 4.1.3, 4.3.2, 4.4.1 – capturing participant feedback; 4.4.3 – measuring legacy.
5. Conclusions & recommendations

This evaluation concludes that the Cooking Bus is a high quality facility using teaching methods that were reported to be effective, enjoyable and often inspiring. It can contribute to meeting current Scottish Government policy priorities by improving school and community participants’ cooking skills, nutritional knowledge, understanding of food safety and hygiene and increased confidence in food handling.

Qualitative and quantitative data provided very positive input about the degree to which intended outcomes of the Cooking Bus, such as improvements to knowledge and/or skills, have been met although it was recognised that the conclusions drawn had some limitations. With these and wider learning points from the programme delivery in mind, a number of recommendations have been developed to better plan, deliver and evaluate the Cooking Bus programme in future. These relate to:

- A review of the Cooking Bus aims, objectives and outcomes, linking with Scottish Government health policy priorities, in the context of those target groups that would benefit most from the Cooking Bus, to ensure ongoing policy relevance and to provide a framework for future evaluation.
- Developing a marketing and communications strategy for the Cooking Bus, to optimise its reach.
- Encouraging more detailed planning by Cooking Bus applicants and supporting the implementation of these plans to enhance the immediate and longer term impact of a visit.
- Introducing efficiencies that will lower the cost per head.
- Ensuring appropriate data systems are in place to monitor outcomes.

The evaluation was asked to consider five aspects of the Cooking Bus programme and the recommendations that arose in relation to each are given below.

**Recommendations about Cooking Bus development and implementation**

Recommendation 1: Undertake a strategic review that confirms and clarifies the Cooking Bus aims, objectives and outcomes in the context of current policy priorities. Update data monitoring systems to allow appropriate future evaluation of the achievement of aims and objectives.

Recommendation 2: On completion of Recommendation 1, reconsider and explicitly identify target groups that will inform the achievement of updated aims and objectives. Set priorities and ratios, as well as indicators, of target groups e.g. school pupils, teachers, and community participants.

Recommendation 3: Review the current approach to marketing that incorporates clear Cooking Bus branding and consideration of the target groups, including the role of events. Define awareness raising and recruitment objectives in line with
Recommendations 1 and 2. Monitor the source of awareness of the Cooking Bus to help measure marketing activities’ effectiveness.

**Recommendations about the reach of the Cooking Bus**
Recommendation 4: To maximise the reach of a Cooking Bus visit and therefore its impact, provide guidance on the ways that applicants might form local partnerships with other eligible target groups (school or community), as well as the contact details of locally networked individuals that might help establish these where they do not already exist.

Recommendation 5: Provide information and materials to contacts prior to a visit that are easy to use and provide insights about the Cooking Bus experience as a means of motivating potential participants, especially adults. These materials should also communicate the purpose and importance of local promotion of the Cooking Bus.

Recommendation 6: To ensure that the cooking bus programme is as accessible as possible, give consideration to practical ways through which barriers to access can be removed.

**Recommendations about teaching facilities, methods and support materials**
Recommendation 7: To maximise the educational value of visits, continue to utilise highly skilled and engaging teaching staff that use effective teaching methods with participants. No changes are necessary to the Cooking Bus facilities.

Recommendation 8: To continue to add value to the Cooking Bus experience and ensure relevance to programme objectives and target groups, review the content and supply of support materials provided at the end of each visit. Consider methods for ongoing assessment and review of their effectiveness with target groups.

Recommendation 9: To continue to maximise repeat use of recipes and therefore behaviour change, continue to provide them to participants. To improve opportunities for repeat use further and to demonstrate accessibility, provide information on the cost and the local availability of ingredients.

**Recommendations about programme impact and outcomes**
Recommendation 10: In order to better capture immediate and longer term impact of updated Cooking Bus aims, objectives and outcomes (Recommendation 1), review and improve existing data collection mechanisms for use with contacts and participants.

Recommendation 11: To maximise longer term impact and its evaluation, identify (after implementation of Recommendations 1 and 2) achievable and appropriate
ways of sustaining the Cooking Bus legacy from the application to post-visit stages. Twelve months post-visit, review progress of legacy plans including the use of COOKITs, as well as identify and respond to applicants’ support requirements.

**Recommendations about cost effectiveness**

Recommendation 12: To improve the efficiency of the Cooking Bus and lower cost per participant, maximise the number of visits, sessions and participants per session.

Recommendation 13: On implementation of Recommendations 1-3, and to allow more robust evaluation of activities’ cost effectiveness in future, update data monitoring systems to categorise visits by primary purpose and to categorise costs including marketing activities.
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Appendices
Appendix 1: Target group qualitative sample distribution

Community setting sample
Ten interviews with contacts in total:
- Three were visited in 2009; four in 2010; three in 2011.
- In nine local authorities.
- Three in SIMD quintile 1; three in quintile 2; one in quintile 3; two in quintile 4; one in quintile 5.
- Nine urban; one rural.

School setting sample
Twenty-three interviews with contacts in total
- Eight in secondary schools.
- Fifteen in primary schools.
- Eight were visited in 2008; four in 2009; five in 2010; six in 2011.
- In 19 local authorities.
- Five in SIMD quintile 1; seven in quintile 2; five in quintile 3; three in quintile 4; two in quintile 5.
- Sixteen urban; seven rural and semi rural.
Appendix 2: Analysis of free school meal entitlement data

Free school meal (FSM) entitlement is often used as an indicator of the level of social deprivation in schools and so it was examined as a further means to assess Cooking Bus reach of schools in socially deprived areas. However, the Cooking Bus was not set any FSM entitlement reach goals. Moreover, with only 49 of the 207 schools who participated in Cooking Bus supplying FSM entitlement information, data were extremely limited and so no conclusions about reach have been drawn using them. Findings from this FSM entitlement analysis are detailed below.

Data in Appendix Table 1 indicated that with around half the Cooking Bus school visits to those with an above average FSM entitlement it may not be reaching those in socially deprived areas in greater proportions than the population as a whole. Average entitlement in Scotland in 2008 and 2009 was 15%, rising to 18% in 2010 with new qualification criteria. (Scottish Government)

Appendix Table 1: Cooking Bus visits (2008-11) by free school meal entitlement (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage free school meal entitlement</th>
<th>Percentage free school meal entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-15% of pupils</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30% of pupils</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31+% of pupils</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: visits to schools with identifiable FSM entitlement, (n=49)
Source: Cooking Bus visit application forms.
Appendix 3: Participant information sheet and consent form

Cooking Bus (Scotland) Evaluation November/December 2011

Participant Information Sheet

Invitation
You are being asked to take part in a research study – either as part of a small discussion group or in an individual depth interview. Before you decide whether or not to take part it is important for you to understand why research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully.

What is the study about?
NHS Health Scotland in its role of providing support to improve the health of Scotland, in partnership with national and local, statutory and voluntary organisations, have commissioned an evaluation of the effectiveness of the Cooking Bus. The Cooking Bus makes visits to schools and community groups and organises activities to enhance people's cooking knowledge and skills.

The study consists of analysis of Evaluation forms and a series of in-depth interviews which will be conducted over the next month for feedback from those who have either had a role in setting up and running the Cooking Bus or have experienced it.

Why have I been asked to take part?
You have been invited to participate in this study because we think you would be able to add to the variety of views we are trying to get about the Cooking Bus. We are hoping to interview, in depth, several people from a variety of locations across Scotland who have been involved in setting up the Cooking Bus, or in bringing it to schools and communities, or who have participated in it.

Do I have to take part?
No, it is up to you whether you take part or not. If you do take part you are still free to withdraw at any time and without giving a reason.

What does taking part involve?
If you take part you will be invited to join either one of a number of small groups (no more than 4 people in each group) for a discussion, or to take part in an individual interview, for your thoughts and opinions about the Cooking Bus. The one-off meeting would take 1 hour of your time if in a discussion with others or 30 minutes if a one-to-one interview. If you would like to take part in this study a date, time and place will be arranged shortly.

The meeting would be audio recorded so that the research team do not have to rely only on their memories of the discussion. The researcher may also jot down notes during the meeting to help them conduct the discussion or interview.
You would be asked to sign a consent form for the research (saying that you agree for your comments to be included in the study). You would be given a copy of this form to keep.

Is there any benefit to me taking part?
There will be no direct benefit of taking part, although we hope participants will enjoy participating in the research. Generally though, the aim is that this research will help us to make improvements to the Cooking Bus.

Will what I say be kept confidential?
Yes, all information collected about you will be kept strictly confidential and will only be used for research purposes. You will not be identified in the analysis or reporting. We may use anonymised quotes from participants in the report to support more general findings. Only members of the research team will have access to the data, which will be stored securely at Margaret Reid Research & Planning offices. Any personal details will be destroyed on completion of the project. Information that you give us will be kept for a period of 7 years and then securely destroyed.

What will we do with the results?
The findings will be used to make adjustments and improvements to the Cooking Bus (Scotland). They will be written up into a report which will be published on the NHS Health Scotland website, where you will be able to read them.

Has the study been reviewed?
Because it is an evaluation, this type of study does not need formal ethical review and approval.

Contacts for further information
If you have any questions about the study or wish to withdraw at any time, please feel free to contact Margaret Reid (details below). If you would like any other information or have any concerns about the study, then please contact Claire Hislop (details below).

Thank you

Researcher: Margaret Reid; 01848 331 051; margaret.reid@btinternet.com
Independent advisor to project: Claire Hislop, Development Manager - Food & Health; NHS Health Scotland; Tel: 0131 313 7580; claire.hislop@nhs.net
As part of this study, we are asking you to take part in a one-to-one interview or discussion group.

All information that you give us will be used for research purposes only, be anonymised and held securely by Margaret Reid Research & Planning.

Feel free to contact Margaret Reid or Claire Hislop (see details below) if you wish to ask any questions.

Please initial box

1. I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet for the study dated November/December 2011 and have had the chance to ask questions.

2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving a reason.

3. I agree to take part in this study

Please tick box

Yes No

4. I agree to the interview being audio recorded.

5. I agree to the use of anonymised quotes in publications.

____________________            _____________   ________________________
Participant name                          Date                                Signature

___________________       _____________      ________________________
Researcher                                              Date                                  Signature

Researcher: Margaret Reid; 01848 331 051; margaret.reid@btinternet.com
Independent advisor to project: Claire Hislop, Development Manager - Food & Health; NHS Health Scotland; Tel: 0131 313 7580; claire.hislop@nhs.net
Appendix 4: Staff and contact feedback forms

STAFF VISIT EVALUATION FORM

I. GENERAL ARRANGEMENTS
Name of school
Date of visit
Name and position of school contact

Date of first contact
Telephone demeanour
School's assessment of Bus access was

Actual quality of access

The site for parking was

Driver/technician facilities

ARRIVAL OF THE BUS
Did the contact visit The Cooking Bus
Did the headteacher visit the Cooking Bus

COOKING BUS 6
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COOKING BUS VISIT EVALUATION FAX BACK FORM

Full Name of School: Date of visit:

Address:

Telephone: E-mail:

Please rate the following on a scale of 1 – 5 (1 = poor, 5 = very good).

1. Preparation before the visit:
   - The written information sent to you:
     [Rating options: Poor □ □ □ □ □ Very good □ □ □ □ □]
   - The telephone contact confirming your booking and the initial arrangements:
     [Rating options: Poor □ □ □ □ □ Very good □ □ □ □ □]
   - The Advisory Teacher’s planning of workshops with the school’s coordinator:
     [Rating options: Poor □ □ □ □ □ Very good □ □ □ □ □]

2. The standard of presentation of the Bus for teaching:
   [Rating options: Poor □ □ □ □ □ Very good □ □ □ □ □]
   - The standard of teaching during sessions:
     [Rating options: Poor □ □ □ □ □ Very good □ □ □ □ □]
   - The standard of the teacher training session/s:
     [Rating options: Poor □ □ □ □ □ Very good □ □ □ □ □]

3. Were the specific aims and objectives that were planned in advance with the Advisory Teacher achieved? Yes □ No □
   If no, please comment:
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

4. Safe food handling, hygiene and personal safety are of the utmost importance and run as ‘threads’ throughout the campaign’s workshops. How did you rate that coverage?
   [Rating options: Poor □ □ □ □ □ Very good □ □ □ □ □]

5. Pupils gained direct experience of making food on the Bus. How do you rate the standard of their finished products?
   [Rating options: Poor □ □ □ □ □ Very good □ □ □ □ □]

6. Please indicate the relevance of the sessions on the Cooking
7. How did you rate the success of the Cooking Bus visit overall? [ ] Poor [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] Very good

8. Please indicate how you intend to develop and sustain the impetus generated by the Cooking Bus visit to your school.

- More cooking in the curriculum
- More confidence to develop food as part of Design and Technology
- Championing Focus on Food Week Tastebud Challenge
- Developing better resources to support food teaching

9. Please use the space below to make additional comments about the Cooking Bus visit to your school.

10. Sometimes we like to make telephone contact to follow up, in a little more detail, the answers to the above questions. Please tick this box to confirm that you have no objections to possibly being contacted by telephone.

- [ ] No objection to being contacted
- [ ] Please do not contact me

Signed: ……………………………………… ………….  Designation: …………………………………………...

Please print your name: …………………………..….… Date: ……………………………………………………

THANK YOU. Please fax back to 01422 341148

Office Use Only
Date of Cooking Bus visit (week starting): / /10  Specify Cooking Bus:
Appendix 5: Discussion guides

Cooking Bus discussion guide - stakeholders

Introduction – reiterate what is covered by the consent sheet i.e. purpose of the study; what is expected of the respondents; reassurance on confidentiality and anonymity.

Background
How would you describe your relationship to Cooking Bus and your role, if any, in its set up/development/ongoing work?

Origins and aims
Can you tell me a bit about (your understanding of) how the Cooking Bus (Scotland) initiative came about – what was the rationale behind it? What were its origins? What prompted it? What were its key aims from the outset? Have these changed in any way? And expectations for it?

Chance to express, early in the discussion, overall opinion
Can you sum up your overall opinion of the Cooking Bus (Scotland) project. In general, have aims and expectations been met? Overall what do you see as the challenges going forward? What would you say would make the Cooking bus a success as an initiative? What would be a good indicator to say that the investment in the CB was worthwhile? What key changes, if any, would you make to optimise its effectiveness and success?

Role and remit
Can you describe the reasons for targeting both schools and community groups Did you experience any specific issues in ‘planning’ visits to either of these settings? Probe on issues How different, if at all, is the role and remit of the Bus for each setting and why? The Cooking Bus also visits Events – can you tell me a bit about its role here; how Events were identified as a setting for the Bus; the objectives of these visits and whether they are met. Probe for details on what has made one Event more successful than another.

Delivery and outcomes
Would you describe how the Cooking Bus has developed and been delivered? And what has facilitated the planning and implementation processes? What have been the main barriers? Probe fully on emerging issues.
What do you see as the key outcomes for the Cooking Bus and what kind of behavioural changes would you hope to see as a result of Cooking Bus visits? (Some Stakeholders will have been more involved than others and can give detail on this.) Could you give me more detail on whether the aims and ambitions of the Cooking Bus have been met? Probe for detail. What have been its biggest successes? Why? Tell me a bit about targeting the Cooking Bus? In what settings and with whom has it been best received? Go into detail on specific issues with appropriate Stakeholders:
- on application process;
- on development and distribution of COOKITS;
- on menu development and suitability for the target audiences
• how were materials for use on the Bus selected? Were they consistently used/distributed?
• on the efficiency of the Bus i.e. could it make more visits or engage with more groups at each visit? Is the bus promoted or is there any co-ordination with other schools and groups when the bus is in situ so that its use is maximised? What determines it being at optimal levels of use (e.g. funding, numbers and timings of applications)?

And make sure best practice or any suggested improvements are captured.
Has the Cooking Bus had the right levels of ‘support’ from the right organisations to optimise its effectiveness? Probe appropriately for details if yes or no in response.
(Support can mean positive partnership working, financial support, etc.)
Probe for more on partnership working in schools and with community groups – how well did this proceed? Probe for examples of best practice? How could this be improved?
What is your perspective on the communications strategy of the Cooking Bus?
If not already covered in detail, what would you like to see changed, if anything, to make the Cooking Bus better able to meet its aims and objectives? Probe for details.

Legacy
In what ways has the Cooking Bus made a difference to the target groups it reached?
Probe for details on aims such as improved knowledge and skills.
Have there been any unforeseen or incremental benefits to participants – what are they?
And any for Cooking Bus partners?
How could this legacy be enhanced?

Costs
As appropriate ask about details of funding/expenditure data.
Is the Cooking Bus good value for money in your opinion? On what basis or criteria have you arrived at this viewpoint? If you could, would you change anything to make it more cost effective? Have any changes been implemented since inception to make the Cooking Bus more cost effective? Probe for details.
Very specifically, probe for details on costs/sales data for COOKITS.

Monitoring
When setting up and implementing an initiative of this kind what type of data do you think should be collected routinely?
Do you know what monitoring/data collection has taken place?
(Ask of those who claim to know what data is collected.)
Is the data collection system and monitoring and review process for the Cooking Bus as good as it could be in your view? If not, what changes are required to make it so?

Summing up
Can you sum up with your thoughts on the key achievements of planning and delivering the Cooking Bus (Scotland)?
And what have been the challenges – past or ongoing?
If you were to go through the process again what would you do/expect to be done differently?
Is there anything else you want to tell me about the Cooking Bus that I haven’t asked you about?

Thank you
Discussion guide - staff

Introduction – reiterate what is covered by the consent sheet i.e. purpose of the study; what is expected of the respondents; reassurance on confidentiality and anonymity.

Background
How would you describe your relationship to Cooking Bus and your role (if any) in its development; and your role in its ongoing delivery?

Chance to express, early in the discussion, overall opinion
In general, have aims and expectations been met? Overall what do you see as the challenges going forward? What would you say would make the Cooking Bus a success as an initiative? What would be a good indicator to say that the investment in the CB was worthwhile? What key changes, if any, would you make to optimise its effectiveness and success? Can you sum up your overall opinion of the Cooking Bus (Scotland) project.

Role and remit
Can you describe the reasons for targeting both schools and community groups. How different, if at all, is the role and remit of the Bus for each setting and why? The Cooking Bus also visits Events – can you tell me a bit about its role here; how Events were identified as a setting for the Bus; the objectives of these visits and whether they are met. Probe for details on what has made one Event more successful than another.

Delivery and outcomes
Would you describe how the Cooking Bus has been delivered and (as appropriate, been developed)? And what has facilitated the planning and implementation processes? What have been the main barriers? Probe fully on emerging issues. What do you see as the key outcomes for the Cooking Bus and what kind of behavioural changes would you hope to see as a result of Cooking Bus visits? Could you give me more detail on whether the aims and ambitions of the Cooking Bus have been met? Probe for detail. What have been its biggest successes? Why? In what settings and with whom has it been best received? Why do you think this is the case? (Some Staff will have been more involved and have more responsibility for some issues than others and provide feedback accordingly.)

Go into detail on specific issues with appropriate Staff:
Application process and getting the Bus on site: describe this and how well it works; barriers to applications proceeding; and what might have ensured success i.e. participation in the Bus; suggestions for improvements? This will also cover process issues once the application has been accepted and a visit agreed.

Reach: detailed description of reasons for who was reached and who was not. Barriers and facilitators to groups attending?

Communications: How were aims and remit of the Bus articulated to target groups? Could improvements be made here? How, if at all, are equality targets who do not tend to ‘group’ formally e.g. LGBT individuals, engaged? Is the Bus promoted with other schools and groups when it is on site? Probe for details.
Facilities offered by the Cooking Bus:
How well do you think the facilities on the Cooking Bus support the provision of new (or practicing of existing) cooking skills with the school or community groups?. Make sure the following areas are covered:

**COOKITS**: strengths; any weaknesses; improvements; with regards to contents, increasing/improving usage when distributed, perceived value for money.

**Written and other materials** (other than COOKITS) used on the Bus. This will also cover Menu development.
Describe and give your opinions of these materials.
How were they used?
How were they distributed?
Do they meet target group needs?
Do you have any suggested improvements of the materials?
In your opinion, are there any gaps in the provision of useful support materials for people that visit the Cooking Bus, either for use by staff on the Bus or for distribution to participant organisations/individuals?

**Efficiency of the Bus**: could it make more visits or engage with more groups at each visit? Is the bus promoted enough or is there any co-ordination with other schools and groups when the bus is in situ so that its use is maximised?
What would make its use more efficient and effective from the Driver’s perspective/Co-ordinator’s perspective?
What do you think determines the Bus being at optimal levels of use (e.g. funding, numbers and timings of applications)?

**Partnership working and communications at delivery level**:
Has the Cooking Bus had the right levels of ‘support’ from the right organisations to optimise its effectiveness? Probe appropriately for details if yes or no in response. Probe for more on partnership working in schools and with community groups – how well did this proceed? Probe for examples of best practice. How could this be improved?
What is your perspective on the communications strategy of the Cooking Bus?
Aim to ensure best practice or any suggested improvements are captured.

**Legacy**
In what ways has the Cooking Bus made a difference to the target groups it reached?
Probe for details – as far as Staff are able to comment - on:
- Improved knowledge, skills and/or attitudinal change
- Improved skills in food handling and preparation skills
- Improved knowledge of food issues such as nutrition, hygiene and recycling

Do you have any indication of target group behaviour change (in dietary behaviour and whether and how much any changes have been sustained).
Have there been any unforeseen or incremental benefits to participants – what are they?
And any for Cooking Bus partners?
If not already covered in detail, what would you like to see changed, if anything, to make the Cooking Bus better able to meet its aims and objectives? Probe for details.
Monitoring
When setting up and implementing an initiative of this kind what type of data do you think should be collected routinely?
Do you know what monitoring/data collection has taken place?
(Ask of those who claim to know what data is collected.)
Is the data collection system and monitoring and review process for the Cooking Bus as good as it could be in your view? If not, what changes are required to make it so?

Summing up
Can you sum up with your thoughts on the key achievements of planning and, in particular, delivering the Cooking Bus (Scotland)?
And what have been the challenges – past or ongoing?
What key improvements would you make to the Cooking Bus and why?
Is there anything else you want to tell me about the Cooking Bus that I haven’t asked you about?

Thank you

Target groups discussion guide – schools/community groups
NB: references to schools will be omitted when interviewing community group respondents
Introduction - reiterate what is covered by the consent sheet i.e. purpose of the study; what is expected of the respondents; reassurance on voluntary nature of taking part, confidentiality and anonymity.

Background
What was your involvement with the Cooking Bus? Did you also participate in a session?
What prompted you to apply for a visit from the bus? What did you know about the bus before you applied? Probe for details on word of mouth, contact from other organisations, any promotions or awareness raising activities.
Did you see the bus as contributing to any specific ongoing initiatives or activities that your group/school has been involved with e.g. such as healthy catering; cooking clubs. Or did you see the bus as helping you develop an initiative or activity e.g. to set up a cooking club or helping people source local healthy fresh ingredients? Probe for details Did you apply for a bus visit with other partner schools or organisations? Describe how this came about and how it proceeded? Barriers and facilitators.

Application process
Can you describe for the process in applying for the visit? How, if at all could this be improved? Could anything about the application process have been easier/more efficient/more positive?
And what about the process of agreeing details and organising the visit e.g. site needs, selection of pupils for participation/community participants etc.
Prompt – how easy or difficult was the process of selecting participants (perhaps of finding voluntary participants if a community group)? How did you decide?. Probe for details.
Did you promote the Bus to other local schools/groups on confirmation of a visit? If yes, give details of this.
The experience of the bus on site
To what extent did the bus meet your hopes and expectations? Describe how, if at all, it differed from what you were expecting or hoping to achieve with the visit (differed both positively and negatively).
Did the bus contribute to ongoing, or prompt new, cooking initiatives or ambitions and in what ways? I mean both as a school/community group and at the personal level for the attendees at your visit.
Tell me about the facilities offered by the Cooking Bus and the extent to which these met the needs of the schools/community groups involved regarding learning new (or practicing existing) cooking and food handling skills. Include support such as written materials in this description and assessment. Remind respondents of the facilities using visuals of the inside of the bus; and of the written materials used by teachers on the bus such as recipes. (For those who choose a phone interview, these will be itemised verbally.)
Did anyone in your group have any difficulties with the accessibility of the Bus? If so, how might this be improved?
What is your opinion of the teaching methods on the Cooking Bus? Did they:
- Meet the skills and knowledge objectives as you understood them (As necessary probe for more detail on this understanding covering):
- Improved skills in food handling and preparation skills
- Improved knowledge, skills and/or attitudinal change such as increased confidence
- Improved knowledge of food issues such as nutrition/healthy eating, hygiene and recycling.
- Suit the current knowledge and experience levels of the participants – pupils; teachers; parents; specific community group participants? Probe – for example were the recipes and ingredients accessible to participants.
What, if any, written materials were used or referred to during the session – for example was the Eatwell plate used? How useful were these materials?
Describe and give me your opinion of the written materials that participants took away with them? How were they subsequently used? Do they meet target group needs?
Do you have any suggested improvements of the materials?
In your opinion and with the participants in mind, are there any topics that the Cooking Bus materials don’t cover that you think they should?
(If COOKITS mentioned here – probe as per outlined later.)
Overall, how useful and effective is the Cooking Bus and the skills it teaches? How could the bus experience itself be improved?

Cooking Bus legacy
In what ways has the Cooking Bus made a difference to the participants? Describe the impact the Cooking Bus had on participants: Immediately – after x years since the visit? Any incremental/unforeseen benefits?
To what extent have the lessons and messages of the bus been sustained since participation? Are there any indications of behaviour change such as in diet? And have there been:
- Improved skills in food handling and preparation skills
- Improved knowledge, skills and/or attitudinal change such as increased confidence
- Improved knowledge of food issues such as nutrition/healthy eating, hygiene and recycling
If participants had been motivated to change what they ate/served their families as a result of the bus visit, what barriers, if any, were there that meant this change could not
take place? Prompt, for example, on affordability/local availability of recipe ingredients; access to cookery equipment needed, appeal of recipes to the family, etc.
What might be done differently to make behaviour change more likely or sustained?
School groups only: Describe how much and how well the cooking skills have been supported within the school curriculum.
To what extent has the healthy eating and other messages from the Cooking Bus been supported more broadly by the school/community group e.g. school/venue catering; contents of vending machines.
What has continued/been initiated in terms of ongoing cooking activities as a consequence of the bus visit?
Tell me about the use of the COOKITS.
How are they used? Is this ideal?
Describe how people access the COOKITS if the bus visit was a joint venture?
What is good about them e.g. in terms of contents; instructions; overall usability? And what improvements would you suggest? What would increase/improve usage and overall value of COOKITS.
Would the participants benefit from additional support to optimise the impact and benefits of the bus visit? What form would this take? Probe for comments/ideas on follow-up support as well as support at the visit.

Feedback
What did you think of the evaluation forms? Did they cover the right issues? Probe for details. (Forms will be available as prompts.)
How would/do you feel about providing additional feedback e.g. 6 months to a year after the visit? To capture the important information to help improve the Cooking Bus what should the questions cover at this later survey?

Summing up
Sum up for me your overall opinion of the bus and what it has contributed to improving the skills or changing the attitudes and behaviour of the participants.
Thank you.

Target groups discussion guide – community participants

Introduction - reiterate what is covered by the consent sheet i.e. purpose of the study; what is expected of the respondents; reassurance on confidentiality and anonymity.

Background
How did you hear about the Cooking Bus? What did you know about the bus before you took part in a session? Probe for details on word of mouth, contact from an organisation, any promotions or awareness raising activities.
Why did you decide to take part in the bus session? How did you get involved in taking part?
What made it easy to participate? And were there any difficulties or barriers that had to be overcome?
Describe the group that you were a part of (if any) e.g. mother and toddlers.
The experience of the bus on site
To what extent did the bus meet your hopes and expectations? Describe how, if at all, it differed from what you were expecting or hoping to achieve with the visit. Did you see the bus as contributing to any specific ongoing initiatives or activities that your group has been involved with e.g. sourcing local health fresh ingredients. Or did you see the bus as helping your group start an activity e.g. to set up a mother and toddlers cooking club. Probe for details. Has it prompted you to do more personally in terms of healthy cooking? Probe for details. Tell me about the facilities offered by the Cooking Bus and the extent to which these met your needs and the needs of others in your group. Probe for details regarding learning new (or practicing existing) cooking and food handling skills. Include support such as written materials in this description and assessment. Remind respondents of the facilities using visuals of the inside of the bus; and of the written materials used by teachers on the bus such as recipes. What is your opinion of the teaching methods on the Cooking Bus? Probe with - did they help:
- Improve your skills in food handling and preparation skills. How? In what ways?
- Improve your knowledge or skills or change your attitude to cooking and food handling in any way e.g. increased confidence. Any other improvements?
- Improve your knowledge of food issues such as nutrition/healthy eating, hygiene and recycling. Can you give me examples of this.
- Did the teaching methods suit your level of experience and what you wanted and felt you needed to learn from the sessions? How? In what ways? /Why not?
- What, if any, written materials were used or referred to during the session – for example was the Eatwell plate used? How useful were these materials?
Describe and give me your opinion of the materials that you took away with you? Were they useful again? How were they used after that, if at all?
Do you have any suggested improvements of the materials?
In your opinion, are there any gaps in the support materials for people who take part in the Cooking Bus? What other information and in what formats would you like to be given?
Overall, how useful and effective is the Cooking Bus and the skills it teaches? How could the bus experience itself be improved?

Cooking Bus legacy
Has your experience on the Cooking Bus made a difference in the longer term to your cooking and food handling knowledge and skills and to what you eat? Describe what it has done for you or what you do now that you didn’t before? Could it have even more impact? How would this be achieved?
If no longer term impact – why do you think the Cooking Bus session has not made a difference over the longer term? Probe: were you inspired to change what you ate/served your family as a result of the bus visit? What made it difficult for you to make the changes? What would make long term changes more likely? Prompt, for example, on affordability/local availability of recipe ingredients; access to cookery equipment needed, appeal of recipes to the family, etc.
Any extra or unexpected benefits from taking part in the Cooking Bus?
For those with access to COOKITS: Tell me about the use of the COOKITS. How are they used? Is this ideal? What is good about them e.g. in terms of contents; instructions;
overall usability? And what improvements would you suggest? What would increase/improve usage and overall value of COOKITS.

Do you think you would have benefited from any additional support to get the most out of your bus visit? What form would this support take e.g. more meal ideas? Probe for comments/ideas on follow-up support as well as support at the visit.

Feedback
How would/do you feel about providing feedback e.g. just after the visit or 6 months to a year after the visit? To capture the important information to help improve the Cooking Bus what should the questions cover?

Summing up
Sum up for me your overall opinion of the bus and what it has contributed to improving your skills or changing how you feel about cooking and what you cook.

Thank you.

Target groups discussion guide – pupils
Introduction - reiterate what is covered by the consent sheet i.e. purpose of the study; what is expected of the respondents; reassurance on voluntary nature of taking part, confidentiality and anonymity. Make sure that parental permission to interview has been given.

Background
What did you know about the Cooking Bus before you took part in a session? Probe for details on what sort of information.descriptions the school provided.
How did you come to take part in the bus session? For example were you studying HE; did you volunteer or were you picked; are you part of a cooking group in school? (Some might not know why they were selected.)
Probe for any barriers/facilitators to attendance.

The experience of the bus on site
Was the bus what you were expecting or hoping for? In what ways was it just as you were expecting and how was it different?
Did the session on the bus help with any of your regular cooking activities at school? In what ways?
Did any new activities such as a cooking club start up after the bus visit? Probe for details.
Tell me about the facilities on the Cooking Bus (show photos of interiors to jog memories) and whether they were what you needed. Did you learn any new cooking or food handling skills? Or did you get a chance to use the skills you already had in new ways? What, if anything, did you learn about healthy eating? And about food hygiene? And anything about recycling? Probe for details each time.
Accessibility of the Bus (were there any issues, could things be presented better)?
What, if any, written materials were used or referred to during the session – for example was the Eatwell plate used? How useful were these materials?
Describe and give me your opinion of the materials that you took away with you? How did you use them again after that, if at all?
Thinking of the recipes in particular – did they suit what you like to eat and cook? Do you think they are affordable to cook at home? Have you used them again – probe for details.

Do you have any suggested improvements of the materials?

In your opinion, are there any topics that the Cooking Bus materials don’t cover that you think they should?

What other information and in what formats, if any, (such as leaflets, weblinks) would you like to be given?

What is your opinion of the teaching on the Cooking Bus? Overall, did you learn what you wanted to learn, or…?

Probe with - did they help: (NB first three probes have been covered earlier – this will be a chance to gain more detail as necessary.)

- Improve your skills in food handling and preparation skills. How? What did you learn? In what ways?
- Improve your knowledge of cooking and food handling in any way e.g. increased confidence. What did you learn? Any other improvements?
- Improve your knowledge of food issues such as nutrition, hygiene and recycling. Can you give me examples of what you learned?
- Did it change your attitude to cooking and food handling in any ways? Probe for details.
- Are there any things that you’ve changed or do differently in relation to food preparation (or cooking) after visiting the Bus and seeing its materials?
- Did the teaching suit what you felt you needed to learn? How? In what ways? /Why not?
- And did it suit what you wanted to learn? How? In what ways? /Why not?
- Did it suit your level of experience? How? In what ways? /Why not?

Overall, how useful has the Cooking Bus and the skills it teaches been to you? Did it work well in teaching you these skills or not? How could the bus experience itself (its layout, the materials it gives or the type of teaching you received) be improved?

**Cooking Bus legacy**

If skills and knowledge improvements noted earlier then ask: Are you still using the skills you learned on the Bus. Probe for details on this.

Describe what the session on the Cooking Bus has done for you or what you do now that you didn’t before? Could it have had an even bigger impact on what you eat or how you cook? How? In what ways?

Has your experience on the Cooking Bus changed your attitude to food and cooking? Probe for details.

Did you notice if it had any impact on e.g. school meals or contents of vending machines? Do you choose to eat different sorts of snacks or food for lunch at school now? And what about the foods you eat out of school?

If no longer term impact – why do you think the Cooking Bus session has not made a difference over the longer term? Probe for details including suggested changes and improvements to encourage long term impact.

Any extra or unexpected benefits from taking part in the Cooking Bus?

For those with access to COOKITS: Tell me about the use of the COOKITS. How are they used? Is this the best way of using them? What is good about the COOKITS e.g. in terms of contents; instructions; overall usability? And what improvements would you suggest? What would increase/improve usage and overall value of COOKITS.
Has there been any follow-up/support or ongoing use of your skills and knowledge in the school curriculum/lessons?
Do you think you would have benefited from any additional support (information, advise, instruction, materials to take away) to get the most out of your bus visit? What sort of support would you have liked e.g. different or more meal ideas, or different information? Probe for comments/ideas on follow-up support as well as support at the visit.

Feedback
How would/do you feel about providing feedback e.g. just after the visit or 6 months to a year after the visit? What would be the important questions to ask to get information on how to improve the Cooking Bus?

Summing up
Sum up for me your overall opinion of the bus and what, if anything, it has done to improve your skills or change how you feel about cooking and what you cook.

Thank you.
Appendix 6: Healthier Scotland Cooking Bus visuals