



27th Australasian Transport Research Forum, Adelaide, 29 September – 1 October 2004

Paper title: **The TravelSmart universities program in Victoria: the problems of going to scale**

Author(s) name(s): David Meiklejohn and Sally Semmens

Organisation(s): Department of Infrastructure

Contact details:

Postal address: Level 10, 80 Collins Street, Melbourne VIC 3000

Telephone: (03) 9655 6951

Facsimile:

email: david.meiklejohn@doi.vic.gov.au

Abstract (200 words):

In 2003, the Victorian TravelSmart program piloted a travel behaviour change program at Monash University. Of the 494 first year students participating in this study: (a) 69 % increased their use of public transport, (b) 33 % used their cars less than anticipated and (c) 16 % increased their cycling. In 2004, attention shifted to wider implementation of the program in a sustainable manner. The roll out has proceeded at two suburban university campuses in Melbourne, namely Monash and La Trobe. Once again the program has targeted first year students through the enrolment process. First year students are considered to be more open to alternative suggestions. Students were surveyed during their enrolment and have received targeted information based on their home location during term. The students were also contacted by e-mail on a regular basis and incentives provided in recognition of any detected travel behaviour changes. The degree of travel behaviour change amongst the participating student population is measured in an after survey and compared against three benchmarks: (1) participating students' stated preferences in the enrolment survey, (2) the travel behaviour of a cohort of new students who did not receive any information under the TravelSMART program, and (3) the travel behaviour of the wider student population. The paper discusses the challenges of engaging with universities and how TravelSmart has attempted to persuade university administrations to value and own the program.

2 The TravelSmart universities program in Victoria

Introduction

This paper describes the growth of the Victorian TravelSmart Universities program in 2003 and 2004. TravelSmart is the Victorian state government's travel behaviour change program with projects delivered across three streams of work: education, communities and workplaces.

It outlines the development, implementation and outcomes of a pilot program run at Monash University in 2003 and explains how TravelSmart has sought to develop the program in a sustainable manner within two universities and roll it out to large numbers of first year students.

Finally, the paper discusses the problems involved in expanding the program and lessons learned from the delivery process in 2004, evaluation underway on the program, and plans for how the TravelSmart University program will expand in the coming years.

The 2003 Universities Pilot at Monash University

In 2002, the TravelSmart program at the Victorian Department of Infrastructure engaged Peter Brett Associates International (PBAI) to conduct a travel behaviour change pilot at two large Melbourne workplaces. The pilot was to explore new ways of inducing travel behaviour change on a large scale at the chosen locations.

Monash University's Clayton Campus was selected for the pilot as it is a major traffic attractor in the south-eastern suburbs of Melbourne. The university had previously been involved with the TravelSmart program developing a travel plan for staff, as part of a broader integrated transport plan for the site. The Monash Student Association had also expressed an interest in the work of TravelSmart and a desire to be involved in any potential programs at the university.

Clayton Campus is located just south of the Monash Freeway, 18 kilometres from the city centre. It has public transport access limited to 12 bus services, including some connections to nearby train stations three kilometres away. The campus has extensive parking on-site and also runs a car pooling system for both staff and students. It has limited off-road cycle routes to the campus, some of which are bisected by the major obstacle of Princes Highway. There are no trams serving the campus.

The 2003 pilot was comprised of three stages. The first was qualitative research into the best approach to take; the second was a small scale pilot at the end of the 2002 academic year; and the third was a large scale pilot with first year students at the beginning of the 2003 academic year. A fuller report on the 2003 University pilot was written up in a paper delivered to the 2003 ATRF conference in Wellington. The paper, "A new approach for travel behaviour change in universities" by David Meiklejohn and Bryony Cooper is available on the TravelSmart Victoria website, www.travelsmart.vic.gov.au.

Qualitative Research

The qualitative research was conducted through a literature review of previous and current methodologies employed at universities and other tertiary institutions, both in Australia and overseas, as well as focus groups with students at Monash University.

The focus groups sought to understand what might motivate students to use alternative forms of transport, such as walking, cycling and public transport, more than they currently did. The participants in the focus groups noted that money was the key determinant for travel behaviour, with other considerations, such as health and the impact on the environment being viewed as relatively unimportant.

University students in Victoria currently pay \$79.20 to get a student concession card, which allows them to travel at a reduced rate on the Melbourne public transport system.

At the same time, students going to Monash's Clayton campus could pay \$77 for an annual parking permit, allowing them to park on-site, although it by no means guaranteed a space. Consequently, students in the focus groups noted that they tended to weigh one cost against the other and generally opted for the parking permit as they felt the car gave them greater flexibility in their travel choices.

The focus group work also found that students made decisions about how they travelled to and from campus early in their university career and tended to stick to that decision. This guided the development of the program to decide to target new students before they had developed set travel patterns.

Small Scale Pilot

Based on the focus group findings and with a view to a large scale pilot in 2003, PBAI conducted a small scale pilot in the last academic term of 2002 with 31 students. Generic travel packs were developed containing information and incentives relating to a particular mode of transport which would be of most relevance to the individual.

Individuals were not asked to select their preferred travel mode but rather were nominated for modes by the contractors, based on their assessment of what would be most useful for each individual. This reflected focus group work which found that individuals had limited awareness of their travel options and so made travel decisions based on incomplete information.

There is an implicit assumption in this approach that with a broader awareness of the range of travel options at their disposal, students might consequently make different decisions about how they travel. However, the reverse might also be true in that students may be discouraged precisely because they need extra information for some transport modes, such as public transport, in a way they think they don't need for driving. This would simply serve to reinforce perceptions that public transport is too difficult and restrictive and not worth using.

The range of packs was restricted in the small scale pilot in order to produce something which would be replicable on a large scale but would still retain individual relevance. The small scale pilot work also reinforced the finding of the focus group that the cost of the student concession card was a major disincentive to using public transport. Based on this, the

4 *The TravelSmart universities program in Victoria*

contractors decided to test this in the large scale pilot through the provision of free student concession cards to some students, to investigate whether they would use public transport more than others.

Large Scale Pilot

The large scale pilot aimed to work with 1000 new students enrolling at Monash University in January 2003. This represents about a third of the annual intake of new students. The enrolling student population was divided into five groups to receive specific modal packs. These were:

- students who could walk to campus
- students who could drive to campus
- students who could catch public transport to campus
- students who had no option but to drive to campus

The public transport group was further divided into three to test how important the cost of the student concession card was as a deterrent to students using the public transport system. One group received a free concession card, a free six month ticket and information. Another group received a free concession card and information and the third group just received information. All other modal groups received information and incentives relevant to their particular mode. For example, cyclists received discounted service vouchers for use at local bike shops.

The students were recruited during the enrolment process at the end of January 2003. They were asked to complete a short questionnaire which was designed to capture enough information to assign them to a particular modal group. Over 2000 students were surveyed and their details entered onto a database. A larger number than the target group was sought as it was realised that there might be drop-offs after the initial contact period.

In the large scale pilot, students were contacted after enrolment and encouraged to pick up their travel packs from a central location in the Monash Student Association. The best collection results were for the packs with the perceived highest value items, such as the free ticket and free student concession card.

There were much lower rates of collection for the other packs. Once students collected a pack they generally then continued to the evaluation stage of the program. Overall 93 percent of pack recipients completed an evaluation questionnaire which was conducted over the phone four weeks after pack collection.

The participating students were asked about their perceptions of the packs as well as whether the packs had any impact on their travel behaviour. The items which were most highly rated and most frequently used were the free public transport ticket and the free concession card. A map of the Melbourne public transport system was highly regarded as were water bottles and t-shirts, which were provided for walkers and cyclists.

Throughout the program the greatest impact was on public transport usage with 69 percent of all participants reporting that they used public transport more as a result of the pilot. 33 percent of respondents said they used their car less and 16 percent said they cycled more as a result of the information and incentives provided.

One issue for the future evaluation of the program was that the survey asked about relative changes in attitudes and behaviours, so if participants were already engaged in a sustainable form of transport, their actual change might have been quite small. As first year students are yet to develop travel patterns to and from campus at the time they are initially surveyed, evaluation of a change in their behaviour will always be problematic, though the 2004 program has sought to address this in its methodology.

The 2004 TravelSmart Universities Program

In 2003, TravelSmart Victoria received funding from the Australian Greenhouse Office's Greenhouse Gas Abatement Program, to support the further development of travel behaviour change programs. The Victorian component of the program contains three key program elements, detailed above, that involve the community, universities and flagship workplaces.

In the university element, TravelSmart Victoria has agreed to deliver a travel behaviour change methodology to 40 000 students over four years and measure the impact in terms of travel behaviour change. The objective of the program is to develop a travel behaviour change methodology for university students which is effective, sustainable and valued by the university.

The 2003 pilot had pointed the way towards a methodology which might be effective in generating change, particularly in the context of little or no additional supportive infrastructure or services. At the time the program was launched, it was assumed that this situation was likely to continue.

In terms of the sustainability of the methodology, the program faced a number of immediate challenges. The first issue faced by TravelSmart was that the 2004 program would be operating from a smaller budget than had been available for the pilot program, yet was attempting to reach a greater number of students. This suggested that some of the more cost intensive elements of the pilot would have to be adapted or dropped in the larger scale 2004 program, without compromising quality. Once again, new students were selected as the key target group.

Finally, the program needed to prove to the participating universities that this methodology could play a key role in campus traffic management, in addition to existing infrastructure. The aim of the TravelSmart program is that such travel behaviour change programs are developed successfully and then adopted by the organisation and supported for the long term.

In 2004, the key elements of the program were identified as:

- recruitment;
- materials;
- conversation; and
- evaluation.

Two university campuses were selected for the 2004 program: Monash University's Clayton campus and La Trobe University's Bundoora campus.

6 *The TravelSmart universities program in Victoria*

Monash University's Clayton campus covered in the 2003 pilot which worked with a target group of 1000 students. In 2004, the decision was made to attempt to recruit all students enrolling during the first round of enrolment in late January. This gave us a target population of approximately 3000.

A key factor for the success of the program at Clayton was the support of the Monash Student Association Transport Office. The office employs two part-time staff whose job it is to promote sustainable transport, assist students in using the transport system and lobby the university for improvements to the campus which will support sustainable transport modes. In 2003, the Transport Office had proved invaluable in providing input into the development of the methodology as well as a link to the student population and the university administration.

Monash University also faces increasing pressure on its existing car parks, both for staff and students, as it will be losing land currently used for car parking with the building of a synchrotron. A synchrotron is a particle accelerator that uses high-energy electrons to create bright, pinpoint beams of light. These high intensity light beams allow scientists to examine the structure of matter at the atomic scale over a wide range of energies. The whole structure will occupy a site of 12 000 square metres, resulting in the loss of approximately 2000 car parks.

The second campus chosen was La Trobe University's Bundoora campus. Located in the mid-north of Melbourne, Bundoora has a range of public transport options including bus, train and tram. It has generally good links through the northern suburbs but not to eastern suburbs. The campus has extensive car parking and an active carpooling program. La Trobe University had also been involved in the TravelSmart workplaces program carrying out baselines surveys of how its staff travelled to and from campus. To this degree, the university had experience with travel behaviour change programs which would be important when developing a new approach aimed at students.

While not having a transport office in the student union, as was the case at Monash, La Trobe's car pooling office was well developed and professional in delivering its program of registering students and encouraging them to share rides to campus. As with Monash University, the TravelSmart program at La Trobe sought to reach all 3000 first year students as part of the enrolment process.

In both cases, TravelSmart sought to develop the program in collaboration with both universities, with a view to embedding it as an ongoing feature of the university's enrolment process. To do this it was necessary to run a successful program that would be well regarded by both universities and to have a natural home for the program in the future if it were to be taken over by the university.

Recruitment

The universities both had four days of enrolment when the majority of new students attending the university would be enrolled. These ran from 27 January to 30 January 2004, inclusive.

Following discussions with the universities, it was decided that the best method would be to approach the students as part of the enrolment process, making registration for the TravelSmart program seem as official as possible. At both campuses, privacy concerns about

the information to be gathered as part of the initial survey, had to be addressed through statements on the surveys. An example from Monash University is included in Appendix B.

Due to the layout of enrolment areas, slightly different approaches were taken at the two campuses. At Monash, the TravelSmart team was set up in a space which allowed large numbers of students to be funnelled through at one time. Students were approached by volunteers working for the Monash Student Association Transport Office with surveys on clipboards. The students at Monash completed 2674 surveys.

They completed the survey while standing in line and then took it to a desk where they were talked through their travel options by a trained volunteer from the Transport Office. Students were encouraged to complete the survey by the promise of a free one day public transport ticket which they received at the TravelSmart desk. The volunteers went through a series of training days run by the Transport Office, based heavily on principles of persuasion. The training days included likely questions they might receive from students as well as role playing to work out difficult scenarios. TravelSmart funded the Transport Office to develop and run the training sessions.

At La Trobe, there was far less space to hold students in a queue while some were receiving travel information. In this case, it was decided that the best option was to move students through quickly, get them to complete the survey but post out the materials to them after enrolment day. The students at La Trobe completed 2504 surveys.

A mailing house was engaged to compile the packs of information and incentives, enter the contact data from the completed surveys and post them out to the participating students. The students received their packs within three weeks of enrolment day, just before they were to begin attending classes.

Free public transport tickets were not offered at La Trobe. Instead, students were encouraged to sit down at the desk and complete the survey by a large sign asking DO YOU WANT TO SAVE \$1500 A YEAR – ASK US HOW. This figure was based on the average running costs of a car in Melbourne, as calculated by the RACV, compared to the most expensive public transport ticket. The desk also contained bowls of Smarties as an inducement. As this proved to be much cheaper than purchasing public transport tickets, it's an approach TravelSmart will be using again in the future.

While the difference in the approaches was brought about by circumstances beyond the control of TravelSmart, there exists the opportunity to test which is the better method. While the face-to-face approach taken at Monash would seem to be intuitively better, the students at La Trobe received their transport information much closer to the start of term when they would be more actively thinking about how to get to campus.

The enrolment process at La Trobe also threw up two unexpected hurdles. One was that the TravelSmart team shared a desk with the car pooling team which was in the business of registering students for the car pooling database. In one respect this worked well, as both teams agreed to work together and get students to fill out both surveys. However, as much of the information gathered was similar on both forms, these could have been merged into one, making the process much easier and quicker for students. This will be changed next year.

8 *The TravelSmart universities program in Victoria*

The other hurdle was that the enrolment process was set up in such a manner that by the time students reached the TravelSmart desk, they had already been asked whether they wanted to pay for a car parking space for the year. Obviously, this was less than ideal as they were making a decision about travel to campus before they had received information about the different options. While it was anticipated that this could have a significant effect on the results as some students had already made a travel decision before being exposed to TravelSmart, the desk staff collecting the surveys calculated that only about 10 percent of students had already purchased their parking passes. However, it is an anomaly which we will seek to correct if implementing the program again at La Trobe University.

Materials

As with the 2003 pilot, participating students were drafted into different modal groups based on their likely residential location during term. All students received information about a variety of modes, according to where they were likely to live. So, students living close to campus might receive information about walking or cycling, but also some relevant public transport information.

In most packs, the information was based on an existing product, such as public transport timetables. The exception was a transport access guide for both campuses, developed by TravelSmart in association with Melways which provides the most commonly used street maps in Melbourne.

The guides were comprised of a map highlighting public transport, walking and cycling at the expense of road information on one side and a campus map and information about transport to campus on the other. An example is included in Appendix C.

The maps are quite different to anything produced before in Melbourne. Previous alternative transport maps, such as cycling or public transport maps, have tended to highlight just those modes with little or no reference to other modes or geographical landmarks.

The TravelSmart map design takes an integrated approach using the Melways base map and overlaying public transport, walking and cycling information. The cycling information included on and off-road cycle lanes and paths but also quiet routes identified by local cyclists in a consultation process as part of the development of the map.

The modal packs contained the following materials:

Car Drivers

- individualised covering letter
- A3 access guide
- public transport map
- carpool leaflet
- public transport concession application form

Cyclists

- individualised covering letter
- A3 access guide
- public transport map

- public transport concession application form
- bike shop leaflet

Walkers

- individualised covering letter
- A3 access guide
- public transport map
- public transport concession application form

Public Transport

- individualised covering letter
- A3 access guide
- public transport map
- public transport concession application form
- relevant timetables for postcode
- car pool leaflet

Conversation

TravelSmart was keen to test whether we might be able to establish a conversation with the participating students. This was to take the form of a monthly e-mail and automatic entry into a prize draw. The thinking was that by generating monthly messages, TravelSmart and travel behaviour change messages would be reinforced to the students at the same time as they were being made to feel special, by being the only ones who could enter the prize draw. A decision was made that this contact should happen through relevant contacts at the universities.

However, this has not been a successful approach, primarily because the universities do not seem to have always clearly understood the reasoning behind the contact with students. This has resulted in the universities only sending out a few conversation e-mails, rather than regular updates.

A local issue at La Trobe has been that while contact has been made through student e-mail addresses, students do not seem to regularly check their university appointed e-mail. Even when contacted to be told they have won a prize, students have not turned up to actually collect the prize.

While the conversation approach is to be re-thought for next year, consideration will have to be given to deciding which is the best form of communication with students and whether TravelSmart should play a stronger role in developing and sending out the messages.

Evaluation

The travel behaviour of the participating students was to be compared to:

- the mode the students intended to take before they received the TravelSmart information
- the rest of the first year student population who enrolled a month later
- the rest of student population

10 *The TravelSmart universities program in Victoria*

One of the first elements from the 2003 pilot to be reconsidered was the evaluation. Whereas in 2003, students had been contacted by phone and completed a ten minute questionnaire on their attitudes towards the packs they had received and any behaviour change, the decision was made that in 2004 there would be greater reliance on completed paper or electronic surveys, due to a restricted budget.

An adapted version of the 2003 survey was used in 2004. It sought three main points of information:

- likely living address during term
- alternative contact information
- intended travel mode for attending campus

The likely living address was to allow TravelSmart to select the most appropriate mode of travel for the participating students. As with the findings from the 2003 pilot, it was assumed that many new students would have a limited understanding of the transport system in Melbourne.

Alternative contact information, such as e-mail and mobile phone number, was also requested as some students were unsure as to their likely term address at the time of enrolment.

Finally, students were asked about their intended mode of travel as one in a three stage process of evaluation of behaviour change.

TravelSmart planned to carry out student surveys in 2004 at both campuses to assess the current travel behaviour of students at the universities. A survey was developed with the assistance of Professor Geoff Rose from the Institute of Transport Studies at Monash University, and is included in Appendix A.

In the end, the survey was conducted successfully at Monash but not at La Trobe due to internal IT difficulties: the survey was sent out much later than originally planned and conflicted with exam time for students. A key lesson from this process was to conduct the pre-survey early in the year preceding the TravelSmart intervention and this has been since carried out at the University of Melbourne, which will be running the program in 2005.

The survey run at Monash in 2003 asked about the travel patterns of the students over a week, in contrast to a standard workplace survey which focuses on travel on a certain day,. This was done to reflect the more irregular travel habits of students who may not attend campus on days when they do not have classes or lectures.

The survey found that students most commonly attended campus on Mondays, Tuesday and Wednesdays with little variation in how they travelled on those days. On Thursdays and Fridays, there was a sharp decline in the number of students attending campus.

The averages for the first three days of the student week at Monash University's Clayton campus are set out below for each mode of travel:

Table 1 – Student Travel Modes at Monash University’s Clayton Campus in 2003

MODE	ALL STUDENTS (N=2920)	FIRST YEAR STUDENTS (N=2674)
walk	10.6%	15.4%
cycle	1.4%	1.2%
motorcycle	0.5%	0.4%
drove alone	46.6%	33.4%
as a car passenger (dropped off)	2.7%	3.7%
as a car passenger (carpool)	2.4%	2.6%
bus	12.8%	17.3%
train	9.2%	12.6%
tram	0.1%	0.2%
other	0.1%	0.2%
did not attend campus	13.2%	13.1%

The survey found distinct differences between the behaviour of first year students and the general student population.

First year students were far less likely to drive alone to get to campus, probably because many of them either may not have a licence yet or were able to afford a car. Only 59.4 percent of first years said they either owned a car or had access to one whenever they needed, compared to 78.3 percent of the rest of the student population.

First years were also more likely to possess a student concession card for public transport, with 28.1 percent possessing a card, compared to 20.8 percent of the rest of students.

The percentage of students eligible to get a student concession card but who chose not to purchase one also increased the longer students were at the university. While 37.4 percent of first years who were eligible chose not to get a card, that figure grew to 56.1 percent for the rest of the student population.

Without a baseline survey pre-dating the intervention at La Trobe University, the only direct point of comparison for the students participating in the 2004 TravelSmart program

12 *The TravelSmart universities program in Victoria*

was their behaviour compared to the rest of the 2004 intake of first years and the difference between how they thought they might travel and how they actually ended up travelling to and from campus.

At both campuses, as part of the enrolment process, the participating first year students were asked about how they intended to travel. They were allowed to choose more than one option reflecting that they might vary their travel some days according to their commitments.

The results are set out below:

Table 2 – Intended Modes of Travel to Campus for Enrolling Students in 2004

MODE	LA TROBE (N=2504)	MONASH (N=2674)
walk	14.9%	9.3%
cycle	6.8%	4.0%
drove alone	58.5%	45.4%
car passenger	28.5%	24.7%
bus	39.1%	49.7%
train	21.4%	22.6%
tram	33.8%	4.2%
other	1.1%	0.5%
not sure	2.1%	2.6%

The surveys showed distinctive differences between the two campuses as to how the first year students intended to travel.

A higher proportion (58.5 percent) intended to drive alone to La Trobe as opposed to Monash (45.4 percent).

While bus was the most favoured alternative option for both universities, the students at La Trobe also indicated a likely higher use of tram, which reflects the provision of a tram service to the western entrance to the Bundoora campus.

Assessing the degree of behaviour change at the universities was to be conducted through a survey run at La Trobe in May 2004, near the end of first semester. The survey was conducted electronically with an HTML document distributed to all students through their university e-mail.

Unfortunately, the response rate for the survey was so poor (770 from a total population of all students of 15 000) as to make any results meaningless. The survey was distributed much later than originally anticipated due to hold-ups within the IT department at La Trobe. In the end, the survey was launched with little publicity to alert students to its existence and importance.

This may present a challenge to the program in assessing whether a mass e-mail survey to all students is the best form of evaluation in the future or whether alternatives, such as a sample survey might generate more useful results.

In the meantime, TravelSmart will investigate whether it will repeat the e-mail survey at La Trobe later in the academic year in an attempt to generate a better response or explore alternative evaluation methods to give us an assessment as to whether there has been travel behaviour change as a result of the intervention.

At Monash a separate survey is to be conducted at the beginning of the second semester, specifically with the students participating in the TravelSmart program. There will also be focus groups run with students from the program to investigate what they thought were the strengths and weaknesses of the program.

Conclusion

At the time of writing, the main lessons learned from the expansion and rollout of the TravelSmart program in 2004 have been around the process involved rather than the degree of behaviour change achieved.

These lessons include:

- the need to assess the best method of surveying university students
- ensure the recruitment of students at enrolment is not undermined by other factors which may have already determined student travel choices
- develop a conversation methodology which can be easily delivered through the universities to our target audience
- the need to reduce the cost of the student concession card in Victoria

The TravelSmart program is currently reviewing its options as to the best method of surveying university students. While the enrolment process gives us access to all first year students, it is difficult to attain comparable numbers in an after-survey conducted electronically. Part of the reason for this is not only that students may not feel like completing a survey they may not regard as relevant, but also that students may simply not see the survey in the first place.

An issue raised by the universities is that although all students receive student e-mail addresses, many continue to use non-university addresses, such as Yahoo or Hotmail. At Monash, the university administration has begun to use the student e-mail system as the sole distribution channel for announcements and results, which may partly explain the stronger response rates there compared to La Trobe.

14 *The TravelSmart universities program in Victoria*

The problems raised at La Trobe whereby some students were receiving car parking passes before coming to the TravelSmart table, are surmountable. It does require a greater degree of involvement by the administration and thought as to how its current enrolment processes might affect the involvement of students in TravelSmart.

The idea of the conversation to be conducted by e-mail, was developed in 2004 as way of filling some of the gaps from the 2003 program which operated from a larger budget and was able to offer incentives up front as an inducement to participate in the program. It was hoped that the conversation and the running of regular prize draws might achieve the same effect at a lower price, but this did not seem to be the case. The biggest problem seemed to be an uncertainty on the part of the universities as to what was involved. This will be clarified in any future programs involving this element and presented more in a standard format rather than something each university can adapt for its purposes.

On the final issue of the student concession card, the Victorian state government has recently announced that the cost of the card will be reduced to \$8 per annum from the start of 2005. While this is welcome, students still face considerable administrative hassle to actually get their card. Currently, they must apply for the card on campus and receive university certification before taking the form to a railway station to receive the actual card.

TravelSmart hopes to work with the public transport operators and the universities to ease the administrative process. Ideally, we would like to see the cost of the card rolled into the overall student union or administration fee and all students automatically receive a student concession card, along the lines of the UPASS program in the United States and Canada. This may be more likely given that Victoria will be moving to a Smart Card ticketing system by 2007 and indeed, the idea of an integrated student university and travel card has been mooted as part of the publicity for the Smart Card.

The TravelSmart University program in Victoria is an evolving methodology facing the twin challenges of developing and implementing a robust approach which delivers measureable behaviour change, and does so quickly to large numbers of students.

The lessons learned in 2004, while frustrating at the time, will help to create a better program in 2005 and for the years beyond.

Appendix A - Travel Survey

This survey is designed to find out how students and staff travel to Monash University.

Your participation will help the Department of Infrastructure and the University plan for the provision of better transport services to and from campus.

The survey should take only a couple of minutes to complete.

1. Click on the appropriate button in the table below to show how you travelled to campus each morning this last week, starting Monday 13 October. If you used more than one method of transport, only show the method used for the longest (distance) part of your journey.

	walked	cycled	motorcycle	car (as driver)	car passenger (dropped off)	car passenger (carpool)	bus	train	tram	taxi	other	did not attend campus
Mon	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Tues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Wed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Thurs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Fri	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				

2. Where do you live?

suburb: _____

16 *The TravelSmart universities program in Victoria*

postcode: _____

3. Which days did your trip to campus start from your home address? (tick all that apply)

- Monday
- Tuesday
- Wednesday
- Thursday
- Friday
- Did not travel from home last week

4. Do you normally live

- with my family at home
- on campus in student accommodation
- in a shared house / flat
- alone
- other

5. In what year were you born?

6. What gender are you?

- female
- male

7. Do you have a current Australian car driver or motorcycle licence? (Please tick all that apply)

	car	motorcycle
learners permit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
probationary licence	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
full licence	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. Do you own a car or have access to a car whenever you want to use one?

- yes
- no

9. Do you have a regular car park you pay for on or near the Parkville campus?

- yes
- no

10. If you usually drive to and from campus, what are your main reasons for driving?

- save time
- save money
- physical impairment
- dropping off children
- shopping
- activities before/after university
- carrying equipment or materials
- need car for work
- other _____

18 *The TravelSmart universities program in Victoria*

11. Do you have a student travel concession card?

- yes
- no, I am eligible but have chosen not to get one
- no, I am ineligible (international, most postgraduates or staff)

12. At the University of Melbourne, are you a: (tick as many as applicable)

	full time	part time
on campus student	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
distance education student	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
academic employee	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
general employee	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

[If you are not a student, go to Question 14](#)

13. If you are a student, are you: (please tick all that apply)

- undergraduate
- postgraduate
- international
- Australian

14. If you are a student, how many years have you been studying at Monash University Clayton campus?

15. What is the name of your faculty or division? If you are enrolled in or employed by more than one faculty, tick all that apply

- Arts
- Business and Economics
- Education
- Engineering
- Information Technology
- Law
- Medicine, Nursing and Health Sciences
- Science
- University Administration and Support Services
- other

16. To be eligible for the prize draw, please supply your name, e-mail address and phone number.

Name: _____

E-mail: _____

Phone number: _____

17. Would you be happy to be contacted for further surveys regarding travel to the University of Melbourne?

- yes
- no

18. Are there any general comments you would like to make about transport to the Parkville campus?

Thank you for taking the time to complete this travel survey.

Appendix B – La Trobe Student Enrolment Survey

<p>ENROLMENT QUESTIONNAIRE</p> <p>Congratulations on being accepted to study at La Trobe University!</p> <p>We'd like to help you with some information about how to travel to and from the Bundoora campus.</p>		 <p>TravelSmart better ways to go</p>
---	--	---

This short survey will ask you a few simple questions. We'll gather your answers and prepare packs of information which you'll find relevant and useful when it comes to working out how to get to and from classes.

2. Please complete your personal details during semester –IN CAPITALS- in the boxes below:

You'll also be in the draw to win a \$200 voucher for books.

Surname

1. How are you likely to travel to campus during the term?

walk

cycle

drive alone

drive with a passenger

--	--

Postcode

tram

bus

--	--	--

train

motorbike

--	--

not sure yet

other (*please specify*) _____

At La Trobe University we respect the privacy of your personal information. In association with the Victorian Department of Infrastructure, we collect personal information about you on this form to subsequently provide you with informative travel information in respect to attending La Trobe University. In accordance with privacy laws, personal information about you on this form will not be used or disclosed for any other purpose. You may have the right to access personal information we hold about you, subject to any exceptions in relevant laws, by contacting TravelSmart on 9655 6629

Appendix C – La Trobe Travel Map

