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As the Seasons Change  
Dr. Allen Robinson, CEO

Fall semester is here and a new school year is beginning. The hot summer is over and the cool weather of fall is anticipated. For some of us the harsh winter is just around the corner. But don’t worry, spring and summer will revitalize all of us.

This scenario sounds like the ADTSEA office. The NSSP student conference has been successfully completed; the ADTSEA conference was a huge success. As previously stated, we also replaced two of our management team members. Mary Smiley is our new secretary and Velian Georgiev is our new technical support person.

As we head into fall and winter we are actively making other changes. You will soon see a new look in the ADTSEA web page; updates to the ADTSEA curriculum and stronger support from NHTSA in the implementation of this curriculum. In the near future we may also see a demonstration project using the ADTSEA curriculum.

With the assistance of Lou Pesci, I will continue to manage and direct ADTSEA activities. With the assistance of Beth Weaver, ADTSEA president and all of the division chairs, we have begun planning our next ADTSEA conference scheduled for July 31 – August 4, 2005 in Honolulu, Hawaii. The hotel reports that their reservations area have already handled many bookings. Jan Meeker is working with the Mississippi delegation to plan and conduct the NSSP conference at Mississippi College near Jackson, Mississippi. The dates for this conference are from June 29 – July 3, 2005. Mr. Willie McInnis is providing the local coordination.

ADDING UP THE NUMBERS
Elizabeth Weaver Shepard, President

How long has it been since you saw a description of driver education that looked like this?

Driver Education II is a one-semester course, carrying a half unit of credit, and is offered during the regular school day. Driver Ed II consists of 50 hours of motorcycle training and 40 hours of advanced driving skills in the automobile.

At the risk of revealing that I am older than dirt and collect many dusty things and call them antiques, I found this statement in the April 1976 Spring Issue of the Journal (now called the Chronicle). And yes, the Journal is in my personal resource library and I refer to it as a historical document. The above description of Driver Education I and II by Jack Mahon offered by Wichita (Kansas) High School is one example of the innovations and support that were common during the 1970’s. Today, Driver Education I in the regular school day is becoming history. Driver Education II is rare and considered less than valuable. Today, we are facing issues that can bring driver education out of the shadows and into the light of recognition for the value driver education and training gives to our novice drivers and communities.

Two important issues are on the table:
1. We wait patiently for the National Transportation Safety Board’s report and recommendations after completing their investigation of the Montana fatal crash in January 2003. What will be the impact of their report?
2. We wait patiently as our elected legislators in Washington debate the funding reauthorization for the TEA-21. Will the proposed funding for an office of driver education and licensing within NHTSA escape the knife?

Most of us are vaguely aware of these two issues as we go about our lives doing what we love: promoting and (Robbie continued on page 12)

Editor’s Notes

What a pleasant task it has been to put this issue of “The Chronicle” and “News & Views” together. For the first time in my editorship more publishable materials were available than space for publication. Thanks to all of you who have listened to my pleas to submit materials for publication! In an effort to keep the submissions trend moving in the right way let me show you how painless this process can be.

How many of you read a daily newspaper? If the answer is yes, you’ve made the first step to help this publication’s editor and your fellow ADTSEAns. The next small step in improving our publication is to share your opinion. Notice, I did not ask if you had an opinion because I know ADTSEAns and boy do you have opinions. The last step in participating in enhancement of your professional publication is to put your opinion in writing.

Putting something in writing does not mean you actually have to engage in a creative or scholarly activity. All it means is you have to communicate with me. Since most ADTSEAn’s are concrete sequential learners (just (continued on page 14)
Changing driving attitudes and behaviors is not easy to do yet that is the goal of a driver improvement program. Program participants are exposed to essential information and various learning experiences related to defensive driving. The intended outcome is reduced risk of collisions and moving violations. Throughout the course, students reflect past driving experiences, speculate what to do in given situations, and commit to proper driving in the future (NSC, 1998a).

Driver attitudinal change has been achieved in experimental research. A video-based intervention, relying on reasoned action and planned behavior theory, conveyed anti-speeding messages to focus groups of drivers. After viewing, subjects listed and discussed their thoughts with anti-speeding expressions outnumbering pro-speeding ones. Subjects also completed a questionnaire before and after the intervention with results compared to a control group. Statistically significant differences were recorded in normative beliefs (e.g., people do not like to be driven by a speeding driver), and anticipated regret (e.g., speeding is inherently wrong and would lead to feeling guilty). The intervention was less successful in positively influencing behavioral beliefs (e.g., driving poses road hazards), and perceived behavioral control (e.g., resisting temptation and ones control over personal behavior). The researcher admitted measurement of personal recall of driving attitude might not have been sensitive to subjects at pre-contemplative and contemplative stages of change. Recommendations were made for boosting persuasive anti-speeding messages by increasing the number of video viewings, improving the quality of video production, and implanting the intervention within a larger scale campaign (Parker, 2002).

The recall of personal attributes, such as driving attitudes and behaviors, involves a two-step process. The individual begins by noting his/her present status on an attribute. Using this note as a benchmark, the person recalls the same attribute but an earlier time. The idea is the subject should be able to discern stability or change between the two states while reporting at a single point in time. Personal recall is also referred to as retrospective or memory-based reporting. The ability to accurately and dependably recall an attitude or behavior tends to be consistent with personal beliefs as well as societal expectations (Ross and Conway, 1986).

Asking someone to recall a present personal attribute after program exposure is considered retrospective post-intervention reporting. This is a common practice in causal comparative research during which a subject personally reports on a variable after the cause (e.g., program) and effect (e.g., attitudinal change) have occurred (Gay and Airasian, 1996). Asking someone to recall an earlier personal attribute after program exposure is called retrospective pre-intervention reporting. Investigators have demonstrated retrospective pre- and post-intervention ratings just as valid in measuring change compared to traditional before-after ratings (Skelf, Stratos, Bergen, Sampson, and Deutsch, 1999).

Using a retrospective pre- and post-intervention reporting design, the author attempted to determine and compare subjects’ attitudes and behaviors recalled to be at the start and end of a driving improvement program.

Design

Through purposive sampling, the investigator selected subjects (18 years of age or older) who had completed a National Safety Council’s 8 hour Defensive Driving course at a commercial driving improvement school.* Whereas program participants could be court-ordered, or referred by the Department of Motor Vehicles, the researcher limited subject eligibility to volunteers. Subject recruitment was conducted via two means. Initially, potential subjects were identified from the driving improvement school’s registration records. They were US mailed a postcard questionnaire containing the driver attitude and behavior self-assessment along with an introductory cover letter that addressed human subjects rights. Of the 54 selected subjects, 21 chose to participate (response rate .31). To increase the number of subjects in this study, other program participants voluntarily completing the driver improvement course were approached by the investigator and provided the same questionnaire and letter in person at the end of the 8-hour instructional session. Of the 36 who were solicited in person, 24 agreed to participate as subjects. Thus, a sample size of 45 was achieved. It should be added there was no overlap between the two subject recruitment methods. Potential subjects contacted by US mail were not the same persons who were approached in person by the investigator.

All subjects answered 10 items based on The Defensive Driving

(continued on page 4)
Table 1
Attitudes and behaviors perceived to be "before" and "after" driver improvement program participants (n=45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you . . .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Get irritated when you think other drivers are driving too slowly?</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Think you are the best judge of how fast you should be able to drive?</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sneak through traffic signals and signs when no one is around?</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Obey speed limits only when you think you might get caught speeding?</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Take chances in traffic just for fun?</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Try to get back at other drivers who do something to make you angry?</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Get close as you can to the vehicle in front of you to make the driver move out of the way?</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Not wear your seat belts?</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Try to get ahead of other drivers at a stop sign or stop light?</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Try to do other things in the car while you are driving?</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level

Results
On a five-point scale, lower scores meant agreement with self-assessment items and represented improper driving attitude and behavior. With this in mind, "before" program attitudes and behaviors were: getting irritated with slow drivers, regarding self as best judge of safe speed, and multi-tasking while driving. Scores on these and remaining self-assessment items improved when subjects' post-intervention retrospective reports. "After" program attitudes and behaviors with higher means scores were obeying traffic signals and signs, following at a safe distance, not trying to get ahead at stop signs. In the self-assessment, statistically significant difference was recorded between the "before" and "after" mean scores on six of the 10 items (see Table 1).

Suggestions
A comparison of retrospective pre- and post-intervention scores indicated modest improvement in driver attitude and behavior as measured by items based on The Defensive Driving Course Guide. Before this observation can be validated, additional empirical evidence is needed testing a driver improvement program's impact on participants'. This could be accomplished through an experimental design in which randomly selected subjects represented all potential program participants (court-order, DMV-referred as well as volunteered) and were randomly assigned to either treatment or control groups. The measurement instrument should be examined for construct validity and statistical reliability. Ideally, data should be collected in traditional pre-post fashion as well as retrospectively to further determine if subjects personal recall is dependable.

In sum, the personal recall of attitudes and behaviors in driver improvement program participants were described in this study. Comparison of pre- and post-intervention retrospective scores indicated that program participants perceived improved attitudes and behaviors related to proper driving.
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Introduction

Novice teen drivers need all the help they can obtain in learning how to properly drive safely and defensively in our over crowded and post-modern highways and roads. It is general knowledge that a high percentage of automobile crashes and fatalities occur in the teen age group. There are a number of factors that can contribute to such potential fatal errors in driving. Some of the factors to be considered could be: inconsistent instruction concerning skills for novice drivers, lack of experience in operating a motor vehicle, too much responsibility given too quickly, and lack of knowledge concerning legal and mandatory laws concerning the Oregon Highway Transportation System (OHTS).

The author investigates a solution to this problem by basing the solution on the premise that Oregonians believe that both mandatory and standardized driver’s education should be a requirement for all novice teenage drivers in the state of Oregon. By having mandatory and standardized driver’s education, the rules and skills of the OHTS could be unvaryingly understood by all novice teenage age drivers.

One may ask: “What is mandatory and standardized driver’s education?” Mandatory driver’s education would simply mean that in juxtaposition with Oregon’s mandatory graduated licensing program, that driver’s education must be required by all teens learning how to drive a motor vehicle. Standardization or regulation of driver’s education throughout the state of Oregon would assure that all teens are taught the same skills needed to be defensive, successful drivers.

Investigating the Vulnerability of Novice Teenage Drivers

According to the National Safety Council publication, the highest rate of fatal automobile crashes occurs with drivers 19 years and under (National Safety Council, 1993). It is around this age group, 16 to 19 years of age, that motor vehicle collisions happen due to tacticle errors and misguided safety choices. Inconsistent instruction concerning skills for novice drivers, lack of experience in operating a motor vehicle, too much responsibility given too quickly, and lack of knowledge concerning legal and mandatory laws could be the factors contributing to poor driving skills and attitudes in this age group.

The Graduated Driver’s Licensing Program helps ease teen drivers into the adult responsibilities that driving a motor vehicle demands. According to Gary Direnfeld, graduated licensing is the innate development from driver education. Society must realize that novice drivers need more than just information. Graduated licensing acknowledges that driving is a complex, acquired skill that can only be achieved at a safe and acceptable level with plenty of practice (2001, para 5). Many states have adopted a GDL, graduated licensing program, which has resulted in a reduction of teenage automobile collisions. According to the National Highway and Transportation Safety Administration’s website, 16 year old drivers are 15 times more likely to be involved in automobile crashes than 20-24 year-olds, roughly one-third of all deaths involving motor vehicle crashes are from people 15 to 20 years old, and those states that have implemented a graduated licensing program have seen a considerable reduction in fatal crashes. The U.S. Department of Transportation’s National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (The U.S. Department of Transportation’s National Highway Traffic Safety Administration [NHTSA], 2002) furthers the benefit of graduated licensing by stating that since Oregon has implemented this program the state has seen a 16 % reduction in motor vehicle collisions of males from 16-17 years of age. Oregon has addressed the problem of inexperience in operating a motor vehicle by requiring 50 hours of experience with the addition of some driver’s education training, or 100 hours without such driver’s education training. Too much responsibility handed over too quickly by mandating the GDL program to young, novice drivers is not enough. In concurrence with existing efforts and laws for teen drivers, the state needs to mandate and standardize driver’s education throughout the state for this age group. The author explores this premise by evaluating Oregonians’ opinions on mandatory and standardized driver’s education for the state of Oregon.

Methodology and Process for the Case Study

The sample population of 30 participants was chosen from both rural and urban locales of Clackamas and Washington Counties in the state of Oregon. By sampling both rural and urban areas, the author could arrive at a more representative population of the state. In addition, an even amount of females and males were selected at random. The author approximated age by appearance so that ages could be somewhat dispersed. This was decided so that the random pick of participants would be closely representative of the voting age population of Oregon. The random

(continued on page 6)
voting-age sample population ranged from 19-75 years of age (see Table 1), an even number for each gender (see Table 2), and participants from both rural and urban areas was simply selected in this manner to eliminate any bias towards a less representative Oregonian population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Age of Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15   50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15   50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30   100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A survey was presented to each participant. The survey contained demographic questions and questions that were directed towards the participants’ opinions on the subject of mandatory and standardized driver’s education in the state of Oregon. To further the case of any additional biasness towards the participants, the surveyor asked all participants to request for any clarification on any semantically confusing words, statements, or questions contained in the survey. In addition, the surveyor read to any participants who felt that this mode would be a better alternative for comprehension of the survey. Only one participant requested for the survey to be read by the surveyor while the participant answered the components on the survey.

A mode of surveying the sample group in a public area was done to speed up the returns of the surveys. Yet more importantly, face-to-face surveying was done since this alleviated the problem of possible confusion concerning the survey questions; the possibility of language, challenged participants; and helped the surveyor pick a group based on voter age and gender that would portray a more accurate representative population of Oregon. In defining words or semantically confusing statements, the surveyor was to plainly to define words such as mandatory or standardized as the words are defined in the Oxford or Merriam Webster dictionary. This was done to alleviate any hint of how the surveyor might feel towards the subject. Therefore, the author feels this was the most suitable manner for collecting data for this case study.

The survey contains six questions or statements geared to make a valid and reliable connection to the subject of the premise. In other words the responses to these questions or statements will test how valid and reliable the premise is to its claim that Oregonians believe that both mandatory and standardized driver’s education should be a prerequisite before all novice teenage drivers obtain a provisional or permit license in the state of Oregon. The responses to these six questions or statements were based on a 4-point Likert Scale. The questions or statements test the significance and associative properties based on the responses of the sample group. In the survey there are six questions or statements that relate to the premise and fall under one of two categories: Mandatory Driver’s Education or Standardized Driver’s Education. Two examples of such questions or statements are: "I feel driver’s education should be required before a teen can obtain a driver’s license" (i.e. Mandatory Driver’s Education) and "Driver’s training courses should teach the same skills and information throughout the state" (i.e. Standardized Driver’s Education).

Survey

As a student at Baker College of Graduate Studies, I am conducting a survey for my Graduate course in statistics. Your responses to this survey will be confidential. The purpose of this survey is to collect data on opinions of Oregonians who can vote, about mandatory and standardized driver’s education for novice teen drivers.

Mandatory and standardized education means that all novice teen drivers will be required by the state to take a driver’s education program that would encompass the same skills throughout the state.

If you would like a copy of the results of this study, feel free to contact the primary researcher, Richard P. Van Buren, at: (503) 630-4633 or email me at rvanbu@att.net after November 1, 2003.

Demographics: Age?

1. What is your gender? (Please check mark the appropriate answer)
   Male ___    Female ___

2. Are you a registered voter in Oregon? (Please check Yes or No)
   Yes ___  No ___

3. Do you have a child who will be learning how to drive in the near future? (Please circle the most appropriate answer) 0-6 months 6 months to a year 1 to 2 years 3 years or more I do not have children they drive now

4. I feel I would be qualified to teach a teenager to drive. (Please circle your response) Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree
   (SD D A SA)

5. I feel driver’s education should be required before a teen can obtain a driver’s license.
   SD D A SA
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6) Driver’s education should be offered as part of the school curriculum.

7) How important is state mandated training for driver’s education instructors to you? (Circle the answer closest to your opinion)
   Not Important Somewhat Important Important Very Important (NI SI I VI)
   (NI SI I VI)

8) Driver’s training courses should teach the same skills and information throughout the state.
   (NI SI I VI)

9) Textbooks and other driver’s education materials should be the same throughout the state.
   (NI SI I VI)

Additional Comments

I grant permission for this survey to be used in the study mentioned above:

The author’s exploration entails the challenge to prove or disprove the premise. In other words is the premise just coincidental or does it significantly mirror Oregonians’ perceptions and beliefs for future mandates that should be in place to help novice teen drivers become successful, safe, defensive drivers? Based on this notion the null hypothesis could be stated as: H0 = Oregonians do not believe that both mandatory and standardized driver’s education should be a requirement for all novice teenage drivers in the state of Oregon, and the alternative hypothesis could be stated as: H1 = Oregonians believe that both mandatory and standardized driver’s education should be a requirement for all novice teenage drivers in the state of Oregon.

In researching the responses from the survey, the author first wanted to dispel any further biases by asking the sample group if they felt they were qualified to teach a teen to drive. This would separate the fact on their feelings towards their personal skills to teach a teen to drive and the fact on whether or not they believe mandatory and standardized driver’s education should or should not be enacted statewide. According to the descriptive statistics, the average answer was closest to “agree” (see Appendix D, Figure 1); meaning on average the respondents felt they could teach a teen to drive.

Once it was established that respondents felt they could teach a teen to drive, the author focused on 5 questions or statements on the subject of mandatory and standardized driver’s education. These questions or statements became the main vehicle in determining if the premise was coincidental or significantly true. The initial outcome, in a descriptive form, resulted, on average, per question, that the respondents seem to be in agreement with the alternative hypothesis (see Appendix D, Figures 2-6). That is that Oregonians do indeed believe that all novice, teen drivers, should be required to take mandatory and standardized driver’s education. To further these findings a two-tailed, Spearman Rho test (see Appendix E, Table 1 & Table 2) was done to test the significance in an associative manner of the respondents’ answers. The author wanted to explore the notion on a couple of pairs of significantly related questions or statements to the premise based on the actual responses or beliefs are significantly or coincidentally related to both the subject of mandatory and standardized driver’s education for novice, young drivers in the state of Oregon. In Table 1, the correlation results shows that the author is almost 100% sure there is no coincidence that Oregonians’ believe that Mandatory Drivers ED before Getting a License and Standardization of Skills being Taught in all Driver’s ED Classes in Oregon go hand in hand with each other. Therefore, these two proposed future mandates seemed to favor most Oregonians. Finally, the second association results of the two-tailed, Spearman Rho test, again, conclude that the author is almost 100% sure there is no coincidence that Oregonians’ believe that Standardization of Skills that should be taught to all driver’s education students correlates positively with the fact that all driver’s education instructors should receive standardized training to teach driver’s education.

Concluding Discussion

One might say that this case study has finalized the issue on the need for mandatory and standardized driver’s education throughout Oregon. Although this study proves that Oregonians believe that both mandatory and standardized driver’s education should be a requirement for all novice teenage drivers in the state of Oregon, it is by no means and should not be the final word on this subject. As Oregonians, this study should open the dialogue on why mandatory and standardization in driver’s education is important. This study is only to show how Oregonians might vote at the polls if they were presented this opinion in fortifying our existing and successful Graduated Licensing Program. Future studies are encouraged, especially on the initial cost of setting up such future, proposed mandates. But it is the author’s opinion that the initial costs to initiate mandatory and standardized driver’s education throughout the state outweigh the present day cost. Today’s costs of the loss of young lives and the present day financial societal burdens that are incurred due to the

(continued on page 8)
facts of inconstancy in training and experience for our novice, teenage drivers should never be considered the alternative solution.
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1 = Strong Disagree 3 = No Opinion 5 = Strongly Agree

Are You Qualified to Teach Driver's Ed to a Teen?

Mandatory Drivers ED before Getting a License

1 = Strong Disagree 3 = No Opinion 5 = Strongly Agree

Mandatory Drivers ED before Getting a License
Mandatory Drivers ED as part of the School Curriculum

Frequency in # of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency in # of Participants</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. Dev = 1.32
Mean = 4.1
N = 30.00

Mandatory Drivers ED/School Curriculum

Standardization-Mandate training of Driver’s ED Instructors

Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. Dev = .96
Mean = 3.4
N = 30.00

Standardization-Mandate training of Driver’s ED Instructors

Standardization of Skills being Taught in all Driver’s ED Classes in Oregon

Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. Dev = 1.06
Mean = 3.3
N = 30.00
Standardization of Driver's ED Textbooks and Materials
throughout Oregon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Correlations: Based on the Belief of Oregonians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kendall's Mandatory Drivers ED before Getting a License</th>
<th>Standardization of Skills being Taught in all Driver's ED Classes in Oregon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kendall’s 'tau_b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardization of Skills being Taught</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardization of Skills being Taught in all Driver's ED Classes in Oregon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Correlations: Based On the Belief of Oregonians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kendall's taul_b</th>
<th>Standardized Training for Driver's Ed Instructors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardization-Mandate training</td>
<td>.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardization of Skills</td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardization-Mandate training</td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AlcoholEdu for High School – A review
Dale O. Ritzel Professor, Health Education
Director, Safety Center Southern Illinois University

In February 2004, Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) and Outside The Classroom introduced AlcoholEdu for High School, the first online prevention program designed to combat underage drinking by giving students the information they need to make safer and healthier decisions about alcohol. AlcoholEdu for High School is a Web-based prevention program that engages high school students with science-based alcohol education. Developed by leading prevention experts, it provides an interactive experience that changes perceptions, motivates behavior change and helps high school students contend with a culture that too often encourages, rather than discourages, underage drinking.

MADD joined forces with Outside The Classroom, a Boston-area company, to develop AlcoholEdu for High School following the success of the three-year-old AlcoholEdu for College program, which this year is being taken by more than 100,000 college students on more than 300 campuses nationwide. On college campuses where all first-year students were required to take AlcoholEdu, the proportion of students abstaining from alcohol increased, average consumption of alcohol per student decreased and the proportion of students engaging in dangerous "binge" drinking decreased.

AlcoholEdu for High School can be taken on any standard Internet-connected computer and combines streaming audio with interactive exercises, making it easy for teachers to administer and engaging for students to take. It is divided into three 30-minute sections (with a brief conclusion section), making it ideal for use either in the classroom or for homework as part of the school's alcohol and other drug prevention curriculum. The interactive exercises bring to life the scientific content, and case-history role-playing helps students understand the social context of alcohol and the decisions they have to make when they find themselves in various situations.

The AlcoholEdu for High School is an interesting Web site from a factual standpoint. It was visually eye pleasing and contained some interesting facts. However, it seemed very lengthy. A typical student will take some 90 minutes to complete the lessons. Each part seemed to take forever and gave the user temptation to skip the conclusions. I did like the sounds which accompanied the slides and facts. This kept me listening, and not just viewing. The three chapters in the course including:

Chapter 1: Alcohol the Drug
This chapter focuses on alcohol's effects on the body and on the impairments produced by various levels of a person's blood alcohol concentration, or BAC. One exercise is included: The Impact of Alcohol.

Chapter 2: Effects on Mind and Body
This chapter discusses how alcohol affects the developing teenage brain. It also addresses blackouts, hangovers, and the deadly combination of drinking and driving. One exercise is included: Alcohol and the Brain.

Chapter 3: Making Healthy Decisions
This chapter talks about the factors that influence decisions about drinking—like family and friends—as well as strategies a person can use when facing decisions where drinking is involved. One exercise is including: Knowing your Limits.

In addition to the Web site being aesthetically pleasing, it was very easy to navigate through the different sections. I also like the fact that if I had to stop at a certain point, I could resume where I had left off at a later time. This is definitely an ideal setup for high school students since, sometimes, their attention spans may be limited and since the time allotted to complete and review the information would not allow for a ninety minute session at one time if it was to be done during class time. Although AlcoholEdu for High School offers general information and facts regarding alcohol, I think that there should be more hypothetical situations, role playing, and decision making activities so high school students could provide their responses.

I think that having to provide a response or a decision, a student would make in given situations relating to alcohol, would be more beneficial. This would also help prompt the student to think more about what he/she is doing and would hopefully make them realize the importance of making good decisions in situations where alcohol is present. Mere knowledge and attitude measurement will not lead to behavior change. Students need the skills to be able to make responsible decisions. Whether students knows that alcohol is dangerous or, for example, smoking is addictive and causes cancer is not enough to keep them from choosing to try them. Students need general knowledge, decision choices, consequences (good and bad to all decisions), goal setting, alternative choices, prevention plans, and lastly a skill based practice session.

A survey option enables the

(continued on page 12)
we need louder voices that can be among us. We need a louder voice. What we do.

But one thing is also lacking among us. We need a louder voice. We need louder voices that can be heard by the decision-makers both at home and in Washington. We need to bring positive facts to the table when driver education funding is being discussed. We need to do a better job of promoting driver education and training. But first, we need to stand up and be counted.

Back in the 1970’s it was proudly proclaimed that there were 100,000 driver education teachers! At that time, ADTSEA could say the association represented “X” number of professionals. Today we can’t say how many people nationwide are involved in traffic safety education. Isn’t it time to stand and be counted?

How many people within your state are teaching driver education and training? How many are members of ADTSEA or your state association? ADTSEA-affiliate state association’s are an important and valuable resource to ADTSEA and an accurate count of your members will give ADTSEA the strength that comes with numbers.

ADTSEA is the only national organization that is recognized as the association that represents the driver education teacher at the local level, the administrator working to maintain or improve their program, and the university professor preparing our new teachers. The best way to make ourselves heard is to make our association stronger.

My term as ADTSEA president will be focused on how we can make ADTSEA stronger and carry a louder voice. Imagine the Chronicle 10-20 years from now. Will history repeat the 1970’s with increased support for traffic safety education during the next ten years?

(AlcoholEdu continued from page 11) School to gather pre-, post- and follow-up data on student attitudes and behavior. The surveys provide valuable information about the efficacy of AlcoholEdu and the school's other prevention programs, helping administrators meet federal and state funding requirements for prevention programs.

Some of the additional features that contribute to the benefit of AlcoholEdu for High School include:

1. A glossary which is very thorough.
2. A comprehensive list of references which includes both printed references and Web site based references. Examples include:
   - Sedative (calming or sleep producing) effects of alcohol might be smaller in younger drinkers Spear, L.P. "Alcohol's effects on adolescents." Alcohol Research and Health 26 (2002): 287-291.
3. A list of resources available online in the topic areas of:
   - Underage Drinking
   - Binge Drinking
   - Alcohol and the Brain
   - Drinking and Driving
   - Alcohol Abuse and Addiction
   - Miscellaneous
   - Major Surveys
   - Agencies and Organizations
4. Three Fact Sheets including:
   - Driving Skills
   - Measuring the Effects of Alcohol
   - Before and After the Buzz

To see more about AlcoholEdu for High School Web course go to the Outside the Classroom Web site: http://www.outsidetheclassroom.com/ or the MADD Web site: http://www.madd.org/home/ or directly...
Fall 2004

Marilyn Howard, Ed.D., Superintendent of Public Instruction, Idaho
A Speech to SDE Driver Education Conference Friday, July 9, 2004

In case you didn’t know it, one of the perks that goes along with being state superintendent is that I get invited to meetings and conferences all over the state, and so I’ve seen a good deal of Idaho since I first took office, almost as much as I saw while I was campaigning and driving my mobile office -- a camper -- from town to town. And that means I also get a chance to talk to a lot of people about their schools and what’s good and what’s bad.

All of you are part of what’s good. Over the last 3-1/2 years, you have gained a lot of fans throughout the state. That, of course, marks the effective date of the Graduated Driver Licensing legislation, and since then parents have truly been involved in their teen driver’s training. You’ve gone from the sort-of-teacher-in-a-car to the heroic figures who choose to do this over some other, safer pastime, such as being a police officer or BASE jumper. You should know that there is a keen appreciation now for what you teach and how you go about it.

The Graduated Driver Licensing law is only one part of a continuum of driver education improvement that began in the mid 1990s in response to the alarming trend of increasing crashes, injuries, and fatalities among our teen drivers.

Driver’s education is much older than that, of course. One woman in my office tells of her own driver’s ed class more than four decades ago. Her most vivid memory is of the day the teacher planned to show his students how to change a tire. When the time came, he told the boys to meet in the parking lot and told the girls they could just read in the classroom, because if they ever had to change a tire, all they had to do is stand by the road and look helpless.

That story speaks volumes about changing times. No woman in her right mind would willingly stand by the road and look helpless these days. Tires are so improved that most of us have rarely, if ever, had a flat. If we do, we might just reach for the can of foam that will get us to someplace where we can have the professionals look at the tire. Or punch On-Star. Or reach for a cell phone.

And remember, we are dealing now with a generation that has its own set of cultural references, just as our parents did and just as our grandparents did and so on, probably back to caveman days, when cave dad must have complained to cave mom that these young whippersnappers took fire for granted.

You’ve probably seen the same list that I have of the references that are familiar to this year’s graduating class, most of whom were born after 1985. The Kennedy assassination is truly ancient history to them, and they don’t remember the Challenger space shuttle blowing up. Their indelible memory will probably be the terrorist attacks of 9/11 -- at least, I hope that will be their indelible memory, because if it isn’t, it means something far worse will happen. Last spring’s seniors have never owned a record player and may have never seen a black-and-white television. As far as they know, the Tonight Show has always been hosted by Jay Leno. And don’t all telephones come with answering machines? And doesn’t everyone carry a cell? And doesn’t everybody shop on E-Bay? They have grown up not having a clue what polio is, but always knowing about AIDS.

Driver’s education is not immune to these changes, particularly, as I said, since the mid 1990s. The continuum of improvement has included establishment of minimum standards, with new qualifications for instructors, new curriculum content requirements, new expectations for driver performance, and new instructional support resources. Idaho has been in the forefront of these improvements.

In that sense, driver’s education adheres closely to what is happening everywhere else in public education.

One of the themes I have been emphasizing over the past year is this: that we are here to educate the whole child, not just the child who is going to be tested in the areas of math and language arts required by the federal No Child Left Behind Act. That whole child might be the budding athlete, the computer geek, the struggling reader, the math whiz, the movie star wannabe, and the youngster who can hardly wait to drive. All of them come to us to be nurtured and educated.

Your part is soon to become even clearer. Today the State Department of Education is introducing the standards for an "Approved Driver Education Program," which, if approved by the State Board of Education, will join our standards for math, social studies, humanities, and so on.

For you and your charges, the Content Standards and Benchmarks clearly define the essential knowledge and skills teen drivers need to know and do. This effort has taken almost three years of careful evaluation of state and national standards to make sure Idaho is on the leading edge.

I want to thank all of you here who helped bring this project to life. Because of your work, all teachers will benefit. Teen drivers, their families, and our communities will
(Idaho Speech Continued)
have the ultimate benefit by having teachers throughout the state teaching to the same standards, just as they do in all other subject areas. If there are standards you believe should be edited or added, please put that in writing. The goal is to have our students thoroughly educated and practiced in safe driving habits.

And just as we do for other subjects, we have resources available for you: lesson plans tied to the standards, fact sheets, Power Point presentations, sample quizzes, and so on. Not only will these things help make your jobs easier, they will also improve your knowledge and performance as driver education teachers.

It occurred to me as I reviewed the driver education standards that all of our investments in math, science, social studies, and so on, will be meaningless unless our students are safe. That means safe at school and safe on the road.

Driver education is not just about teaching young drivers how to control a vehicle. It covers the spectrum from basic laws to the physics of motion, to communication, social interaction, time and space management, and decision-making.

Young people come to you after nearly 15 years of passenger experience. During that time they have probably witnessed the best and worst of driving, and the behaviors they have seen will have a large impact on their attitudes about what it means to be behind the wheel. If they come to you from seeing near misses, running traffic lights, speeding – and getting away with it – and the other careless habits of driving, then that will be their standard. Your work is doubled: not only must you undo those attitudes, but you must build new ones. It's a big assignment.

I know that many of you teach early in the morning or into the evening. I see your cars on the highways and on city streets, and just seeing that "student driver" sign always makes me a bit more cautious about my own driving. You steer these youngsters through congested traffic, road construction projects, drowsy or aggressive drivers, and other threats. Your biggest challenge is to teach the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to survive on today's roadways.

Now, let me take off my superintendent's hat for a moment and put on my mother and grandmother hats.

We drive on roads where speed limits are higher than they were not too many years ago. Our cars are smaller, faster, and increasingly more complex. My children, and certainly my grandchildren, are experts at multi-tasking. When they are on the road, I want them to be as careful as they can possibly be, and I want all the other drivers to be careful, too.

I'm far more confident about all of that because of people like you. I know you are dedicated and passionate about traffic safety. Your presence here is a testament to your willingness to adapt new techniques and materials to your driver education program, and to keeping up with changes in vehicle technology.

Like all other teachers in our schools, you know that the "what" you teach, and the "how" you teach it will change over time, yet your attendance reflects your commitment to professional development.

You've told your students that to be a proficient and safe driver takes years of practice, and you can tell them from your own experience that it takes continued practice to stay proficient.

So as a mom, as a grandmother, and certainly as your State Superintendent of Public Instruction, I welcome all of you as colleagues in this great enterprise of preparing this next generation to take its place in our classrooms and on the road.

I'm never sure our students understand how important your work is, and so, on their behalf, let me say "thank you" for what you do. And it's a thanks that is renewed every time I get behind the wheel. I hope you leave here with new information, new energy, and a new appreciation for the responsibility you have undertaken.

(Editor's notes from page 2 ) an opinion not a fact) here is an example of how simple participation and communication can be done.

You read an editorial in your local paper and believe that your fellow ADTSEAs might find it interesting so you send me the editorial page with the editorial circled and a cryptic note that lets me know your opinion. If I agree with your opinion a brief note like the following would appear:

Thanks to Maynard Bridges an editorial published in “The Charlotte Observer” on July 24, 2004 entitled “Teen drinking - These youngsters don't have to die; accidents are preventable” has come to my attention. You can find the editorial at www.charlotte.com.

See how painless this can be? If more of us did what Maynard did your editor would continue to have a plethora of materials.

But please do not stop where Maynard stopped if you are moved to actually write your editor. Editors love letters. These letters provide much needed feedback on the question (Is any one actually reading this?) every editor asks themselves and have the potential to keep stories alive and thus trigger more material for future publications (see David Huff's letter on the next page).

Now for some observations about this edition of your publications. Our new president has set the bar high in call for us to stand
Dear Editor,

I envision a time when we utilize an individualized driver education curriculum, the design of which is based upon a complex mix of the individual's mental and physical skill potential, including qualities such as distractibility, reaction, judgment, and vision skills. We already have the computerized simulators to serve as the platform to merge traffic simulation with psychometric tools. It will not only help us with providing a safer merge into the driving public for new drivers, but it can help us with adults needing remediation and seniors who experience increasing difficulties.

Whoa, you say, how did I get to this point? Let me back up a bit.

The article entitled "Reflections on Brain Research" by Curt Hanson and yourself published in the Summer 2004 edition is right on the mark. Accessing and utilizing emerging research on how the brain functions is important for driver educators if we truly do wish to have our instruction result in safer drivers.

Several years back when I was studying brain research I was struck by the correlation between emerging brain research and the experience and practice of insurance companies. The research I refer to was referenced in the ADTSEA article and states the prefrontal cortex is not fully developed until youth reach the age of 23 to 25 years of age. The insurance practice, which is based upon their claims experience, denies reduced adult rates until youth reach ages 23 - 25, depending upon the insurance company. The similarities is very suspicious and supports the intuition of many parents and individuals who work with youth that kids really do have a form of brain "deadness" or more accurately and respectfully stated, "immaturity", that results in inferior traffic safety behavior.

The ADTSEA article refers to additional research as to the effect of practice on brain development. All these clues that we are getting about what is going on with the young brain are important for us to grapple with in developing and refining our instructional methods, and it is time for us, as a traffic safety community, to take a quantum leap in our approach to instruction.

The future is today! At our recent conference in Portland, a vendor representing CogniFit demonstrated a computer based assessment that claimed to predict which drivers are more prone to accidents. It's about time we have these kinds of tools being applied to driving. This product was developed overseas. Why is that? Why aren't experts in the United States applying these kinds of tools to driving safety? For years we have been able to assess, with respectable success, personality traits, occupational strengths, intelligence, marriage compatibility, and multitudes of other human potential through the use of psychometrics. It's time these technologies help us with the human element of the highway safety challenge.

And this brings me back to my vision...individualized driver education curriculum. We are not all the same. It's time we identify an individual's specific needs and instruct directly to those needs utilizing techniques that maximize knowledge, skill, and good judgment acquisition. Brain research is leading the way.

Sincerely,

David Huff
Montana

The U.S. Federal Highway Administration has released a summary report on a study that found driver, vehicle, and roadway safety programs for truck drivers should address backing, rear-end, right- and left-turn, and sideswipe collisions, because, according to the study, truck drivers are more likely to be at fault in such crashes. In addition, the study suggests that similar safety programs for car drivers should focus on head-on and angle collisions.


Alcohol-related fatalities declined in 2003, according to the U.S. Department of Transportation’s National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). A total of 17,013 alcohol-related fatalities were recorded in 2003, down by 511, or almost 3 percent, from the total of 17,524 recorded in 2002. The greatest reduction in fatalities was among those in crashes where the highest blood-alcohol content (BAC) was .08 and above.


The Center for Transportation Research and Education at Iowa State University has released a report that evaluates the safety effect of all-red clearance intervals at low-speed urban four-way intersections in the City of Minneapolis.


TRB's National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 500 Volume 12: Guidance for Implementation of the AASHTO Strategic Highway Safety Plan -- A Guide for Reducing Collisions at Signalized Intersections provides strategies that can be employed to reduce the number of collisions at signalized intersections.


The Maine Department of Transportation has released a report that examines causes and potential solutions to red-light running. According to the report, 25 percent of drivers involved in red-light running crashes were unaware of the red signal.


The Wisconsin Department of Transportation's Deer-Vehicle Crash Information Clearinghouse has released a report that summarizes and evaluates deer-vehicle crash countermeasures.


According to the U.S. Department of Transportation’s 2003 Annual Assessment of Motor Vehicle Crashes, a total of 42,643 people died and 2.89 million were injured in 2003 on America’s roadways. The fatality rate per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT) was 1.48 in 2003, down from 1.51 in 2002. This marks the first time the fatality rate has dropped below 1.5. In 2002, 43,005 were killed and 2.93 million were injured.


TRB's National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 500-- Guidance for Implementation of the AASHTO Strategic Highway Safety Plan Volume 9: A Guide for Reducing Collisions Involving Older Drivers provides strategies that can be employed to reduce the number of collisions involving older drivers.


The Swedish National Road and Transport Research Institute has released a report that examines performance of snow tires, both studded and unstudded, in terms of age, tread depth, tread rubber hardness, stud protrusion, and stud force. The report is in Swedish with an English summary.
2004 SURVEY OF THE ATTITUDES OF AMERICANS ON HIGHWAY AND AUTO SAFETY  

Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety has released its latest Lou Harris Poll on highway and auto safety attitudes in the United States. According to the poll, 84 percent of the American public, including 8 of 10 sports utility vehicle (SUV) owners, favor the U.S. government requiring manufacturers to make all motor vehicles, including SUVs, more stable and less likely to roll over in crashes.

THE SAFETY IMPACT OF VEHICLE-RELATED ROAD DEBRIS  

The AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety has released a report that examines the magnitude and characteristics of vehicle-related road debris safety issues.

Michigan’s graduated driver licensing program:  
Evaluation of the first four years.  
Jean T. Shope, Lisa J. Molnar  
Abstract:

To evaluate the four-year outcome of Michigan’s graduated driver licensing (GDL) program, motor-vehicle crash data for 16-year-old drivers in 1996 (pre-GDL), and 1998-2001 (post-GDL) were analyzed. Method: Relative risks and 95% confidence intervals for several crash types were computed, and pre-post-GDL population-based crash rates were compared.

Reducions in crash risks among 16-year-olds previously found in 1998 and 1999 were generally maintained in 2000 and 2001. Results: reductions in crash risk among 16-year-olds from 1996 to 2001 were 29% for all, 44% for fatal, 38% each for nonfatal-injury and fatal-plus-nonfatal-injury, 32% for day, 31% for evening, 59% for night, 32% for single-vehicle, and 26% for multi-vehicle crashes. Even after adjusting for more general population-wide changes among drivers 25 years and older that might have contributed to changes in 16-year-old crash risk, reductions remained impressive (19% for all crashes in 2001). Impact on Industry: As one approach to reducing teenage motor-vehicle morbidity and mortality, GDL remains promising.

ANTIHISTAMINES AND DRIVING-RELATED BEHAVIOR: A REVIEW OF THE EVIDENCE FOR IMPAIRMENT  

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration has released a report that examines the effects of first- and second-generation antihistamines on impairment.

A GUIDE FOR REDUCING COLLISIONS INVOLVING PEDESTRIANS  


SAFER DRIVERS IN SAFER CARS ON SAFER ROADS: AN INVITATION TO ACTION  

The Canadian Automobile Association has released a report designed to shift thinking about roadways and roadway infrastructure funding from a transport policy issue to one of traffic and road safety as a preventable national public health problem.

BUSH SIGNS EIGHT-MONTH TRANSPORTATION AUTHORIZATION EXTENSION BILL  

On September 30, 2004, President Bush signed an eight-month extension of funding for national highway and transit programs. The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century expired on September 30, 2003, but has received a series of short-term extensions as Congress and the Administration continue work on different options for reauthorization of many of the nation’s surface transportation programs. The current extension expires May 31, 2005.
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ADTSEA numbers its’ Corporate Members among its’ most valuable assets. Our relationship is one in which the Association and the individual Corporate Members seek to provide counsel, assistance, and service to one another whenever possible. Additionally, the Corporate Members make financial contributions without which the Association would be far less effective.
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TWO CAMERA READY DESIGNS ARE AVAILABLE...
Knipple Selected As Teacher of the Year

John F. Knipple from Colton Joint Unified School District representing the California Association of Safety Education was selected as the ADTSEA Teacher of the Year during the 48th annual conference. The award was presented on behalf of the AAA by Dr. William Van Tassel. Other finalists were: Shirly Rowland Suneson, Minnesota, Cathy Broderick, Vermont, Judy Ode, Oregon, and James C. McGrane, Montana.

Barbara Brody introduced each of the nominees highlighting their accomplishments. The teacher of the year committee made their selection after each nominee had delivered a driver education lesson to the committee. Following the presentation and acceptance of (continued on page 2)

Kline 2004 Kaywood Award Recipient

Dr. Gary Bloomfield 1999 Kaywood Award recipient presided at the award ceremony that announced both the teacher of the year and the Kaywood recipients. Dr. Bloomfield introduced the 2003 Kaywood recipient, Dr. Maucie Dennis who then presented the introduction of Dr. Terry Kline. In begin his introduction Dr. Dennis said: "It was a great honor for me to be selected for the 2003 Kaywood Award. To be asked to introduce the 2004 recipient is also something I am pleased and proud to do."

The guidelines for the Kaywood Award are: Evidence of having made a (continued on page 3)
(from page 1)
the award John F. Knipple presented his award winning lesson to the general session audience.

Pictured to the right from left to right are: Shirly Rowland Suneson, John F. Knipple, Judy Ode, and Cathy Broderic. James C. McGrane was not able to attend the ceremony due to a family illness.

Barbara Brody's remarks introducing the ADTSEA/AAA 2004 Teacher of the Year on July 28, 2004

Good morning, and once again I am honored to represent ADTSEA's Teacher of the Year Committee. And on behalf of ADTSEA I would like to thank AAA for their sponsorship of this very valuable program. On Saturday the TOY committee spent all day scoring portfolio’s, analyzing the teaching lessons and voting on the 2004 teacher of the year. The teaching lessons and portfolios are amazing. Each of us on the committee learned much from each candidate. It has been an honor for me to work with each one of the nominees and as always it has been a great pleasure to work with each committee member. I would like to introduce and acknowledge the committee members (Pictured below from right to left Barbara is second from the right). Barry Thayer from CT, the 2002 TOY Lindsay Townsend from VT, Robin Bordner from Michigan our first Teacher of the year, Terry Kline from KY, last years winner Debbie Cottonware from MT, and the 2001 TOY Chuck Filippini from WA.

George Bernard Shaw wrote: “To me the sole hope of human salvation lies in teaching." What is an outstanding teacher? What qualities can we recognize in a teacher that makes us realize we have just been in the presence of one. Dr James Comer while speaking in Houston, Texas is quoted as saying “No significant learning occurs without significant relationships.” Dr. Harry Wong writes, “the art of teaching is the art of assisting discovery. You can teach a lesson for a day but if you teach curiosity, you teach for a lifetime. William Ward a British Novelist said, “The mediocre teacher tells. The good teacher explains. The superior teacher demonstrates. The great teacher inspires.” Robert Frost wrote I am a writer of books in retrospect. I talk in order to understand; I teach in order to learn. Dr. Parker Palmer wrote “Good teachers are also mentors. Being a mentor to a beginning teacher is one of teaching’s greatest rewards in which the old empower the young with their experience and the young empower the old with new life. And lastly Henry Adams an American historian said “ A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops.”

All of our Teachers of the Year candidates have these qualities. They have formed lasting relationships (continues on page 12)
significant contribution to traffic safety education on the national and or international level and have served the traffic safety education profession for not less than 20 years; and been an active member of ADTSEA for not less than 20 years. Dr. Dennis said: "The guidelines for this award perfectly fit this year's recipient."

Dr. Dennis recounted this year's honoree's involvement in teaching driver and traffic safety education at the high school, undergraduate, and graduate level. Some highlights of Terry Kline's career include: an undergraduate education at Millersville State University; teaching high school driver education; receiving a M.S. in Safety from Central Missouri State University; and ten years of employment and graduate study at Texas A&M interspersed with side visits to Washington state and other places.

Commenting on Terry's knowledge of the field Dr. Dennis said; "After taking charge of our 5 phase driver education teacher preparation and lab program at A&M, I quickly came to see that he had probably forgotten more about driver and traffic safety education than I ever knew. Dr. Dennis went on to describe Terry's organizational skills in this way: "Terry could tell you that on the 19th day of the semester he would be covering perception and on the 28th day be on in-car visual techniques. The organizational expertise went beyond course to include long range planning. In relating some work he and Terry had done together Dr. Dennis said, "I asked him to plan something for the next 2-3 years...He came back with a plan for each year through 2017!"

Dr. Kline's contributions to state and national conferences, curriculum development projects, and editorship of state and national publications was noted before Dr. Dennis invited the traffic safety educator, husband, father, grandfather, colleague, and friend Dr. Terry Kline of Eastern Kentucky University as the 2004 Kaywood winner.

Dr. Kline's acceptance speech can be found beginning in the next column on this page.

One out of Many... Significance of the ADTSEA Richard Kaywood Award
Terry L. Kline, Ed.D., Eastern Kentucky University
2004 Kaywood Award Honoree

Thank you, Dr. Bloomfield, for your comments and recognition of the achievements of Dr. Kaywood. Thank you, Dr. Dennis, for your kind and generous words on my behalf. I am indeed honored, appreciative, and humbled to receive the ADTSEA Richard Kaywood Award this year sponsored by Prentice-Hall Publishing. For those who know me well, I feel somewhat lost and naked behind this podium without a PowerPoint presentation behind me. My wife told me to take this little presentation device used to change slides with me and I would feel more comfortable behind this podium as I deliver these comments.

Often we are thrust into a service role in a professional Association that makes us look like leaders or like experts in our field. My role in the traffic safety field is really a belief in the foundations of service. My early professional life was molded by the Kennedy assertion of service to country, when so many were asking what has my country done for me lately. My early years were greatly influenced by our high school football coach named, Frank Reich. He was a person who lived the concept of service to God, Country, Family, and your Profession in that sequence. He has passed that team concept forward to many high school athletes in his career. Some of you may remember Frank's son as a quarterback for the Buffalo Bills during their Super Bowl runs.

In traveling around the traffic safety community, whether in Brazil, Europe, Guam or the United States, I hear the same type of problems being associated with traffic safety and our professional outlook. One of the issues we all deal with each day was best expressed in the White River Leader Newspaper from Branson, Missouri, "The best substitute for experience is (continued on the next page)
... being 16.” Most of our teachers, instructors, and professionals have a great deal of enthusiasm and dedication to help the youthful drivers succeed and provide the guided experiences necessary for success. Many sincerely say they would like to help the association or share some ideas through a journal publication. In many cases, the teacher says they do not have time or do not write well enough for publication. In fact this concern was just addressed by Dr. John Palmer in the last issue of the Chronicle.

We are not alone as we work in traffic safety education. In the traffic safety education community, we are really one person or one voice out of many in our chosen profession. That is a theme I would like to share with you as we attend various functions at this Conference. Our association, more than any other, is designed to bring various traffic safety educators, problems, ideas, and solutions to the forefront, so that we can share in their value.

There are many mentors in all of our lives that have guided and supported our individual traffic safety efforts. I was very fortunate to be part of the Pennsylvania Association for Safety Education since 1969 as I began a process of learning that continues today. Some of the familiar PASE names that supported my professional choices were Amos Neyhart, Joe Intorre, Richard Giddings, Bill Cushman, Ron Strapel, Phil Adams, Brad Bradshaw, Bobbie Carlson, Rich Hornfeck, John Ratjik, John Markish, and Allen Robinson. As a graduate of Millersville University, Dr. Ray Mullin invited Bill Cushman, Gene Carney, Owen Crabb, Frank Kenel, Dick Bishop, and Ame Neyhart as presenters to many of our sessions. I was just one person influenced by so many traffic safety professionals. I also met the most outstanding person in my life at a PASE Conference in 1969. My wife, Hilde, and I will always have a special appreciation of attending the PASE Conference in Ebensburg, PA. We have been going together and enjoying each other’s company ever since that conference in Ebensburg.

My first activities with ADTSEA occurred as a result of taking graduate classes at Central Missouri State University. Mentors like Bob Marshall, Bob Baldwin, Bob Ulrich, Jim Counts, and Kent Jesse were working on the Safe Performance Curriculum at the time that became the basis of the DeKalb project. At Central Missouri, I made lifelong friends that continue to mold traffic safety programs including Kent Jesse, John Harvey, John Hetcko, Andy Krajewski, Jim Gibb, and Paul Silas. I hope you are beginning to see that sharing and service to our profession has been a part of my life as well as others.

A revered Persian proverb says, "A person who wants to learn will always find a teacher.” My most lasting memories of mentors and fellowship are from the great state of Texas where being an Aggie remains something special in my life and that of my family. No matter where I have traveled, it has been amazing to find an Aggie by my side in airports, other countries, and in this Association. Again the Aggie Spirit supports the concept of an individual providing great efforts with the support of the Aggie family. Maury Dennis and Roy Moss will be forever be a part of my knowledge base in alcohol education. My Aggie cohorts continue to be traffic safety leaders throughout many states and organizations… Randy Thiel, Bill Van Tassel, Ray Sparks, Jane Preston, and Barbara Goodman. Beth Weaver-Shepard and Jack Weaver continue to work in traffic safety education and were part of the Aggie program for many years.

My short time in Washington State has had a profound influence on my professional life. Working with all the great teachers of Washington State in developing a curriculum program is a continuing great experience. Gary Bloomfield, John Harvey, Clyde McBrayer, Ron Hales, Dave Kinnunen, Syd Muzzy, Debbie Cottonware, Chuck Fillipini, Gerry Apple, and Art Opfer continue to be close associates and friends. Again a sign of how my efforts were supported by so many great educators in our profession. They encouraged me to get involved with ADTSEA by editing and rejuvenating the ADTSEA Journal in 1992. With deep respect to the efforts of Richard Kaywood, the WTSEA Board supported the efforts to develop the Chronicle of ADTSEA and the ADTSEA News and Views. With their support, I was able to fashion a new ADTSEA Journal in the style and format of Richard Kaywood. Again I was just one out of many that wanted to serve the traffic safety profession.

My last seven years at Eastern Kentucky University have provided an opportunity for Hilde and I to get involved nationally with all the fine folks at local levels working with
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We have had great opportunities serving as editor of the Chronicle and ADTSEA News and Views for ten years. So many contributors have made our service to ADTSEA and the national programs so worthwhile. While this award honors me, I fully recognize how I am just one person out of many that have influenced my service to this profession. Each one of us in this audience is part of this honor and this award process. It is your dedication, your enthusiasm, and your willingness to share and learn that drives me to attend state conferences and help in the development of curriculum that meets the ADTSEA National Standards. Standards developed by this fine association of traffic safety professionals.

I would like to conclude this session with one thought…. Please be willing to share your problems, ideas, and solutions with our association through attendance at local, regional and national conferences, participation in the Chronicle or ADTSEA News and Views, and spreading enthusiasm to those you teach. I would like to take just a moment of silent meditation for you to remember all those that have helped your professional development…. 

... As we remember those from our past, please remember that we are all one person out of many that share our enthusiasm and dedication to this profession. Using my Texas vernacular, it is because of all of you all that I am here accepting this award today. Thank you for being here and sharing this experience with me. Next year it will be one of you that stand in my place of honor. Thank you.

UNDERSTANDING
“DRIVING IN THE HOLE”
By John F. Knippel
ADTSEA T.O.Y. 2004

Teaching people to “Drive in the Hole” is very similar to teaching people how to read. There are several steps to learning how to read that must be mastered before reading becomes comfortable, efficient, and capable of transferring the mood and intention of the author to the audience. “Driving in the Hole” is a form of “reading” traffic.

One of the first steps in reading is to understand the symbols. One must distinguish shapes and positions and the sounds associated with those shapes and positions. For example “p” and “d” and “q” and “b” are the same shapes in different positions. “f” and “ph” are the same sound, but different shapes and numbers of shapes.

When first learning to read traffic we focus on the small details like limit lines, crosswalks, solid or broken lines, yellow or white lines. Like our letters of the alphabet these symbols need to be mastered in order to advance to the next level of understanding.

The problem for reading text and for reading traffic is that if we only learn the symbols we are limited by our short term memory to make sense of them. XIPLDNUQSTDVNIEW.NBVLEUI has no meaning even if we can pronounce every letter correctly. We are still not reading. Knowing the law or knowing the pavement markings is not driving. We need the next level or step in reading.

In the second level of reading we begin to group the letters together. The small clusters allow us to retain more information and to retrieve it more easily. For example, BUT, NOT, ALL, IS, YUK, This still is not reading as most of us know it. The words must fit a particular pattern to convey a message and does so accurately from one person to another.

The second level of driving is to use repeatable and predictable traffic patterns. We teach how to predict traffic signal changes, the speed of cross traffic and our distance from an intersection, stopping distances and tailgating, and packs and gaps in traffic. This allows us to have limited understanding of what may happen and when it may happen. This is where most driver training stops and the new drivers... 

(continued on next page)
are told they will learn the rest by experience. In most cases experience is equivalent to a crash.

The next level of reading takes the reader beyond merely seeing the words and allows the reader to “feel” and to “see” and to “understand” the context of the story through imagery. Here is where enjoyment and learning take place. Here is where we can fill-in-the-blanks and really speed up the rate at which we take in information. Here is where we truly comprehend. Read the following passage. At the end of the passage reflect on what just happened in your mind. The purpose of the written word is communication.

I codnuolt blveiee taht I cluod aulaclty uesdnatnrd waht I was radgnieg > >THE PAOMNNEHAL PWOR OF THE HMUAN MNID Aoccdmrig to a rscheearh at Cmabrigde Uinertvisy, it deosn’t mttaer in waht oredr the ltteers in a wrod are, the olny iprmoatnt tihng is taht the frist and lsat ltteer be in the rghit pclae. The rset can be a taotl mses and >you can still raed it wouthit a porbelm. This is bcuseae the huamn mnid deos not raed ervey ltteer by istlef, but the wrod as a wlohe. Amzanig huh? > > >So much for all the spelling tests we ever had.... > > >

Communication has occurred. What does this mean for traffic safety?

Going beyond the basics of laws, visual search patterns, procedures, and expecting the novice to drive safely is what is required. We must teach Smith System, I.P.D.E., Zone Control and everything we can. Then we must reach beyond. If we are to prepare novices of all ages how to drive safely for many years, not just get a license, then we must teach “Driving in the Hole”. We must teach a new level of visual search and understanding. We need our drivers to “feel” the pulse or the tempo of the traffic flow. Our new drivers MUST be able to understand the “context” of the traffic at any given moment in time. Predicting driver behavior that is a problem can only happen when we are so very familiar with the “best patterns” (spelling) that we can spot the deviant behavior instantly. We need to know the “plot” of the story to see when certain clues to the action are slowly taking place or are being set up for future events.

“Driving in the Hole” is all about reading traffic like reading a good mystery book. The characters in the book seldom “see it coming” because they are limited in their knowledge or view of the entire plot. Staying way behind the traffic pack and well ahead of the following traffic pack allows us to see the entire plot. We can see the villain’s plan before he can spring the trap. Being in the pack is like being a character in the story. We are limited in our vision and escape routes. Tragedy will strike.

To teach “Driving in the Hole” may require us to look at driver education in a new way. Look back at that crazy paragraph again. Spelling tests are still important. Something else is going on. Without knowing the proper spelling we could not make sense of the paragraph. What is it that “safe drivers” know? Why do some drivers speed and do not get caught by man or by nature, yet others continually crash? Why do some drivers of beat-up old cars not crash and others with new cars and all the technology do crash? Are years of safe driving the result of knowing unique patterns? Can we teach these patterns earlier in a driver’s career?

I came across the system of “Driving in the Hole” by taking pictures of traffic for my classroom. The goal was merely to update what was known then as the Shell Filmstrip Series of Traffic Hazards. Secondly, I was trying to make “local” slides of the scenes I found in the “Perception of Traffic Hazards” series by Warren Quenzel. Lastly, I was attempting to get a “driver’s eye view” of the overhead views of traffic shown in every text book. The process of shooting the photos forced me to be where I could safely hold a camera in one hand, away from my eyes, and drive with the other hand. I had to be in a traffic hole or gap in traffic. I had to be able to predict when the hole would appear and when it would close up again. I later discovered that police officers had to learn this same technique when working their way through traffic to catch speeders. Finally, as I mastered the technique, I found on trips of over 200 miles that I would see the same speeders go past me two, three and four times. I was relaxed. They were harried. I used less fuel. They created more pollution. My car lasted much longer with less maintenance and repair. I have had only one ticket in over 2 million miles of driving. All of my minor crashes happened in the first five years of driving. I was taught to “Drive in the Hole” by professional truck and bus drivers before we had a name for or understood the value of the concept. One of the projects for my credential candidates is to take photos that...
they can use as slides or part of power point presentations in the classroom. They all report the same phenomenon as I did. They end up learning how to spot and how to stay “Driving in the Hole”. Some of my high school students are taking photos for parts of their “student taught lessons” on perception. They are beginning to report the same phenomenon as the credential candidates. Today’s digital cameras and digital camcorders may be part of a paradigm shift in the way we teach driving in the classroom. As school budgets get tighter and tighter, we must prove our value to maintain our place in the school curriculum. I believe we have the most important and most influential class in high school. Let’s lead the way.

Nominee’s for the ADTSEA Teacher of the Year were asked to: 1. Describe what you see as the future of Driver Education/ Traffic Safety.

Each of the finalist’s responses follow.

Catherine J. Broderick’s Response

Looking at the future of traffic safety education in Vermont, there is a shortage of qualified instructors. The pool to draw from is very slim as older teachers are retiring. If the Vermont Standards board for Professional Educator committee would make a recommendation to the state licensing board and approve a limited driver education endorsement for a licensed public school teacher to teach behind the wheel, it would help eliminate some of the backlog. The teacher would need to take Zone Control and In- Vehicle Teaching Techniques. This is a way to start to reduce the shortage of traffic safety educators, we need to support efforts to help in the development of an effective driver and traffic safety educator. If the bill in legislature, allowing for a home-school parent to teach driver education to his/her teenager, passes, I feel this will compromise the standards and high expectations of what Vermont feels our students should know and be able to perform while operating a vehicle within the highway transportation system. Since driving is social task, everyone will be effected by having our standards reduced. This puts everyone at risk! I feel traffic safety needs to continue to support high performance in all students.

When I started in traffic safety, Barb Brody was pushing hard for parent involvement, which hasn’t changed. As educators, we can form a powerful partnership with our students, parents and the community. This quest needs to continue with more vigor in the days to come. With the tightening economy I am sure traffic safety will be on the chopping block in the future. The partnership is critical to the survival and effective performance skills, habits and attitudes for every student.

I feel traffic safety can continue to improve through the efforts of traffic safety educators. We need to focus on a vision of doing this right and doing the right things. In preparing the young drivers in schools we need the support of the staff to help provide a safe and stimulating learning environment. With the same partnership we can continue to vary the instructional presentations to meet the various need of the students.

We need to continue to improve professionally. The states need to offer courses to help traffic safety teacher competencies. I also look to the state associations to provide conferences for new ideas to improve the quality of classroom and behind-the-wheel training.

I look to the future with the thoughts that maybe all schools in the United States could follow the same curriculum guidelines. Vermont is using the curriculum guide created by the National Institute for Driver Behavior. This curriculum has a philosophy, scope and sequence, student outcomes, teacher activities, assessment of program and student performances. These outcomes include the structure with a simple to complex organization of risk prevention behaviors presented for a concurrent and sequential classroom and in-vehicle program. The curriculum includes the use of zone control driving, reference points, targeting skills, effective use of vision for vehicle balance control and other methods for teaching risk prevention driving techniques.

Judy Ode’s Response

Driver and Traffic Safety Education at this time seems to have a bumpy future ahead. There are things we can do to repair that future. We need to get the word out about driver and traffic safety education. We need to advertise. We need to ban together across the country and speak out about our programs. We need a buy in from the parents, they need to believe driver education makes a difference for life long habit training.

(continued on next page)
For driver education to be successful it needs a number of components, each working with and for each other in order to achieve success. First and most importantly we need to be very clear what we expect of our students. What they need to know and do when they are involved in a traffic safety course and what the expectations are of them when they complete a traffic safety course.

Driver education is often seen as a necessary evil something you have to do to get a license. Standards vary across the country, across states and even inside programs from instructor to instructor. A teen trained in the Umpqua Community College program should be getting the same basic information as the teen taking the training at Fredrick Community College in Maryland. They need to receive a course of instruction based on consistent knowledge and skill instruction.

John Knipple's Response

The future of driver education is exactly what we make it. It can be increasing in value and in quality and in the number of class periods offered at the public school sites or it can decline in value and importance. It should be the most significant class offered at the high school level. It should be and could be the cutting edge, demonstration, model curriculum and standards based program at any campus. It is up to each and every one of us, individually, to create and sustain and improve the driver education curriculum.

The entire process of learning how to drive has changed since Amos Neyhart got us started over 50 years ago. Back then there was much physical skill needed to learn to shift, steer and brake those early vehicles. There was also not as much traffic and the drivers were not in such a hurry. Today’s vehicles are very easy to handle for the basic maneuvers, but are very sensitive for emergency maneuvers. Today’s traffic has much more volume, travels at higher speeds and the drivers are more likely to exhibit road rage than in earlier years. Even the roads are very different. We have evolved from the one line macadam road to the multi-lane concrete expressway. Turn lanes and traffic signals are very much advanced. Today’s vehicles are far more dependable. If we continue to teach driver education as we have in the past, we will go the way of the horse and buggy. We will become a museum piece in the education hall of fame.

The following are just a few of the things we need to do to revitalize driver education, or as I like to call it, traffic safety education.

First we need to focus on visual search patterns and perception. One of the handicaps that will not allow you to get a license is being blind. Many of our sighted people drive blindly. We don’t have enough time in the car to teach all the visual skills necessary for safe driving. Many schools do not even have a car portion to their program. If classroom driver education is to remain and even if we have car programs, the visual portion of the program must improve. All of our driving decisions are based upon what we see and what we perceive. We must have course content and methods to teach and to assess what our students can see and respond to BEFORE they get to the car.

Second we need to realize that safe driving is not learned in the car. It is learned as part of safe living. Creating safe, courteous driver behavior is our goal. Many of our current text give lip service to changing driver behavior. Many pages are used explaining car maintenance, insurance, how to parallel park or park on a hill. If our course is being evaluated on crashes, injuries, and death, then we need to focus on the skills and actions that reduce these numbers. We need to relate everything we do in a car to how we live our lives. We need to know how our fast paced, computer driven, narcissistic society influences how we drive. More importantly, we must teach our students how to deal with these forces and how they play out in the way we drive.

Third we need to make the classes relevant and interactive. All of us learn best when we are actively involved. We all want practical ways to use the information we are learning. We need to develop class activities that are related to the area the students will drive in and similar circumstances.

Fourth we need to focus on mastery not on hours or seat time. Many classes are set to meet a MINIMUM NUMBER OF HOURS. There is usually a number of topics that must covered. Skimming over all these topics in a small amount of time, almost guarantees that not much will be retained. Mastery can be accomplished only if more time on fewer topics of greater value to safe driving. Many visual skills and procedures can be mastered in the classroom well before (continued on next page)
Fifth we need to involve our parents as our partners in a more vital fashion. Parents are a wealth of information for the students to draw upon. Parents are very concerned about how well their child will drive. Parents can and want to read the material we teach their children. Parents can and will provide the practice sessions our students need to learn and master the visual skills the students need to know.

Sixth we need to promote our courses as the models for all education. We have the class that all students want and will take if at all possible. We will have “A” students and “F” students. Some teachers only work with the college bound. We have the “full inclusion” laws to work with and all the problems that come with that law. We have the potential to use all the technology available to a high school student. We can teach across the entire curriculum. We can reach students that nobody else can. We should be inviting others to come and observe.

Seventh we need to set realistic goals for our course. We can not reduce teen crash rates by 15 or 20 per cent. Goals that high are a recipe for failure. We might be able to achieve a 5% reduction in a few years with mastery of relevant material and a focus on visual skills and driver behavior.

Eighth we need to work with the private sector. They are not going away. We will need to get better. This can be a win win for both of us.

Ninth we need to realize that no field of education changes as much as we do and we need to constantly update ourselves. Math and English have not changed much in centuries. Spelling and grammar are still the same. History is history. All that can happen is more events are added to a course in current politics. In Traffic Safety, major changes take place every decade. Our vehicles change. Our roadways change. Our society influences change. Each of these MUST BE ADDRESSED in our courses.

Tenth we need to create innovative ways to train new teachers to take our place. We need to combine the need for human contact with the efficiency of on-line instruction. We need to literally see what our teachers are capable of doing as driver role models and how they actually teach their lessons. We need to show them how to teach visual skills and behavior modification.

If we do some of these things, then the future of driver education is bright. It will not be easy. Change is always resisted even when improvement is desired. If we continue as we have in the past we will continue to experience decline as we have for more than the last decade. It is up to us to act now.

Shirly Rowland Suneson’s Response

I am extremely concerned about the future of Driver Education in Minnesota. I believe most of the public school programs have high standards and good quality curriculums and utilize sound teaching methods. Recently, state and school budget problems have driven very successful programs that are offered during school hours to after school programs. In some cases students become secondary to existing low budgets. When this happens a subtle deterioration begins as a student realizes they only need to put in the curriculum seat time requirement dictated by our state. When given a choice, most students will select the easier, faster, and less challenging programs to earn their driver’s license. This is an unfortunate situation resulting from our Department of Public Safety refusing to modify this state rule.

The direction our state legislators and our local school administrators are taking is not encouraging for public high school driver education programs. I have several concerns that cover many different areas. First, we have an unhealthy rivalry between commercial/public driver training programs and the public high school programs. There are some commercial programs in Minnesota who are working against the public high school programs to get them eliminated. This creates a very hostile environment. Instead of working together as a team with students’ interests as a priority, we are directing our energies at one another. Unfortunately, the one really loosing, are our students.

In Minnesota, we have a teacher shortage for certified driver education instructors. We have only one university in the State that offers certification in driver education that requires 13 semester credits. Most current teachers are not willing to give up the amount of time required for this certification or the large cost involved. Therefore, the supply of new teachers is not close to meeting the need. Also, most private/commercial driver training programs are competing with the public programs. The
commercial sector has no requirements on hours for certification except to meet standard competencies. Another concern I have is the lack of support from our school administrators and state representatives. This concern involves the lack of importance they give to driver education. For those programs remaining, most are operating on a minimal or no budget. We need to have legislators and administrators understand and accept the importance of driver education and help support it financially.

I am, also, disenchanted about the lack of parental responsibility as it relates to driver education. Many parents are not being a good role model for their son or daughter. Due to bad driving habits, their skill reflects a lack of concern for safety and other traffic issues one often sees demonstrated on our public roads. Parents are in a unique position to have a lot of "clout" over the behavior of their children. Since driving is a privilege, the parents should make expectations with consequences for their son or daughter and hold them accountable for their actions. I have an exercise in class that involves a parent student agreement. Over the last eight years, I have noticed deterioration of such accountability. In many cases, it appears the students are the ones ("calling the shots") making the decisions. Their parents, instead of being strong decision-makers, go along with their children’s requests so they can maintain a "good relationship" with them. As a result, the child may select a program of lesser quality so they can finish sooner and not have so much homework to do. That is the easy way but not always the best way!

Besides the parents not enforcing rules and consequences, I am very disappointed with our current judicial system. Too many young drivers in Minnesota are only given warnings on their first and second offenses when some are major violations. I witnessed a judge remove all appropriate consequences to a sixteen year old because it was his first offense, and she did not want to have this violation remain on his driving record. You can imagine how many friends he told of this experience. Since these kinds of behavior go without remedy, it is becoming a routine to contest most traffic citations by the young drivers. I believe this is sending the wrong message to all drivers.

James C. McGrane’s Response
The warranty on driver education programs in this country has expired. The damages done will require a major overhaul. Can you remember the first time you climbed up the ladder and walked out to the end of the diving board? Oh, it was such a long way down and that board just kept bouncing. You walked back to the railing, recomposed yourself, and then ventured to the end once again. How many times did that happen before you finally jumped?

Perhaps you even climbed down that ladder only to have your friends start encouraging you, in their special way, to get back up there and jump. Eventually you would jump. Then, you immediately became the expert. You were now qualified to encourage others and tell them, “It’s not so bad.” “You can do it!” “There’s nothing to it.”

That mind set is what causes many problems in driver education. It is not so bad, and you can do it, quickly, creates an expert. Many times this is the person that does nothing wrong. This is the person that cannot understand how others could be so stupid. This is most likely the same person that will tell you it is a constitutional right to drive.

Just one jump and you become the best there is. Driver Education programs take novice drivers to the diving board and provide the knowledge necessary for them to make a safe jump. How they go about jumping and how the land escapes our control very quickly. Becoming a responsible driver is difficult, a never ending task that requires more than one jump.

The problems that exist in driver education are the result of a number of factors. Some students approach the driving responsibility much too young. That can be too young chronology and/or too young cognitively. Some programs, in Montana as well as across the country, are lacking. They might be lacking proper teacher preparedness programs. They might be lacking administrative support and supervision. They might be lacking community support. They might be lacking legislative support. Unfortunately, all states are lacking monies necessary to assess driver readiness. Completing a driver education program of forty-two hours of classroom instruction, six hours behind the wheel experience, and a ten-minute state road test does not make a good driver.

As professionals and as an organization we need to agree there is a problem, then evaluate and rebuild. The leaders of our profession need
to lead the charge in establishing a nationwide unified curriculum. National standards are in place with other disciplines; driver education needs to get on board.

The information and experience that is provided in driver education programs is essential for all drivers. The critics however, are quick to say driver education is not working. These critics are absolutely correct. It is not working under the current delivery model. Numerous studies document that the single largest reason for death in age groups one to thirty-four is our highways. We need to do something about this immediately! Driver education professionals across the country, in both public and private programs, need to incorporate the findings from these studies into their curriculum.

Graduated Driver License laws do not exist in all states. Some states have a GDL but are missing important components. Novice drivers need time to convert the wealth of information received from driver education programs into good driving habits.

For example, studies show that limiting passengers and restricting nighttime driving greatly reduces crashes and fatalities during the initial driving experience. It is imperative that we endorse these types of regulations across the country.

Legislators need to understand that driver education programs are an investment for the future. Adequate support and funding is essential! This means that politicians must bight the bullet and get tough on issues like GDL and primary seatbelt laws. The economic impact of crashes is staggering. If dollar signs are what the politicians notice then we must address the issues with their vocabulary.

The driver education professionals need to work hard re-teaching the concept of what is a model driver. We must bring back those driving habits that exhibit skills and attitude that others can appreciate. We need to create more people that can help the novice up the ladder, explain the jumping process, and assist with the landing.

Addressing the future of driver education is a challenge. Fixing the areas of weakness will be a more difficult challenge. We face an uphill struggle to improve and repair driver education programs in this country. It will be important for us to take a good look at what is working across the country and use that to our advantage. We have dynamic teachers, knowledgeable curriculum advisors, strong administrators, and a concerned public that are all waiting to help with our needs.

(continued on next page)
Another unique feature is the way in which a parent is immediately notified of a new report on their teen’s decal. A parent can select up to three places to receive notifications, such as e-mail, home phone, cell phone, etc., and they will be able to hear a recording of the actual call that was placed. This also helps control prank calls, as the parent can determine whether or not the report is valid. Callers are encouraged to leave their contact information, so the parent may call them if they want more details regarding the driving behavior the caller witnessed. To encourage immediate driving behavior modification, at the parent’s discretion, the teen may receive a hands-free ring tone message of a report having been made on their decal.

Teen Arrive Alive also offers a GPS cell phone program. It gives parents the opportunity to know where their teen is and what speed they are traveling. Parents can retrieve this information by calling the Teen Arrive Alive secure locator line or by logging onto the web where they access a map displaying the location, direction and speed at which their teen is traveling.

To extend their influence beyond the classroom, ADTSEA members can now bring this service with cutting-edge technology to their students. Once registered as a Marketing Organization, the only thing member schools need to do is to assist in introducing the service to the parents. The actual sign up by parents will be handled via the Teen Arrive Alive website so members have no paperwork or payment hassles. In addition a school will receive 10% commission for each one of their students signed up for the Teen Arrive Alive service. To find out more about the program please visit the website at [www.TeenArriveAlive.com](http://www.TeenArriveAlive.com) or to sign up your school, email Dan Mishler at danm@TeenArriveAlive.com.

(Toy from page 2) with their students, colleagues and community members. They all have brought out the curiosity and discovery in learning new things. They all have inspired students to go beyond where they thought they could go, they all have mentored others and they all are themselves continual learners and their influence within their school, community and state will continue for years to come. I would like to introduce to you our five outstanding teachers of the year.

From the Northwest Region representing Oregon is Judy Ode from Roseburg, OR. Judy received her BA from Southern Oregon University and her Driver Education certification from St. Cloud State University. Judy currently works at Umpqua Community College where she is the Driver Program Coordinator and instructor. She has been teaching Driver Education for 10 years. Judy is the current President of the Oregon Traffic Safety Education Association, ADTSEA’s secondary division chair and chair of the host community for the 2004 ADTSEA conference. Besides teaching Driver Education to adolescents at UCC Judy Coordinates and teaches courses in CDL, Flagger Certification and Adult Driving as well as manages UCC’s workforce Training Center. She is also an ADTSEA trainer of trainers and teaches the Driver Education teaching certification courses. Her colleagues and state Driver Education director stated Judy is highly analytical and extremely perceptive. Her desire for lifelong learning is a pleasure to see. Judy serves as a mentor for many Community College and local K-12 Driver Education Programs. Judy became involved in Driver Education 10 years ago when inquiring about job opportunities at the Community College. She applied for the job and got it. With it a set of keys and a list of students to teach. Off she went and the rest is history. Judy feels she learns something new with each class she teaches, each article she reads and each workshop she takes. Judy’s teaching lesson was Sign Signals and Pavement Markings. Did you know that the orange earplugs you see at stores are not really earplugs at all but rather workplace construction cones you use on a small teaching board? Oregon’s 2004 Teacher of the Year candidate Judy Ode.

From the Northeast Region representing Vermont, Cathy J. Broderick. Cathy has taught Driver Education for 22 years with the last 16 years at Lyndon Institute in Lyndon VT. Formerly from MN, Cathy received her BA degree from Bemidji State University in Bemidji, MN, Master of Arts in Counseling Psychology from Lesley College in Cambridge MA and her Driver Education certification work from Norwich University/Vermont College. Cathy loves to hike, horseback ride, ski and motorcycling. Besides being certified to teach Driver Education she is also a Motorcycle Safety Foundation Instructor, is the Project Graduation and SADD advisor, worked with the AMVETS/Dodge National...
Driving Competition, Class advisor, and School bus driver. Cathy is past president of the Vermont Driver & Traffic Safety Education Association and a former presenter at ADTSEA conferences. Before her Traffic Safety life Cathy was a fourth grade teacher. Cathy got started in Driver Education over 20 years ago after she took her first Motorcycle Safety Foundation course, which was taught by a Driver Education instructor. Her demeanor is calm and quiet when dealing with student driving errors. She adapts her style of teaching when the personality and the skill level of the student are in need of a more effective way of teaching. She tries to hold true to her license plate, which reads B Calm.

A former student wrote “I feel the majority of teachers are good at what they do but only a handful of teachers are truly exceptional, the kind you will remember throughout your life, influencing a student’s future. Cathy is one of those few exceptional teachers. Cathy not only helped me to see what was possible but also taught me not to be afraid to take on new challenges. She is much more than a teacher. Cathy has always made herself available to students for problems and questions that arise during the high school years. She is always willing to go the extra mile. One of the most important aspects of teaching is communication between students and teachers. Cathy connects with her students, obtaining an understanding, a trust between student and the teacher. Cathy’s teaching lesson was on motorcycle safety. We especially liked the teaching exercise called the Dance Card. 2004 Vermont’s 2004 Teacher of the Year nominee Cathy Broderick.

From the North Central Region representing the state of Minnesota, Shrilly Rowland-Suneson. Shrilly has taught Driver Education for 20 years in the State of MN and currently teaches at Edison High School in Minneapolis, MN. She needs to adapt her classroom style to fit the needs of the diversity of her student population. It is not uncommon for Shrilly to have 10 different languages spoken in her class. Her parent involvement centers on her students giving vital information and techniques about driving to their non-english speaking parents who are also usually learning to drive. Shrilly received her B.S. degree also from Bemidji State University, and her Driver Education certification courses from Bemidji State and St. Cloud State University. She is the current SADD advisor, has taught Spanish Driver Education for adults, has served on committees with the Department of Public Safety and served on the Edison Management Council representing SPED, Physical ED, Health Ed, ELL, and Driver Education. Shrilly has written articles for the Milepost and The Chronicle. She is past president of the Minnesota Driver Traffic Safety Association, and active in her local church. According to Shrilly, she became a Driver Education Teacher because she loves being around kids of all ages, she feels she can make a difference in people’s lives and she enjoys vehicles …small and large. Influencing the lives of other begins with earning your student’s respect and then through caring and humor, you develop a bond. By setting a good example and being a good role model Shrilly believes she can influence the attitudes and behaviors of her students. Shrilly loves large vehicles. She put her teaching career on hold so she could drive over the road trucks that were used to haul heavy construction equipment; 61-foot motor yachts and a Caterpillar 85-ton end dump truck. All these driving experiences helped lead the way to teaching Driver Education.

A colleague writes: I have witnessed a teacher who is professional, genuine, and cares wholeheartedly for her students. She is always empowering her students to be the best they can be regarding their unique talents and career choices. She can listen to the thoughts of those around her and skillfully blend their ideas with hers to produce success. Shrilly is a passionate professional dedicated to the development of young people. Her energy, sensitivity and personal warmth make her a supportive colleague and mentor. Shrilly’s teaching lesson was an egg and spoon exercise to simulate the difficulty of driving and keeping your vehicle under control. MN 2004 teacher of the year nominee Shrilly Rowland—Suneson.

From the Southwest representing the State of California John Knipple. John teaches at the Colton Joint Unified School District in Bloomington, CA. where he has taught for 26 years. He is currently the president of the California Association for Safety Education (CASE) and has done numerous presentations at state, regional and national conferences. John is a past board member of ADTSEA, has made many presentations at state, regional and the national conference. John is a two-time winner of...
(continued from page 13)

Medal of Honor for community service by the Colton Joint Unified School District.

John volunteers as the key club advisor, Car club advisor, decathlon advisor, is department chair, a mentor teacher, a master teacher for the Credentialing program, a contributing author for Drive Right textbook, teacher’s edition Special Needs and is a school bus driver. John was a fourth place finisher for California League of High Schools “Educator of the Year”. John’s major in college was German with a minor in math. John’s hobby includes swimming, water skiing, motorcycling, and cross country running.

John’s avenue into Driver Education came about as John was working on his credentials to teach math and German. Many of his friends were taking the driver education classes to supplement their income. He pursued his traffic safety education studies under the many great leaders in Driver Education. Among them was Dr. Richard Kaywood at Cal State Long Beach, John worked under Dr. Kaywood and it was through his mentoring that John learned the true virtues of Driver Education. Real teachers teach to and with their heart. Real teachers help students become better people.

John’s principal writes, John has created a physical environment that is conducive to learning and one that creates an atmosphere of mutual respect. His classroom is rich with displays of student work, which gives the students an opportunity to take ownership. John’s Assistant Superintendent wrote John has been a driving force in the school as a role model and as a mentor to students and teachers alike. John feels Driver Education is the most significant class offered at the high school level. He believes the future of Driver Education is exactly what we make of it. John’s teaching lesson was in the area of visual search patterns and believes this is the number one focus all teachers should be doing.

I present you California’s Teacher of the year. John Knipple.

From the Northwest representing the state of Montana is Montana’s 2004 Teacher of the Year James McGrane. James as you know due to family illness was unfortunately unable to come. However it is important we recognize him for his accomplishments. James has taught at Helena Middle School since 1977 where he teaches Social Studies and teachers Driver Education for the Helena Public School System. He received is B.S. degree from Eastern Montana College majoring in Special Education and received an elementary teaching endorsement and his M.S. Education from the University of Montana and his traffic safety certification from Montana State University. He believes strongly in the statement by Confucius “When one stops learning they stop living”. His educational style is to be firm, fair, and consistent. Some of the other things James is involved in are a Special Olympics Volunteer, 15 year level Two firefighter, national ski patrol, does guided backpack trips, boat tours, and high-angle & rope rescue instructor. He has been a cross-country, track and wrestling coach, student council sponsor and is a coast guard certified merchant marine captain. James is past president of Montana Traffic Education Association has been on the Montana Executive board for 11 years. He is highly regarded and has earned a great deal of respect from students, parents, and colleagues. In Jim’s life the most important part is his deep commitment to his family. And it is this commitment that is why James is not here today.

A parent wrote, “Mr. McGrane does far more than teach Driver’s Education. When students enter his class, they are subjected to lessons that cannot be taught from a text. Mr. McGrane is often given the most challenged students. Students who are disabled to students who are academically challenged are placed under his care, knowing he will individualize their programs to bring them success in driving. One parent wrote, “on registration day we along with many parents arrived at the learning center at 6:00 am even though the center did not open to 7:30 am so we would be sure to have Mr. McGrane as our child’s instructor. Dave Huff Montana’s state supervisor will accept on behalf of James McGrane his TOY certificate and recognition award.

ADTSEA conference attendees I present to you the 2004 teacher of the year nominees. A new addition to this years award will be that the winner selected will be presenting to you a teaching lesson. We will be using the fishbowl technique in which the lesson will be taught to 10 students sitting up front as the rest of you watch the lesson.

The 2004 Teacher of the Year award goes to John Knipple from the state of CA.
Improving BTW Instruction
Scott Calahan, Traffic Safety Education Coordinator
Central Washington University

A drive route for a lesson should be constructed according to factors such as the driving experience and level of the student, amount of time available for the drive, and the choices presented by the driving environment available in your community. The route plan should then be performed and “practiced” by the instructor to see what the student will experience.

During a typical behind-the-wheel (BTW) lesson, the instructor has an opportunity to make several observations on a student’s performance; some are planned and others are unplanned. Finally, a method of evaluating the student and a method of recording the student’s performance is needed.

Some programs list a skill and then use a “+”, or “-“ next to the skill. Others use numbers to evaluate similar to this:

**Behind-the-wheel: Lesson 2**
- 2 Left turns
- 3 Right turns

Etc. (other maneuvers on Drive 2)

A score of 1 might mean the student could not perform the maneuver even with the instructor’s assistance. A score of a 2 might mean the student could not perform on his own (needed lots of instructor help), and/or demonstrated inconsistent performance. A score of a 3 might mean the student was able to perform the maneuver on an acceptable level, but needed some instructor help. A score of a 4 would mean the student was able to perform the maneuver with little or no assistance from the instructor and performed on a consistent basis.

Using this scale or some variation of this scale might mean a student earning a 3 or 4 would pass the concept/maneuver, but a 1 or a 2 would mean the student would need to repeat the concept/maneuver.

Now imagine this scenario. You are the coordinator of a TSE program. You teach the classroom phase and you have three part time instructors who help teach the BTW phase of your TSE program. Out of the blue, you get a phone call from an angry parent. She wants to know why her son did not pass “left turns” on drive 2. You look at her son’s drive sheet and sure enough he earned a 2 as his score.

The angry and curious mother wants an explanation because she claims that when her son drives with her, he does just fine. How do you answer the legitimate question posed by this concerned parent? What was wrong with the left turn that required the student to have to repeat the maneuver? Was the student’s speed too fast, or was he not signaling? Maybe he was not scanning properly. Or, maybe it was a combination of several inappropriate actions. At this point you’re probably not sure and you are going to have to determine which of the BTW instructors taught the student and hope that instructor remembers what the specific problem was. Then, a phone call will need to be returned to the mom with an explanation. This all too common occurrence is time consuming, frustrating, and ineffective.

Now, imagine this scenario. You require all instructors in your program to use district approved behavioral route plans. The same left turn maneuver, in question above, now looks something like this:

**At Poplar Street, turn left**: during the turn the student:
- 3 Searches to target area
- 4 Signals at least \(\Omega\) block away
- 2 Checks rear zone before slowing
- 2 Enters lane position 2
- 2 Scans R, F, L
- 3 Begins turn at proper front location
- 3 Searches to target area
- 4 Selects proper lane position
- 4 Begins steer recovery @ Transition Peg
- 2 Re-evaluates rear zone
- 3 Smooth acceleration, no pitch felt

Assuming you used the same grading scale as above and you received the exact same phone call, how would this conversation be more productive, and how would you look more informed about your own program, and what your students do in the lab phase of your program?

Without being in the car, you could quickly and clearly see the student was not checking the rearview mirror regularly; he was not getting in the correct lane position to begin the turn; and he was not scanning the three frontal areas: right, front, left. At this point, you know a lot about this student’s driving skills/behavior—even though you were not in the car with him and could easily communicate with the parent.

(continued on bottom of next page)
A behavioral pattern is a single observable action the driver takes. When those behaviors are incorporated into the drive routes, they offer many advantages:

Teachers and instructors of a traffic safety education program must provide information to students and parents on models for adult guided practice. This may include school policy on the requirement and delivery of guided practice.

The behaviors are so specific, even an untrained parent can see the behavior required and they know the location, even the street, where the skill is to be practiced.

- When the behaviors are used as an “activity checklist” for the backseat observer, they can learn the required behaviors, along with the driver, while sitting in the backseat. This addresses WAC 392-153-032 3. (g) Provide not less than four hours of behind-the-wheel observation time to all students enrolled in a traffic safety education class.

- When the behaviors are discussed and practiced in class, students know what they have to perform and to what standards they will be held. This addresses WAC 392-153-032 1. (e) The evaluation criteria for the classroom and laboratory phase.

- The specificity of the behaviors leaves less room for subjective grading, therefore reducing the chances of a student claiming the teacher picked on him or her.

- When the behaviors are laid out in a logical order, the classroom teacher(s) and the BTW instructor(s) are more likely to teach concepts consistent with each other. It helps eliminate a student saying “My other teacher told me to do the maneuver a different way.”

- Behavior route plans allow different BTW instructors to know exactly where a student had success and/or problems on previous drives, when they were not that student’s instructor. The same behavior may be seen on a number of maneuvers which are easier to detect and correct.

- As listed on the “left turn” example above, the directions follow the “where/what concept”. (Anderson) *WHERE the skill is to be performed: “at the next intersection…,” in this case Poplar Street, and *WHAT skill is to be performed: “turn left.” That way the last thing a student hears is what skill or maneuver is to be performed.

- When copied in duplicate form (NCR paper), one copy can be kept for your school’s records, the other copy can be given to the student/parents to help with home guided practice.

(from previous page) The main disadvantage in using behavioral route plans is the extra time required by the BTW instructor needed to fill in the required scores for each behavior. This can be offset by becoming familiar with the listed behaviors and the repeated experience of grading in this fashion. In my opinion, the benefits clearly outweigh any disadvantage and are a must for any program to achieve consistency, accuracy and good communication between school and home.

A complete set of behavioral route plans specific to the Ellensburg area that can be modified to meet your local program objectives can be obtained by emailing Scott Calahan at calahans@cwu.edu
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Dr. James E. Aaron Dies
Dr. Aaron, retired Professor of Health Education and founder of the Safety Center Southern Illinois University -Carbondale died August 15th with his wife and daughter by his side. He is also survived by two sons.

Dr. Aaron founded the SIUC Safety Center in 1960 and was its Coordinator until his retirement. He was an international known driver and traffic safety education professional having written 6 major university level textbook, received grants totaling over $11,000,000.00, and was the major advisor to most of the traffic safety university personnel in the USA today.

Dr. Aaron served as President of ADTSEA in 1968-69 year and was honored by our association in 1992 with the Richard Kaywood award. His family has established a James E. Aaron Scholarship fund through the SIU Foundation.
Gerald Apple Washington State
SADD Coordinator

The Washington State SADD (Students Against Destructive Decisions) “Youth Advisory Board” hosted the annual NSSP (National Student Safety Program) conference at Seattle Pacific University on July 7th-11th. Approximately 200 students and advisors from throughout the nation attended this annual conference.

The following officers were selected as the 2004-2005 NSSP officers. They were installed by Dr. Allen Robinson of ADTSEA/IUP.

President- Tim Donnell- - Shelton, Washington
Vice-President-Shawna Hatfield- Fairbault, Minnesota
Secretary- Hailey Crozier- Roosevelt, Utah
Northwest Representative-Rachel Goosen- Spokane, Washington
Southwest Representative- Lemafoe Talataina- Honolulu, Hawaii
North Central Representative- Jenny Tousignant- Fairbault, Minnesota
South Central Co-Representative- Jennifer Yamada- Ft. Worth, Texas
South Central Co-Representative- Ashley Greer- Newkirk, Oklahoma
Southeast Representative- Justin Bobo- Batesville, Mississippi

There were four general session speakers at this conference: Fianna Dickson (2003 Miss Washington), Brad Henning (from Puyallup), Dr. Terry Kline and the NSSP officers. Miss Washington spoke on the importance of good quality traffic safety education programs in the public schools and the importance of state funding for these programs. She stated that driving a vehicle requires proper training and paying attention to your driving.

Brad Henning spoke on sexual abstinence until one gets married. Brad in an educational and comical way mentioned the major differences on how men and women act and why.

Dr. Terry Kline from Eastern Kentucky University talked about the proper way to control a vehicle when you are involved in a corner skid. Terry talked about targeting and how to adjust the mirrors to see your blind spots on the back corners of your car. You will never lose tract of the driver coming up along side you if you move your mirrors out 15 degrees. The students had the opportunity to drive the auto control monster in one of the parking lots at Seattle Pacific University. Plus, the students were able to see the importance of walking around the car before getting into the car. There is a footprint around your car that represents a huge blind spot. The biggest blind spot is behind your car. Normally you can not see anything directly behind your car for fifty feet when you are sitting in the driver’s seat.

Finally, the officers of NSSP did a general session using a game show format. Over forty traffic safety questions were asked of the contestants. The audience was allowed to participate in the game show and help the contestants by shouting out the answers. The audience and the contestants had to choose the correct answer from four choices.

The students attended four sets of workshops throughout the conference. Two of the sets of workshops were led by adults and the other two sets of workshops were led by students. Some of the topics were pedestrian safety, using drama skits to depict scenarios that show risky behavior amongst teenagers and to avoid or minimize these situations, mock car crashes, Fish leadership training, seatbelt usage, drug free graduation parties, cross peer teaching and graduated drivers licensing.

Throughout the conference the students and advisors from each school worked on their action plan. The schools figured out what fundraisers, fun activities, community and school service projects they wanted to do. Plus, they incorporated the new ideas they learned from the workshops into their action plan for the 2004-2005 school year.

This year the students on the first night of the conference during the ice cream social were divided up into groups of ten. During lunch each day these students got together and talked about the following topics: fundraisers, why they got involved in SADD/SAFEYE clubs, and what community service and safety projects they were doing in their school and community. This was a great idea because the students shared ideas and got to know students from other schools and states.

Everyone enjoyed the boat cruise on the Puget Sound. The students got the opportunity to dance and eat a lot of good food. The boat cruise was sponsored by Argosy Cruises of (continued on the next page)
Seattle. The skyline of downtown Seattle and the sunset were beautiful.

On Friday morning the students and adults participated in a two mile fun run/walk. Everyone received a water bottle or a t-shirt. There were forty-five participants and everyone ran from SPU to the Freemont bridge and back.

On Saturday night there was an awards banquet, dinner, dance, karaoke and a slide show of the NSSP conference at SPU. David Satterfield from Pacific Stage in Olympia was the DJ.

The NSSP Awards Program received 50 entries for the 2004 school year. At the 48th annual NSSP Conference, all entries were judged by the national officers in the high school division. No entry was judged from the same state. Each entry was judged by a minimum of three judges. The winners of the various programs were announced on July 10th at the Awards Banquet. Congratulations to the following recipients:

National Student of the Year, HS Division- Tim Donnell, Shelton HS, WA
National Student of the Year, College- Anderson Boothe, South Panola, School District, MS
National Advisor of the Year- Jackie Huster, Newkirk High, OK
National State Coordinator of the Year, Martha Lynn Johnson, South Panola School District, MS
Best in T-Shirt Design- Students Encouraging Peers Positively UP STEPP Up, Newkirk High, OK
Outstanding Community Service Project- 1st place- Mabank High, TX
                                          2nd place- Shelton High SADD, WA
                                          3rd place- Mason County Drug Abuse, WA
Outstanding Safety Project
                                          1st place- Operation Save Lives, Teens Are Concerned, TAC- AR
                                          2nd place- Shelton High SADD, WA
                                          3rd place- STEPP Up, Newkirk High, OK
Outstanding Youth Safety Group/Club
                                          1st place- Shelton High SADD, WA
                                          2nd place- South Panola HS, MS
                                          3rd place- STEPP Up, Newkirk High, OK
                                          Medina Valley High, TX

At the banquet a check for $450 was given to the Northwest Harvest to feed the hungry people. Kelsea Larsen from Shelton High School was the chairperson for the coin drive. Throughout the conference coins were collected from the conference attendees by the Washington Host Committee.

Next July the 2005 NSSP conference will be held in Jackson, Mississippi. There will be a planning meeting held the first weekend in December. The executive committee and the six regional representatives will attend this three day planning meeting along with their advisors.

**ADTSEA CONFERENCE PRESENTERS**

If you wish to present at the ADTSEA conference, please complete the following information:

**Preferred Division Meeting**

- Secondary  Judy Ode
- Administration  David Kinnunen
- Higher Education  Stan Henderson
- Research  Dr. Michaen Manser
- Bishop  James Gibb

**Topic** (name of your presentation)

**Length** (amount of time you are requesting) __

**Summary** (short narrative describing your presentation which should include; why this topic is important; benefits of this topic to conference attendees; topical outline; conclusions).________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

The ADTSEA office will forward this to the division chairperson. The chairperson will contact you if your presentation is selected.

**Name:**______________________________________

**Phone:**______________________________________

**Email:**______________________________________

**Conference Dates:**____________________

**NOTE:** All ADTSEA members/driver education teachers who wish to present are required to register for the conference.

Please email your completed form to Allen Robinson, arrobin@iup.edu. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact us at 800-896-7703.
### Institutions of Higher Education That Offer Driver Education Related Coursework and Degrees

#### Abbreviations:
- **Cert:** Certificate
- **Col:** College
- **DE:** Driver Education
- **D&SE:** Driver & Safety Education
- **ED:** Endorsement
- **Min:** Minor
- **MA:** Masters of Arts
- **MS:** Masters of Science
- **TE:** Traffic Education
- **TSE:** Traffic Safety Education
- **U:** University
- **Under:** Undergraduate
- **Grad:** Graduate
- **End:** Endorsement
- **Min:** Minor
- **DE:** Driver Education
- **MS:** Masters of Science
- **MS ED:** Masters of Science Education
- **PhD:** Doctor of Philosophy
- **TE:** Traffic Education
- **U:** University
- **Under:** Undergraduate
- **Grad:** Graduate
- **End:** Endorsement
- **Min:** Minor
- **MA:** Masters of Arts
- **MS:** Masters of Science
- **TE:** Traffic Education
- **TSE:** Traffic Safety Education
- **U:** University

#### State | University | Under | Grad | Subject - Comments
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
**AL** | Montevallo | End | DE |  
**AZ** | U of Ottawa, Phoenix | End | DE |  
**AR** | AR State/Jonesborough | End | DE | Grad credits available  
**FL** | U of FL | End |  
**GA** | Albany State | End |  
**IL** | E IL U | End | MS | D&TSE; Grad credits available  
| No IL | End | MS | D&TSE; Grad credits available  
| So IL U, Carbondale | Min | MS | Ed with concentration D&TSE  
|  | PhD | | Concentration in D&TSE |  
**IN** | Indiana State U | End | MS | Safety Management/DE |  
**IA** | U of Northern IA | End | |  
**KS** | Emporia State | End |  
**KY** | E Kentucky U | End/ Min | MA Loss Prevention-Safety with TE credits |  
**MI** | Bethel College (Indiana) End | DE |  
| Central MI U | End | DE |  
| Northern MI U | End | DE |  
| Wayne State U | End | DE |  
**MN** | St Cloud State | End | MSS | Special Studies |  
**MS** | Old MS U, Oxford | End |  
| Jackson State | End |  
**MO** | Central MO State U | End | DE |  
| Southwest MO State U | End | DE |  
**MT** | MT State U Northern | End/ Min | TE; Graduate Credits available |  
**NE** | U of NE - Kearny | End | MS | MS Ed Safety Emphasis |  
**NH** | Keene State College | End | | TE; Grad credits available |  
**NY** | Broome Community Col | End | D&TSE |  
| Hofstra U | End | D&TSE |  
| SUC @ Buffalo | End | D&TSE |  
| SUC @ Oswego | End | D&TSE |  
| New Jersey City Col | End | D&TSE |  
**ND** | Minot State | Min | TE; Grad credits available |  
**OK** | Northeastern State U | Cert | DE |  
| U of Central OK | Cert | DE |  
**OR** | Western Oregon State U | End | DE |  
**PA** | IN U of PA | Cert | DE |  
| West Chester U | Cert | Kinesiology/DE |  
**TN** | Middle TN U | End | ED; Grad credits available |  
**TX** | Lamar U | End | DE |  
| SW TX State U | End | DE |  
| Sul Ross State U | End | DE |  
| TX A & M | End | MS & PHD or EDD Health & Kinesiology/DE |  
| TX A & M – Commerce | End | DE |  
| TX Southern U | End | DE |  
**UT** | Brigham Young | End | DE |  
| U of UT | End | DE&S |  
**VT** | Castleton State U | End | TE; Grad credits available |  
**WA** | Central WA U | End/ Min | | ME ED/TSE |  
**WI** | U of WI/Stout | MS | Safety/Emphasis TE |  
| U of WI/Whitewater | MS | Safety/Emphasis TE |  
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If no or partial information is shown for your state no one reported the information. If the preceding or the following information is incorrect or you would like to report information about your state's requirements for teaching driver education or institutions of higher education that offer course work in traffic safety education please, contact David Huff at: ASSSDE@metnet.state.mt.us

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Public School</th>
<th>Commercial School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Complete training course by Hawaii DOT;</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No more than one moving violation in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 year, 2 in 3 or 3 in 5; age 21; driver license recognized by Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Teaching Certificate + 4 sem credits;</td>
<td>4 sem credits of TE, plus 8 sem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ 15 hours of prof. dev. every 2 years</td>
<td>credits of teaching skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Teaching Cert. + 9 semester credits including Gen Safety; DE I Philosophy</td>
<td>9 sem. Credits or 30 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; DE II Lab</td>
<td>classroom and 6 hours BTW by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>licensed instructor of school where he/she will teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Teaching Cert. + 8 semester credits in driver education; 21 years of age;</td>
<td>Same as public school except: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no more than 6 points on driving record (4 or 6 point alcohol conviction)</td>
<td>teaching cert required, and instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Teaching License + 13 semester credits</td>
<td>40 clock hours; 100 Q test;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Observation by DPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Teaching Certificate + 8 sem credits and working toward 20 sem credit minor;</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no more than 3 moving violations in 3 years-no DUI.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Backround Check; passed the required driver training instructor testing;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>has completed, within the past 10 years, an approved 40-hour instructor's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>course or a valid copy of a State of Ohio Department of Education Certificate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with a driver training endorsement; A statement from a licensed physician the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>instructor applicant is in sound physical and mental health, the applicant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>has no injury or physical or mental impairment, and the applicant is not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>under the influence of or addicted to any drug or medicine.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Foundation course and/or Behind the Wheel and/or Classroom Course.</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Teacher Cert + 18 sem credits; may include DE I &amp; II; Zone Control;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-Vehilcle Teach Techniques; Ed Psych; Alcohol/Drug Abuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Teaching Cert. + 15 semester credits including Gen Safety, Beg &amp; Adv TSDE;</td>
<td>40 clock hours or 9 semesters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alcohol/Drugs; Behavior Factors in Accident Prevention; Background check;</td>
<td>college credits; written &amp; drive test;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>acceptable driving record (6 points max in 12 mo);</td>
<td>background check; acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>driving record; periodic physical exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State by State Requirements for Driver Education and Training Instructors**