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Greetings To ADTSEA Members  
Roger Voigt, President

2008 is gone, but it has been a very interesting year. A Presidential campaign and election seem to go on forever. A meltdown in our economy that left many 401K’s devastated. For all of us Cub fans, we made it to the playoffs, but didn’t break our 100 year drought. Fortunately I have only suffered 66 years.

One positive aspect of 2008, is that traffic deaths are down. There are many reasons for this; gas at $4.00 a gallon, more fuel efficient cars, people driving less, states enacting graduating licensing for teen drivers, better enforcement of current laws, and better education of our teen and senior drivers. I would be remiss if I didn’t applaud all of our members, who have done an outstanding job in educating these groups, particularly in the use of seat belts.

As we enter 2009, there is always room to be optimistic. According to the Insurance Institute of Highway Safety, cell phone usage has increased. University of Utah engineers have developed a device preventing teen drivers from handling cell phone calls and text messaging while they drive. It’s called Key 2 Safe Driving. Illinois currently has a law that prohibits anyone under the age of 19 from using a cell phone when driving. The problem of drunk driving is still a problem. The State of Illinois, as of January 1, 2009, will require all first time offenders to install a ignition interlock device. This prevents someone who has been drinking from driving the car. New Mexico has had this law since 2005. The rate of drunken driving deaths has dropped about 25 percent.

More and more states have adopted or stiffen their graduated license laws.

If you have not taken time to read Dr. Robinson’s article in the fall issue of the Chronicle, I would strongly recommend that you do so. We, as ADTSEA members, should be proud of our curriculum and BTW standards, that we as an association, have developed. I can only hope, in the upcoming meeting with NHTSA and Emory Technologies, our standards will become the model.

I wish you and yours a healthy and prosperous New Year. Please become involved in your local, state, and national organizations. You could write an article on some teaching techniques that you have found to be successful, run for an office, or attend a state, regional or national conference.

It is my wish in this New Year, that as you travel, may the wind be at your back, the sun shining on your face, many friends surround you and a soft and smooth path on which to travel. SEE YOU IN CHARLOTTE.

Margaret L. (Micky) Johnson’s Remarks Upon Receiving 2008 Kaywood Award

I sincerely thank you ADTSEA for this very special honor. I am humbled by my joining the company of the names of those outstanding people who have preceded me as the recipients of the Richard Kaywood Award. This is truly an honor for me to continue what I can to further the work, the projects and the programs of ADTSEA. I donate this stipend to ADTSEA for that purpose.

For many years I worked closely with Dick Kaywood in many different areas before his untimely death in 1984. During my years in traffic safety I made every effort to instill the enthusiasm and the love of teaching and learning in my staff and student. Dick had set the model for in his. Dick was more than one of the early guiding lights in the field of traffic safety. He was one who blazed new trails and new innovations and techniques in our very early endeavors to instill in young people the desire and the quest to become safe participants in the changing world of traffic safety.

I knew Dick Kaywood well. We were close friends in our early endeavors to instill in young people the desire and the quest to become safe participants in the changing world of traffic safety.

During my years of working with Dick we came through good times. We came through hard times and even some almost desperate times. Many of you here have done the same thing, come through the cycles of good times and also of tough times for driver education. You still do continue in your efforts because you know, as Dick knew back then, that you can and you do make a difference in the saving of lives of our young people as they mix with the masses in the ever changing world of traffic safety.

Again I am humbled by this honor of receiving the Richard Kaywood Award, and I thank you. I charge you with the task of continuing your efforts whether in good times or in hard times, to develop within young drivers the attitudes and practices that further traffic safety in all times. In your own driving always remember to drive right.

Micky Johnson remains an author of Drive Right.
Two Hopefull Documents Released
Allen Robinson, Ph.D. CEO ADTSEA

In recent months you have heard a lot about two items. The economy is number one and NHTSA describing driver education is number two.

My personal forecast on the economy is that we have turned the corner and the economy will gradually improve. In driver education, we have also turned the corner and have two substantial documents to help support our cause.

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration has been developing program guidelines for accident countermeasures which they support. At long last, Guideline No. 4- Driver Education has been posted in the Federal Register. Please note these are guidelines for the development and implementation of a comprehensive highway safety program to achieve significant reductions in traffic crashes, fatalities, and injuries on public roads. “The highway safety program should include a driver education and training program designed to educate new drivers and provide remedial training for existing drivers.”

Immediately following this article the NHTSA, “Guideline No. 4” appears. While the economy will continue to hamper our efforts, this guideline clearly directs state Highway Safety Offices to include driver education in their comprehensive highway safety program.

The second significant document released by NHTSA is the Novice Driver Education and Training Standards. These standards have been under development for the past year. The concluding phase of this developmental process was a conference in Phoenix, Arizona to broaden support in the materials that had been developed.

The development of these standards has been a very difficult process. As you are aware, it has been very frustrating for me personally. The standards don’t reach the level of proficiency that I have hoped for, but the standards are an excellent goal for state and local programs to strive for.

There will be pieces of these standards that you cannot achieve at this time. Build your program around as many of these standards as possible. Use the remaining standards as your goal for the future. *See standards document starting on page x.

The two key documents now available must be use to improve our programs. If we could all measure up to these documents, then driver education would be the same throughout the country. This could be a major step in ensuring quality driver education for all new young drivers. I hope you will embrace these documents and share them with everyone who has an interest in quality driver education. We will be discussing the implementation of guidelines and standards at our National conference July 25-29, 2009 in Charlotte, North Carolina.

Highway Safety Program Guideline No. 4 Driver Education

Each State, in cooperation with its political subdivisions and tribal governments, should develop and implement a comprehensive, culturally competent highway safety program, reflective of State demographics, to achieve a significant reduction in traffic crashes, fatalities and injuries on public roads. All programs should be data driven, and the highway safety program should include a driver education and training program designed to educate new drivers and provide remedial training for existing drivers. This guideline describes the components that the State driver education program should include and the minimum criteria that the program components should meet. Resources permitting, schools should also include traffic safety education for children and youth designed to engender knowledge of safe driving practices.

I. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Each State should have centralized program planning, implementation, and coordination to deliver comprehensive and uniform driver education that applies to both public and private programs. Evaluation should be used to revise existing programs, develop new programs, and determine progress and success. The State Highway Safety Office (SHSO) in collaboration and in cooperation with other State agencies involved in driver education, such as:
- Transportation Departments
- Motor Vehicle Departments
- Licensing Departments
- Education Departments, should:
  - Provide leadership;
  - Training and technical assistance to public and private providers of driver education to ensure consistency and quality;
  - Resources permitting, work with other relevant State agencies to identify staff resources to provide full-time oversight over driver education programs delivered within the State;
  - Evaluate the effectiveness of the State’s driver education program.
II. LEGISLATION, REGULATION AND POLICY

Each State should enact and enforce laws and policies intended to reduce crashes caused by novice drivers. To enhance the effectiveness of driver education, States should:
- Enact Graduated Driver Licensing (GDL) laws that include three stages of licensure, and that place restrictions and sanctions on high-risk driving situations for novice drivers (i.e., nighttime driving restrictions, passenger restrictions, zero tolerance, portable electronic communication and entertainment devices restrictions, and required seat belt use);
- Ensure that the GDL restrictions and sanctions for GDL licensure are adapted for and applicable to motorcycle operators, and enforceable for motorcycle operators;
- Develop driver education standards and guidelines to which all driver education programs, whether public or private, must adhere to satisfy licensing requirements for novice drivers; and
- Ensure that completion of driver education programs will not reduce time required for novice drivers to proceed through a GDL system.

III. ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM

Components of a State driver education enforcement program should include:
- Visible and well-publicized law enforcement of the components of GDL and zero tolerance laws;
- Licensing sanctions for violations of these provisions;
- Evaluation of enforcement efforts to determine effectiveness;
- State agency oversight of driver education programs to ensure delivery of approved State curriculum; and
- Administrative or financial penalties for programs in noncompliance.

IV. DRIVER EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM

A driver education program should be available to novice drivers and all youths of licensing age and include the following criteria:
- The program is taught by instructors, public or private, certified by the State as qualified for these purposes; examples of such standards might include: minimum levels of education and continuing education, not being convicted of any felony or certain misdemeanor crimes, holding a valid driver license, and setting limits on numbers and types of driving violations.
- All vehicles used in public or commercial Behind the Wheel training have appropriate safety inspections and are equipped with, at a minimum, a safety brake accessible by the driver side passenger, a first aid kit, a fire extinguisher, an instructor rear view mirror and an eye check mirror for the instructor.
- It provides each student with practice driving and/or instruction in at least the following:
  - Basic driving techniques, including starting, stopping, turning, and basic interaction in controlled environments in light and moderate traffic;
  - Additional driving techniques, including balanced vehicle movement through steering, braking, and accelerating in a precise and timely manner;
  - Cognitive aspects of driving, including gap management, recognizing blockage and hazards, responding early and appropriately to hazards and potential hazards, signaling techniques, methods for speed management and effective visual searching, and decision-making and habit-making strategies;
  - Risk prevention techniques such as skid prevention;
  - Rules of the road and other State laws and local motor vehicle laws and ordinances;
  - Attitudinal awareness training that includes how attitudes can have an impact on driving behavior;
  - Peer pressure training including how vehicle operators and passengers can say no in unsafe peer-pressure situations and how to utilize leadership skills in managing the driver and the passengers in a vehicle;
  - Vehicle technology and the benefit of braking, traction, intelligent handling, and stability systems;
  - Critical vehicle systems and sub-systems requiring preventive maintenance;
  - Vehicle and highway features including different vehicle and roadway conditions that:
    - Aid the driver in avoiding crashes;
    - Protect the driver and passengers in crashes; and
    - Maximize the care of the injured.
  - Signs, signals, and highway markings and highway design features that require understanding for safe operation of motor vehicles;
  - Differences in characteristics of urban and rural driving including safe use of modern expressways;
  - Safe Driving Practices, including making good driver decisions; use of occupant restraints; not driving under the influence; and dealing with fatigue, distractions, and aggressive drivers; and
  - Sharing the roadway with other users, especially pedestrians, bicycles, scooters, and motorcycles, who are more physically vulnerable to injury or death in the event of

(more on page 13)
A driver's license represents considerable freedom to a young person. Parents, too, may eagerly anticipate and look forward to the additional help that a teen driver provides to an American household. In addition, mobility is an important factor for today's teens as well as a key factor in the economic and social growth of our country. Teens view this mobility as evidence of becoming an adult. Unfortunately, these freedoms and conveniences come at a high price, which continues to be paid via traffic-related fatalities, life-altering injuries, and economic costs. Crashes continue to be the leading cause of death among American teens, accounting for more than one third of all deaths of 16 to 19 year olds. The crash rate is greatest among 16 year olds, who have the most limited driving experience and an immaturity that often results in risk-taking behind the wheel. This segment of new drivers has been over-represented in U.S. crash statistics since tracking began and continues this distinction in current driving population demographics. The social costs of these senseless tragedies are immeasurable.

While the value of novice teen driver training and education has long been a subject of debate among researchers, educators, and others in the transportation and traffic safety community, it continues to be the primary introduction to the driving task for American teens. McKnight (1985) writes, "...it is clearly something of a distortion to attribute accidents to driver education just because it leads to driving. Any group of people that drive will have accidents. By agreeing to license them, society accepts that risk. Driver education is simply a means of achieving a socially accepted goal." Enhancing consistency and providing guidance to states seeking to improve the novice teen driver education and training experience was the goal of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) Working Group as they convened to craft the Novice Teen Driver Education and Training Administrative Standards.

The implementation of the resulting standards is a first step and is intended to assist driver education and training professionals in providing the administrative framework to teach novice teen drivers the skills and transfer the knowledge necessary to perform as safe and competent drivers, thereby contributing to the reduction of crashes, fatalities, and injuries. The Novice Teen Driver Education and Training Administrative Standards set forth in this document serve to guide all novice teen driver education and training programs in states striving to provide quality, consistent driver education and training. While noting that administering education standards and policies are a state's right, these standards were created to serve as an anchor for state policies on driver education and training with the following understandings:

- The goal of driver education and training is to transfer knowledge, develop skills, and enhance the disposition of the teen, so he/she can perform as a safe and competent driver, thereby contributing to the reduction of crashes, fatalities, and injuries.
- Driver education and training should be an integral part of the GDL system.
- Driver education and training should be a lifelong learning process.
- Driver education and training should be a phased education process.
- Driver education and training standards should help an organization be successful in administering and/or providing quality and uniform driver education and training, consistent with the latest advances in methodology, subject matter, and technology.
- Any standard promulgated for driver education and training must be supported with a communication strategy for all stakeholders.

(more on page 6)
Background

NHTSA’s approach to developing these standards was as follows:
- Review a cross-section of state-level driver education and training standards, curriculum content, and delivery requirements to determine how they can help shape national standards of oversight, delivery, monitoring, and evaluation of state and local driver education and training programs. Research, review, and compare driver education and training-related documents from the following stakeholder organizations:
  o NHTSA
  o American Driver and Traffic Safety Education Association
  o AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety
  o Driving School Association of the Americas (DSAA)
- Identify differences in the approaches currently used by states and other programs to determine what modifications are needed to ensure uniformity and acceptance by public and private driver education and training programs.
- Assemble a Working Group consisting of program administrators and driver education and training specialists, both public and private, as well as other stakeholders to develop draft standards, guidelines, monitoring and evaluation approaches and oversight techniques.
- Devise standards/guidelines for overseeing public and private driver education and training programs to ensure program quality upon delivery, including monitoring and evaluation recommendations.
- Present the Working Group materials at a national conference on driver education and training attended by key driver education and training providers from state government driver education and training administrators and private entities. The conference attendees are provided comments discuss implementation strategy development as well as mechanisms for update, change, and follow-through on standards. The Working Group determined that standards should be established for the following topic areas:
  - Program Administration
  - Education/Training
  - Instructor Qualification
  - Parent/Guardian Involvement
  - Coordination With Driver Licensing

Reflections on the “National Driver Education Standards” Conference (NDESC)

Dale O. Ritzel, Professor/Director Emeritus, Safety Center, Southern Illinois University

Before I attended the NDESC, I started to think about what probably occurred in 1949 at Jackson’s Mill, West Virginia, where the famous Civil War General Stonewall Jackson was born. Jackson’s Mill was the location of the First National Conference on Driver Education, an activity that bought people from the north and south to develop the first driver education standards and I was hoping that the NDESC event in Phoenix AZ would be another victory for General Driver Education as the Battle of Bull Run had been for General Jackson.

I am not sure that a victory occurred in Phoenix. The various sides would move to the battle front, fire, and then retreat to reload. Sometimes I wished that I had bought my bullet proof vest. I do not know what my expectations were going into the NDES conference, but in general it was hopeful. Little information was provided to the group before the conference. What was provided was very limited. We received a brief “standards” document, which was so general; it was difficult to see what could be done over 3 days to “improve” it. The document did not contain much details in the areas cited and really was not written in what is generally considered to be a standards’ statements.

I know that the writing group that was assembled to provide a draft document for the persons attending the conference worked hard on preparing the document. Generally standards need to reflect best practices and highest goals of the (continued on page 7)
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and reflect a significant understanding of all the modern approaches and technologies we have available to us. However I urge the reader to recognize that all technologies are not metal, silicon and plastic. They are more often implementations of higher thought and ways of doing things. Therefore, moving forward, the standards document needs to recognize and accommodate the new understandings of teen brain development, the importance of the affective domain in learning and retaining significant information (flashbulb memory), the significance of adolescent development and gender differences in implementing and delivering a curriculum, and the potential for better implementing competency-based and mastery based learning models.

Our understandings of adolescent development, psychology, sociology and education have improved significantly since the last standards meeting some 60 years ago. I would urge the working group and the larger expert community to continue to look at these areas and to support efforts to implement them in existing or experimental curriculums in the future. It might be of value for NHTSA to establish some sort of loose oversight or review committee to not only guide and encourage the dissemination and implementation of the standards, but also to provide guidance for research and prototyping of potential promising curriculum elements.

I truly hope that this standards meeting sets the stage and plants a seed for further attention and effort in this important area and allows us in the future to measure, evaluate, redevelop and redeploy promising new driver educational technologies.

ADTSEA

For me, one of the strongest comments of the event (and one of the more motivational) was from Allen Robinson, when he talked about the same kind of standards event over 60 years ago and the outcome of that effort. I hope we can move a bit further forward with this current effort.

Jerry Gaines, California

Shannon Woods and I just returned from three days of being a part of some 50 invited stakeholders to participate in NHTSA's Driver Education Standards Project. Much more information will be given to you at the CASE Conference next month. For sure this is a historical moment in the area of driver education.

The federal government has been working on this "standards" effort for over two years, leading to the event we just witnessed and participated in this week. To be among a wide range of stakeholders from research, teaching, administration, public programs, commercial programs, on-line vendors, professional organizations, etc., was a unique experience. As I am sure Shannon will agree, there was intense interaction among the participants.

The most challenging aspect of this event was trying to get agreement among the participants that the efforts being made this week on framing national standards or guidelines are directed toward a "Starting Point" Document. That flexibility is required to continue to update the document through further study and input. In other words some felt their efforts were valuable and others felt the existing bar was not high enough to merit national level endorsement. You will want to learn more about the merits of this effort at our conference.

What should be noted is that there is a higher level of interest at the federal level giving attention to the driver education program than in the past several years.

Terry L. Kline, Eastern Kentucky

There were some interesting developments that occurred in the presentation by Jeff Michael at the end of the session. He basically explained that the ADTSEA Standards for curriculum were accepted as an appropriate document and has been supported by NHTSA in all of their communications. He explained that this document was designed to develop the Program administration and management phase of the process. He used a three tiered effect to explain his model. He also clearly indicated that the Eureka document is not a NHTSA document. He referred to it as a document of the Working group and whatever group that the agency or commission takes after this point in time. I found this rather interesting that Peter Kissinger and David Huff tried to push through a resolution that this group accept this Eureka document (that has not been produced) as a standards document to lead into a National Commission on Driver Education Standards made up initially from this working group. Allen did volunteer the staff services of ADTSEA to develop this process from this point forward.

I found it strange that the group wanted to develop a resolution on an incomplete document. My thoughts are that this Eureka document and this process only validates the work done by the working group set up by Mike Smith in 1999-2000 that has produced a standards-based document for the ADTSEA/NHTSA produced "Traffic Safety Education Life-Long Learning" with a section devoted to Program Delivery that was revised in 2002. I feel that using the Eureka document as a validation of the ‘Traffic Safety Education Life-long Learning’, ADTSEA can ask the Standards committee to revise the present
document in the format of the recently developed "National Health Education Standards" to have a "National Novice Driver Education and Training Standards-2010" that can be used as the basis of the National Commission for Driver and Traffic Safety Education Standards-2010 that would involve all of the present stake holders and to include health educators, CDC, PTA, Gov. highway safety reps, insurance, manufacturers, and law enforcement. Each would have their role in developing different phases of the standards document rather than the hodgepodge of representation that was evident at this past meeting.

It would also be important to have ADTSEA involved in the process of helping states with certification and curriculum development. If we would be in the approval and Model curriculum areas, we should not package and sell any particular curriculum, but support our sponsoring agencies in their efforts to develop materials that meet the expectations. The standards committee and ADTSEA does need to get a handle on the rapidly spreading area of online instruction that does not involve certified instructors in the process. It seems as the industry has mushroomed without any realistic guidelines or controls for program development. ADTSEA or DSAA or ASSSDE could be developed to act as control agents over this process. I also believe that ADTSEA should reenlist the help of several State Administrators to restart the ASSSDE program that associates itself with ADTSEA and look at DETA as a program in opposition to ADTSEA goals and program endeavors. DETA has Coombs as a separate spokesman and does not work with ADTSEA and is often in completion with ADTSEA objectives. We should not consider that organization as part of the ADTSEA structure at Conferences or program areas.

These were my observations of the process in Phoenix. I thought it was a validation of the ADTSEA role and that the document does meet or exceed present ADTSEA guidelines as defined in our NHTSA sponsored, Traffic Safety Education Life-Long Learning Guide. We need to have our committee review the documents revised in 2002 and include guidelines for online learning selection. ADTSEA needs to play a leadership role in developing a National Commission of Driver and Traffic Safety Education Standards. ADTSEA should seek NHTSA support to take this to the next level and have a supporting agency that is made up of the stakeholders. If NHTSA provides initial support, a mechanism may be put in place to have the stakeholders fund the future meetings after the three-year process of getting an organization like this into place. This is similar to the process that is in place for other areas that involve educational programs for our national interest.

Kal Keliher, GA

I appreciate the chance to react to the "event". I find the term more satisfying than a "National Driver Education Standards Project" When our group would start to get "into" a subject we were usually informed that we were not here to change the document. So the logical question, which was not answered, was why are we here? We also heard "that is what the working group came up with so let's not go over that again". That coincided with OK guys we do not have much time.

On a positive note it was good to see that groups that typically do not see eye to eye could sit down together. I would have expected that was possible anyway. I often appear to share many "pleasant" moments with a local gentleman (DSAA) with whom I often disagree and feel I must watch like a hawk. I would like to see this event evolve into a working relationship that gets into the "dirt and flowers" level. I believe the influence of "outside groups" (AAMVA, PTA and licensing agencies) helped keep some things in check. The benefit could be of diminished value as it may have kept the real concerns from surfacing. Those groups provided an outside perspective that is not necessarily associated with instructional based efforts to provide a quality driver education program. They need standards to be able to recognize a quality program and hold others accountable.

It was interesting that there were so many Canadians working on our "national standards" We put out some thoughts – raising the classroom and on street time. There was not much discussion of quality or outcomes.

The ramblings above indicate the following... I am not certain what was accomplished other than sending a minimal document back to the working group with a few editorials or proof reading notes. The resolution was an effort to claim the necessity of working together. However, how will we fare if true standards are discussed? I did feel hopeful that someday the groups may eventually be able to discuss real issues. I wanted to get to the answers, but perhaps wiser people know that we must establish a working relationship first.

If I see this "event" as simply getting the groups used to working together and developing a working relationship without demonizing anyone, then we have a good start. We are tip-toeing around but not acting on issues. We gathered, sat down, talked about very basic issues with few specifics, and left it with it is still up to the states to do as they see fit anyway.
1.1. Management, Leadership, and Administration

Each state should:

1.1.1 have a single agency, or coordinated agencies, informed by an advisory board of stakeholders and charged with overseeing all novice teen driver education and training programs. That agency should have authority and responsibility for the implementation, monitoring, evaluation, and enforcement of these standards. This agency should also be charged with developing and executing communication strategies to inform parents and the public about driver education and training issues. In addition, the agency should inform providers in a timely fashion about changes to laws, regulations, and procedures.

1.1.2 carefully choose a state agency that is best suited and ideally not a direct provider of driver education to administer a statewide education and training program and that can provide needed and appropriate regulatory environment, oversight, monitoring, evaluation, review and approval processes, professional development, and all other administrative actions that make available a quality driver education and training program to all age-eligible residents.

1.1.3 have a full-time, funded state administrator for driver education and training. This individual should meet or exceed the qualifications and training required by the state for a novice teen driver education and training instructor and/or school owner or possesses equivalent experience or qualifications. This administrator should be an employee of the agency that has oversight of driver education and training.

1.1.4 have standardized monitoring, evaluation/auditing, and oversight procedures to ensure that every driver education and training program uses a curriculum with written goals and objectives.

1.1.5 have a program renewal process to ensure that curriculum materials and procedures are current.

1.1.6 adopt an instructor certification renewal process.

1.1.7 approve driver education and training programs that conform to applicable state and national standards.

1.1.8 deny or revoke approval of driver education and training programs that do not conform to applicable state and national standards.

1.1.9 ensure that programs reflect multicultural education principles and are free of bias.

1.1.10 administer applications for licensing of driver education and training instructors, including owner/operators of public and private providers.

1.1.11 develop and execute monitoring, evaluation, and auditing procedures to ensure standards are met by public and private providers.

1.1.12 adopt goals, objectives, and outcomes for learning.

1.1.13 develop criteria to assess and approve programs, curricula, and provider effectiveness. Financial and/or administrative sanctions for non-compliance with the state application and approval processes and/or standards should be provided to all applicants and provide remediation opportunities to driver education and training providers when sanctions are issued.

1.1.14 establish and maintain a conflict resolution system for disputes between the state agency and local novice teen driving education and training programs.

1.1.15 require, provide or ensure the availability of ongoing professional development for instructors to include updates in best education and training methods and materials.

1.1.16 require all public and private driver education and training providers to report program data to the designated state agency so that periodic evaluations of the state’s driver education and training programs can be completed and made available to the public.

1.1.17 ensure that student information submitted to the agency or used by the agency remains confidential, as required by applicable state and federal regulations.

1.1.18 ensure that all novice teen driver education and training programs, instructors, and associated staff possess necessary operating licenses and credentials required by the state.

1.1.19 ensure that each driver education and training provider has an identified person to administer day-to-day operations, including responsibility for the maintenance of student records and filing of reports with the state in accordance with state regulations.

1.1.20 ensure that all materials, equipment, and vehicles are safe and in proper condition to conduct quality, effective driver education and training.

1.1.21 refer to a general standard for online education such as those established by the North American...
2.1 Each state should:

2.1.1 have driver education and training that meets or exceeds current nationally accepted content standards and benchmarks.

2.1.2 approve curricula that are based on nationally recognized standards such as ADTSEA and DSAA – Attachments E and F. Each state retains authority in determining what curricula meet its state standards. Other resources include AAA\textsuperscript{1} and NIDB\textsuperscript{2}.

2.1.3 regulate the use of simulation and driving ranges.

2.1.4 require an approved end-of-course knowledge and skill assessment examination based on the stated goals and objectives to graduate from the driver education and training program.

2.1.5 require a course provider to conduct valid post-course evaluations of driver education and training programs to be completed by the students and/or parent/guardian for the purpose of improving the effectiveness of the program (a resource for help in conducting these evaluations is the AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety\textsuperscript{3}).

2.1.6 require core driver educational hours that focus on the driving task and safe driving practices sufficient to meet the criteria established by the end-of-course examination. To enable states to select the appropriate guidelines for contact hours to meet the desired outcomes the following instructional time should be:

First stage education:
- Minimum of 45 hours of classroom/theory
- Minimum of 10 hours of behind the wheel instruction
- 10 hours in-car observation
- Second stage education
- minimum of 10 hours
- The in-car instruction can be enhanced with simulation or driving range instruction.

2.1.7 require distributive learning.

3.0 Instructor Qualifications

3.1 Each state should:

3.1.1 require the following prerequisites for instructor certification and recertification:
- a) possess a valid driver’s license, as recognized by the state.
- b) have an acceptable driving record as determined by the state.
- c) pass a federal and state criminal background check.
- d) meet health or physical requirements as determined by the state.
- e) achieve a minimum academic education requirement as determined by the state.
- f) meet a minimum age requirement as determined by the state.

3.1.2 require instructors to complete approved standardized instructor training that applies to instructors/teachers in all public and private driver education and training programs. This preparation should include a course of study that is no less than 120 hours of preparatory time. (See Attachment B Instructor Qualifications Statement)

3.1.3 require instructors to receive training in accepted best practices in course delivery and evaluations using various delivery modalities.

3.1.4 require that an instructor pass a state approved practical and/or written exam (e.g., Praxis II, National Teacher Certification Program [sponsored by ADTSEA – Developed by AAA Roadway Safety Coalition]).

3.1.5 require annual continuing education and professional development hours for instructors.

3.1.6 require an annual driving record review for instructors.

4.0 Parent Involvement

4.1 Each state should:

4.1.1 require the parent of a teen driver education and training student to attend a parent seminar, pre-course, or the initial session of the teen’s driver education and training course. This session should outline the parent’s responsibility and opportunity to reduce their teen’s crash risk in several ways, including modeling safe driving behavior. Information conveyed to the parent in this session should include, but not be limited to, the following known best practices of GDL:

a) Managing their novice driver’s learning-to-drive experience to determine the readiness of their teen to begin the process, and supervising their teen’s driving so that they can better determine their teen’s readiness to advance to the next licensing stage and assume broader driving privileges.

b) Supervising an extended learner permit period of at least six months that provides at least weekly opportunities for the novice driver to accumulate a minimum of 50 hours of supervised practice driving in a wide variety of increasingly challenging circumstances. Hours of supervised practice driving required in GDL should not be reduced by a novice driver’s participation in other driver education and training programs, nor should any other activity be considered a substitute. Parental attendance at the pre-course should not count toward the 50 hours of supervised practice driving.

c) Supervision of an extended intermediate license period that temporarily restricts driving unsupervised with teen passengers and during nighttime hours until the

\textsuperscript{1}AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety
\textsuperscript{2}National Network for Driving Behavior
\textsuperscript{3}National Association of College Online Learning
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5.1 Each state should:

5.1.1 have a formal system for communication and collaboration between the state driver education and training agency and the state driver licensing authority. This system should allow sharing of information between driver education and training program/course administrators and the state’s driver licensing authority.

5.1.2 have a GDL system that includes, incorporates, or integrates driver education and training. Completion of driver education and training should not reduce the time requirements in the GDL process.

5.1.3 provide information and education on novice teen driving requirements and restrictions to judges, courts, and law enforcement officials charged with adjudicating or enforcing GDL laws.

5.14 ensure that sanctions for non-compliance with GDL requirements by novice teen drivers are developed and enforced uniformly.

5.1.5 require a parent to submit state-specified documentation that certifies completion of required supervised hours in a manner that reduces the possibility of fraudulent entries.

5.1.6 ensure that state licensing tests are empirically based and reflect performance competencies of the standards-based driver education and training program outlined in the previous sections of this document.

5.1.7 develop and implement a valid and reliable driver’s knowledge and skills test that assesses factors associated with the novice teen driver’s ability to reduce driving risks.

Definitions of Key Terms

Administrator – manager (affairs, a government, etc.); having executive charge of.

Advanced driving skill program – an additional driving program designed to promote safe driving skills outside of the novice training.

Alternative delivery – delivery of the theory portion of driver education using channels other than the traditional classroom, such as: internet-based, correspondence-based, and parent-taught.

Behind-the-wheel – actual instructional driving time during which the novice teen driver drives on streets/highways and is guided by an instructor in the front passenger seat. Observation is not included in behind-the-wheel time.

Certification – to award a certificate to a person attesting to the completion of a course of study or the passing of a qualifying examination.

Classroom (content) – that part of the driver education and training program that imparts the knowledge, theory, principles, laws, rules, best practices, and related curriculum content through student-centered activities, lecture, media, programmed instruction, independent study, correspondence, and other effective techniques.

Classroom (setting) – the delivery of the classroom portion of the curriculum is not limited to a traditional physical location, but includes the services of a professional instructor/facilitator in a variety of physical, real-time, on-line, and video settings. It may include home-based and parent-taught or parent-facilitated venues in which case the services of a professional instructor may or may not be required depending on state law. It does not include observation time or behind-the-wheel instruction.

Concurrent instruction – the practice of using in-vehicle, classroom, simulation, and range based teaching methods simultaneously.

Confidential – spoken, written, acted upon, etc. in strict privacy.

Consistent – agreeing or accordant; compatible; not self-contradictory; constantly adhering to the same principles, course, form, etc.

Content – the subject matter taught in driver education and training.

Correspondence-based driver education – a driver education program in which the classroom/theory portion is completed by the student at the student’s home location and at their personal pace.

Credential – usually credentials. Evidence of authority, status, rights, entitlement to privileges, or the like, usually in written form.

Curriculum – the overall program of instruction, including classroom, behind-the-wheel, observation, simulation, or driving range instruction. Generally required to be approved by the state in which the program is delivered.

Distributive Learning – where the acquisition of knowledge and skills is spread over a longer period of days and weeks with fewer hours of instruction in a day, as opposed to fewer days and weeks, but more
Apprehension; acquaintance with facts, truths, or principles, as from study or investigation.

**Learner permit** – the initial driving permit in the GDL system.

**Licensing (for novice teen drivers)** – formal permission from a governmental authority to operate a motor vehicle on public roadway.

**Licensing (for driving schools)** – formal permission from a governmental or other constituted authority to operate a driving school.

**Lifelong learning** – the ongoing formal and informal acquisition of knowledge or skills. www.ifdn.com/teacher/glossary.htm.

**Measure** – to ascertain the extent, dimensions, quantity, capacity, etc., of, especially by comparison with a standard; to judge or appraise by comparison with something or someone else.

**Monitoring, evaluation/auditing** – recording, regulating, or controlling a process or system.

**Multi-stage driver education** – a system where combined phases of classroom/theory and behind-the-wheel instruction are delivered at different times to enhance learning. That is, a portion of the required classroom and behind-the-wheel instruction is completed, then the parent/guardian conducts supervised driving for a specified time or amount, then the novice teen driver returns for the remaining classroom and behind-the-wheel instruction.

**Novice teen driver** – any teen that falls under the jurisdiction of the state’s GDL system.

Novice teen driver education and training – classroom instruction and supervised driving practice with instructors, training materials, and procedures to reduce risk taking and improve safety decision-making for these drivers.

**Observation time** – instructional time whereby novice teen drivers observe a behind-the-wheel lesson and receive perceptual practice in

**Public driving school** – a driver education program that is delivered by a business entity.

**Provider** – the legal entity (“private” or “public”) that offers a driver education program.

**Program** – the full scope of delivery of novice teen driver education, including both classroom/theory and behind-the-wheel instruction.

**Parent** - a parent, guardian or other mentor responsible for managing a novice teen driver’s learning-to-drive experience.

**Parent-taught driver education** – a system whereby parents/guardians are authorized to be their novice teen driver’s driving instructor and able to perform either or both the classroom and behind-the-wheel instruction responsibilities.

**Phased education** – the incremental introduction of concepts, skills, and techniques based on the acquisition of foundational knowledge.

**Private driving school** – a driver education program that is delivered by a business entity.

**Professional development** – the ongoing acquisition of knowledge, skills, and awareness of new or emerging issues by driving instructors, generally required as a condition of certification as an instructor by a state.

**Public driving school** – a driver education program that is delivered by a political subdivision of the state.

**Report** – to give or render a formal account or statement of

**Second stage driver education and training** – education and training that occurs after formal driver education and training is completed. This can include classroom and/or behind the wheel and is conducted under the supervision of a qualified driver education and training instructor.

**Simulation** – using interactive computer programs which imitate (Continued on page 14)
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real or imaginary driving scenarios.
Often used to create events that would normally be impossible,
difficult or dangerous to the novice teen drive www.learning.ac.nz/mod/
glossary/view.php

Simulator – a replica of basic vehicle controls and instruments
that allows student response to driving situations. An
electromechanical device designed to represent the driver’s
compartment of the automobile and
with the use of films, video programs, or computer generated
multi-media attempts to develop judgment, decision-making skills,
behavior response, and
manipulative skills essential in
learning the driving task.

Skill – the ability, coming from one’s
knowledge, practice, aptitude, etc.,
to do something well; competent excellence in performance.

Standard – something considered
by an authority or by general
consent as a basis of comparison;
an approved model; a rule or
principle that is used as a basis for
judgment.

Standardized – to bring to or make
of an established standard size,
weight, quality, strength, or the like.

Theory – while “theory” specifically
refers to the general principles of the
body of knowledge related to
driving, including the ideal set of
facts, principles and circumstances
for driving, it is sometimes used as
a substitute for “classroom” when
referring to driver education - as in
"...the classroom or theory portion
of driver education.”

Instructor Qualifications

Statement

Quality instructor training is the
backbone of quality driver education
and training; therefore, it is an
important component for helping to
produce a safe teen driver.

1.1 Instructors should be required
to complete approved standardized
instructor training that applies to
instructors/teachers in all public and
private driver education and training
programs. This preparation should
include a course of study that is no
less than 120 hours of preparatory
time.

1.2 Courses to prepare instructor/
teachers should include both theory
and laboratory education. The
following competencies for
classroom and in-car instruction
should be achieved:

- Ability to recognize and explain
  the general nature of the drivers’ task
  within the highway transportation
  system and the consequences of
  system failures
- Ability to apply risk management
  skills to the task of driving as a driver
  or passenger
- Ability to apply and explain the
  principles of perception to risk
  management when operating a
  motor vehicle
- Ability to apply and explain the
  techniques for managing risk when
  operating a motor vehicle over pre-
  selected on and off-street activities.
- Ability to recognize and identify
  physical, social and psychological
  influences that can affect motor
  vehicle operator performance
- Ability to demonstrate concepts
  and generalizations which enable
  one to make objective decisions
  regarding the:
  * use of alcoholic beverages and
drugs
  * use of occupant restraints and protective devices
  * consequences of speed
  selection
  * consequences of fatigue, drowsy
  driving and road rage
  * environmental factors that
  influence the decision-making
  process
  * use of visual skills to obtain
  appropriate information to make
  reduced-risk decisions in low,
  moderate and high risk driving
  environments
  * management of time, space
  and visibility when operating
  a motor vehicle
  * interaction with other roadway
  users in a positive manner
  * demonstration of balanced
  vehicle movement
  * additional skills practice with
  parents/guardians/mentors
  * identification of laws, rules and
  regulations that govern the smooth
  movement of traffic
  * use of current methodologies for
  providing classroom instruction in
driver education including
organization, classroom
management and technologies
  * use of current methodologies for
  providing in-car instruction in
driver education including
route development, giving directions,
positive evaluation feedback and
evaluating driver performance
- Ability to identifying and support
rules and regulations governing a
state’s GDL program
- Ability to demonstrate
knowledge of the state-specific rules
of the road
- Ability to demonstrate vehicle
operation and control from the right
passenger position
- Ability to provide oral instruction
- Ability to develop training routes
- Ability to develop task
breakdown explanations
- Ability to conduct performance
assessments and evaluations
- Ability to contact first aid
resources in the event of an
emergency

1.3 Each state should require that
courses offered to fulfill instructor
preparatory requirements include
the following outline and topics:

1.3.1 Driver Task Analysis: a course
that is designed as a prerequisite to
provide instructors with the content
knowledge and skills necessary to
teach driver education and to attain
established instructor
competencies. These suggested
topics are a minimum and may be
expanded:

  * Preparing for state administered
    written examination

(continued on page 15)
1.3.2 Vehicle operational and instructional skills: a course that is designed to provide instructors with the knowledge and skills necessary to successfully conduct in-car instruction, provide a safe learning environment while doing so, and evaluate new driver performance.
- Risk management principles in driving situations
- Factors that influence learning and habit development
- Standards for driver performance
- Lab learning environments
- Planning and preparing for instructional performances and outcomes
- Planning vehicle operational experiences
- Planning off-street laboratory experiences
- Planning on-street laboratory experiences
- Techniques for student performance assessment
- Involving mentors in the learning process
- Local curriculum and program needs
- Crash avoidance

1.3.3 Classroom Knowledge: a course designed to provide the instructor with the knowledge and skills necessary to provide quality student centered classroom instruction, successfully manage the classroom, and provide for appropriate student evaluation and assessment.
- Course introduction, scheduling and grading
- Risk management principles in all driving situations
- Influencing learning and habit development
- Standards of driver performance
- Classroom learning environments
- Planning for classroom experiences
- Planning for computer-assisted instruction
- Instructor characteristics and techniques
- Planning for simulation-based instruction
- Assessment of student performances
- Course assessments
- Planning for local curriculum and program needs
- Classroom lesson plan development
- Classroom lesson presentation
- Knowledge of state rules of the road, driver licensing, and penalties for improper driver behavior

A crash. This should include techniques to increase awareness of motorcycles and other road users.

Each State should also ensure:
- That research and development programs include adequate research, development, and procurement of practice driving facilities, simulators, online teaching resources, and other similar teaching aids for both school and other driver training use;
- There is a program that engages parents and/or guardians in the driver education and GDL programs;
- There is a program for adult driver training and retraining; and
- Commercial driving schools are licensed and instructors are certified in accordance with applicable State

(continued on page 16)
An Annotated Chronology of In-Car Technology
Troy Reynolds, Driver Education Teacher Candidate at St. Cloud State University

1.a.Past
i.1885 – First automobile Karl Benz, Germany
ii.1908 – First automatic transmission Henry Ford’s Model T in 1908.
iii.1919 – 1929 – Front-engine cars came to dominate, with closed bodies and standardized controls.
iv.1930 – 1948 – Fully-closed bodies began to dominate sales, with the new sedan body style even incorporating a trunk at the rear for storage. The old open-top runabouts, phaetons, and touring cars were phased out by the end of the classic era as wings, running boards, and headlights were gradually integrated with the body of the car.
v.1950 – 1983 – The biggest developments of the era were the widespread use of independent suspensions, wider application of fuel injection, and an increasing focus on safety in the design of automobiles.
b.1983 – Present - wide spread of front-wheel drive and all-wheel drive, the adoption of the V6 engine configuration, and the ubiquity of fuel injection. Three types, the hatchback, minivan, and sport utility vehicle, dominate today’s market yet are relatively recent concepts.

c.Future
i.Driverless cars – Priming the brakes so that just touching the pedal will apply their full force; the car will start reducing engine power, which will slow the car and reduce the severity of the crash; if the system detects that a crash can’t be avoided, it will prepare the airbags for deployment and tighten all of the seat belts, keeping occupants safe.

Adaptive Cruise Control – Using radar sensors on the front of the car, adaptive cruise control can tell when an object is in front of it, if the object is moving, and how fast it’s moving. When cruise control is set, adaptive cruise control will maintain a constant speed, but will also maintain a set distance between it and the car in front of it. (http://futurecarstechnology.com/)

iii.Lane Departure Warning - LDW uses tiny cameras, mounted on rearview mirrors, to watch the lane markings. This information is fed to an onboard computer, which then warns the driver with a combination of lights, steering wheel vibration, and perhaps an alarm that the car is drifting out of the lane. (http://www.dmv.org/how-to-guides/lane.php)

iv.Parking Assist Systems - Vehicles have sensors in the bumpers that transmit signals to the car, and calculate the locations of objects near the vehicle. Other systems sense objects by using radar or lasers, or have cameras mounted on them. The current technology for these systems allows the car to take over the steering, while you control the brake. The assistant emits a warning tone when you should stop the car and shift into reverse or forward. Other systems have a monitor mounted in the dash, and a computer voice telling you what to do. (http://www.dmv.org/how-to-guides/parking-assistant.php)

Parking Sensors and Cameras - Backup systems fall into two categories: sensors and cameras. Sensors placed on bumpers use technologies such as ultrasound, lasers, and radar to sense objects around the car and then sound a warning when you come too close. Some also offer visual warnings in the form of an in-dash LED display. Backup cameras, on the other hand, are mounted on the back of the vehicle (sometimes in the license plate frame), and display an image on a monitor, much like your rearview mirror. (http://www.dmv.org/how-to-guides/parking-sensors.php)

V. COMMUNICATION PROGRAM
States should develop and implement communication strategies directed at supporting policy and program elements. The SHSO, in collaboration and cooperation with driver education and training and highway safety partners, should consider a statewide communications plan and campaign that:
- Identifies audiences at particular risk and develops appropriate messages;
- Provides culturally competent materials;
- Informs parents/guardians and young drivers about the role of supervised driving and the State’s GDL law;
- Informs novice drivers about underage drinking and zero tolerance laws (in effect in all 50 States and the District of Columbia), such as including information in manuals for new drivers and including a question about the topic on the written test for a learner’s permit;
- Informs the public on the role of parental monitoring/involvement;
- Informs the public about State guidelines and regulation of driver education.

VI. PROGRAM EVALUATION AND DATA
The SHSO, in collaboration and cooperation with the State agencies responsible for driver education and training, should develop a comprehensive evaluation program to measure progress (more on page 17)
Serving Students with Physical Disabilities
Driver Education Teacher Candidate at St. Cloud State University

**Introduction**
As a choir teacher, I encounter over 250 students a day. Not all of these students, over the years, have been physically perfect. In my classroom, I have made accommodations for students who were on crutches, in wheelchairs, or do not have a limb. As I prepare to re-enter the driver education field, I question how we, as public school driver educators, address the issue of physical disabilities in the behind-the-wheel experience.

**Background Information**
While researching this topic, I kept reflecting upon a former student, Chris, whose shortened Achilles tendons prevented him from putting his feet flat on the ground. He would use crutches to walk, until he broke them from over use doing acrobatic stunts. He would then proceed to his wheelchair antics. I had wondered how he would be able to drive or maintain control of a vehicle when he couldn’t maintain physical control over his legs.

**Application of Literature**
According to Lynn Moore’s article “Driver ed for teens with disabilities”, teens with disabilities use adapted driving equipment and specialized strategies to learn to drive. She also states that every licensed driver must pass the same driver assessment. The Wisconsin Assistive Technology Initiative pamphlet states “Any school district that offers driver education to the general student population must also offer it to students with disabilities, or contract with outside agencies to provide similar instruction to these students. …Not all students will have the potential to drive due to limitations created by their disability”. I would assume the district (at least according to the Wisconsin pamphlet) is responsible for providing the funding to have a student assessed. The assessment can be done with a qualified agency like Adaptive Experts in Oakdale, MN for example, that specializes in assessment, rehabilitation and driver training. The ADED (Association for Driver Rehabilitation Specialists) website includes fact sheet and considerations for various physical disabilities such as cerebral palsy, loss of limb, Multiple sclerosis and spina bifida.

As a public school teacher, I have the resources/staffing to teach students with physical handicaps in my classroom. That’s a different scenario when I get behind-the-wheel with a student. According to the National Driver Education Standards Development Committee, driver education teachers typically are not trained to provide instruction to persons with special needs. They recommend that we refer students to specially trained professionals and/or agencies for evaluation and possible training.

**Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations**
In a driver’s education behind-the-wheel setting, most instructors are not trained to effectively instruct students with physical handicaps. I myself have no knowledge or experience in manipulating any of the vast products used to assist those with physical handicaps. Nor, would I know how to teach someone how to use them. I recommend that each instructor investigate what each school’s policy regarding assessment with physically handicapped students entails. I also recommend that instructors in the public school setting communicate with the professionals that work with handicapped students to develop a list of options and contacts for students interested in pursuing their license.

**References**
http://www.adaptiveexperts.com
http://www.aded.net
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toward established project goals and objectives and optimize the allocation of limited resources. The State should promote effective evaluation by:
- Supporting the analysis of police accident reports;
- Encouraging, supporting, and training localities in process, impact, and outcome evaluation of local programs;
- Evaluating the use of program resources and the effectiveness of existing countermeasures for the general public and high-risk populations; and
- Ensuring that evaluation results are used to identify problems, plan new programs, and improve existing programs.

Assorted networking may be leading us to a brave new world where periodicals will not exist. In this rapidly changing information rich environment, the fate of this publication will be determined by you the readers and contributors. If readers stop reading what will writers do? Does the question: If a tree falls in a forest and no one is there to hear it fall does it make a sound apply to *The Chronicle*? Or is the old chicken or egg puzzle more appropriate? I do hope that some of you will take the chance that some one will read what you write. If no one writes readers will not be able to read and the medium will die. Since you have read this far maybe there is hope of our association’s publication and perhaps you will take the time to write so others will have something to read. JWP
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Dirt Roads
by Paul Harvey

What's mainly wrong with society today is that too many Dirt Roads have been paved. There's not a problem in America today, crime, drugs, education, divorce, delinquency that wouldn't be remedied, if we just had more Dirt Roads, because Dirt Roads give character. People that live at the end of Dirt Roads learn early on that life is a bumpy ride. That it can jar you right down to your teeth sometimes, but it's worth it, if at the end is home...a loving spouse, happy kids and a dog.

We wouldn't have near the trouble with our educational system if our kids got their exercise walking a Dirt Road with other kids, from whom they learn how to get along. There was less crime in our streets before they were paved. Criminals didn't walk two dusty miles to rob or rape, if they knew they'd be welcomed by 5 barking dogs and a double barrel shotgun. And there were no drive by shootings. Our values were better when our roads were worse! People did not worship their cars more than their kids, and motorists were more courteous, they didn't tailgate by riding the bumper or the guy in front would choke you with dust & bust your windshield with rocks. Dirt Roads taught patience. Dirt Roads were environmentally friendly, you didn't hop in your car for a quart of milk you walked to the barn for your milk. For your mail, you walked to the mail box. What if it rained and the Dirt Road got washed out? That was the best part, then you stayed home and had some family time, roasted marshmallows and popped popcorn and pony rode on Daddy's shoulders and learned how to make prettier quilts than anybody.

At the end of Dirt Roads, you soon learned that bad words tasted like soap. Most paved roads lead to trouble, Dirt Roads more likely lead to a fishing creek or a swimming hole.

At the end of a Dirt Road, the only time we even locked our car was in August, because if we didn't some neighbor would fill it with too much zucchini.

At the end of a Dirt Road, there was always extra springtime income, from when city dudes would get stuck, you'd have to hitch up a team and pull them out. Usually you got a dollar...always you got a new friend...at the end of a Dirt Road! http://famguardian.org/Subjects/FamilyIssues/Articles/DirtRoads/DirtRoads.htm
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A Life Time of Teaching Pays Off
Richard D. Ellis, New York

Hopefully you will never have to use the following account of a non-preventable crash in which I was involved today, 12.19.08 at the intersection of 85A West and the driveway exit from the High School.

It had been snowing for about thirty minutes and the school was dismissing early. There was a long line of drivers approaching the exit, on my immediate right. I was topping on the incline at about 25 MPH and observed the long line. The first driver in line failed to stop at the sign, which triggered a mental and physical response, ie. get off the accelerator and cover the brake! Simultaneously the other involved driver was accelerating through a left turn, the vehicle went into a severe counter-clockwise spin, approaching my side of the westbound lane of 85A.

Having taught hundreds the correct evasive action in our Traffic Safety Education Program, through controlled simulation on a slippery parking lot at the University, I immediately and reflexively steered 45 degrees hard right. This avoided a head-on contact or a tee crash by changing the angle to the spinning vehicle. The right-side-of-the vehicle contacted the left front quarter panel of my vehicle which then continued across a shallow ditch, stopping several feet from the school sign.

I walked away without a scratch, though as you know, in similar situations drivers have been killed or seriously injured. Thank goodness for a perfectly equipped 1998 Chevy recreational van with only 138,000 beautiful miles! The perfectly positioned lap and shoulder belt and head restraint, and fully-deployed passive restraint air bags did a perfect job. My usually sore artificial knees and diabetic neuropathic (M.D. talk) feet, seem to have survived, although in such crashes they often take the g-forces of the crash. Thanks to all of the above, and the good Lord, another Ellis has survived! The young, inexperienced female in the other vehicle was ambulatory and taken away by ambulance.

Our beautiful van had never had as much as a scratch, but is now in the nearby body shop.

In spite of it all, I am pleased that I am physically able to function. and can tell this story of survival.

A Letter to the Editor from
Richard D. Ellis, New York

re: PH.D Williams, on page 15 etc. still will not give us a break. Unfortunately my good contact, William Haddon from NYS, and the first President of IIHS, did not have a chance to get his successors in line to support our Driver Education movement as he did on early encouragement from several of we NY Staters.

re: And congratulations to our colleague Micky Johnson. She was fabulous to work with on the ADTSEA Board, And I imagine she had some early influence on one Allen Robinson!

Lastly, as cited on the back cover, Lee and I have noted the date and location of the Charlotte/ADTSEA conference. One of our best friend-couple live thirty minutes from downtown Charlotte, and we would hope to stay with them. We tried it two years ago when our National Square Dance Festival with 10,000 dancers was downtown and we had a miserable experience. There were simply no easy routes into the city, and NO spaces to park once we got there. I hope you have some assurances from the Convention people that Conference commuters, especially with big vehicles, will have adequate parking within an easy walk of the Hilton Hotel. Available maps in the pre-registration packets would be very helpful.

Thanks for the attentive eye on this response from one appreciative member. And thanks to the good lord and mother nature for allowing me make it another week. The crashing experience was well beyond all that I have ever discussed and simulated. The old Reader’s Digest article, SEVEN TENTHS OF A SECOND between living and dying is certainly true.
Precison Systems, Inc. Programs From Doron

Two New Driving

Crash Avoidance III

Call now to order!

Doron's two new driving programs will help develop critical "threat recognition" skills and enhance peripheral vision capability for both driver's and novice drivers.

Highway Users, threatening actions or other drivers' ability to recognize accident free driving.

Doron systems, Inc.
Prepare Your Students for the Road Ahead

Join the thousands of instructors that count on AAA's How To Drive to help them make a difference in driver safety.

A recommended resource for instructors using the ADTSEA curriculum.

To order:
How To Drive - 13th Edition
Contact your local AAA club, or go to AAA.biz/trafficsafety
Technology you can trust... for your classroom!

SSI Driving Simulators offer:
- Ideal instructor teaching resource
- The ability to connect to video projector for the whole class to see
- Engaging interactive lessons
- Add to your current classroom and use during lecture time
- 8 lane expressways, urban city, residential and rural roads
- Crash avoidance scenarios including pedestrians and other vehicles
- Adverse weather conditions
- High fidelity vehicle dynamics modeling insures the simulator handles like a real vehicle
- Both 5-speed and automatic transmission capability
- Single screen systems starting under $5,000

Simulator Systems International
www.simulatorsystems.com • 1-800-843-4764 • 918-250-4500