STATE OF MICHIGAN

TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT
of the
DRIVER EDUCATION PROGRAM

April 28 – May 2, 2014

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
Technical Assistance Team

Troy E. Costales
Sharon R. Fife
Kevin R. Lewis
Connie Sessoms, Jr.
Vanessa C. Wigand

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 3
INTRODUCTION 4
ASSESSMENT BACKGROUND 9
PRIORITY RECOMMENDATIONS 11
ASSESSMENT FINDINGS 12
1.0 Program Administration 12
Advisory 12
Status 14
Recommendations 14
2.0 Education/Training 20
Advisory 20
Status 21
Recommendations 22
3.0 Instructor Qualifications 25
Advisory 25
Status 25
Recommendations 26
4.0 Parent Involvement 27
Advisory 27
Status 28
Recommendations 29
5.0 Coordination with Driver Licensing 30
Advisory 30
Status 30
Recommendations 32
APPENDIX 1 – Team Credentials 37
APPENDIX 2 – Assessment Agenda 40

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Technical Assistance Team (the Team) acknowledges and thanks Ms. Ruth Johnson, Michigan Secretary of State and Mr. Kirk Ferris, Director, Michigan Department of State (MDOS), Driver Programs Division for their support and able assistance in making this review possible.

The Team acknowledges and thanks Ms. Emily Davis, Analyst/Project Lead MDOS Driver Programs Division, Ms. Carol Reagan, Traffic Safety Specialist, MDOS Traffic Safety Division and Mr. Greg Lantzy, Manager (retired), MDOS Driver Education Section. They played major roles in this assessment, coordinating speakers and presentations, compiling briefing materials, and assisting with meeting facilitation during the course of the week and the extensive planning period.

The Office of Highway Safety Planning (OHSP) provided the funding for this assessment. It is with great appreciation that the Team acknowledges their support. Special thanks to Mr. Michael Prince, Director, OHSP and Ms. Linda Fech, Special Projects Coordinator, OHSP for their leadership.

Mr. Jim Wright, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) Headquarters and Mr. Mike Witter, NHTSA, Region 5 Office, assisted with the facilitation of the assessment process. The Team would like to thank NHTSA for helping to give a national and regional perspective to the assessment.

The Team also thanks each of the participants in the review process for the time and energy invested in preparing and delivering their presentations. The participant's candor and thoroughness in discussing driver education in the State of Michigan greatly assisted the Team in conducting a complete review.

The Team believes this report will contribute to the State's efforts to enhance the effectiveness of its Driver Education program in preventing injuries, saving lives, and reducing economic costs of young novice driver motor vehicle crashes on Michigan's roadways.

The Team recognizes the assessment is a review of all driver education activities and commends all who are involved in the day-to-day efforts to improve driver education in Michigan.

INTRODUCTION

Michigan is comprised of two peninsulas separated by the Straits of Mackinac and virtually surrounded by the Great Lakes. The State covers 58,110 square miles of land with thousands of inland waters and lakes.

Population

According to 2013 census estimates, Michigan ranks 8th in the nation with a population of nearly ten million persons (9,895,622). Michigan has 83 counties. Forty (40) percent of the total population resides in the urban centers of the southern half of the Lower Peninsula. In spite of urban expansion into agricultural lands, the state still has nearly 10 million farm acres and approximately 53,000 farms.

According to the 2013 Census, the most populated cities were Detroit – 701,475; Grand Rapids – 190,411; Warren – 134,141; Flint – 100,515; Sterling Heights – 130,410; Lansing (Capitol City) – 113,996; Ann Arbor – 116,121; and Livonia – 95,586. Statewide, Caucasians make up 80 percent of the population, Blacks or African Americans make up 14 percent, American Indian and Alaska Natives make up 0.7 percent, Asians make up 2.6 percent and 2 percent claimed Other. Hispanics or Latinos of any race make up about 4.6 percent. In more recent migrations many African Americans, Asians, Near Eastern and people of Spanish origin have made Michigan their home.

Economy

The three largest income-producing industries in Michigan are manufacturing, tourism and agriculture. As a four-season state, the State is host to approximately 3.8 million out-of-state visitors each year.

Michigan will always be associated with the automobile and Michigan leads the nation in automobile manufacturing. In addition to transportation-related items, Michigan manufactures a wide variety of products including non-electric machinery, furniture and appliances, cereals, baby food, chemicals, pharmaceuticals and lumber. Tourism is one of its largest income producers making Michigan one of the largest travel states in the United States. The state ranks first nationally in the production of red tart cherries, dry beans, blueberries, pickling cucumbers, and potted Easter lilies and geraniums. It is also a major supplier of spearmint.

Michigan has a very rich history and cultural past. In 1908, the Ford Model T was first manufactured in Michigan giving rise to a long history of automotive and related industries. In 1974, Gerald R. Ford of Grand Rapids became the 38th President of the United States.

Transportation

Michigan has a total of 120,256 miles of paved roadway (9,716 miles of state trunk line, 89,755 miles of county roads, and 20,785 miles of city and village streets). More than 96 billion miles are driven on Michigan roadways every year.

FIGURE 1

Highway Safety

An examination of the State's Traffic Crash Statistics files reveals the following data for Michigan:

> "In 2011, drivers ages 16-24 constituted 13.7 percent of all licensed drivers in Michigan. However, young drivers were involved in 33.0 percent of all crashes and 32.0 percent of fatal crashes. There rates are even more pronounced when considering the number of drivers and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) within this age group.
>
> This age group of drivers was most prone to crashes under winter conditions, a likely reflection of inexperience. Among the most prevalent hazardous actions attributed to young drivers are speeding and failure to yield, which also can be attributed to inexperience or poor risk assessment."[1]

In 2011, drivers ages 15-17 constituted 3.24 percent of all licensed drivers in Michigan. However, these young drivers were involved in 4.4 percent of all motor vehicle fatal crashes. Drivers ages 18-20 constituted 4.62 percent of all licensed drivers and were involved in 8.88 percent of all motor vehicle fatal crashes.

[1] State of Michigan – Strategic Highway Safety Plan 2013-2016

The number of permitted/licensed 15-17 year-old drivers decreased from 245,819 in 2008 to 228,454 in 2012, a seven percent decrease. Motor vehicle crashes for 15-17 year-old drivers decreased from 23,343 in 2008 to 17,545 in 2012, a reduction of almost 25 percent. Additionally, fatal crashes for 15-17 year-old drivers decreased from 50 in 2008 to 39 in 2012, a 22 percent reduction. Although the number of 15-17 year-old licensed drivers decreased over this five year period, crashes and fatal crashes for this age group decreased by a greater percentage.

TABLE 1

Number of Michigan Driver Licenses Age 15-17						
Age	**Year**					
	2008	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**Total**
15	53,002	46,785	52,789	49,998	52,354	254,928
16	87,497	83,183	84,446	81,707	81,487	418,320
17	105,320	99,589	98,320	96,443	94,613	494,285
Total	245,819	229,557	235,555	228,148	228,454	1,167,533

TABLE 2

Number of Motor Vehicle Crashes in Michigan Involving a Driver Age 15-17						
Age	**Year**					
	2008	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**Total**
15	668	614	625	575	505	2,987
16	9,344	8,482	7,861	7,355	7,169	40,211
17	13,331	12,010	11,013	10,260	9,871	56,485
Total	23,343	21,106	19,499	18,190	17,545	99,683

TABLE 3

Number of Fatal Motor Vehicle Crashes in Michigan Involving a Driver Age 15-17						
Age	**Year**					
	2008	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**Total**
15	3	4	4	4	2	17
16	19	15	13	21	17	85
17	28	24	27	18	20	117
Total	50	43	44	43	39	219

TABLE 4
PERSON AGE - DEMOGRAPHICS AND CRASH INVOLVEMENTS 2011

Age	Licensed Drivers	Michigan Population	Drivers in All Crashes	Drivers in Fatal Crashes	Occupants Killed	Occupants Injured	Bicyclists in All Crashes	Bicyclists in Fatal Crashes	Pedestrians in All Crashes	Pedestrians in Fatal Crashes
0-15	49,998	2,011,374	850	4	20	4,565	505	2	547	9
16	81,707	140,998	7,571	21	12	1,381	64	0	59	3
17	96,443	143,440	10,586	19	12	1,805	71	0	52	4
18	95,050	147,804	13,210	32	18	2,326	58	0	83	4
19	109,690	146,619	13,582	39	27	2,230	55	1	70	5
20	120,784	154,272	13,330	39	22	2,184	62	0	59	1
21-24	482,991	544,388	45,247	139	92	6,996	190	2	215	11
25-29	544,579	586,608	43,106	108	66	6,315	121	1	166	7
30-34	536,882	583,170	37,990	103	46	5,347	74	0	146	10
35-39	525,314	580,108	35,856	82	35	4,848	54	2	122	6
40-44	609,767	662,087	39,126	100	52	5,136	79	0	147	14
45-49	652,652	718,152	39,316	101	53	5,164	120	2	155	15
50-54	698,848	763,859	37,253	98	53	5,253	118	9	149	18
55-59	656,253	699,224	31,528	74	36	4,514	109	3	124	13
60-64	564,899	604,929	24,105	72	43	3,436	61	0	85	12
65-69	419,525	430,419	15,336	49	29	2,300	25	1	48	3
70-74	296,614	315,134	10,003	39	31	1,607	16	0	35	4
75-79	215,300	244,165	6,830	29	22	1,128	10	1	29	5
80-84	161,052	200,182	5,037	29	30	907	1	0	25	5
85-100+	119,528	199,255	3,289	30	26	656	3	0	20	3
Unknown	---	---	40,350	60	0	246	99	0	63	0
Total	7,037,876	9,876,187	473,501	1,267	725	68,344	1,895	24	2,399	152

TABLE 5
PERSON AGE - DEMOGRAPHICS AND CRASH INVOLVEMENTS 2012

Age	Licensed Drivers	Michigan Population	Drivers in All Crashes	Drivers in Fatal Crashes	Occupants Killed	Occupants Injured	Bicyclists in All Crashes	Bicyclists in Fatal Crashes	Pedestrians in All Crashes	Pedestrians in Fatal Crashes
0-15	52,354		929	4	26	4,559	480	1	505	17
16	81,487		7,367	17	13	1,342	51	0	62	0
17	94,613		10,192	20	10	1,779	61	1	63	0
18	94,131		12,398	34	21	2,097	60	0	70	2
19	107,958		12,640	33	21	2,182	65	1	69	5
20	116,563		12,710	30	20	2,017	77	0	72	4
21-24	488,279		45,389	153	100	7,356	185	3	230	17
25-29	551,108		41,883	112	76	6,336	160	0	174	13
30-34	538,749		36,759	113	64	5,240	88	0	129	8
35-39	519,299		33,578	84	46	4,439	76	1	109	7
40-44	597,346		37,101	113	50	4,982	99	1	136	12
45-49	635,000		37,030	119	41	4,978	112	2	158	13
50-54	690,190		35,751	89	52	5,049	128	4	174	14
55-59	666,945		30,932	111	52	4,413	117	2	128	14
60-64	570,932		23,470	75	44	3,478	48	3	83	14
65-69	441,197		15,765	64	45	2,327	46	0	65	5
70-74	314,640	awaiting data	10,187	49	28	1,550	23	0	48	5
75-79	219,722		6,869	27	19	1,122	16	1	28	2
80-84	160,035		4,890	32	30	890	7	0	19	3
85-100+	124,021		3,336	24	25	689	4	1	13	2
Unknown	---		39,854	49	0	132	78	0	62	0
Total	7,064,569	9,883,360	459,030	1,352	783	66,957	1,981	21	2,397	157

Michigan has a safety belt use rate of 93.6 percent, one of the nation's highest. The State's fatality rate per 100 million VMT has consistently remained below the national average. Since 2008 annual crash fatalities have remained below 1,000.

Fatal and serious injury alcohol and drug-impaired crashes have declined since 2008. The number of alcohol/drug-related crashes as a percentage of total fatal crashes has been fairly steady over the last decade but declined slightly since 2008.

Major accomplishments by the Michigan Legislature led to the approval of changes to the state's Graduated Driver Licensing law, enacting passenger restrictions and strengthening the nighttime driving restrictions. Additionally, as of July 1, 2010, Michigan enacted a texting while driving law, which prohibits all drivers from reading, manually typing, or sending text messages while operating a moving vehicle on a street or highway.

Michigan also developed and implemented a comprehensive driver education curriculum based on national standards from the American Driver and Traffic Safety Education Association. As part of the certification renewal process, driver education instructors in Michigan are now required to complete professional development activities every two years.

TABLE 6

Michigan Population Eligible for Driver Education

Age	Year				
	2008	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**
15	144,395	140,159	142,118	136,466	135,132
16	148,755	143,468	144,663	140,998	136,444
17	151,121	147,513	148,001	143,440	140,751
Total	444,271	431,140	434,782	420,904	412,327

Source: Census and Demographic Data from the Michigan Department of Technology, Management & Budget (www.michigan.gov/cgi)

It should be noted that in 2012 over 94,000 17 year-olds successfully completed a driver education course and obtained a driver's license. However, over 46,000 17 year-olds who were eligible for driver education remained unlicensed (see Tables 5 and 6).

ASSESSMENT BACKGROUND

Motor vehicle crashes are the leading cause of unintentional injury and death in the United States. Nationwide, the economic cost of motor vehicle traffic crashes exceeds $230 billion annually. Motor vehicle crashes are the leading cause of teen (ages 15-20) deaths in the United States.

The mission of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) is to reduce deaths, injuries, and economic and property losses resulting from motor vehicle crashes. In its ongoing efforts to reduce teen traffic crashes and subsequent fatalities and injuries, NHTSA continues its program of providing technical program assessments including Driver Education to the States upon request.

NHTSA acts as a facilitator by assembling a team composed of individuals who have expertise in driver education program administration, program development and evaluation, curriculum and instruction, and teen driving advocacy and outreach. Expertise among Team members includes: program administration, driver licensing, education and training, instructor qualification, and parental involvement.

The purpose of the assessment is to assist in the review of the driver education program in this State, identify the program's strengths and accomplishments, identify problem areas and offer suggestions for improvement. The assessment can be used as a tool for planning purposes and for making decisions about how to best use available resources. This assessment tool follows the format of the *Novice Teen Driver Education and Training Administrative Standards.* The Advisory that precedes each section of this report is taken from this document. The assessment process provides an organized approach for measuring program status.

The initial Driver Education Program Assessment was conducted in the state of Maryland. The Maryland Assessment Team and the State of Maryland developed the assessment tools and processes with the assistance of NHTSA and independently conducted an assessment in August of 2010. Following the success of the Maryland driver education assessment, NHTSA assumed the role of coordinator and facilitator of future assessments. Michigan is the seventh state to undertake a driver education assessment.

NHTSA utilized the newly developed *Novice Teen Driver Education and Training Administration Standards* as the assessment framework. These standards were developed by representatives from the driver education professional community, with assistance from NHTSA. The five major topic areas in the standards are:

- Program Administration
- Education/Training
- Instructor Qualifications
- Parent Involvement
- Coordination with Driver Licensing

The topic areas identified in the standards became the foundation for this assessment as well as key factors in identifying the panel of experts for the technical assistance team. NHTSA developed a list of national experts in the five areas above and used that list to determine the assessment team. Team members were also provided with a comprehensive "briefing book" by the Michigan Department of State (MDOS) Driver Programs Division.

Assessment Process

NHTSA Headquarters and Regional Office staff facilitated the Driver Education Program Assessment which was conducted at the Ramada Lansing Hotel and Conference Center in Lansing, Michigan from April 28 – May 2, 2014. Operating under a grant from the Michigan Office of Highway Safety Planning (OHSP), the MDOS took the lead for the state in coordinating the assessment. Working with the MDOS, NHTSA recommended a team of six individuals with demonstrated expertise in the topic areas of the National Administrative Standards. Efforts were made to select a team that reflected the needs and interests expressed by the MDOS during pre-assessment conference calls. The assessment consisted of interviews with state and community level driver education program managers, trainers, public and private instructors, law enforcement personnel, students, parents, MDOS staff and OHSP staff. The conclusions drawn by the assessment team are based upon the facts and information provided by the various experts who made presentations to the team as well as the briefing materials.

Following the completion of the presentations, the team convened to review and analyze the information presented and developed recommendations. The report is a consensus report by the Team. The recommendations are based on the unique characteristics of the state and what the Team members believed the state and its political subdivisions and partners can do to improve the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of their programs.

The assessment Team noted that many exemplary programs are conducted throughout Michigan in the area of driver education and traffic safety in general. It is not the intent of this report to thoroughly document all of these successes, nor credit the large number of individuals at all levels who are dedicated to driver education. By its very nature, the report tends to focus on the areas that need improvement based on the *Novice Teen Driver Education and Training Administrative Standards*. The report is an attempt to provide assistance to all levels for improvement, which is consistent with the overall goals of these types of assessments.

On the final day of the assessment, the Team briefed the Michigan driver education community on the results of the assessment and discussed major points and recommendations. This report is an assessment Team report; it is not a NHTSA document. Michigan may use the assessment report as the basis for planning driver education program improvements, assessing legislative priorities, providing for additional training, and evaluating funding priorities. On behalf of the assessment Team, NHTSA provides the final report to the MDOS and OHSP.

PRIORITY RECOMMENDATIONS

1.1.1

- **Establish an advisory board of stakeholders that has input on the implementation, monitoring, evaluation and enforcement of the Michigan driver education program with membership from the principle associations and providers from different regions of the state.**

1.1.7

- **Develop a process to incrementally increase the hours of instruction to align with the National Standards.**

1.1.16 and 1.1.17

- **Initiate a review of program data so the student enrollment, driver licensing, traffic convictions, crashes, suspensions and other data can be tied together showing the overall data story of the driver education program.**

4.1.1

- **Require parent(s) to attend a parent seminar, a pre-course session, or the initial session of the driver education program.**
- **Require parents to document the 50 hours of supervised driving practice.**

4.1.2

- **Provide feedback to the parents on their teen's in-car driving skills using a proficiency-based grading system to measure student achievement.**

5.1.7

- **Reduce the time period that printed knowledge tests are valid and utilized from one-year to a shorter period to increase the security of the tests and effectiveness of the item pool.**

ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

1.0 Program Administration

All entities delivering driver education and training should be treated fairly and equitably, meet the same quality standards, and have equitable access to State driver education and training resources.

Most States may have a multitude of public and private novice teen driver education and training programs. Each State may have different administrative and provisional structures. Alternative delivery (e.g., online, parent-taught, and correspondence) programs can be either public or private, may not have a physical location, and are subject to varying requirements set forth by the State.

1.1 Management, Leadership, and Administration

Advisory

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 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 material 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 programs when sanctions are issued.

1.1.14 establish and maintain a conflict resolution system for disputes between the State agency and local driver 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 material.

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 Council for Online Learning in the absence of national standards specific to the delivery of online driver education or online teacher preparation.

1.1.22 ensure that the instruction of novice teen drivers is completed using concurrent and integrated classroom and in-car instruction where the bulk of the classroom instruction occurs close in time to the in-car instruction to ensure the maximum transfer of skills.

Status

1.1.1
The authority and responsibility for the implementation, monitoring, evaluation, and enforcement of novice teen driver education standards resides with the Michigan Department of State (MDOS). This office is charged with developing and executing communication strategies to inform parents and the public about driver education and training issues. The driver education expertise of the personnel in this office is a major strength for Michigan. An advisory committee was engaged in 2005 and many of their efforts led to the current driver education law in Michigan (PA 384 of 2006). At this time there is no advisory board of stakeholders that has a sole responsibility for advising the MDOS in its charge on driver education. Currently, an established *Drivers Age 24 and Younger Action Team* is working on strategies for the State Strategic Highway Safety Plan. Discussions on driver education have been a part of the recent *Team* agendas with no formal action on recommending driver education as an emphasis area in the Plan. MDOS has a plethora of communication mechanisms to reach teens, parents, providers, law enforcement, and others. This outreach effort continues to evolve and is a strong element of the program.

Recommendations

1.1.1

- **Establish an advisory board of stakeholders that has input on the implementation, monitoring, evaluation and enforcement of the Michigan driver education program with membership from the principle associations and providers from different regions of the state.**
- Request that the *Drivers Age 24 and Younger Action Team* emphasize driver education in Michigan's Strategic Highway Safety Plan.

Status

1.1.2
MDOS – Driver Programs Division, Driver Education Section is the State agency

responsible for novice teen driver education. MDOS is not a provider of driver education. This allows MDOS to avoid the potential conflict of offering a course and regulating the program at the same time.

Status

1.1.3
The MDOS has multiple staff that are in the Driver Education Section, with the Section Manager fulfilling the role of "State Administrator" for driver education and training. The Driver Education Section program staff appears to have the equivalent experience or qualifications for operating these programs. A current vacancy, Driver Education Section Manager, exists and there is a need to fill this position with a candidate possessing a high level of driver education experience to take on this statewide leadership role.

Recommendation

1.1.3

- Fill the position of Driver Education Section Manager possessing a high level of driver education experience.

Status

1.1.4
The MDOS's standardized Michigan curriculum is an adaptation of the American Driver and Traffic Safety Education Association (ADTSEA) 3.0 Curriculum. Approved driver education providers can submit alternative curricula to MDOS for approval. The approval process includes written goals, objectives and a crosswalk of content that aligns with the state standards. The Secretary of State also has the authority to approve alternative curricula if the provider substantiates that the curriculum meets or exceeds the standards prescribed by the state. Onsite review/audits are initiated when MDOS deems it necessary or in response to concerns or complaints.

MDOS and Michigan Driver Traffic Safety Education Association (MDTSEA) offer opportunities for staff development and training. Instructors must renew their instructor certifications every two years, and self-certify their participation in professional development activities.

Recommendations

1.1.4

- Conduct regularly scheduled audits of approved driver education program providers.
- Continue to offer a variety of training opportunities for driver education program providers.

Status

1.1.5
All driver education providers are required to renew their certification every two years. When the ADTSEA 3.0 Curriculum was adopted in 2013, all providers were required to document in writing their adoption of the ADTSEA 3.0 Curriculum, unless they received approval to use an alternative curriculum. In addition, MDOS provides ancillary resources that enhances curriculum content and provides updated reference materials. The alternate curriculum review process was established by MDOS. There appears to be no scheduled re-evaluation of approved curricula. Reference: MCL 256.631.

Recommendation

1.1.5
- Establish a Driver Education Advisory Committee to assist in and maintain the regular process for updating curriculum materials, procedures, and re-evaluation of curricula.

Status

1.1.6 and 1.1.15
An instructor certification renewal process is in place and providers are well aware of the requirements. Individual instructors must renew their certification on a two-year cycle. The renewal process requires a medical and criminal history background check.

The MDOS requires that instructors complete professional development every two years. When the instructor renews they self-certify they have completed professional development. MDOS randomly solicits driver education instructors to show proof of professional development.

Status

1.1.7
Michigan's driver education providers are certified under MCL 256.629. Driver education providers are required to use a "Michiganized" version of the current ADTSEA 3.0 Curriculum. This curriculum meets the Michigan State content standards; however, their state approved 30-hour version does not meet the 45-hour standard prescribed by the national standards. Additionally, the "Michiganized" curriculum requires only six hours of behind-the-wheel (BTW) instruction while the National Standards prescribes 10 hours of BTW.

Recommendation

1.1.7
- **Develop a process to incrementally increase the hours of instruction to align with the National Standards.**

Status

1.1.8; 1.1.11; 1.1.18; and 1.1.20
The MDOS monitors the providers based on paperwork submissions which include monthly/annual reports specific to class session dates and student certificates. Only approved driver education providers can issue a completion certificate to driver education students. Instructor and operator/owner certifications are renewed every two years from the original date of issuance. The MDOS conducts random unannounced inspections based primarily on customer complaints. Currently, there is no systematic method to ensure that all materials, equipment, and vehicles are safe and in proper condition to conduct quality, effective driver education and training.

MDOS has established a process to deny or revoke approval of driver education and training programs that do not conform to applicable State and national standards. Michigan's approval process accommodates alternative curriculums.

Recommendation

1.1.8; 1.1.11; 1.1.18; and 1.1.20

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

Status

1.1.9; 1.1.12; and 1.1.13
Michigan Driver Education programs must comply with the American's with Disabilities Act, and not show prejudice or partiality. The issue of bias, however, is not delineated in the Driver Education Provider and Instructor Act (DEPIA).

The MDOS adopted the ADSTEA 3.0 Curriculum or a provider can submit an alternate curriculum for approval which meets or exceeds state established goals, objectives and outcomes for learning. Provider non-compliance of published laws or rules can result in sanctions. The MDOS Driver Education Section employs progressive discipline and works with providers to achieve compliance, using financial sanctions in egregious or repeat violations.

Recommendation

1.1.9; 1.1.12; and 1.1.13

- Review the current protocols to ensure programs reflect multicultural principles and are free of bias.

Status

1.1.10
The MDOS issues the driver education certifications for public/private instructors and owners/operators.

Status

1.1.14
In the event of a dispute, Michigan achieves resolution by using an administrative hearings process. It is rare that a conflict rises to the level of a hearing as the use of progressive discipline and communication between the State and the Provider most often comes to a final resolution early on in the discussion.

Status

1.1.16 and 1.1.17
Driver education course providers report information to MDOS before a course is held, a completion report and year-end reports by January 31. At this time there is very little evaluation of this data at the state, county or provider level. Depending on the reports utilized, there were different data counts for: licenses issued to driver education graduates; driver education student enrollment counts; and how many teens "skip" to age 18 before they apply for a license in order to avoid driver education requirements and other GDL provisions. Reports that tie traffic convictions and crashes to graduates from driver education are not available. In addition, the same reports do not exist for traffic convictions and crashes for 18-year olds that obtained their license without the benefit of driver education. Providers are required to hold student information in confidential files. Any printed records are required to be handled as confidential material when discarded.

Recommendations

1.1.16 and 1.1.17

- **Initiate a review of program data so the student enrollment, driver licensing, traffic convictions, crashes, suspensions and other data can be tied together showing the overall data story of the driver education program.**
- Create a data report on 18 year-old licensees who did not take driver education for traffic convictions, crashes and suspensions in order to compare the history of driver education students versus non-driver education students.

Status

1.1.19
Michigan's program rules require all providers to identify a specific representative or coordinator that is responsible for the day-to-day operation and communication with MDOS. Some larger program providers have regional points of contact.

Status

1.1.21
Michigan law does not allow the delivery of online Driver Education to replace classroom instruction. MDOS, however, has convened a working group of stakeholders who are

reviewing and considering a pilot program to deliver blended online instruction to accommodate students who need this option. The workgroup believes that there are benefits to delivering online instruction to enhance face-to-face learning. The proposal for a pilot has not yet been finalized and is still a work-in-progress.

Recommendation

1.1.21

- Continue evaluating the option of online classroom driver education that meets the North American Council for Online Learning (iNACOL) national standards or other national standards for online learning.

Status

1.1.22
The State of Michigan classroom and BTW instruction of novice teen drivers is completed using concurrent and integrated classroom and BTW instruction where the bulk of the classroom instruction occurs close in time to the BTW instruction to ensure the maximum transfer of skills. A minimum of four hours of classroom instruction is received before the student begins BTW instruction. At least three hours BTW instruction must be completed before the student completes the minimum twenty-four hour classroom segment one phase. All required BTW instruction must be completed within three weeks after the last classroom instruction was completed. The student cannot receive more than two hours of classroom instruction and one hour of BTW instruction in any one day.

2.0 Education/Training

Advisory

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[2] and NIDB.[3]

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 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[4]).

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; and

The in-car instruction can be enhanced with simulation or driving range instruction.

2.1.7 require distributive learning.

---

[2] Lonero, L., Clinton, K., Brock, J., Wilde, G., Laurie, I., & Black, D. (1995). Novice Driver Model Curriculum Guidelines. Washington, DC: AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety. . http://www.aaafoundation.org/resources/index.cfm?button=lonaro

[3] Mottola, F. R. (n.d.). Standards for a Risk Management Program. Chesire, CT: National Institute for Driver Behavior. http://www.nidb.org/

[4] Clinton, K., & Lonero, L. (2006, October). Evaluating Driver Education Programs: Comprehensive Guidelines Washington, DC: AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety. http://www.aaafoundation.org/pdf/EvaluatingDriverEducationProgramsGuidelines.pdf

Status

2.1.1
Section 35 of PA 384 of 2006 requires the Michigan Department of State (MDOS) to prescribe a model curriculum for teen driver training. As of September 1, 2007, a teen driver education provider shall use the prescribed model curriculum or may use an alternative curriculum only after it has been reviewed and approved and must align with the learning targets prescribed in the American Driver and Traffic Safety Education Association (ADTSEA) 3.0 Curriculum. MDOS chose to "Michiganize" the nationally-recognized 3.0 Curriculum developed by ADTSEA. The MDOS also has the authority to approve an alternative curriculum if it substantially meets or exceeds the standards of the MDOS's prescribed model curriculum.

Status

2.1.2
Michigan is one of the few states that offers classroom driver education in two segments of tiered instruction.

Segment 1 driver education is offered before the driver begins supervised driving, and requires a minimum of 24 hours of classroom instruction, a minimum of six hours of behind-the-wheel (BTW) instruction, and a minimum of four hours of observation time in a training vehicle.

Segment 2 driver education is offered after the driver has acquired 30 hours of guided practice with a parent or guardian. Segment 2 includes a minimum of six hours of classroom instruction with a driver education provider. It appears that the Segment 2 educational content may not match the student's needs at this stage of their learning.

Status

2.1.3
An approved teen driver education provider may not substitute simulation for BTW driving instruction (MCL 257.657).

The MDOS shall review and approve or deny the use of a multiple vehicle driving facility. The MDOS shall perform an onsite inspection and approve a facility if it meets criteria prescribed by the MDOS (MCL 256.629(11)). The driving range is approved for a two-year period. The range must be approved prior to instruction being provided (MCL 256.657).

Providers approved to deliver range instruction, may deliver BTW on a multiple-car-range and substitute up to two hours of BTW instruction on a one-to-one ratio.

Status

2.1.4
MCL 256.653 requires that each provider administer a knowledge test approved by the MDOS to each student at the completion of a driver education course in accordance with the standards prescribed by the MDOS.

MCL 256.663 outlines the authority for the MDOS to require an end of course knowledge test. A driver education provider classified to provide teen driver training shall issue a driver education course certificate of completion to a student who successfully passes a written knowledge test prescribed by the MDOS for that segment and successfully completes the other course work for that segment. The MDOS shall prescribe the knowledge test administered to a teen student, including establishing a passing score and the maximum number of times a student may take the test.

The MDOS provides a pool of approximately 375 Segment 1 and 80 Segment 2 knowledge test questions, from which a provider/instructor generates and prints an 80-question Segment 1 test and a 20-question Segment 2 test. There is no requirement that each knowledge test be uniquely generated for each student. Each version of the knowledge test generated may be used for up to one year. Algorithms developed by the contractor (Solutions Thru Software) ensure that the test rigor is consistent with each randomly generated test; and that test questions are randomly selected; and that all knowledge domains established by the MDOS are equally included in the tests. The knowledge domains align with the standards of learning prescribed in the ADTSEA 3.0 Curriculum. There is, however, no prescribed standardized BTW driving skills assessment.

Recommendations

2.1.4
- Require a Segment 1 end-of-course behind-the-wheel standardized skill assessment based on required skills and objectives.

Status

2.1.5
The MDOS does not require that driver education providers conduct post-course evaluations, although some providers conduct post-course evaluations as standard practice.

Recommendations

2.1.5
- Design a standardized post-course evaluation to be completed by parents and students that gives feedback and measures the effectiveness of the program.

Status

2.1.6
Michigan's structure of the driver education curriculum for Segment 1 is found in MCL 265.657 which states:

> "(1) A segment 1 curriculum shall include both classroom and behind-the-wheel driver education course experience. The classroom instruction and behind-the-wheel instruction shall be integrated, relate to each other, and meet the following requirements:
>
> > (a) Each student shall receive not less than 24 hours of classroom instruction. Classroom instruction shall be scheduled to occur as follows:
> >
> > > (*i*) Classroom instruction shall occur not more than 2 hours per day.
> > >
> > > (*ii*) Classroom instruction shall occur over the course of 3 or more weeks.
> > >
> > > (*iii*) Classroom instruction of 4 or more hours shall be delivered before the student begins to receive behind-the-wheel instruction.
> > >
> > > (*iv*) Behind-the-wheel instruction of 3 or more hours shall be completed before classroom instruction terminates."

Michigan's structure of the driver education curriculum for Segment 2 is found in MCL 256.659 which states:

> "(Sec. 39) Segment 2 of this course shall be offered to a student who has successfully completed segment 1; has held a valid level 1 graduated driver license for not less than 3 months; has acquired 30 or more hours driving experience on a level 1 graduated driver license that includes not less than 2 hours of night driving with a licensed parent or legal guardian, or with the permission of a parent or legal guardian, with any licensed driver who is 21 years of age or older. In addition, the student must receive 6 or more hours of classroom instruction that is scheduled so the student receives not more than 2 hours of classroom instruction per day."

The instructional hours for delivering the "Michiganized" version of the ADTSEA 3.0 Curriculum does not meet the instructional time nor the expectations of the *Novice Teen Driver Education and Training Administrative Standards*.

Recommendations

2.1.6

- Continue requiring the two segment courses of the driver education program.
- Incrementally increase classroom hours from 30 hours to 45 hours of instruction.
- Incrementally increase behind-the-wheel instruction from six hours to 10 hours of instruction.
- Incrementally increase in-car observation from four hours to 10 hours of instruction.

- Incrementally increase second-stage driver education from six hours to at least 10 hours of classroom and/or behind-the-wheel instruction.

Status

2.1.7
Segment 1 and Segment 2 stages of classroom and BTW instruction follows distributive learning principles.

3.0 Instructor Qualifications

Advisory

3.1 Each State should:

3.1.1 require the following prerequisites for instructors receiving certification and recertification:

a) possession of 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 and 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 [available at www.ADTSEA.org]).

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

3.1.6 require an annual driving record review for instructors.

Status

3.1.1
The Michigan Department of State (MDOS) requirement for instructor certification is; a valid driver's license that has been in continuous effect for not less than 5 years immediately preceding the application, an up-to-date certified driving record, pass a Federal and State criminal background check, submit a certified medical report not older than 90-days, and be at least twenty-one years of age.

Status

3.1.2
The MDOS requirement for instructor applicants to complete a driver education instructor preparation program consisting of four courses including: the Driver Task Analysis, Developing Classroom and Program Knowledge, Developing Vehicle Operation Skills and a Practicum totaling 180 hours. Each course must be delivered over no less than a three-week period.

Status

3.1.3
The MDOS reviews the instructor preparation program annually with the program providers to update best practices. These courses include best practices in course delivery, content and evaluation. MDOS provides multiple opportunities for instructors and providers to access information via website, printed materials and in-person training.

Status

3.1.4
Currently instructor applicants must pass each of the four courses: The Driver Task Analysis, Developing Classroom and Program Knowledge, Developing Vehicle Operation Skills and a Practicum, however, there is no standardized written test or behind-the-wheel exam.

Recommendations

3.1.4

- Require instructor candidates to take a standardized written test and behind-the-wheel exam.

Status

3.1.5
The MDOS requires instructors to complete professional development every two years. There are no specific requirements for professional development. MDOS must pre-approve all professional development courses.

Status

3.1.6
The MDOS monitors instructor driving records continuously. An out-of-state instructor must submit a driving record review every 60 days.

4.0 Parent Involvement

Advisory

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 his or her 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 and parental involvement:

a) Manage the novice driver's learning-to-drive experience to determine the readiness of the teen to begin the process, and supervise the teen's driving so that the parent can better determine the teen's readiness to advance to the next licensing stage and assume broader driving privileges;

b) Supervise 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;

c) Supervise an extended intermediate license period that temporarily restricts driving unsupervised with teen passengers and during nighttime hours until the State's GDL requirements have been met and the parent determines the teen's readiness to drive unsupervised in these high risk conditions; and

d) Negotiate and adopt a written agreement between the teen and parent that reflects the expectations of both teen and parent and clearly defines the restrictions, privileges, rules, and consequences that will serve as the basis for the teen to earn and for the parent to grant progressively broader driving privileges.

4.1.2 require a parent to complete a debriefing with the driver training instructor to inform the parent of the progress and proficiency of the teen driver. This final session should include a reminder that it is the parent who must ultimately determine the teen's readiness to obtain a license with full driving privileges and of the parent's responsibility and important role in helping the teen to become a safe driver.

Status

4.1.1
Michigan encourages but does not require driver education providers to conduct a pre-course parent seminar. The Michigan Department of State (MDOS), however, has partnered with the Michigan Driver Education and Traffic Safety Association (MDTSEA) to develop meaningful parent involvement resources that are designed to inform parents about Michigan's licensing process; empower parents to set and enforce rules; encourage them to model safe driving behaviors; invest in meaningful guided practice over a long period of time to improve driving skills and safe driving habits; and to gradually increase their teen's driving privileges. Parents are also encouraged to be proactive and vigilant gatekeepers of vehicle use and driving privileges.

In some cases information conveyed to the parent did include, but was not limited to:

- Discussion about Segment 1 driver education, which includes a minimum of six hours of behind-the-wheel (BTW) instruction where the student can drive with a driver education provider without any license issued by MDOS. The driver education provider does, however, have the option of issuing a "pink slip" which would allow the student to practice the driving skills learned during the BTW phase of instruction with a parent. Very few driver education providers issue a "pink slip" and exercise the option of exposing the teen to additional driving experiences because of the required 24 hours of the classroom instruction, and the entire 6 hours of BTW instruction occurs in a compressed three-week period of time.

- Awareness that upon completion of the Segment 1, a student can apply for a Level 1 Learner's License that must be held for a minimum of six months before advancement to a Level 2 Intermediate License. A Level 1 Learner's License requires parents to supervise a minimum of 50 hours of driving practice, including 10 hours at night, in concert with Segment 2 of the driver education program.

- Assistance on how to divide the 50 hours of guided practice into suggested lessons that follow a sequential learning pattern - progressing from low risk to higher risk driving environments; from a parking lot, to neighborhood roads, to light traffic, to rural highways, to expressways, and then to city driving.

Some Providers offer parent seminars and they utilize the MDOS-provided "*Parents Supervised Driving Guide"*, to encourage parents to plan driving lessons before they get in the vehicle. Parents are encouraged to practice often, accumulate more than 50 hours, and complete a driving log documenting successful completion of the state-required practice driving time.

Participation in an approved driver education program does not reduce GDL restrictions. Michigan disseminates GDL information to parents in various formats, including publications, e-mail and through social media. Publications include: "*Michigan's Graduated Driver Licensing: A Guide for Parents" booklet*, the "*Parent's Supervised Driving Guide*" booklet; "*Kelsey's Law*" brochure; and "*Your Probationary License*" brochure.

Michigan encourages but does not require the use of parent-teen driving agreements, and provides sample agreements. MDOS also promotes the Checkpoints program through the Teen Driver website and at branch offices.

Recommendations

4.1.1

- **Require parent(s) to attend a parent seminar, a pre-course session, or the initial session of the driver education program.**
- Require a written agreement between the teen and parent that reflects the expectations of both the teen and parent, and clearly defines the restrictions, privileges, rules, and consequences that will serve as the basis for the teen to earn, and for the parent to grant progressively broader driving privileges.
- **Require parents to document the 50 hours of supervised driving practice.**

Status

4.1.2

The State of Michigan allows an applicant to get a license at 16-years-of-age. The parent in collaboration with the driver education provider, not the state, is in the best position to determine when the teen is ready to drive alone. Michigan encourages but does not require a parent to complete a debriefing with the driver training provider. In addition, Michigan also does not require driver education providers to administer a standardized assessment tool to measure the student driver's in-car driving skills.

Some Providers hold a debriefing that includes information about student achievement, insights on ways parents can help their teen become safer drivers, determine their teen's readiness to drive and the importance of parental guidance and supervision. Parents are encouraged to establish "family laws" that place limits on when, where and with whom their children may drive. Some driver education providers also encouraged parents to place restrictions on high-risk driving, such as driving at night or with passengers. Michigan law puts parents in the driver's seat to monitor safe teen driving behaviors, and it empowers parents to suspend their teen's driving privileges if they are not demonstrating safe and responsible behaviors.

Recommendations

4.1.2

- Require a parent to complete a debriefing with the driver training instructor.
- **Provide feedback to the parents on their teen's in-car driving skills using a proficiency-based grading system to measure student achievement.**

5.0 Coordination with Driver Licensing

Advisory

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.

5.1.4 ensure that sanctions for noncompliance 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.

Status

5.1.1
The Michigan Department of State (MDOS) is the single agency responsible for driver education, driver training and driver licensing. Communication is not an issue since all functions reside in the Bureau of Driver and Vehicle Programs.

MDOS regulates driver education and has approved the American Driver and Traffic Safety Education Association (ADTSEA) Version 3.0 Curriculum as the approved curriculum. Driver educators are required to use the ADTSEA curriculum or an approved alternate curriculum.

The Bureau of Driver and Vehicle Programs adds the 3-digit school code to the driver record which facilitates the ability to tie the driver record with driver education.

Status

5.1.2
Michigan's Graduated Driver Licensing (GDL) system fully integrates driver education. There are no reductions in requirements for completion of driver education.

Michigan's GDL system consists of two segments of driver education instruction and three licensing levels.

The driver education course is made up of two segments. Segment 1 consists of a minimum of 24 hours of classroom instruction, a minimum of six hours of behind-the-wheel instruction and a minimum of four hours of observation time as a passenger in a training vehicle. Segment 2 consists of a minimum of six hours of classroom instruction, designed to provide teens with defensive driving skills.

The three licensing levels in GDL are: a supervised learner's license (Level 1 License), an intermediate license that limits passengers and unsupervised nighttime driving (Level 2 License), and a full-privilege driver license (Level 3 License) issued after a teen driver has successfully completed all previous instruction and driving requirements.

A publication, *Michigan's Graduated Driver Licensing: A Guide for Parents* is provided to inform parents of the required steps needed to successfully complete all phases of teen licensing. This publication provides a detailed chronology from the first step of acquiring the learner's permit to gaining full licensing privileges. Teen drivers and their parents are informed of the different phases of licensing, minimum age requirements, course requirements and the restrictions involved. It appears that the GDL parent guide is underutilized and not effectively distributed. The document is available at MDOS branches and may be provided to students and/or parents through some driver education providers. The GDL structure is complex and difficult for parents to understand.

At issuance of a Level 1 Leaner's License the following publications are provided by MDOS branch offices and driver education providers:

- Driving Skills Test Study Guide (SOS-360)
- Statewide Skills Testing Organization List (TPT-031)
- Your Probationary License Brochure (SOS-215)
- The Parent's Supervised Driving Guide (SOS-191)

At issuance of a Level 2 Intermediate License, the following publications are provided by MDOS branch offices and driver education providers:

- Parent/Guardian Request to Continue Minor's Level 2 Intermediate License form (BFS-146). This handout advises parents of Level 2 restrictions and advancement to Level 3 Full License privileges.
- STOPPED brochure (published by the Michigan Sheriffs' Association)

Additional information and publications are available at www.Michigan.gov/teendriver.

In 2014, the MDOS is implementing a new initiative to provide information to parents and teens about driver education and the GDL process via a subscription to the Secretary of State (SOS) Express News and through social media.

Recommendations

5.1.2

- Investigate methods for Michigan Department of State to insure parents and guardian are aware of and are provided with the Michigan's *Graduated Driver Licensing: A Guide for Parents*.

Status

5.1.3

Michigan provides multiple levels of information for the legal community regarding teen driving and the rules/regulations required to lawfully operate a motor vehicle in the State of Michigan.

Information on Michigan's GDL program is offered to all courts, prosecutor offices and police agencies. These materials consist of departmental memos of any legislative or departmental changes. All Michigan courts are also provided with court manuals distributed by the MDOS's Bureau of Driver and Vehicle Programs. The manuals provide instruction on proper abstracting of convictions at adjudication and sentencing. The legal community is also offered individualized abstract training by the MDOS. The courts have full and direct access to the MDOS, as they have Court Liaisons that are assigned to geographic regions statewide. Information is also distributed from the Prosecutors Association of Michigan.

The MDOS Court Liaisons are communicative conduits between the judiciary and the MDOS. They convey pertinent legislative changes that impact the legal community, including law enforcement, judges, magistrates, court administrators and court staff.

Law Enforcement receives GDL information though the Michigan Office of Highway Safety Planning (OHSP) handouts and informational bulletins. OHSP has provided law enforcement officers with GDL information reference cards when the legislature has approved significant changes to the GDL law. This included 2011 changes to the nighttime driving restrictions and passenger restrictions. The Michigan State Police also send out legal bulletins that address GDL issues.

Status

5.1.4

Enforcement of GDL by law enforcement is mostly done as a secondary effort when an officer comes into contact with a GDL driver for a traffic violation or crash investigation.

Prior to pulling someone over it is difficult, if not impossible, to determine or verify GDL status of the teen driver.

In Michigan there is a central repository for traffic citations known as the Judicial Data Warehouse (JDW) System. The MDOS has just learned of this repository of data and will be exploring its potential for use by the GDL program. Additionally, each police agency and court maintains their own database of citations.

There is little data available regarding the number of GDL-related citations issued by law enforcement.

MCL 257.320 authorizes the MDOS to notify and schedule drivers for a driver reexamination for violation of license restrictions, terms or conditions.

In accordance with MCL 257.310e(7), the provisions and provisional periods of a Level 1 or Level 2 GDL are extended for 12 months for the following reasons:

- Conviction for a moving violation, civil infraction, or probate court disposition.
- Traffic crash with moving violation.
- License suspension for reason other than mental or physical disability.
- Violation of GDL Level 1 or Level 2 restrictions - driving without parent or designated driver age 21 or older; or violation of passenger, cell phone or nighttime restrictions.

Notice is given via first-class mail to the licensee if the Level 1 or Level 2 provisions are expanded or extended. A designated parent or guardian is notified in writing of any GDL Level 1 or Level 2 restriction violations.

GDL Level 1 drivers must be crash, violation, and suspension free for 90 consecutive days before they are eligible for a GDL Level 2 Intermediate License. To be eligible for a Level 3 License (full driving privileges), GDL Level 2 drivers must be crash, violation, and suspension free for 12 consecutive months. GDL ends at age 18.

Probationary licensing controls imposed as a result of a driver reexamination also extend the provisional period of a GDL Level 1 or Level 2 Intermediate License.

Recommendations

5.1.4

- Investigate the creation of a centralized database for traffic violations by GDL holders.
- Gather data on GDL-related convictions to determine the effectiveness of GDL enforcement.

Status

5.1.5

When signing up for a Segment 2 driver education course the parent must sign a contract that includes confirmation that their teen has completed at least 30 hours of practice driving.

Michigan requires the parent or legal guardian to accompany the teen to the driving skills test which is conducted by a third-party contractor. The parent or legal guardian is required to sign a certification/affidavit that the teen has completed the minimum 50 hours of practice driving at that time.

Upon completion of the Segment 2 driver education course and having passed a driving skills test, the parent must accompany the student to the MDOS Branch office to obtain the Level 2 Intermediate License where the parent signs an affidavit indicating the teen driver completed the minimum of 50 hours of supervised practice driving.

The MDOS does not ask for the 50-hour driving log nor do they verify the 50 hours of supervised driving has been completed.

The warning to parents or guardians regarding falsification of driver log entries or sanctions does not site any specific reference to law.

Recommendations

5.1.5

- Provide additional education to the parent, guardian, or mentor, regarding the consequences of falsifying driver log entries.
- Emphasize, in the Parent Session, the importance of truthfulness for the parental submission of state specified documentation certifying completion of supervised practice driving.
- Develop administrative sanctions that apply to parents, guardians, or mentors for willful falsification of driver logs.

Status

5.1.6

In 2006, driver education instructors in Michigan were surveyed and asked:

1. To identify the driver education knowledge categories that should be taught in Segment 1.
2. To rank the knowledge categories in order of importance.
3. To identify the most-critical to least-critical knowledge category for obtaining a learner's permit.
4. To identify the most important elements in each knowledge category.
5. How many classroom hours should be spent on each knowledge category with a total of 24 hours being available?
6. How many test questions should be asked for each knowledge category?

This survey produced the current make-up of the knowledge test pool of questions. Each test question/answer was field tested, difficulty levels were determined, and an algorithm constructed to ensure that each randomly-generated test is similar in difficulty to any other test generated.

The test questions and answers are also periodically reviewed and are altered if needed.

Usually once every year or two, the test questions/answers are thoroughly reviewed and field tested.

Michigan has administrative testing procedures that do not permit a GDL applicant to receive a score of more than five-points on the parallel park skills test exercise. Validity of the test is compromised by limiting the number of points that can be accumulated on any single exercise. This particular maneuver demonstrates a driver's competency to safely maneuver a vehicle around other objects.

Recommendation

5.1.6

- Amend the parallel parking skills test procedures to allow examiners to score a GDL applicant for more than five-points on the exercise.

Status

5.1.7

The driver education knowledge test categories coincide with the ADTSEA curriculum.

The Segment 1 test utilizes approximately 375 questions used to generate an 80-question test.

The Segment 2 test utilizes approximately 80 questions used to generate a 20-question test.

Tests generated by each provider and instructor are randomly monitored to ensure tests being used are not more than one year old and that at least two tests are being used in any given class.

Michigan's auto driving skills test being used today is a slightly modified version of the test used since 1997. MDOS staff developed the test after studying auto skills tests used in California and the Province of Ontario, as well as Michigan's CDL driving skills test.

The skills test is designed to assess an applicant's ability to handle a vehicle by performing basic off-road maneuvers. The test assesses factors associated with driver ability, including but not limited to: search patterns; speed control; direction control; timing; and driving habits.

Procedures and scoring methods are standardized on the test: examiners use standardized verbal instructions and scoring methods. The off-road exercises are consistent at all testing location. All on-road test routes contain the same number of scoring elements. Both tests are designed to offer the same level of difficulty at each testing facility.

Michigan uses third-party testers exclusively to conduct auto driving skills tests. MDOS has staff dedicated to inspecting third-party testing businesses, examiners, and overseeing compliance with test procedures and business requirements.

MDOS staff conducts overt and covert observations of skills testing to ensure compliance and reviews any information suggesting improper testing or fraud. All score sheets are submitted to the department and a database is used to track the number of tests reported by examiners, as well as the number and types of failures. Examiners with high or low failure rates are subject to additional scrutiny.

Recommendations

5.1.7

- **Reduce the time period that printed knowledge tests are valid and utilized from one-year to a shorter period to increase the security of the tests and effectiveness of the item pool.**

APPENDIX 1 – Team Credentials

TROY E. COSTALES

Administrator, Transportation Safety Division
Oregon Governor's Highway Safety Representative
Oregon Department of Transportation
4040 Fairview Industrial Drive SE
Salem, Oregon 97302

503-986-4192 Work
503-986-3143 Fax
503-510-2566 Cell

troy.e.costales@state.or.us

Troy has served as the Transportation Safety Division Administrator and Governor's Highway Safety Representative since September of 1997 with formal delegation letters from former Governor Kulongoski and Oregon's current Governor Kitzhaber. He has over 25 years of experience in Transportation Safety, including 17 as the Administrator of the Division. In this current position, Troy serves as a member of the executive management team for the Oregon Department of Transportation.

Over the past 17 years, he has served multiple terms as a member of the board for the Governor's Highway Safety Association (GHSA) and is currently the Immediate Past Chair; served as a member of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) – Standing Committee on Highway Safety; served as a team member for the revisions to the NHTSA Impaired Driving program management course; is currently serving as a member of the Transportation Safety Management Committee and the NCHRP Panel 17-18 for the Transportation Research Board (TRB); currently serving as the task group Chairman for the AASHTO Strategic Highway Safety Plan initiative; and served as a member of the International Association of Chiefs of Police – Drug Evaluation and Classification Program - Technical Advisory Panel. Mr. Costales serves as the GHSA Representative to the Association of National Stakeholders in Traffic Safety Education (ANSTSE).

Under Mr. Costales' leadership, Oregon has seen a dramatic decline in traffic fatalities and injuries, to the lowest level since 1944. The number of individuals injured in traffic crashes has also declined by more than 30%. In addition, Oregon started a strong graduated driver license program that includes an incentive for driver education. Over the past three years the number of 16 year-old drivers behind the wheel when someone is killed or injured, has declined by over 50%. Oregon continues to post one of the highest safety belt use rates in the nation at 98+%. With the decline in the overall fatality toll, the number of alcohol-involved fatalities has also decreased by double digit percentages in this past decade.

SHARON R. FIFE

3125 Wilmington Pike
Kettering, Ohio 45429

Cell: 937-609-8499
Email : Spostigo@aol.com

Sharon Fife is president, owner and operator of D & D Driving School, Inc., a family owned business, since 1952. Currently, she is the Immediate Past President of The Driving School Association of the Americas (2011 and 2012) and the Vice Chairperson of the Association of National Stakeholders in Traffic Safety Education (ANSTSE). Formerly, she was vice president of DSAA in 2009-2010; 2008-2001 DSAA Secretary; and 1996-2001 DSAA Controller. She participated in *Instructor Train the Trainer* programs including ADSTEA *Teacher Trainer,* AAA *Licensed to Learn* and Ohio Train the Trainer Course. Sharon is a recipient of 2001 DSAA Cathy Hensel Woman of the Year Award, the DSAA George Hensel Leadership Award, 2002 and DSAA President's Award, 2013.

Sharon Fife graduated from Ohio Wesleyan University, 1985, with a Bachelor's degree in International Business and Spanish. She currently resides in Kettering, Ohio, is married to James Fife and a mother of two children, Ben and Elizabeth.

KEVIN R. LEWIS

Director, Driver Programs
American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators
4301 Wilson Blvd., Suite 400
Arlington, VA 22203

Office Phone: 703.908.2823
Email: klewis@aamva.org

Kevin was born in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, on January 5, 1955, served in the United States Navy in the military intelligence arena from 1973 to 1979 and graduated from the University of Maryland with a degree in Business Administration in 1985. Kevin has over 39 years of Information Systems, Computer hardware/Software Integration and Driver Licensing experience.

Kevin has worked for a wide variety of employers, including NASA, where he worked on the first three Space Shuttle launches and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) where he was responsible for managing the Agency's Data Processing Center as well as providing computer hardware support for over 1,500 workstations. Kevin joined AAMVAnet in August 1997 as the Driver Systems Implementation Manager and became manager of the Operations Department in June 1998. In March of 2000, he assumed the position of CDL Safety Director in AAMVA's Programs department. He currently serves as Director of Driver Programs in AAMVA's Programs and Member Support Division.

Kevin has been married for 30 years and resides in Mitchellville, Maryland.

CONNIE SESSOMS, JR.

Driver Education Specialist
9015 Pleasant Ridge Road
Charlotte, NC 28215-9798

980-343-6573 - Office
980-722-1912 – Cell
connie.sessoms@cms.k12.nc.us

Connie is the Driver Education Specialist for Charlotte Mecklenburg Schools (CMS) and directs all phases of the Driver Education program for CMS, the 22nd largest school district in the nation where 144,000 students are educated annually. Of that number, 14,000 will learn to drive through the CMS Driver Education program this year. Connie is President of the American Driver and Traffic Safety Education Association (ADTSEA) and is also the Executive Director of the North Carolina Driver and Traffic Safety Education Association (NCDTSEA). Connie is Chair of the North Carolina Driver Education Advisory Committee. He is also a member of the Association of National Stakeholders in Traffic Safety Education (ANSTSE). Connie has served on the Executive Committee of Driver Education and Training Administrators (DETA). He has also served on the NC Governor's Child Fatality Task Force – The Unintentional Death Committee. One of Connie's degrees from Appalachian State University in Boone, NC is in Driver Education and Traffic Safety and he has worked in this field for 38 years.

Connie lives in Charlotte, NC and has been married to a wonderful and supportive wife for 40 years. They have three beautiful daughters and a five-year old grandson who is his "Pa-Pa's" best buddy.

VANESSA C. WIGAND

16255 Maple Hall Drive
Midlothian, VA 23113

Office Phone: 804.225.3300
Email: vanessa.wigand@doe.virginia.gov

Vanessa Wigand is Principal Specialist for Health Education, Physical Education, Driver Education and Athletics at the Virginia Department of Education. She has over 37 years of experience in the field of driver education and has been at the Department of Education for 22 years. Vanessa oversees driver education programs for public and private schools, and is responsible for establishing the standardized curriculum of instruction for public, private and driver training schools. She is presently Chairperson of DETA (Driver Education and Training Administrators).

APPENDIX 2 – Assessment Agenda

Michigan Department of State – Driver Programs Division
Driver Education Program Assessment
April 28 – May 2, 2014
Ramada Lansing Hotel and Conference Center
7501 West Saginaw Highway
Lansing, MI 48917

Day One: Monday April 28, 2014

6:00-8:00pm		**Reception at the Ramada** *Assessment introduction and overview (refreshments provided)* Attendees: Troy Costales, Connie Sessoms, Brett Robinson, Vanessa Wigand, Kevin Lewis, Sharon Fife, Jim Wright, Mike Witter, Kirk Ferris, Mike Wartella, Emily Davis, Carol Reagan, Linda Fech, Mike Prince, Fred Bueter, James Fackler

Day Two: Tuesday April 29, 2014

8:30am	Session 1:	**State Overview of Driver Education** Kirk Ferris, Driver Programs Division Director
9:00am	Session 2:	**Statistical Data & Research** Patrick Bowman, UMTRI and OHSP Biostatistician Ray Bingham, UMTRI Research Professor
9:30am		**Break**
9:45am	Session 3:	**Program Management 1** David Muma, Century Driving Group LLC Owner Greg Lantzy, Driver Education Section Manager (retired 3/28/14) Kirk Ferris, Driver Programs Division Director
10:45am		**Break**
11:00am	Session 4:	**Program Management 2** Emily Davis, Driver Education Section Analyst Greg Lantzy, Driver Education Section Manager (retired 3/28/14) Barb Malone, Driver Education Section Analyst Al Harns, Driver Education Section Analyst
12:00pm		**Lunch and Team Debrief**
1:30pm	Session 5:	**Education/Training – Curriculum** Greg Lantzy, Driver Education Section Manager (retired 3/28/14) Brandon Semrau, Courtesy Driving School Inc

		Al Harns, Driver Education Section Analyst
2:30pm		**Break**
2:45pm	Session 6:	**Education/Training – Teen Panel** Will Kordenbrock, teen Vivian Trutzl, teen Nicole Teachout, teen
3:30pm		**Break**
3:45pm	Session 7:	**Parent Involvement – Parent Panel** Linda Witan, parent Doug Trutzl, parent Chad Teachout, parent
4:45pm	Session 8:	**Parent Involvement** Ruthann Jaquette, Michigan PTA President Elect

Day Three: Wednesday April 30, 2014

8:15am	Session 9:	**Ranges and Instructor Licensing** Randy Rand, Jungle Survival Drivers Training LLC Owner Emily Davis, Driver Education Section Analyst Al Harns, Driver Education Section Analyst
9:15am	Session 10:	**Instructor Qualifications** Robin Bordner, Michigan Traffic Safety Owner
9:45am		**Break**
10:00am	Session 11:	**Coordination with Driver Licensing and Parent Involvement** Phil Robinson, Driver Assessment Section Manager John Strodtbeck, Program Procedures Section – Driver Procedures Christine Adams, MDTSEA & UDriveSafe Driving Academy Inc
11:00am		**Break**
11:15am	Session 12:	**Parent Involvement** Carol Reagan, Traffic Safety Division Specialist
11:45am	Session 13:	**Coordination with Driver Licensing** David Handsor, Driver Records Section Court Liaison
12:15pm		**Lunch and Team Debrief**
1:15pm	Session 14:	**Law Enforcement** David Walker, Van Buren County Sheriff Office Sheriff Sergeant

Mark Fazzini, Van Buren County Sheriff Office Sheriff Deputy
Ken Plaga, Meridian Township Police Department Lieutenant
Jill Bennett, Michigan State Police Sergeant

2:15pm Session 15: **Knowledge and Skills Testing**
Greg Lantzy, Driver Education Section Manager (retired 3/28/14)
Tom Bryant, Third Party Testing Manager

3:00pm **Close of Briefing Sessions – Work Session (closed to public)**

Day Four: Thursday May 1, 2014

8:00am – 12:00am **Report Write-Up (closed to public)**

Day Five: Friday May 2, 2014

8:00am **Final Team Report Review**

9:00am **Report Out**
Assessment team presents draft report

Attendees: Troy Costales, Connie Sessoms, Brett Robinson, Vanessa Wigand, Kevin Lewis, Sharon Fife, Jim Wright, Kirk Ferris, Mike Wartella, Greg Lantzy, Emily Davis, Carol Reagan, Kathy Farnum, Mike Prince, Mike Senyko, Chris Hackbarth, Michelle Strobel, Fred Bueter, James Fackler, Dave Richmond, Ramona Putnam, Bill Kordenbrock, Gisgie Gendreau, Christine Adams

Friday – May 2, 2014

9:00 am REPORT OUT

Ramada Lansing Hotel and Conference Center
7501 West Saginaw Highway
Lansing, MI 48917

Open to all interested parties