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Brief History

• OSBM Report, November 2010
• PED Review, December 2010
• SL 2011-145, Section 28.37 - Driver Education Reform
• Previous reports made by DPI on September 18, 2012 and January 14, 2013
Advisory Committee

- Workgroup provides recommendations to DPI Consultant
- DPI, DOT, DMV, DOI, GHSP, NCSHP, UNC-HSRC
- NCDTSEA, LEA Coordinators, In-house LEA and Commercial Driver Educators
- Reviewing National Standards to guide progress
Management/Oversight

- Driver Education Strategic Plan adopted by SBE, February 7, 2013
- Key areas: administration & oversight, funding, curriculum, instructor qualifications, coordination with driver licensing, parental involvement, other program improvements
- A working document to guide all driver education stakeholders
LEA Flexibility - “in-house” programs (checks), commercial providers (circles), transitional (yellow)
## Comparison of programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA</th>
<th>In-House</th>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>Salary/Benefits</th>
<th>Vehicles</th>
<th>Insurance</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>Supplies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alamance</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standardized Curriculum

• Developed, adopted and revised as directed by General Assembly

• Approved by SBE in March 2011

• Revised in July 2011 to include one hour of motorcycle safety as directed by General Assembly

• All LEA’s must use the curriculum
Instructor Qualifications

- ECU is no longer offering driver education classes for DPI licensure by individuals
- ECU will offer cohorts, if enough interest
- DMV offers 80-hour driver education certification course
- Recommend more hours on effective teacher training, differentiated instruction and working with exceptional students.
Coordination with Driver Licensing

- Established positive relationship with DMV
- Discussed possibility of testing students in DE classrooms for learner’s permit
- If successful, could eliminate time spent on first time visits to DMV and multiple visits
- Continue exploring improvements to GDL
Parental Involvement

• Many LEA’s are already meeting with parents before, during or at the end of DE

• Goal to have parent meetings in all LEA’s

• Provide latest information on laws, driving log requirements, procedures for maneuvers and acceptable driving practices

• Provide support for learner’s permit stage
Online Pilot Project

- Five LEA’s participated
- February 2012 – June 2012
- 30 hours of computerized instruction, no teacher interaction
- 532 students enrolled, 358 completed
UNC-SOG Evaluation Methods

- Review of other national studies
- Comparison of the quality of teaching mode with various performance measures
- Comparison of cost information
- Use of optional fee
UNC-SOG Data

Literature and report review

Test scores, school attended, and related teaching method for students who took the DMV knowledge test from July 1, 2010 and July 31, 2012 (N=273,726 students state-wide)

State-wide survey of schools (N=338, 81% response rate)

Selected interviews of officials in other states (California, Georgia, Florida, Indiana, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Texas, and Virginia)
UNC-SOG findings

- No other study of impact of different teaching modes exists
- Using various measures of performance, there is little difference between teaching modes
- It is too early to assess impact of NC pilot of on-line exclusive program
- Comparable cost information was not available
- Of those who responded to the question, \( n=242 \), 164 schools require the fee, and of those, most require the top allowable amount of $45.
Conclusion

• DPI is committed to improve Driver Education and Traffic Safety in NC

• DEAC has a quarterly meeting schedule to discuss program improvements and advise DE Consultant

• A positive dialogue among stakeholders has been established to improve novice driving in NC