

## **AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety and BMW**

### **Request for Proposals**

**RFP- 04-3 dated May 13, 2004, Revised June 16, 2004 with deadline extended.**

### **Guidelines for Evaluating Driver Education Programs**

The AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety (AAAFTS) and BMW of North America are funding a research project to develop guidelines for how to evaluate driver education programs. At present there are no comprehensive guidelines on how to evaluate driver education programs and developing a rigorous evaluation plan, if attended to seriously, it can be very time consuming. Thus, people who want to evaluate driver education programs often "reinvent the wheel" by developing their own approaches, sets of questions, etc. Unfortunately, sometimes evaluators have not scrutinized the literature to find how others have evaluated programs or have inadequate designs for other reasons and, as a result, their evaluations are not methodologically sound. This project will assimilate the good work that has been done, consult extensively with experts, and provide a road map of how to evaluate driver education programs.

**Individuals or organizations (hereafter referred to as the Consultant) interested in competing for this project should email a proposal to Scott Osberg no later than July 8, 2004.**

### **Background**

Motor vehicle crashes are the leading causes of death for 15 to 20-year-olds and, looking at drivers only, in 2001, "3,608 drivers 15 to 20-years old were killed, and an additional 337,000 were injured, in motor vehicle crashes" (Traffic Safety Facts, 2001). Another way of looking at the problem is that in 2001, over eight thousand 15 to 20-year-old drivers were in crashes where there was at least one fatality.

Although in recent years, graduated driver licensing laws (GDL) are believed to have resulted in fewer crashes, the crash rates for teens and particularly 16-year-olds remains extremely high when compared to other drivers. This is partly due to the inherent weakness of GDL - that of relying on experience gained through observing imperfect models (parents), and partly because there are no checks on the quantity or quality of parental driving instruction.

According to Allan Williams, Chief Scientist, Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, 16-years olds have a crash rate per mile traveled that is three times that of 18-year-olds and ten times higher than 35 to 39-year-olds. Moreover, the fatal crashes involving 16-year-olds "were largely the result of driver error due to inexperience and immaturity (82 percent of the 16-year-olds in fatal crashes made at least one driving error that contributed to the crash as compared to 52 percent of the 25 to 49-year-olds)" (Williams 1996).

As in many other safety education efforts, in driver education, there are a wide variety of interventions (Masten and Chapman 2003) and few evaluations of what works. Evaluations are rarely built into new programs and actually measuring effectiveness is risky because you

may find no effect. In fact, the failure to demonstrate effectiveness was cited by schools as a reason for dropping driver education from many public school curriculums in the early 1980s.

Given the limited resources devoted to driver education, there are also extremely high expectations (lifetime crash-free performance, improving behavior, etc.). Parents and students don't want to spend very much for driver education and government and researchers haven't devoted enough resources to properly support or measure what works. Furthermore, the wide variety in driver education program structure, process and quality render meaningful comparisons and conclusions extremely difficult. The evaluations that have been done have taken different approaches, considered different variables and had different time frames and sample sizes.

Mayhew and Simpson (2002) discuss five reviews of various evaluation studies of driver education programs and none of the reviews detected crash reductions among the driver education students. Some experts argue that driver education programs may be effective, but that the wrong measures of effectiveness have been considered and wrong approaches to evaluation have been used (Waller 1975, Smith 1983). Additionally, some of the components of driver education programs may be effective, but this is often lost when the overall conclusion is that the program did not work. Evaluations not only need to give a final verdict, but also need to decipher which components are most promising.

### **Related AAA Foundation Work**

AAAFTS has been involved in driver education since it was founded in 1947. Today, automobile clubs, driving schools, corporations and other organizations rely on AAA Foundation educational materials to teach teens and adults how to drive more responsibly. Many school districts use the Foundation's child-oriented materials to teach pedestrian and bicycle safety and teen-oriented materials are often used in high school driver education programs. The Foundation's interactive risk management training program available on CD-ROM ("driver-ZED") has been immensely popular since it was introduced in 1998.

One of the most relevant contributions to this project by AAAFTS is the "Novice Driver Education Model Curriculum Outline," published by the Foundation in 1995. The Novice Driver Education Model Curriculum Outline is the most widely distributed report ever produced by the Foundation.

### **Proposed Scope of Work**

The Consultant will develop guidelines for evaluating general driver education programs. The guidelines will provide detail on which variables need to be considered and the best analytic approaches. They will also cover time frames and sample sizes necessary for rigorous evaluation of driver education programs. For instance, this will go beyond saying simply that driving exposure should be measured; ways to obtain data on miles traveled by teens, such as survey questions or logs kept by teens will be outlined. They will discuss the merits of aggregate state-level data, survey data, crash records, police reports and the importance of

obtaining multiple types of data. The guidelines will also discuss the complexities of attributing crash reductions to particular interventions (see Quensel 2003).

The Consultant will work closely with a 10-12 person advisory group to develop a discussion document and eventually arrive at a set of draft guidelines. Initial contacts with the advisory group will be through email and conference calls, followed by a workshop in Washington, DC. Prior to the workshop, a discussion paper will be sent to the advisors and the workshop will be used to arrive at a consensus on critical approaches and variables for evaluating driver education programs. Workshop proceedings will be distributed to the group shortly after the meeting, members will be asked to comment, and advisors will continue to be contacted throughout the course of the project.

The guidelines and other materials to be included in the project's final report will be subjected to independent peer review and then be revised accordingly. Subsequently, the Foundation will produce the final guidelines, as well as a final report, that incorporates the guidelines with a comprehensive literature review, explanation of the project, its methodology, and a general discussion of its importance.

Specific project objectives include:

- Form an advisory group of experts and key stakeholders, including researchers, driving schools owners/educators, representatives from AAA, BMW, state DMVs, NHTSA, and ADTSEA.
- Organize a face-to-face workshop of the advisory group and communicate regularly with them to allow the group to "guide" the project and where possible, develop consensus findings.
- Review methods of past evaluation studies
- Develop discussion paper for workshop
- Send meeting proceedings and draft guidelines to advisors
- Revise and circulate guidelines to advisors
- Finalize comprehensive guidelines
- Draft final report including guidelines
- Revise based on independent peer reviews of report
- Finalize report

There are many different driver education interventions and many different audiences. In this RFP, we are referring to initial driver education for teens delivered by public and private driving schools, which typically include classroom and behind the wheel training. In addition, home schooling is on the increase, so we'd like to consider this "venue" if it is feasible within the proposed budget. Specialized training, such as behind the wheel training, just for emergency conditions; driver improvement programs for seniors, violation-based courses, and others that are not focused on teens, are not within the scope of this project and will not be considered. However, it is expected that the guidelines emanating from this project could be adapted for other types of driver education.

## Timeframe & Budget

It is expected that this project will be completed within 12 months from execution of the contract. The proposed budget for the project may not exceed \$80,000, including reasonable and customary travel expenses for 8 to 10 panelists to attend a two-day workshop in Washington, DC at the AAA Foundation office.

## Criteria for Selecting Consultant

All proposals received by the specified deadline will be analyzed by Foundation staff and possibly others. Due to the nature of the work, it is expected that mid- to senior-level traffic safety researchers with solid reputations in the fields of driver education and evaluation would be most competitive. The following factors will be used to determine the “most qualified” Consultant for this project:

- Consultant qualifications, including in depth knowledge of traffic safety
- Research on teen drivers and familiarity with teen driver education
- Expertise in evaluation research
- Experience working with advisory groups
- Track record of conducting and publishing traffic safety research
- Well-organized and well-written proposal

## Proposal Requirements

Proposals must clearly and succinctly describe how you would accomplish the scope of work and why you should be selected. At a minimum, the proposal must include:

- A summary of the proposed research plan that is fully responsive to the scope of work and includes, for example, a discussion of the potential measures of effectiveness for the evaluation guidelines
- The qualifications of the Consultant
- A management plan that summarizes tasks, milestones and deliverables
- Recommendations for potential advisory group members
- A budget with line items for personnel and workshop expenses
- A signed statement declaring your understanding and acceptance of AAA Foundation’s Research Policies available at:  
<http://www.aaafoundation.org/pdf/AAAFTSResearchPolicies.pdf>. The statement can be faxed to 202-638-5943.

The body of proposal may not exceed **12 single-spaced pages, one-inch margins in 12pt Arial**. Resumes or additional material can be included as an appendix to the proposal. Appendices may not exceed 20 pages. All submitted proposals become the property of the AAA Foundation. MS Office and MS Excel are our preferred software. PDF files will also be accepted.

For questions regarding this RFP, or to submit an electronic proposal, please contact Scott Osberg:

J. Scott Osberg, PhD  
Director of Research  
AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety  
607 14<sup>th</sup> St., NW, Suite 201  
Washington, DC 20005

[sosberg@aaafoundation.org](mailto:sosberg@aaafoundation.org)  
Phone 202/638-5944, ext. 7  
Fax: 202/638-5943

### **About AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety**

Founded in 1947 by the American Automobile Association (AAA), the AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety (AAAFTS) is an independent not-for-profit, publicly supported, charitable research and education organization dedicated to saving lives and reducing injuries by preventing traffic-related injuries and deaths. The Foundation is committed to sponsoring research and education projects leading to real-world improvements in traffic safety.

The Foundation's research and education projects are funded by voluntary contributions from motor clubs associated with the American Automobile Association and the Canadian Automobile Association, individual AAA club members, and AAA-affiliated insurance companies.

### **About BMW Group**

BMW of North America has been present in the United States since 1975. Since then, the BMW Group in the United States has grown to include marketing, sales and financial service organizations for the BMW and MINI brands and Rolls-Royce Motor Cars; DesignworksUSA, an industrial design firm in California; a technology office in Silicon Valley and various other operations throughout the country. BMW Manufacturing Corp. in South Carolina is part of BMW Group's global manufacturing network and is the exclusive manufacturing plant for all Z4 roadster and X5 Sports Activity Vehicles. The BMW Group sales organization is represented in the U.S. through networks of 340 BMW car, 327 BMW Sports Activity Vehicle, 148 BMW Motorcycle retailers, and 70 MINI dealers. BMW (US) Holding Corp., the BMW Group's sales headquarters for North, Central and South America, is located in Woodcliff Lake, New Jersey.

As one of the world's largest companies, we believe that the BMW Group has a duty of social responsibility. A key focus of our philanthropy is a commitment to safety, both in the design of motor vehicles and their usage. According to the BMW Group philosophy, "sheer driving pleasure" and traffic safety go hand-in-hand. As such, the Company is committed to improve road safety by supporting public education on safe driving practices.

## References

Anderson D, et al. Young Drivers: A Study of Policies and Practices, George Mason University, Center for the Advancement of Public Health, December 2000

Cochrane Review - <http://www.update-software.com/cochrane/>

Community Guide - <http://www.thecommunityguide.org/>

Journal of Traffic Safety Education. An Evaluation Plan for Driver Education (October, 1979)

Journal of Traffic Safety Education. How to Measure Program Effectiveness (July, 1979)

Lonero L, et al. Novice Driver Education Model Curriculum Outline, Published by the AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety, 1995

Masten SV, Chapman EA. The Effectiveness of Home-Study Driver Education Compared to Classroom Instruction: The Impact on Student Knowledge, Skills, and Attitudes, California Department of Motor Vehicles, Final Report CAL-DMV-RSS-03-203, 2003.

Mayhew DR, Simpson HM. The Safety Value of Driver Education and Training, Injury Prevention 2002;8(Suppl II):ii3-ii8

Quensel WP. Suggestions for the Improvement of Driver Education, The Chronicle of ADTSEA, 2003;51(2)

Roberts I, Kwan I, and the Cochrane Injuries Group Driver Education Reviewers. School based driver education for the prevention of crashes, The Cochrane Library 2003, Issue 2.

Smith, D.L. (1983). The DeKalb driver education project, The same mistakes: Improper criteria. Journal of Traffic Safety Education, XXX, 2, 14

Traffic Safety Facts, 2001

Van Tassel W. The Novice Driver Education Model Curriculum Outline Critique, Chronicle of the American Driver and Traffic Safety Education Association, Winter, 1998

Waller PF. Education for Driving: An Exercise in Self-Delusion. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina, Highway Safety Research Center, 1975

Williams AF. Magnitude and Characteristics of the Young Driver Crash Problem in the United States, in H Simpson, ed. New to the Road: Reducing the Risks for Young Motorists, p 19-25. Proceedings of the First Annual International Symposium of the Youth Enhancement Service, Brain Information Service, UCLA, 1996