

8-27-2009

Death by Design: An Examination of Historically Black Colleges and Universities Intercollegiate Athletic Department Transportation Policies

Courtney L. Flowers

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/educ_hess_etds

Recommended Citation

Flowers, Courtney L.. "Death by Design: An Examination of Historically Black Colleges and Universities Intercollegiate Athletic Department Transportation Policies." (2009). https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/educ_hess_etds/11

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Education ETDs at UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Health, Exercise, and Sports Sciences ETDs by an authorized administrator of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact disc@unm.edu.

Courtney Flowers

Candidate

Health, Exercise and Sport Sciences

Department

This dissertation is approved, and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication:

Approved by the Dissertation Committee:

Todd L. Seidles

, Chairperson

David Scott

John C. Ba

**DEATH BY DESIGN: AN EXAMINATION OF
HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND
UNIVERSITIES INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC
DEPARTMENT TRANSPORTATION POLICIES**

BY

COURTNEY L. FLOWERS

B.S., Biology, Mississippi Valley State University, 1999
M.S., Sports Administration, Grambling State University, 2001

DISSERTATION

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
Physical Education, Sports & Exercise Science

The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

July, 2009

DEDICATION

I dedicated this book to the four most important people in my life, my four elements: my husband, mother, sister and father. Without their love, support and encouragement none of this would have been possible.

To my husband and best friend, Gaylyn Rashan Flowers, as my air, he never gave up hope, support or belief in me. No words can express the love I feel for my husband for allowing me the opportunity to work on this project full-time. Without his love I can't breathe or live.

To my mother, Sandra Lynn Snell, who as my earth, taught me as a child that anything was possible. She generously gave so much of herself to set a foundation for my educational studies. Without her as mother I can in no way be the woman that I am today.

To my sister, Ashley Lynn Snell, my fire, her words of wisdom, honesty and openness encourages me to be better person. Her strong belief in her ideologies has encouraged me to belief more in myself. Without her in my life I am weak and meaningless.

To my father, Lester Anthony Snell Jr., my water, who taught me about myself through showing me his reflection. Without him as a father I could never had understood the importance of accepting people without judgment and accepting oneself flaws and all.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project was a labor of love that had many trials and tribulations. The following people I would like to acknowledge for supporting me through the good and bad.

First I would like to thank Mr. Henry Flowers and Mrs. Rosetta Flowers for giving me my husband and graciously inviting me into their loving family.

To my cousins Helen James and Catherine Hyde who lovingly, in the absence of my grandmother filled that sport.

To my grandmother Hazel Bacon, who effortlessly holds the family together and always expects the best of everyone. Last, but definitely not least to my brother and sister in the struggle, Aaron Livingston and F. Michelle Touson. Their support and guidance through this process was priceless.

I was also blessed to have a very supportive dissertation committee. Dr. Todd Seidler, my dissertation chair, who tirelessly guided me through this process via telephone and email. I was truly honored to have the opportunity to study under him and elated to have him serve as the chair of my dissertation committee. I can never thank him enough for his support and belief in me and this project. I also have to thank Dr. David Scott. He provided me with great insight and direction throughout this project and my academic career at UNM. His knowledge and character are second to none. Also, Dr. David LaVetter, who not only guided me through this process, but also supported me professionally, words can never express the thanks I owe him. He is a tremendous role model and an excellent friend. Last, but not least, Dr. John Barnes, who graciously joined this committee and provided excellent feedback and support.

I would also like to acknowledge other people at the University of New Mexico that supported me. Dr. Joy Griffin, who was my advisor and assisted me through completing my classes. My brother, Robbin Garcia and sister, Andrea Chapman who provided balance in my life throughout this process and constantly reminded me not take life so seriously.

I also have to acknowledge people who set the foundation of my educational studies. Without their support this would not have been possible. To my professors at Grambling State University: Dr. Willie Daniel, Dr. Darlene Kluka, Dr. Obadiah Simmons and Dr. Phyllis Love thank you for the support and encouragement towards continuing my education. Dr. William Mahone, my professor at Mississippi Valley State University, thank you for never giving up on me. Last, but definitely not least I have to graciously thank Ms. Estrella Vielita, Mrs. Tinny Barnes, Sister Stella Rabault and Mr. John Hughes. Through my experience in your classrooms I found my path to teaching. Thank you for being excellent teachers and role models.

Finally have to acknowledge my two mentors, Dr. Barbara A. Douglas and Dr. Belle Wheelan. I could not have picked to better women to be my role models. You both are everything that I aspire to be.

**DEATH BY DESIGN: AN EXAMINATION OF
HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND
UNIVERSITIES INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC
DEPARTMENTS TRANSPORTATION POLICIES**

BY

COURTNEY L. FLOWERS

ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
Physical Education, Sports & Exercise Science

The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

July, 2009

**DEATH BY DESIGN: AN EXAMINATION OF HISTORICALLY BLACK
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC
DEPARTMENT TRANSPORTATION POLICIES**

By

Courtney L. Flowers

B.S., Biology, Mississippi Valley State University, 1999

M.S., Sports Administration, Grambling State University, 2001

Ph.D., Physical Education, Sports and Exercise Science, University of New Mexico,
2009

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine HBCU intercollegiate athletic transportation practices and policies. This dissertation examined the transportation policies and procedures currently used by HBCU intercollegiate athletic programs.

The study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the current transportation policies, procedures and practices relative to :
modes of transportation, policy development and communication, driver
qualifications, vehicle maintenance, and the use of 12 & 15-passenger vans
2. What are the factors that contribute to mode of transportation?

Ninety-nine HBCU athletic administrators were surveyed for this study using a 28-question survey developed by LaVetter (2004). The survey was administered online and had a sixty-seven (67.6%) response rate.

Results from the study found that despite the NTSB warnings against 15-passenger

van use HBCU continue to use them. The study found 15-passenger vans were used by the following teams: baseball, golf, men's & women's soccer and volleyball teams. These results were equivalent to previous studies which reported similar sports teams using these vans.

Findings indicated that HBCUs are being careless by not only using 15-passenger vans, but also by allowing 13 or more passengers to occupy the vehicle. Furthermore they continue to allow students to drive personal and university owned vehicles and tragically a significant number reported having no policy on travel hours, miles, and driver qualifications. These elements allowed the researcher to better understand that HBCU are struggling with adhering to recommendations and warnings that may keep their students and administrators lives out of danger.

This study also showed forty (61.5%) reported allowing students to drive. Furthermore the study found that the average age of this student was 21, which is comparable to previous research. Even though 35.5% in this study and 46% in previous studies are restricting age to 21 for these drivers many hazards still surround them and their driving skills.

Finally, these institutions must look at revamping their transportation practices, policies and procedures to include NTSB recommendations and safety routines. With incorporating these policies the institutions will face less risk in regards of transportation safety.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
CHAPTER ONE	1
INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem.....	9
Purpose of the Study	10
Research Questions.....	11
Limitations	11
Delimitations.....	11
Assumptions.....	12
Significance of the Study	12
Definition of Terms.....	12
CHAPTER TWO	17
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	17
Introduction.....	17
Historically Black Colleges and Universities	17
History of Transportation.....	21
Department of Transportation (DOT).....	24
College Transportation Policies.....	26
Athletic-Related Accidents	29
State Accident Statistics.....	31
Cell Phones	51
Driver's Fatigue	52
Speeding.....	52
Intercollegiate Athletic Transportation.....	53
Personal Vehicles.....	54
Fifteen-Passenger Vans.....	56
Chartered and Rented Transportation	59
Athletic Budgets.....	60
Transportation Liability	63
Insurance Coverage.....	66
NAIA and NJCAA Study.....	67
Conclusion	68
CHAPTER THREE	72
METHODOLOGY	72
Research Design.....	72
Participants.....	73
Instrument	73
Pilot Study.....	74
Confidentiality	75
Procedures.....	76
Data Analysis	78
CHAPTER FOUR.....	80
RESULTS	80

Introduction.....	80
Response Rate.....	80
Demographic Data	80
Results.....	82
CHAPTER FIVE	99
DISCUSSION	99
Introduction.....	99
Demographic data.....	100
15 – Passenger vans	101
12- Passenger vans.....	102
Aircraft.....	103
Mini-bus.....	104
Bus	104
Personal vehicles.....	104
Policy Development.....	105
Vehicle Maintenance	107
Recommendations.....	107
Recommendation for Future Research.....	109
Conclusion	109
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	112
REFERENCES	122

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 - 2007 Fatal Accidents	32
Table 2 - Rural and Urban Road Accidents	36
Table 3 - 2007 Fatal Accidents Involving Drivers 15-20 Years Old.....	39
Table 4 - Driver Education Programs	41
Table 5 - 2006 State Fatal Accidents Based on BAC Levels	46
Table 6 - Sports Mode of Transportation Use	83
Table 7 - Personal Vehicle Usage.....	84
Table 8 - Aircraft Usage	85
Table 9 - Athletic Transportation Policies Development	86
Table 10 - Staff Communication Practices of Transportation Policies.....	87
Table 11 - Driver Qualifications	89
Table 12 - Policy on Obtaining Driving Records	90
Table 13 - Alcohol Related Citations.....	91
Table 14 - Vehicle Maintenance and Inspections	92
Table 15 - How Vans Are Acquired	93
Table 16 - Travel Limits	94
Table 17- Authorized Drivers for Away Events	96
Table 18 - 15-passengers van drivers on the return to campus.....	97
Table 19 - Factors Effecting Mode of Transportation	98

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

On February 10, 2000, members of the Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical University (PVAMU) indoor men's track team were involved in a life altering automobile collision, killing four occupants, and seriously injuring six others. The team was traveling in a 15-passenger van to an indoor track meet at the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff. In the, traveling group were the head coach, athletic trainer, and eight student-athletes. According to a 2002 report published by the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB), a 21 year-old student-athlete was selected to drive the team to the tournament due to his knowledge of the route. The student-athlete was driving 82 mph on a two-lane highway when he approached a vehicle, which was signaling to turn left to enter into a convenience store parking lot. Instead of turning into the first driveway, the vehicle turned into the second driveway, and, in an attempt to pass the vehicle, the student swerved which forced the van to drop off the highway's edge and violently roll over three times causing four occupants to be ejected.

This accident subsequently motivated the NTSB to analyze intercollegiate athletic transportation policies. Due to these efforts, PVAMU has become an example of the hazards surrounding the transportation of college student-athletes.

Following the investigation, the NTSB (2002) found that the following were probable causes for the accident:

- Excessive speed and hazardous operating maneuvers by the student driver of the van.

- Hazardous operating maneuvers by the driver of the Jeep.
- Lack of substantial university travel policy regarding transporting student-athletes.
- Lack of state policies regarding the use of safety belts for front and back seat occupants.
- Lack of back seat occupant, safety belt use (p. 4).

In a subsequent study, the NTSB (2005) reported that drivers between the ages of 15 and 20 represent 6.4% of licensed drivers in the United States, yet was involved in 13.6% of fatal crashes and 18% of all police-reported crashes in 2003. The report further stated, “Novice drivers can have superior driving maneuvering skills and still have many crashes” (p. 2). Neyens & Boyle (2007) stated that driver distractions are a major basis for these crashes. Distractions while driving, such as, cell phone use while driving, alcohol and drug abuse impairment, passenger disturbance and lack of developed driving skills have all been established as major causes for accidents involving novice drivers.

Valerie (2004) stated that the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) has not developed an association-wide travel policy due to its member institution’s varying budgets and team sizes. Valerie further stated only trained and licensed personnel should be allowed to operate university owned or rented vehicles. Moreover, accidents in the past are often attributed to untrained personnel, fatigued drivers, and student-athlete drivers (Valerie, 2004, p. 2). Valerie (2004) recommended that student drivers should not be permitted to operate university owned or rented vehicles due to their inexperience when driving certain vehicles (e.g. 15-passenger vans), exhaustion, and fatigue resulting

from athletic competition.

In 2003, the NTSB held a public forum on Driver Education and Training during which, driver safety and transportation regulations were analyzed and discussed (NTSB, 2003, p.3). The forum's panel and participants were made up of members of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), state government representatives, safety and consumer associates, driver's training educators, as well as teachers, researchers and students.

The two-day forum analyzed driver's training, novice drivers, and crash statistics. It was stated that the formalized system for driver's education was started in 1930. In its infancy, the program consisted of 30 hours of classroom education and six hours of behind-the-wheel education. According to the forum, this sort of driver's education format has not changed since 1930, and driver's education teachers are still expected to teach driver's education in this manner. As a result, the NTSB, declared that not enough research is know in order to calculate valid effects of driver's education, and therefore it would be presumptuous to develop a new method of driver's education without having knowledge on what aspects new drivers need to learn about driving rules and regulations. Furthermore, it was stated that although hardly any research exists about the effects of driver's education on novice drivers, plenty of research exists to support the claim that students should not drive university vehicles.

Student drivers not only bring about dangers for potential passengers they also may be a liability for the institution. Liability can be defined as a legal responsibility (Cotten, 2003). LaVetter (2004) stated, "Transportation of college athletes may be one of the most overlooked risk management issues facing intercollegiate athletics administrators

(p.4). Moreover, LaVetter (2004) stated, “even when an event is properly organized and managed, an accident can quickly change the event into a disaster” (p. 3). Furthermore, intercollegiate athletic programs have a duty to provide their athletes with a safe environment (NCAA, 2006, Aaron, 2004, Pittman & Lehr, 2003). Duty can be defined as “a special relationship that exists between the program or service provider and the participant, which gives rise to an obligation to protect the individual from unreasonable risk of harm” (Pittman & Lehr, 2003, p.157). An athletic department could face liability issues if it is found that they did not provide a safe environment for their athletes (Aaron 2004, van der Smissen, 2003). Pittman & Lehr (2003) expressed “The duties to provide transportation usually begins at the point of departure and continues until those using the transportation have been returned to the original departure point” (p. 157). They further stated, “Liability exists regardless of whether the participants meet at an organization and are then assigned a particular vehicle or they are picked up by the driver at their homes or elsewhere” (p. 157).

Aaron (2004) stated that a study of litigation awards conducted by the University of Houston concluded, “The average injury award is now over \$1.5 million” (p. 22). In the case *Clement v. Griffin*, 634 So.2d 412 (4th Cir. 1994). The plaintiff brought a negligence suit against the student coach who was driving the van at the time of the accident, Delgado Community College, the State of Louisiana, Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company, and Ford Motor Company (Pittman & Lehr, 2003). The accident occurred as a student coach was driving 13 members of the Delgado Community College baseball team to Meridian, Mississippi for a baseball game. Griffin lost control of the Ford Club Wagoneer when a blowout occurred causing it to roll over three times and eject several

passengers. The court found that “Delgado/ State had duties to the plaintiff to do the following things: (1) properly maintain the vehicle, (2) select a qualified driver for the vehicle, and (3) properly train the driver” (Pittman & Lehr, 2003). The court reversed the trial court judgments against Goodyear and affirmed the judgments against Delgado/ State and Ford Motor Company. Pittman & Lehr (2003) further stated, “Damage judgments in favor of three students were reduced to \$1,660,576.75; \$150,000; and \$234,839.50 (p. 166).

In addition to the Delgado accident, there have been several others within intercollegiate athletics. The following are some examples:

- December 29, 1999 five Urbana University Basketball players were injured when their van crashed into a tree (Pittman & Lehr, 2003, p. 166).
- January 22, 2000 three De Paul University women’s track team athletes were injured when their van overturned after skidding on a patch of ice (Pittman & Lehr, 2003).
- January 30, 2000 twelve University of Wisconsin swimming team members were injured when their van overturned due to an icy interstate highway (Pittman & Lehr, 2003).
- March 29, 2000 seven University of Tennessee at Martin athletes and one coach were injured when their van was hit by a tractor-trailer (Pittman & Lehr, 2003).

Intercollegiate athletic programs traditionally select mode of transportation based on budget, team size and travel miles (Pittman & Lehr, 2003, p. 167). LaVetter (2004) stated the following: “The modes of transportation vary depending on the needs and

resources of the college athletic departments and their respective athletic teams” (p. 1). He further stated, “Some schools employ school-owned vehicles, whereas others may contract with independent companies for their transportation services” (LaVetter, 2004, p. 1). An independent contractor can be defined “as an individual or a company that contracts to perform a particular task” (Cotten, 2003, p. 85).

A common mode of transportation for sports teams is the 15-passenger vans (NTSB, 2002). Fifteen-passenger vans make up approximately “0.25% of the passenger vehicle fleet in the United States” (NTSB, 2002, p.ii). The NTSB has conducted numerous studies on the dangers surrounding the use of 15-passenger vans. In a safety alert published by the NTSB (2006), about 15-passenger vans, they stated the following:

- Fifteen-passenger vans were involved in 1,512 fatal crashes during 1994-2004.
- In 2004, 120 people lost their lives in 15-passenger van accidents.
- Eight-one percent of fatal fifteen-passenger van accident occurred in single – vehicle rollovers.
- Fifteen-passenger vans are three times more likely to rollover when they contain ten or more passengers (NTSB, 2006).

In a 2002 report, the NTSB stated that occupancy level and speed are common factors that usually cause rollovers in 15-passenger vans (NTSB, 2002). Rollover rate increases when vans are occupied with 15 passengers or more. Furthermore, “fully loading or nearly loading a 15-passenger van causes the center of gravity to move rearward and upward, which increases the vehicles rollover propensity and could increase the potential for driver loss of control in emergency maneuvers” (p. 14).

Fifteen passenger vans are not the only mode of transportation that is currently being used by intercollegiate athletic programs. Some programs also use 7- and 12-passenger vans, buses and airplanes, and personal cars to transport athletes (LaVetter, 2004), but like 15-passenger vans, these modes of transportation have also been linked to fatal accidents. This further conveys the need for intercollegiate athletic programs to develop and maintain safety regulations with respect to, transporting student-athletes.

If the sporting venues are located away from the main campus, student-athletes may use personal cars to travel to and from practice, but like other modes of transportation, personal cars operated by novice drivers may lead to dangerous accidents.

According to Gossett (2008), a member of the Franciscan University of Steubenville cross-country team was fatally injured in an accident when returning from a practice. Members of the team were returning to campus by private cars when a sophomore student-athlete was killed and six other members of the cross-country team were injured while riding in a SUV. The SUV “swerved to avoid a tire on U.S. 22 near the West Virginia-Pennsylvania border and plunged over a wooded hillside” (Gossett, 2008, p. 1).

Another popular mode of transportation for intercollegiate athletic programs is airplanes. Although the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) “issues and enforces regulations and minimum standards covering manufacturing, operating, and maintaining aircraft operation (FAA, 2005, p. 1), it is still imperative for athletic programs to set and maintain their own safety standards. Airplane usage has increased with the growth of athletic conferences (Canfield, 2001), but with this increase, regulations must be updated in order to maintain a safe environment for transporting athletes.

In 1994, the University of Texas at Austin women’s basketball team was traveling to

Nebraska for a tournament when their Boeing 737 ran off the taxiway after losing hydraulic power. The flight concluded without further incident.

On January 27, 2001, The Oklahoma State University (OSU) men's basketball team was traveling using three airplanes, one of the airplanes transporting two pilots and eight passengers, crashed and was instantly destroyed, killing all on board. The NTSB (2003) stated that the cause of the accident was due to the pilot's failure to maintain manual control of the airplane and the loss of electrical power.

As a result of the OSU accident, the NCAA, American Council on Education (ACE), and United Educators Insurance (UEI) collaborated to develop Safety in Student Transportation: A Resource Guide for Colleges and Universities (Resource Guide, 2006, p. V). The Resource Guide addresses the following concerns:

- Vehicle Maintenance and Documentation
- Driver Selection and Training
- Safe Driving Practices
- Emergency Preparations and Response
- Vehicle Safety Technologies
- Fifteen-Passenger Vans
- Pickup Trucks
- Privately Owned Vehicles
- Golf Carts and Utility Carts
- Students Clubs and Special Road Travel Issues

- Air Travel
- Risk Transfer
- Travel by Minors
- Waivers
- Charter and Rental Contracts
- Insurance Types and Limits (The Resource Guide, 2006).

The resource guide also provides safety recommendations regarding travel modes, 15- passenger vans, student drivers and driving distractions. The guide serves as a template for institutions to develop their own travel policies and procedures based on statistics provided by the NTSB.

All too often colleges and universities are using inadequate risk management operations in regards to transportation of student-athletes (The Resource Guide, 2006). The OSU and PVAMU accidents are examples of such inadequate policies. These accidents further illustrate that 15-passenger vans should not be used by uncertified and/or novice drivers. Additionally and trained drivers and regulations are needed for teams traveling by airplane, vans and personal cars.

LaVetter (2004) stated, “Existing transportation policies need to be analyzed among...institutions to determine what factors contribute to and affect proper policy development, implementation, and management (p. 5).

Statement of the Problem

Transportation policies of Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) intercollegiate athletic programs have not previously been studied. Accidents have

occurred within HBCU, including the PVAMU thus, demonstrating the need to study this population's transportation policies and procedures. Additionally economy struggles have also affected HBCU. Many are struggling to keep their intercollegiate athletic programs solvent (O'Neil, 2008, p. 1). Economic factors such as increased gas prices have caused them to become more reluctant towards changing their modes of athletic transportation.

In a 2008 report, O'Neil stated that Delaware State University has the largest athletic budget among all HBCUs. "Out of 339 NCAA Division I institutions, its \$17.2 million budget ranks 124th" (O'Neil, 2008, p. 1). However, some universities were forced to take drastic measures in order to reduce operating costs. Fisk University dropped their entire athletic program in order to reduce operational costs (O'Neil, 2008).

Finally, many HBCU are located in rural areas, in which drivers are forced to use two lane and poorly lit roads to travel to and from events. According to the University of California at Berkeley, Traffic Safety Center, 61% of all accidents that occurred on rural roads ended in fatalities (2008, p. 1). The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) reported in 1999 rural roads had 8,479 speeding related fatal accidents versus urban roads, which had 4,792 (2000, p. 1).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine HBCU intercollegiate athletic transportation practices and policies. This dissertation will examine the transportation policies and procedures currently used by HBCU intercollegiate athletic programs. Information about current HBCU transportation practices, as well as provide data regarding transportation

safety issues surrounding frequently used university vehicles, will be derived from this investigation.

Research Questions

1. What are the current transportation policies, procedures and practices relative to:
 - a. Modes of transportation
 - b. Policy development and communication
 - c. Driver qualifications
 - d. Vehicle maintenance
 - e. The use of 12 & 15-passenger vans
2. What are the factors that contribute to mode of transportation?

Limitations

Information gathered by the researchers may be limited by:

1. The athletic director's reluctance to discuss transportation issues.
2. The athletic director's knowledge of their team's transportation policies and procedures.
3. The athletic director's perception of the survey questions, which may or may not be the way the researcher intended.

Delimitations

Information gathered by the researcher will be delimited to:

1. HBCU institutions.
2. Data gathered from 2009.

Assumptions

The assumptions of this study were:

1. All athletic directors in this study population will have access to the Internet to complete the online survey and correspond with the researcher.
2. All athletic directors in this study population will understand how to complete and submit the online survey.
3. Participants will submit and complete accurately and honestly the questions on the survey.
4. Participants are knowledgeable about their team's transportation policies.

Significance of the Study

This study is significant because it provided information regarding HBCU intercollegiate athletic programs transportation policies.

Definition of Terms

- Aggressive Driving - Driving under the influence of impaired emotions, resulting in behavior that imposes one's own preferred level of risk on others (Nahl and James n.d.).
- American Council on Education (ACE) - A major coordinating body for higher education institutions that focuses on serving higher education institutions through research, and advocacy (ACE, 2008).
- Department of Transportation (DOT) - Congress established the DOT on October 15, 1966. The mission of the department is to serve the United States by “ensuring a fast, safe, efficient, accessible, and convenient transportation system that meets the vital national interests and enhances the quality of life of the

American people, today and into the future” (DOT, 2008).

- Driver Distraction - A process or condition that draws the driver’s attention away from the driving task (Neyens & Boyle, 2007).
- Duty – “A special relationship that exists between the program or service provider and the participant, which gives rise to an obligation to protect the individual from unreasonable risk of harm” (Pittman & Lehr, 2003, p. 157).
- Fatal Crash - A police reported motor vehicle traffic crash in which one or more of the people involved died of their injuries within 30 days of the crash (NHTSA, 2005).
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) - The FHWA is under the umbrella of the U.S. Department of Transportation. It serves the purpose monitoring US roads and highways (FHWA, 2006).
- Head Coach - One who is designated by the institution’s athletics department to perform coaching duties and who serves in that capacity on volunteer or paid basis (NCAA, 2008).
- Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) - An institution that was established before 1964, whose mission includes educating African Americans and who holds a nationally recognized accreditation (The White House, 2008).
- Independent contractor - An individual or company that contracts to perform a particular task (Cotten, 2003, p. 85).
- Inexperienced/ Novice Drivers - Driver with little or no knowledge or understanding of the complexities of driving a motor vehicle (FHWA, 2007).
- Land-Grant Institutions - US based higher education institutions that receive

funding based on the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890 (Jackson & Nunn, 2003, p. 225).

- Liability - A legal responsibility (Cotten, 2003, p. 66).
- Local Roads - The primary access to residential areas, business, farms, and other local areas (FHWA, 2007).
- National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) - The National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics serves approximately 50,000 student-athletes and 300 member institutions in the United States and Canada. The Purpose of the conference “is to promote the education and development of students through intercollegiate athletic participation”. The NAIA was the first to include HBCU African-American students and women in championships. The NAIA also supports 23 championships and 13 sports. (NAIA, n.d.).
- National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) - The NCAA is a voluntary organization that governs colleges and universities athletics programs. The organization includes: institutions, conferences, organizations, and individuals committed to the best interests, education, and athletics participation of student-athletes (NCAA, 2008).
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) - The NHTSA is under the umbrella of the DOT. It serves the purpose of reducing deaths, injuries, and economic losses resulting from motor vehicle crashes. The administration develops, maintains, and enforces safety performance standards for motor vehicles and equipment (DOT, 2006).
- National Junior College Athletic Association (NJCAA) – The purpose of the

NJCAA is to “to promote and foster junior college athletics on intersectional and national levels so that results will be consistent with the total educational program of its members” (NJCAA, n.d.).

- National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) - The NTSB is a Federal agency under the umbrella of Congress. The Board investigates civil aviation, railroad, highway, marine, and pipeline accidents. The Board also issues safety recommendations (NTSB, 2004).
- Negligence - The “failure to exercise a degree of care that, in the circumstances, the law requires for the protection of other persons or those interests of other persons that may be injuriously affected by the want of such care” (Dictionary, n.d.).
- Night - 6:00 p.m. to 5:59 a.m. (NHTSA, 2006).
- Risk-taking Behavior - Adolescent impulsiveness that result in poor driving judgment and participation in high-risk behavior such as speeding, inattention, drinking and driving and not using a seat belt (FHWA, 2007).
- Rural - Rural areas comprise open country and settlements with fewer than 2,500 residents (USDA, 2007).
- Safety in Student Transportation: A Resource Guide for Colleges and Universities - The NTSB investigated the OSU Men’s Basketball team accident and recommended that the NCAA should work at educating higher educational institutions about the safety issues of athletic travel. The NCAA, ACE, and the UEI developed a resource guide for higher institutions with the primary focus of educating institutions about travel tips and safety as well as providing tools for

institutions to develop their own policies on transportation (NCAA, 2006).

- Student-Athlete – “A student whose enrollment was solicited by a member of the athletics staff or other representative of athletics interests with a view towards the student’s ultimate participation in the intercollegiate athletic program. Any other student becomes a student-athlete only when the student reports for an intercollegiate squad that is under the jurisdiction of the athletic department. A student is not deemed a student-athlete solely based on prior high-school athletics participation” (NCAA, 2008).
- United Educators Insurance - UEI is a risk, retention, licensed insurance company that serves higher education institutions as well as public schools and independent schools throughout the United States (UEI, 2007).
- United States Collegiate Athletic Association (USCAA) – Founded in 1966 the association currently serves sixty member institutions and contains nine sports: Baseball, Men’s and Women’s Basketball, Men’s and Women’s Cross Country, Men’s and Women’s Soccer, Softball, and Volleyball (USCAA, n.d.).
- University Risk Management and Insurance Association (URMIA) - The mission of URMIA is to promote the advancement and application of effective risk management principles and practices in institutions of higher education (URMIA, 2006).
- Urban - Urban areas comprise larger places and densely settled areas around them. They are essentially densely settled territory as it might appear from the air (USDA, 2007).

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter provides a review of literature pertaining to intercollegiate athletic transportation. The chapter also explores the study's research questions, which were introduced in chapter one:

1. What are the current transportation policies, procedures and practices relative to:
 - a. Modes of transportation
 - b. Policy development and communication
 - c. Driver qualifications
 - d. Vehicle maintenance
 - e. The use of 12 & 15-passenger vans
2. What are the factors that contribute to mode of transportation?

Moreover, chapter two addresses theories and legalities surrounding student drivers and 15-passenger vans. In addition, the research introduced in this chapter provides a shocking reality of the state of intercollegiate athletic transportations safety and furthermore explores the need for an examination of Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) intercollegiate athletic transportation policies and procedures.

Historically Black Colleges and Universities

HBCU is defined in the amended portion of the Higher Education Act of 1965 as an institution that was established before 1964, mission includes educating African Americans and holds a nationally recognized accreditation (The White House, 2007). Cheney University, founded in 1837 in Pennsylvania was the first established HBCU (United Negro College Fund, 2007). Most HBCU were established through the efforts of

the Morrill Land Grant Act, American Missionary Association, and the Freedmen's Bureau.

The Morrill Land Grant Act was named for Senator Justin Morrill who proposed the act in 1862. In the proposal, the states were each given 30,000 acres of land per senator and representative it had in Congress. In 1890, the Act expanded its goal by supporting higher education for all land grants, but it prohibited distribution of money to states that made distinctions of race in admissions.

The American Missionary Association (AMA) was established in 1846. The association had "a strong commitment to social justice and focused its efforts on abolishing slavery, assisting formerly enslaved people, improving the treatment of Native Americans, assisting immigrant populations, and meeting the needs of people in foreign lands" (Amistad Research Center, 2003). Furthermore, the AMA established institutions for freedmen, during and after the civil war (Amistad Research Center, 2003).

The Freedmen's Bureau was established in 1865 by the War Department to "oversee all aid and education of freedmen. Moreover, the Bureau issued food, clothing, and medicine to refugees and freedmen. HBCU were established to provide African Americans an opportunity to "gain education grounded in liberal arts. Many legal aspects have shaped and influenced the growth and development of HBCU. Three crucial events were: The Higher Education Act of 1965, Brown vs. The Board of Education, and The United States vs. Fordice.

The Higher Education Act of 1965 was documented "to strengthen the educational resources of colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education" (United States Department of Education, 2008). The

It was further stated that the Act of 1965 was established to provide lower and middle income families with more higher education opportunities as well as provide more assistance to “small and less developed colleges”(2008).

The historical case of *Oliver L. Brown vs. Board Education of Topeka, KS* changed the state of the educational system forever. The 1951 Supreme Court case included approximately 200 plaintiffs representing previous National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) equality based educational cases¹ from five states² (Brown Foundation, 2008). The Brown Foundation further stated that the case was named for Oliver Brown as a “legal strategy to have a man head the plaintiff roster” (2004). In this case the Supreme Court ruled that separate public schools for African American and Caucasian students were not equal. The ruling also stated that by not providing African American students with equal educational opportunities their fourteenth amendment rights were being violated. Controversially, the *Brown vs. Board of Education* case overturned the ruling set forth in the *Plessey vs. Ferguson* case. The 1896 case of *Plessey vs. Ferguson* ruled that separate educational opportunities for African American and Caucasian students were equal (*de jure segregation*³) (Brown Foundation, 2008).

The *Jake Ayers Sr. vs. Governor Kirk Fordice*⁴ case was a twenty-three-year old law suit filled by African American students in Mississippi. The Supreme Court found that the State of Mississippi failed to equally fund and support HBCU in Mississippi. In 2002, a settlement was reached awarding Alcorn State University, Jackson State

¹ Belton vs. Gebhart, Briggs vs. Elliot, Davis vs. County School Board of Prince Edward County, and Bolling vs. C. Melvin Sharpe (Brown Foundation, 2008).

² Delaware, Kansas, South Carolina, Virginia, and Washington D.C. (Brown Foundation, 2008).

³ *de jure segregation* – “Based on laws or actions by the state” (Merriam-Webster Online, 2008).

⁴ The defendant in the case changed based on which governor was in office at the time of the case.

University, and Mississippi Valley State University, each, \$503 million (Roach, 2007).

Currently there are 102 HBCU, these institutions include: 40, four-year public institutions; 50, four-year private institutions; 11, two-year public institutions and 3, two-year private institutions (The White House, 2007). Nearly one-third of African American students are enrolled in a HBCU, which represent 3% of US colleges (United Negro College Fund, 2007). Additionally, in 2001 the total economic impact of HBCU was \$10.2 billion. It was further mentioned the following accomplishments of HBCU:

- HBCUs graduate 75% more of their students compared to other institutions.
- More than 50% of US African-American public school teachers received their undergraduate degrees at a HBCU.
- Approximately 70% of US African American dentists earned their degrees at a HBCU.
- Approximately 50% of members on the Congressional Black Caucus attended a HBCU.
- Tuskegee University is the only institution to be designated as a national historic site.

This study analyzed HBCU athletic departments within four athletic associations: National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA), National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), National Junior Collegiate Athletic Association (NJCAA), and United States Collegiate Athletic Association (USCAA).

The NAIA serves approximately 50,000 student-athletes and 300 member institutions in the United States and Canada. The association promotes the education and

development of students through intercollegiate athletic participation (NAIA, n.d.). The NAIA was the first athletic association to include HBCU African-American students and women in championships (NAIA, n.d.). The association includes 25 conferences and the Association of Independent Institutions. The NAIA also supports 23 championships and 13 sports.

In 1966, the National Little College Athletic Association (NLCAA) was founded by athletic directors from the Lake Erie (Ohio) Conference and the Eastern Shore Basketball League. Although in 2001, the name of the association was changed to United States Collegiate Athletic Association (USCAA) the goal “to provide opportunities for small colleges to compete on an equal level of competition with schools of like size athletic programs” remained (USCAA, n.d.). The association currently includes sixty member institutions and includes nine sports. In order to gain a better understanding of transportation policies and procedures that these four athletic associations’ member institutions use one must first understand the development of transportation policies and procedures implemented by the United States government.

History of Transportation

Since the beginning of time, man has been on a quest to invent and improve modes of transportation. Transportation is defined as “means of conveyance or travel from one place to another” (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 2008). Due to transportation, industrialization and infrastructure continue to grow, the beginning years of transportation brought question and doubt. Very few were imaginative enough to envision what was to come with the development of automobiles.

According to Smithsonian National Museum of American History, (n.d.) during the

1800's the United States saw an expansion of transportation modes. Steamboats were dominating the rivers, canals were developed, and being used as well as trains, which were transporting not only people but goods. The Smithsonian further mentioned that by the 1900's, Americans commonly used bicycles, streetcars, wagons, and horse-drawn carriages for transportation, but from this era a need for change and faster transportation emerged, which the automobile could provide (n.d.). Not all Americans were overcome with the need for change, which the automobiles offered or their coined named of the era "devil wagons", but with time comes change (National Museum of American History, n.d.). People soon came to value the convenience of the automobile and as they adapted it to their own needs, automobiles became a significant part of everyday life. People began to envision places that they could travel or family members that they could visit. With the concept of automobiles captivating the minds of people, the idea of an attached road connecting states soon began to thrive.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1916 was signed into law by President Woodrow Wilson. The purpose of the Act was to develop the nation's first highway system.

The National Museum of American History (n.d.) stated that the 1920's brought automobile accidents and parking problems to cities. According to the Smithsonian, during this era, more than 30,000 people were involved in fatal automobile accidents (n.d.). It was further stated that in order to deal with these new hazards, cities developed and enforced speed limits, installed traffic signals, and parking restrictions (National Museum of American History, n.d.). Due to these hazards, many cities were confronted with the need for transportation policies, but it was not until William Phelps Eno's "Rules of the Road" that many cities looked to develop their own set of traffic rules and

regulations.

Mr. Eno's philosophies on traffic safety were well perceived by most cities because the rules were introduced during an era of increased auto accidents (ENO Transportation Foundation, n.d.). William Phelps Eno although known as the "Father of Traffic Safety" had a distrust for automobiles and in fact never drove one during his life time, he was instead interested in innovating new ways to improve traffic safety (ENO Transportation Foundation, n.d.). Mr. Eno is credited with developing the stop sign, pedestrian crosswalk, safety islands, traffic circle, one-way street, and taxi stands (ENO Transportation Foundation, n.d.).

In 1920, William Phelps Eno founded the ENO Transportation Foundation. The present day goal of the foundation is "to attract the thinking of the other transportation experts and specialists and to provide a forum for unbiased discussions that would lead to improvements in the movement of people and goods" (ENO Transportation Foundation, n.d.). Although Eno provided transportation policies for states to pursue, more policies had to be developed to deal with new technologies and the growth of the transportation industry. Safety regulations in automobile manufacturing were recognized in the 60's.

Innovators like Henry Ford lead the development in envisioning and developing automobiles. The transportation industry continued to grow, as Detroit became the paradigm of automobile mass-production. Due to this cities became engulfed with automobiles and the idea of the once "devil wagon" was close to being obsolete. With an increased driving population came even more traffic and road hazards. Cities and states were encouraged to develop plans to deal with the new hazards, but some felt that this was the job of the US government and not city or state agencies (National Museum of

American History, n.d.). One organization developed to take on the task of US transportation procedures and policies is the Department of Transportation.

Department of Transportation (DOT)

On October 15, 1966, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the Department of Transportation Act and stated “Transportation has truly emerged as a significant part of our national life” (DOT, 2008). The mission of DOT is to “Serve the United States by ensuring a fast, safe, efficient, accessible and convenient transportation system that meets our vital national interests and enhances the quality of life for American people, today and into the future” (DOT, 2008). According to the Department of Transportation, it annually funds \$32 billion in grants and cooperative agreements. The DOT funds state and local government offices, colleges, and universities, Native American tribes and non-profit organizations.

Currently the DOT houses 11 government agencies, which include:

- Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA)
- Federal Railroad Administration (FRA)
- Federal Transit Administration (FTA)
- Maritime Administration (MARAD)
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA)
- Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA)

- Research and Innovative Technology Administration (RITA)
- Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation (SLSDC)
- Surface Transportation Board (STB) (DOT, 2007).

Of the 11, three of these administrations deal directly with automobile transportation: FHWA, NHTSA and RITA. Statistics and data gathered from these agencies will be used in this study to analyze HBCU intercollegiate athletic transportation policies and procedures.

The FHWA was established to expand and develop ways to make highways safe by providing financial assistance to construct and improve highways (FHWA, 2006). The FHWA houses two major programs: The Federal-aid Highway Program and The Federal Lands Highway Program. The Federal-aid Highway Program provides financial support to state and local governments who are looking to preserve and maintain the highway system. The Federal Lands Highway Program provides financial support for roads and highway system that are not governed by the state or local governments. The seven goals of the FHWA are: Safety, Mobility, Productivity, Global Connectivity, Environment, National Homeland Security, and Organizational Excellence (FHWA, 2006).

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's (NHTSA) mission is to "save lives, prevent injuries, and reduce vehicle-related crashes" (NHTSA, n.d.). The NHTSA researches motor vehicle and highway safety, it sets the safety agenda and serves as a leader in defining and educating consumers on motor vehicle and highway safety issues. Furthermore, the association houses many educational and supportive programs like: child seat fitting stations, safety recalls, and fuel economy. The NHTSA fact sheet

provides statistical information about: alcohol-impaired driving, children, bicyclists, occupant protection, pedestrian, school transportation crashes, speeding, state traffic data, young and old drivers (NHTSA, n.d.). The NHTSA also provides consumers and organizations with an annual report, which provides traffic safety data for that year. The report includes: vehicle miles traveled, crash and driver statistics and safety precautions.

The Research and Innovative Technology Administration (RITA), coordinates and facilitates the Department of Transportation's programs through research and education of transportation safety issues. RITA houses the following programs: Bureau of Transportation Statistics, Intelligent Transportation Systems, National Transportation Library, Research, Development and Technology, Transportation Safety Institute, University Transportation Centers and Volpe National Transportation Systems Center. Collectively these associations provide a unique glimpse into the driving hazards that US drivers face and cause. Through statistics, US driving trends and hazards have been explored and analyzed.

College Transportation Policies

- Springfield College stated that all drivers must be at least 20 years old, possess a valid United States driver's license, have held that license for at least 3 consecutive years, successfully completed the college's DDC IV Defensive Driving Safety Program and maintain an approved driver's history (Springfield College, 2008, p. 2). Additionally all hand held devices, drugs and alcohol use are prohibited while driving (Springfield College, 2008, p. 4).
- The Clarendon College Athletic Department prohibits all students while traveling and regardless of age from using drugs and alcohol. Students are also prohibited

from driving personal vehicles to and from athletic events and students traveling with the team must return to campus with the team (Clarendon College, n.d.).

- Macalester College requires that all leased vans must be certified by the College Safety Department. Furthermore, if a student-athlete elects not to travel to an athletic event with his/her team the coach must be informed and the student must sign a waiver form accepting full responsibility and liability (Macalester College, 2006, p.6).
- Wilmington University requires all students planning to travel for six or less hours must use chartered buses for travel. Furthermore, students traveling for more than six hours are required to use airplane travel (Wilmington University, n.d., p.2). If rented vehicles are used all drivers must be over 25 years old and have at least two years of driving experience (p.3). Wilmington requires that all drivers have a good driving record, which includes no more than 6 points, no major violations, and no chargeable accidents within the last 24 months (p.3). Additionally no driver may travel over 200 miles or four hours without stopping and no vehicles can be rented that are larger than a 15-passenger van (p. 3).
- Lehigh University Athletic Departments insists that all drivers of university vehicles be a Lehigh University employee or student. Furthermore all drivers must be at least 21 years old, possess a valid driver's license, at least two years of driving experience in the United States, complete a driver information form and have a good driving record (Lehigh University, n.d.).
- The University of Mary Washington allows students to drive if they are at least 18 years old, have valid driver's license, are familiar with safety training and have

singed a vehicle usage form, but students are prohibited from driving over night trips (University of Mary Washington, n.d.).

- Auburn University prohibits students from driving other students to and from athletic events. They require that a contracted driver must be used if the team is traveling farther than 350 miles or if the trip is expected to “extend later than 2:00 a.m. or overnight” (Auburn University, 2008, p.2). In regards to 12 and 15-passenger vans all drivers must attend the Auburn University 12-15 passenger van driver’s training class (p.3).
- Oklahoma State University requires students who drive to be at least 21 years old, have a valid driver’s license, and be well rested. They also require a contracted driver if the trip is more than 350 miles or extends longer than 2 a.m. or overnight (NCAA, 2006, p.13).
- The University of Texas at Dallas requires two university-appointed drivers on trips requiring 200 or more miles. Furthermore, the drivers are required to rotate every three hours and are not allowed to drive more than eight hours in one day. They also prohibit any driving between the hours of 11 p.m. and 6 a.m. without prior approval from the university (NCAA, 2006, p.12).
- Dartmouth College requires driver’s that are planning to use personal automobiles to have proof of liability insurance, a statement of safety check, and written documentation from the vehicle’s owner for the university to use the vehicle (NCAA, 2006, p.13).

- Texas A&M University requires driver's that are planning to use personal automobiles to have documentation proving insurance, registration, and state inspection (NCAA, 2006, p.12).
- Prairie View A&M University prohibits the use of personal automobiles for university trips (NCAA, 2006, p.13; PVAMU, n.d., p.4). If a person selects to use their personal automobile for an institutional trip, their liability insurance will be held accountable in an accident (NCAA, 2006, p.13; PVAMU, n.d., p.4).

The NCAA recommends that institutions review the resource guide to assist with safety tips on chartering a plane.

Athletic-Related Accidents

- In 2005, a group from Utah State University was involved in an accident. The accident resulted in 11 people being ejected and nine being fatality injured (NCAA, 2006, p.50).
- A professor and student from the University of Texas were involved in an accident. Neither was wearing their seatbelt and both died (NCAA, 2006, p.50).
- On October 2, 1970 a Martin 404, N464M airplane was carrying members of the Wichita State University football to Logan, Utah. The airplane crashed into the base of a mountain and killed the pilot, flight attendant, 28 passengers, the first officer, and 10 passengers sustained injuries. The NTSB found that the accident occurred due to deviations from regulations during the flight (NTSB, 2005).
- On January 27 2001, The Oklahoma State University, Men's Basketball team was traveling using three airplanes. One of the planes, N81PF, which carried two pilots and eight passengers crashed and was instantly destroyed due to the impact

of the crash. The NTSB determined that the cause of the accident was due to the pilot's failure to maintain manual control of the airplane and the loss of electrical power (NTSB, 2003). Due to this accident the NCAA, American Council on Education and United Educators Insurance came together to develop the Safety in Student Transportation: A Resource Guide for Colleges and Universities. The Resource Guide provides institutions safety facts concerning transportation and insurance. The resource guide also provides safety recommendation regarding travel modes, 15-passengers vans, student drivers and driving distractions. The Resource Guide serves as a template for institutions to develop their own travel policies and procedures based on statistics provided by the NTSB.

- In 1988, terrorists attacked and killed occupants including students from Syracuse University on a Pan Am flight over Scotland (NCAA, 2006, p.50).
- In 2005, an accident involving eight students from Minnesota State University at Mankato resulted in five students being injured and three being fatality injured. The group was traveling from Minnesota to Detroit for a Society Automotive Engineers event. The driver lost control of the van when the trailer was pushed by the wind, which caused it to fishtail. The van rollover into oncoming traffic and was hit by two semi-trucks that were unable to stop (NCAA, 2006, p.50).
- On May 8, 2001, a Dodge 15-passenger van was traveling to Gainesville, Texas. Traveling at an estimated speed of 61 MPH, the tread separated from the left rear tire, which caused an instant blow out. Due to the blow out the driver, lost control of the van and the van began to rollover at least twice. The rollover caused seven passengers to be ejected and the driver and three of the ejected passenger were

fatality injured in the accident (NTSB, 2005).

- On July 1, 2001, a 1989 Dodge Ram 15-Passenger van was traveling to Virginia carrying 13 passengers and one driver, at an estimated speed of 65 MPH the van approached an exit as the tread from the left rear tire separated causing the van yaw and then rollover. The rollover caused four passengers to be ejected and one to be fatality injured (NTSB, 2005).

NCAA (2006) stated that at least 200 students and accompanying staff have died from air travel since 1970.

State Accident Statistics

This study investigated all HBCU intercollegiate athletic programs located in twenty states: Alabama, Arkansas, District of Columbia, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Missouri, Mississippi, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Below is a table summarizing each state's fatal accidents⁵. The table shows that in 2007 Texas had highest number of fatal accidents with 3,363⁶ and D.C. had the lowest with 44. The table further shows that Texas also lead in alcohol impaired fatalities, car fatalities, truck-van fatalities, and speeding and rollover fatalities.

⁵ Data obtained from National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (2008)

⁶ The number of fatal accidents and alcohol-impaired fatalities can be attributed to the population size of Texas.

Table 1 - 2007 Fatal Accidents

State	Total Fatalities	Alcohol-Impaired BAC = .08+	Passenger Car (Occupant)	Light Truck – Van (Occupant)	Speeding	Rollover
Alabama	1,110	389	495	37	497	437
Arkansas	650	182	245	22	64	203
Delaware	117	50	54	5	44	26
District of Columbia	44	15	15	0	8	5
Florida	3,214	890	1,122	105	611	772
Georgia	1,641	441	680	70	384	511
Kentucky	864	210	383	28	132	269
Louisiana	985	368	354	22	251	332
Maryland	614	179	254	22	216	75
Mississippi	884	302	386	24	349	167
Missouri	992	418	423	53	434	381
North Carolina	1,675	487	763	73	620	546
Ohio	1,257	391	607	77	277	274
Oklahoma	754	219	248	42	209	288

Pennsylvania	1,491	500	706	58	783	340
South Carolina	1,066	463	408	39	454	335
Tennessee	1,210	390	519	44	268	412
Texas	3,363	1,292	1,158	140	1,343	983
Virginia	1,027	332	440	33	341	278
West Virginia	431	142	173	22	76	154

Rural and Urban Road Statistics

Several HBCU being investigated in this study are located in rural areas and these roads are considered some of the most dangerous roads in the United States (3M, n.d.; DOT, 2008). Although these roads are viewed as dangerous, 70% of US roads are classified as rural (DOT, 2008). When traveling, these teams are often confronted with the hazard of using two lane or unlit roads to reach their destination. Due to this, travel can be dangerous especially when traveling at night. Another hazard that rural drivers face is speed. There is a need to be cautious when driving on rural roads because many of them were not designed for high-speed traveling. The DOT further states that rural roads contain the following safety hazards:

- Lack of signs or accurate maps
- Blind curves

- Narrow width
- No shoulder or guard rails
- Soft surface
- Rough or damaged road surface
- Obstacles on the road (slowing moving vehicles, debris and/or animals)
- Usually steep hills or sharp curves

Additionally, drivers should use extreme caution when driving on rural roads because of the delay that might occur in receiving emergency or medical assistance due to distance from urban area. The DOT also provided recommendations for drivers planning to travel on rural roads:

- Carry a compass or GPS system.
- Carry a current map.
- Double check map and/or directions before traveling.
- Gas up before traveling. There are less gas stations in rural areas versus urban areas.
- Check air in the spare tire. Make sure that you have all of the necessary equipment to change a tire (jack, flashlight and tire).
- Carry food, water, and emergency supplies.
- Do not count on cell phone service some areas may have blackout areas where cell phones are unable to gain reception.

The following are some rural road hazard statistics:

- Sixty percent of fatalities nationwide are on rural roads (FHWA, 2007).
- For 10-vehicle miles traveled, fatalities are 2.75 times higher on rural roads than on other roads.
- In 2003, 25,136 people died because of run-off-road crashes.
- Drivers are three times as likely to be involved in an accident during rainy or wet pavement conditions.
- Seventy-five percent of reported rollover accidents occurred on rural roads (NHTSA, n.d.).

In 2005, the FHWA annual report on highway provided statistics regarding the number of people fatally injured in motor vehicle accidents on rural, urban, national highways, federal-aid highways, and non-federal-aid highways.⁷ According to the table, Texas had the highest number of fatalities on a rural and urban, national highway system, and the highest rural fatalities on federal-aid highways and the highest on non-federal-aid highways.⁸ Florida had the highest urban fatalities on federal-aid highways and highest rural fatalities on non-federal-aid highways.

⁷ Data obtained from FHWA (2005)

⁸ The number of fatal accidents and alcohol-impaired fatalities can be attributed to the population size of Texas.

Table 2 - Rural and Urban Road Accidents

State	National Highway System		Federal- Aid Highways		Non-Federal-Aid Highways	
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
Alabama	233	162	574	311	162	44
Arkansas	193	48	445	87	62	34
Delaware	21	19	53	37	29	1
District of Columbia	0	5	0	5	0	43
Florida	374	582	594	1,583	716	395
Georgia	232	175	595	500	168	97
Kentucky	181	71	496	178	241	69
Louisiana	169	106	421	264	206	57
Maryland	80	124	190	339	54	30
Mississippi	169	74	563	90	202	70
Missouri	325	152	755	266	156	80
North Carolina	251	117	627	269	422	216
Ohio	146	134	550	424	274	72
Oklahoma	157	71	402	189	163	28

Pennsylvania	194	240	578	659	255	118
South Carolina	317	51	870	124	32	0
Tennessee	96	89	144	122	25	9
Texas	632	899	1,514	969	460	534
Virginia	174	150	480	307	102	56
West Virginia	117	35	259	66	41	8

Student Driver Statistics

Drivers between the ages of 15 to 20 years old represent 10% of approximately 202.8 million licensed US drivers and in 2007, 12% of this population were involved in fatal automobile accidents (NHTSA, 2008, p.2). Additionally, this age group had the highest rate of fatal crash involvement in 2006 with “59.5 fatal crashes per 100,000 licensed drivers” (NHTSA, 2007, p.2). Moreover, in 2006, 28% of young drivers who were involved in fatal automobile accidents did not have a valid driver’s license and 31% of those drivers were under the influence of drugs or alcohol (NHTSA, 2007, p.1). Another factor that contributes to risky driving behavior among young drivers is their lack of seatbelt use.

The NHTSA “estimates that over the past 26 years, 135,000 fatalities and 3.8 million injuries in the U.S. have been prevented by seat belts” (2007, p.2). According to research females wear seat belts more often than males, but when compared to other driving

groups, young drivers are the least likely to wear seatbelts (NHTSA, 2007, p.2; NHTSA, 2006, p.2; Deery 1999, p.225; NCAA 2006, p.6 & Neyens 2007). Furthermore, a national survey conducted by NHTSA, found that seatbelt use among African Americans is “more than 4 percentage points lower than the national average” (NHTSA, 1998, as cited in NHTSA n.d.).

Some reasons why drivers do not wear seatbelts are: they are driving a short distance, forgot to put it on, they are in a rush, or the belt is uncomfortable. According to NHTSA (2007) in 2006, 64% of drivers aged 15-20 who died in passenger vehicles were not wearing seatbelts (p.2).

The State of California composed state statistics for fatal crashes involving young drivers between the ages of 15 and 20 years old. Below is a table of crash statistics representing the states being researched in this study⁹. According to the table, Texas had the highest number of young drivers involved in a fatal automobile accident, passenger of a young driver; occupants of the other vehicle¹⁰ and Florida had the highest number of non-occupant fatal accidents.

⁹ Data obtained from, State of California (2007)

¹⁰ The number of fatal accidents and alcohol-impaired fatalities can be attributed to the population size of Texas.

Table 3 - 2007 Fatal Accidents Involving Drivers 15-20 Years Old

State	Young Drivers	Passengers of Young Drivers	Occupants of the other vehicles	Non-occupants	Total
Alabama	92	65	40	15	212
Arkansas	58	30	27	9	124
Delaware	17	11	5	3	36
District of Columbia	4	1	2	4	11
Florida	249	118	150	80	597
Georgia	140	82	73	24	319
Kentucky	79	34	39	8	160
Louisiana	88	43	37	16	184
Maryland	50	38	28	11	127
Mississippi	71	40	38	8	157
Missouri	130	73	63	15	281
North Carolina	136	92	74	16	318
Ohio	125	80	78	12	295
Oklahoma	50	39	35	6	130

Pennsylvania	157	93	63	23	336
South Carolina	82	45	36	8	171
Tennessee	108	55	42	11	216
Texas	332	219	203	51	805
Virginia	81	43	38	12	174
West Virginia	32	24	12	3	71

Due to the following statistics, researchers have attempted to analyze factors that contribute to young drivers being involved in fatal automobile accidents. Some have based their theories on inexperience and lack of driver's education training some have observed the factors as behavioral and others state that it is due to risky behavior (Neyens, 2007). All of these theories are logical and have been well documented. To better understand these theories one must first analyze the policies and procedures surrounding the Driver's Education Program in the United States.

During the mid 90's, the United States began to restructure their driver's education program to include a Graduated Driver's License (GDL) program for first-time drivers. Prior to this date teens were able to obtain a full-privilege license at an earlier age than in most other countries with little driving experience. Currently all but three states (Arkansas, Kansas and North Dakota) use some form of the GDL program. The GDL program places restrictions on new teen drivers and eases them into driving situations through comprehensive driving skills test and practice. According to the Governors

Highway Safety Association (2008), the program includes three stages:

- Learner stage - Supervised driving only.
- Intermediate stage – Passenger limits and nighttime driving restrictions are placed on unsupervised drivers.
- Full privilege stage – A standard driver’s license is issued.

The following table illustrates the driver’s education programs for the states being researched in this study¹¹. The table shows the majority of the states have a minimum start age of 15 for driver’s education, a minimum duration of 6 months, night-time driving restrictions of midnight- 6 a.m., passenger restrictions of carrying no more than one passenger and 40 hours of supervised driving.

Table 4 - Driver Education Programs

State	Min. age	Min. duration	Night-time driving restrictions	Passenger restrictions	Supervised driving
Alabama	15	6 mos.	Midnight – 6 a.m.	No more than 3 teens	30 hrs.
Arkansas	14	6 mos.	1-5 a.m.	None	None
Delaware	16	6 mos.	10 p.m.- 6 a.m.	No more than 1 passenger	50 hrs.
District of Columbia	16	6 mos.	Sept. to June 11 p.m. – 6 a.m. (Su-Th) midnight –	First 6 mos. no passengers	50 hrs.

¹¹ Data obtained from, Governors Highway Safety Association

				6 a.m. (Fr-Sa) July-Aug midnight – 6 a.m.		
Florida	15	12 mos.	Age 16 11 p.m. - 6 a.m.	None	50 hrs.	
			Age 17 1 a.m. - 5 a.m.			
Georgia	15	12 mos.	Midnight – 6 a.m.	First 6 mos. no passengers	40 hrs.	
Kentucky	16	6 mos.	Midnight – 6 a.m.	No more than 1 passenger under 20 yrs.	60 hrs.	
Louisiana	15	6 mos.	11 p.m. – 5 a.m.	None	35 hrs.	
Maryland	15	6 mos.	Midnight – 5 a.m.	First 5 mos. no passenger under 18 yrs.	60 hrs.	
Mississippi	15	6 mos.	10 p.m. – 6 a.m.	None	None	
Missouri	15	6 mos.	1- 5 a.m.	First 6 mos. no more than 1 passenger	40 hrs.	
North Carolina	15	12 mos.	9 p.m. – 5 a.m.	No more than 1 passenger under 21 yrs.	None	
Ohio	15	6 mos.	11 p.m. –	No more than	40 hrs.	

				5 a.m.	1 passenger under 21 yrs.	
Oklahoma	15 (driver's ed) 16 (w/o driver's ed)	6 mos.	11 p.m. – 5 a.m.		No more than 1 passenger under 21 yrs.	40 hrs.
Pennsylvania	16	6 mos.	11 p.m.- 5 a.m.		None	50 hrs.
South Carolina	15	6 mos.	6 p.m. – 6 a.m.		No more than 2 passenger under 21 yrs.	40 hrs.
Tennessee	15	6 mos.	11 p.m.- 6 a.m.		No more than 1 passenger under 21 yrs	50 hrs.
Texas	15	6 mos.	Midnight – 5 a.m.		No more than 1 passenger under 21 yrs	None
Virginia	15	9 mos.	Midnight – 4 a.m.		First 12 mos. no passenger under 18 yrs.	45 hrs.
West Virginia	15	6 mos.	11 p.m.- 5 a.m.		No more than 3 passenger under 19 yrs.	30 hrs.

State agencies continue to explore new techniques of educating new drivers.

According to Drummond (1999) some techniques that have been explored are:

- Incorporating longer learning period with emphasis on safety.
- Using driving simulation activities to enhance the learning process.
- Using CD-ROM applications to enhance cognitive driving skills.

- Focus on upgrading teacher's training, graduated licensing, human development, and knowledge.

Although driver's education is being restructured to better prepare new drivers for the road, research has proven that young drivers lack the maturity required to negotiate traffic and road hazards (NHTSA, 2007). New drivers lack important skills, specifically the ability to acquire and process information in a fast past setting. Due to this, young drivers are less able to maintain full attention, less developed in scanning the environment, have problems with recognizing potential hazards, and making tough decisions quickly (Deery 1999, p.230). They also tend to underestimate the danger of certain risky situations and overestimate the danger in others (NHTSA, 2007, p.2).

In 1994, the American Automobile Association (AAA) of Michigan conducted a study on pre-crash hazardous actions performed by young drivers before an automobile accident. The study stated that young drivers showed a failure to yield, excessive speeding, and improper use of lane change (Lonero, 1995, p.10; Neyens, 2007). Young (1993), expanded this idea to include frequent violations caused by young drivers, which included non-observance of posted signs, equipment defects, aggressive passing, and right of way violations (p. c-3).

Novice drivers develop at a slower rate when it comes to the perceptual and cognitive ability to successfully drive an automobile (Deery 1999, p.230). Deery (1999) further stated that novice drivers detect road hazards less quickly and are more accepting when it comes to taking risks on the road versus more experienced drivers (p.229). Additionally, Heinrich (1995) stated that two primary problems that young people face when driving are inexperience and emotions. According to Heinrich, (1995) these factors

are what seem to set novice drivers apart from their counterparts. Heinrich (1995) goes on to state that novice drivers lack the natural routine or behavior to prepare them for daily driving tasks like changing lanes, turning or shifting gears.

Based on this research, it is easy to comprehend the hazards novice drivers bring to the roads, but despite their inexperience and draw towards risky driving behaviors, other factors also affect their capabilities to be safe drivers. When compared to older drivers, younger drivers are more easily distracted when driving (NHTSA, 2007, p.2; Heinrich, 1999; Deery 1995, p.229; Young 1993, p.4). Some of the distractions that young drivers face are: alcohol and drug use, cell phone use, driver's fatigue, lack of nighttime driving experience and speeding.

Drug and Alcohol Abuse

According to the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) "Every day, 36 people in the United States die, and approximately 700 more are injured, in motor vehicle crashes that involve an alcohol-impaired driver"(2008). Driving under the influence of drugs and/or alcohol increases a person's chances of a tragic automobile accident (Smik, 2005, p. 430; CDC 2008; NTSB, 2008; NHTSA, 2008, p.2). It is illegal in the United States to drive with a Blood Alcohol Level (BAC) of 0.08% or higher (CDC, 2008). In 2007, approximately 12,998 people were killed in alcohol-related fatal automobile accidents (NHTSA, 2008, p. 1). When compared to female drivers, male drivers are more likely to be in a fatal automobile accident due to having a BAC of 0.08% or higher (CDC, 2008; NHTSA, 2008, p. 3).

A study entitled Drinking Behavior in Young Adults: the Potential Role of Designated Driver and Safe Ride Home Programs analyzed 917 drivers between the ages

of 21-34 years old. The study found that 21% of participants drove an automobile after consuming more than the legal limit of alcohol (Rivara, F., 2007, p. 170). Another study conducted in 2006, on drivers between the ages of 16-75 showed that drivers in the age group of 21-24 were more likely to be in a fatal car accident due to having a BAC of 0.08% or higher (NHTSA, 2008, p. 4).

The table below shows the BAC levels that correspondences to fatal automobile accidents and statistics of states being researched this study¹². According to the table, in 2006, Texas had the highest number of fatal automobile accidents with 3,466¹³ and the District of Columbia had the lowest with 37, but Florida had the highest number of accidents caused by a BAC =. 08+.

Table 5 - 2006 State Fatal Accidents Based on BAC Levels

State	Total fatalities	BAC = .00	BAC = .01-.07	BAC = .088+
Alabama	1,206	761	61	384
Arkansas	665	420	48	197
Delaware	148	98	7	43
District of Columbia	37	24	2	12
Florida	3,363	2,252	152	959
Georgia	1,688	1,149	76	464

¹² Data obtained from, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

¹³ This can be attributed to the population size of Texas.

Kentucky	913	656	35	222
Louisiana	982	557	61	364
Maryland	651	416	42	193
Mississippi	911	553	37	320
Missouri	1,087	619	88	380
North Carolina	1,558	1,068	70	420
Ohio	1,235	784	74	377
Oklahoma	765	522	41	201
Pennsylvania	1,517	961	69	487
South Carolina	1,037	560	57	420
Tennessee	1,286	808	70	408
Texas	3,466	1,922	190	1,354
Virginia	961	614	47	300
West Virginia	408	253	26	129

In the 80s, the US adopted an age restriction of 21 years old in order for a person to purchase or consume alcohol beverages (NHTSA, 2008, p. 2). Due to this restriction, most states saw a 10-15% decline in alcoholic related accidents (NHTSA, 2008, p.2).

According to the World Health Organization Department of Injuries and Violence Prevention (2007), novice drivers under the age of 25 years old account for 30% of those killed and injured in traffic accidents and is ranked as the eighth leading cause of death of this age group around the world (p. 2). They also stated that male drivers have a higher percentage rate of being in fatal accidents due to risky driving behavior (p. 4).

Research has also been conducted focusing on ethnic groups and alcohol consumption. According to Kapner (2003), students at HBCUs and African Americans students consume less alcohol versus students at predominately white institutions (PWI) (p. 1). Students that attend HBCUs tend to consume less alcohol compared to Caucasian students, at PWI (Kapner, 2003). Kapner (2003) further stated that African-American students that attend PWI and African American students that attend HBCU usually consume alcohol at the same rate (p. 2).

In the study entitled The Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Study, it was found that in 2001, 21.7% of African American students, 50.2 % of Caucasians, 34.3% of Hispanics, 33.6% of Native Americans and 26.2% of Asian and Pacific Islanders were heavy drinkers (Kapner, 2003, p. 2). Research has also been conducted on college athletes regarding alcohol and drug abuse. In a publication entitled Understanding and Promoting College Student-Athlete Health: Essential Issues for Student Affairs Professionals, Etzel (2006) states, college students are engaged in excessive alcohol consumption, which contributes to negative alcohol-related consequences and behaviors (p. 523). Etzel (2006) further states athletes are more likely to engage in binge drinking activity versus non-athletes due to the pressures surrounding being an athlete in the eyes of associates and friends (p. 520). This idea is further

explored in an article entitled College Athletes and Alcohol and Other Drug Use. The study found that 26% of female student-athletes and 42% of male student-athletes consumed alcohol once a week during their athletic season.

Another significant study on the impact of drugs and alcohol on college athletes was conducted by the NCAA. The study was the sixth study conducted in a series of studies starting in 1985. The study sampled all NCAA athletes from every sport and all three divisions. The study stated that “Over 85% of student-athletes who reported using alcohol in the last year say they did so an average of two or fewer times per week, which was an increase from 2001. While the number of student-athletes using drugs decreased in 2001, the number of student-athletes drinking more than five drinks in a sitting increased (NCAA, 2006, p. 10). Additionally the study presented reasons why student-athletes selected to consume drugs and or alcohol, it was stated that they make them feel good, relieves stress and recreational or social reasons (p. 11).

In a study completed by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), 70% of their participants responded that they had used marijuana prior to driving and of the 70%, 56% reported that marijuana use did not affect their capability to drive safely (2007).

The NCAA (2001) found that in regards to drugs and alcohol use “The vast majority of student-athletes who reported using marijuana during the previous 12 months used it only one or two times or “occasionally”, a decrease from the previous report (p.11). The number of respondents who reported smoking more than two marijuana cigarettes also decreased significantly from 2001” (NCAA, 2001, p. 13). A person can feel the effects of marijuana within minutes and reach their peak in 10-30 minutes (NHTSA, 2004, p.

10.). Studies have proven that marijuana users who inhale before driving show driving complications for up to 3 hours (NHTSA, 2004, p. 10). The effect of even a low dosage of marijuana still affects a person's ability to safely drive (NHTSA, 2004, p. 10). Studies found that students who attend HBCUs tend to have a lower usage of marijuana versus students who attend PWI (Kapner, 2003, p. 2, NCAA, 2001, p. 13). The NCAA (2001) further expressed this idea in a study that showed African-Americans have a lower usage rate of Ergogenic and social drugs versus Caucasians. Kapner (2003) stated that the low usage amongst students attending HBCU could be attributed to the focus of character development among these institutions as well as their significant enrollment of religious students.

While attending college, athletes are introduced to new ideas and theories about their social life. Sometimes this introduction includes drugs and alcohol. To assist student-athletes with the hazards surrounding drug and alcohol abuse, the NCAA encourages the use of educational drug and alcohol programs; their most popular program is the NCAA CHAMPS Life Skills Program. Most of the NCAA member institutions have implemented this program into their programs by providing students with monthly or annual Health based seminars. This program was developed to “support the student-athlete development initiatives of NCAA member institutions and to enhance the quality of the student-athlete experience within the context of higher education” (NCAA, n.d.). Additionally the NCAA provides its member institutions with “sample materials and supplemental resources which support a student-athlete's development in five areas: academics, athletics, personal development, career development and community service” (NCAA, n.d.).

Another resource used by the NCAA, is The National Center for Drug Free Sport, Inc. (DFS), this program manages the drug-testing program and the appeal process for NCAA athletes that have tested positive on a drug test (DFS, n.d.).

Cell Phones

In the age of technology, having a cell phone has become more of a necessity versus a need. “Worldwide use of cell phones is growing with more than 175 million U.S. subscribers at the beginning of 2005” (Rakauskas, 2005, p. 2). Some people have even replaced their landline phones with cell phones; this change is due to lower rates and more availability for people to not miss any calls. With cell phones being so popular, it is no wonder that people continuously talk and use, their cell phones while driving, even with understanding the hazards contributed to driving distractions.

According to Rakauskas (2005) stated more than 156 million people converse on cell phones while driving. Due to this hazard, many states have imposed cell phone restrictions on drivers

In a study, it was revealed that novice drivers are more at risk for a tragic accident if distracted by cell phones (Neyens, 2007, p. 256). Neyens (2007) further stated that female drivers were more easily distracted versus male drivers (p. 258).

Another study found that cell phone use while driving impaired driving performance. According to the NTSB (2006), a bus driver was operating a bus while holding a conversation on a cell phone. Due to the conversation, the driver was distracted from seeing a low clearance sign on an oncoming bridge and had an accident (NTSB, 2006). Another distraction that drivers are faced with is fatigue.

Driver's Fatigue

Driver's fatigue is just as hazardous as using drugs or alcohol, due to the slowing of reaction time and concentration (NCAA, 2006). Most drivers experience fatigue during nighttime driving. Drivers between the ages of 18 and 24 years old are more likely to fall asleep at the wheel (NCAA, 2006). Most fatal automobile accidents that take place on the highway happen during the night (FHWA, 2007). Male drivers are more likely to have driving fatigue versus female drivers (NCAA, 2006). Drivers are more likely to experience fatigue between the hours of 2 a.m. and 6 a.m. (NCAA, 2006). The NTSB recommends that people, who are experiencing fatigue while driving, pull over and get off the road (NTSB, 2005).

The NCAA (2006) stated that a study was conducted using a driving stimulator. The study revealed participants driving for long hours exhibited the skill level of being moderately intoxicated (NCAA, 2006). The FHWA stated that the reasons why people driving long period of times show skills level of being moderately intoxicated is due to their vision being obscured from oncoming automobile headlights glare, traffic and roadway signs, and weather conditions (FHWA, 2007). One study showed that 60% of the participants surveyed reported that they fall asleep while driving on the highway with a posted speed of 55 MPH or higher. Speeding also has hazardous effects on a driver's ability to safely perform the task of operating a vehicle (FHWA, 2004).

Speeding

Speed has been a factor effecting driver's safety since the beginning of the development of automobiles. In 2002, a study found that 32% of researched, fatal automobile accidents were due to speeding (NHTSA, 2005). Most of these accidents

take place on local or collector roads (FHWA, 2007). Despite the projected statistics and knowledge of this epidemic, speeding related fatality accidents continue to rise (NHTSA, 2005). Researchers attribute this fact to continuous speed limit changes.

The National Maximum Speed Law was developed in 1974 as a provision of the Emergency Highway Energy Conservation Act, which was a reflection of the oil crisis of 1973. During this time, all speed limits were capped at 55 miles per hour (MPH) (NHTSA, 2005). In 1980, the law was modified and the speed limit was changed to 65 MPH (NHTSA, 2005). The NHTSA (2005) further stated that in 1995, the ruling was overturned and the states gained the authority to reset their speed limits. Since the overturning of the ruling in 1995, speed-related fatality accidents have risen on roads with a posted speed of 65 MPH, but accidents have continued to be average on roads with a posted speed of 55 or less MPH.

Intercollegiate Athletic Transportation

Since the beginning of athletics, teams have been traveling to and from events to compete in tournaments. Athletic teams travel using many different modes of transportation. The most commonly used vehicles by athletic departments for team travel are: 12 and 15-passenger vans, buses, mini-buses, personal vehicles and airplanes (Valerie, 2004; Lavetter, 2004). These modes have not always been the commonly used by Athletic Departments. Legendary football coach Eddie Robinson stated that during the 40's the Grambling State University football team traveled by bus and train to and from athletic events (Robinson & Lapchick, 1999).

According to the PVAMU athletic department policies and procedures handbook, the head coach selects the mode of transportation for his/her team (NCAA, 2006; LaVetter,

2004). The selection is usually based on the team's size, budget, vehicle availability, and miles the team plans to travel (PVAMU, n.d; LaVetter, 2004).

Due to the risks surrounding the use of automobiles, some institutions require that larger traveling groups use other forms of transportation (NCAA, 2006). Oklahoma State University requires teams traveling with 20 or more athletes to use buses (NCAA, 2006). The University of Tulsa requires teams traveling with 25 or more athletes to use only approved bus companies to travel (NCAA, 2006). Additionally, The University of Richmond recommends that their teams use chartered buses for away trip of 75 miles or more from campus (NCAA, 2006).

Personal Vehicles

Personal vehicles are used to transport student-athletes not only to and from athletic events, but also to and from athletic practice. Personal vehicles are more prevalently used by student-athletes that have to travel off their main college campus to athletic facilities. As a Senior Athletic Academic Advisor at the University of New Mexico, it was very common for student-athletes to drive from main campus to south campus for practice or a tournament. South campus (which houses the majority of the athletic facilities) is located approximately two miles away from the main campus. Some institutions prohibit student-athletes to use personal vehicles for travel to and from campus, even if the athletic facilities are located off main campus.

Louisiana State University (LSU) also has sports facilities located away from their main campus and they require the use of university vehicles to transport student-athletes to and from practice. Additionally at LSU the equipment manager is in charged on monitoring who drives the student-athletes to and from practice facilities.

As a student-athlete at Mississippi Valley State University (MVSU), I drove not only myself, but also usually 3-4 of my teammates to and from practice and tournaments in Greenville, Mississippi. Greenville, Mississippi is approximately 45 miles away from Itta Bena, Mississippi where MVSU is located. It was very common for my teammates and I to drive our personal vehicles to and from athletic tournaments located in Mississippi. We usually drove our personal vehicles due to having to leave campus later or return sooner than the team was planning to return. This decision was commonly due academic obligations like having to take a test that we could not make-up. Although MVSU during the 1994-1999 era allowed student-athletes to travel using personal vehicles, not all institutions agreed with this policy. The NCAA (2006) reported that Texas A&M University discourages their student-athletes from driving personal vehicles to and from athletic events (p. 41). According to Pittman & Lehr (2003) “before the use of private vehicles is permitted, risk management policies should be established to be certain that both vehicles and drivers conform to acceptable safety hazards” (p.160).

During 1994-1999, MVSU student-athletes were mandated to complete paperwork, which included personal vehicle insurance information. Moreover, although administrators permitted the use of personal vehicles for practices and tournaments located in Mississippi, student-athletes were discouraged from using personal vehicles to travel to and from tournaments located outside of Mississippi.

When a student-athlete drives their personal vehicles for university activities the student’s insurance serves as the “primary policy for third party liability and physical damage to the vehicle” (NCAA, 2006, p. 41). Furthermore, it was stated, “if a claim arising out of an accident exceeds the students policy limits, the College’s policy will

cover the accident in excess of the policy” (Mount Holyoke’s Fleet Vehicle Handbook as cited in NCAA, 2006, p. 41).

Fifteen-Passenger Vans

The most dangerous vehicle used by athletic departments for team travel is the 15-passenger van (NHTSA, 2005; NCAA, 2006; Lavetter, 2004). Pittman & Lehr (2003) “Budget restrictions and squad size are major considerations when choosing to use vans or other modes of transportation” (p.167). Even though the vans seem to be prone to rollover accidents, no state currently requires a special license to operate these vans (NTSB, 2002). Fifteen-passenger vans usually carry one driver and fourteen passengers and are the largest passenger vehicles that do not require a driver to have a commercial driver’s license (NCAA, 2004).

Since 2001, the NTSB has analyzed accident statistics and issued numerous warnings about the dangers associated with 15-passenger vans. Fifteen-passenger vans have been the focus of many traffic safety reports due to the increase number of the vans that have been involved in tragic accidents (NHTSA, 2005, NCAA, 2006). Moreover, the NTSB has expressed the importance of van maintenance and inspection. It states regularly inspecting tire condition can assist in decreasing the occurrence of a rollover (NCAA, 2006). The NCAA (2006) further mentioned, “a major problem with these vans is that tires are often under-inflated, leading to higher tire temperatures, faster tire deterioration, and diminishing driving stability” (p.29).

The NCAA (2005) reported on a study conducted by the College Athletic Administrators of New Jersey, which surveyed NCAA Division III athletic directors. The survey found the following:

- When asked the question “Does your institution use 15-passenger vans to transport teams”? Eighty percent responded that they do use 15-passenger vans.
- When asked the question “Are student-athletes allowed to drive 15-passenger vans”? Thirty-eight percent responded that they do allow student-athletes to drive 15-passenger vans.
- When asked the question “Do any requirements exist before coaches are allowed to drive 15-passenger vans”? Thirty-three percent responded that they did not require anything other than a driver license.
- When asked the question “Are their distance/time limitations associated with 15-passenger van use”? Forty-seven percent responded that they did have distance/time limitations.
- When asked the question “Are their driving-time limitations associated with 15-passenger van use”? Nineteen percent responded that they had driving-time limitations.
- When asked the question “Are there passenger limits (fewer than 15)”? Nineteen percent stated that they limited passengers.

Furthermore, it was reported the following were “other regulations noted by four or more institutions”:

- Seven stated they require all passengers to wear seatbelts.
- Six stated they require their drivers to submit emergency phone numbers and/or they provide safety procedures to their drivers.
- Five stated that they require drivers to follow state speed limits.

- Five stated that they prohibit the use of drugs, alcohol, and smoking.
- Four stated that they require cell phones in the vans.
- Four stated that they require coaches to carry university issued AAA cards.

Fifteen-passenger vans are more prone to rollovers when they contain ten or more passengers (NHTSA, 2005; NHTSA 2006, Pittman & Lehr, 2003; NCAA, 2006; & Lavetter, 2004). Pittman & Lehr (2003) stated, “The risk of rollover is increased because the center of gravity of the vehicle is raised when more passengers are transported” (p.166).

Some safety recommendations for using and driving 15-passenger vans are:

- Limit number of passengers to 10.
- Seat passengers in front of the rear axial.
- Require seatbelt use.
- Restrict use of trailers and roof racks.
- Check tire pressure.
- Require special driver’s training (NCAA, 2006, p.43; NTSB 2005).

NCAA (2006) recommends that institutions replace their 15-passenger vans with either: 8-passenger vans, 10-passenger vans, mini-buses, private charter buses, or school buses (p.29). Due to the dangers associated with 15-passenger vans, some colleges no longer use them. The following institutions have stopped using 15-passenger vans or issued warnings to departments that use them:

- Indiana University began the process of phasing out 15-passenger vans and 12-

passenger vans in 2001.

- The University of Virginia began the process of phasing out 15-passenger vans in 2002.
- William & Mary University began the process of phasing out the use of 15-passenger vans in 2005.

Chartered and Rented Transportation

Some colleges and universities have selected to use contracted services to reduce transportation liability (Pittman & Lehr, 2003 & NCAA, 2006). There are two types of independent contractors: common carrier and private carrier. The common carrier “is one that is in the business of transporting goods or persons for hire” (Pittman & Lehr, 2003, p. 159). The private carrier is one who “only hires out to deliver goods or person in particular cases” (Pittman & Lehr, 2003, p. 159). Selecting to use an independent contractor can be a complex legal transaction and therefore colleges should be familiar with the logistics of what they expect in their contract. The following are recommendations to assist colleges in hiring independent contractors:

- Obtain a copy of the contractor’s insurance to insure they have sufficient liability insurance.
- Verify the contractor’s interstate commerce number.
- Confirm the age of the rented equipment.
- Ask for the contractor’s safety record and emergency procedures.
- How often they perform safety and maintenance checks on their vehicles.
- Ask for information on the contractor’s selection process for drivers. How often

they check the driver's off-the-job record (NCAA, 2006; Pittman & Lehr, 2003).

Many of the larger universities are using commercial airlines or chartered flights to transport student-athletes to and from athletic events. This mode of transportation is prevalent in institutions that participate in tournaments located at least eight hours away from their campus. The NCAA considers a team eligible for airplane travel, to a championship game, if they plan to travel more than 400 miles.

According to NCAA (2006), the Federal Aviation Association (FAA) makes the following recommendation to assist institutions in chartering an air service:

- Verify that the carrier is currently a certified FAA carrier.
- Obtain the certificate number.
- Obtain the name and telephone number of the FAA Flight Standards District Office and the person who is the FAA Principle Operations Inspector (NCAA, 2006, p.40).

Athletic Budgets

“Total expenses for Division IA programs have almost tripled over the past years, from 6.9 million in 1985 to \$20 million in 1999” due to gender equity issues and increase in college tuition (Howard & Crompton, 2005, p. 20; Gardiner, 2008). Furthermore, the NCAA expects an increase of “\$6 to \$7 million in Division I travel expenses next year” (Johnson, 2008; Gardiner, 2008).

HBCU are funded through private and public funding and tuition fees (Wenglinisky, 1999). In 2001, US governmental agencies provided over \$404 million to HBCU (Greene, 2007). Although federal funding support for HBCU increased by 60%, federal

support for PWI increased by 79% (President's Board of Advisors on Historically Black Colleges and Universities, 2005).

The College Cost Reduction and Access Act mandated \$170 million to HBCU for the next two years. The additional funding was provided to “expand college access, strengthen support services that focus on helping low-income and minority students stay in school and graduate, and renovate campuses in need of improvement” (Kittredge, 2008). Kittredge further stated that President Bush has “proposed cutting funding for HBCU by \$85 million in 2009, which will be a 35% decrease from the 2008 budget” (2008).

As stated in Chapter one, HBCU are facing decreasing financial assistance and increasing financial debt (Nealy, 2008). Nealy (2008) further stated that 10% of Fisk University's current budget includes debt. As a result, of increasing debt many HBCU are exploring the option of disbanding their athletic programs. Seymour (2006) stated that most athletic departments are barely breaking even (2006). Seymour (2006) further stated Southern University and A&M College have a \$7 million budget for its 18-sport athletic department. Moreover, the average Division I-A program has a budget of \$35.59 million and an average total cost is \$34.57 million.

Some athletic programs gain revenue through participation in bowl games. According to O'Toole (2006), the Gaylord Hotels Music City Bowl paid out \$1.6 million per team, the Alamo bowl paid out \$2.2 million per team, the Chick-fil-A Bowl paid out \$3.25 million per team and the Rose Bowl paid out \$17 million per team. On average athletic teams will gain \$1 million per bowl game participation (Seymour, 2006). In

contrast HBCU bowl game revenues are distinctly lower. In 2006 Grambling State University gained \$863,119 for its participation in the Bayou Classic.

Gardiner (2008) reported “In 2007-08, the NCAA generated 89% of its revenue (\$548.2 million) from television and marketing rights fees while 9% (\$54.9 million) was produced by championship tournaments. All but five cents on every dollar is returned to member institutions”. Even though the NCAA reported substantial earnings, they are also feeling the effects of economy in crisis due to this, the NCAA Travel Committee made the following adjustments to attempt to save money:

- Limiting student-athletes to two pieces of luggage. The NCAA projected a savings of \$1.5 million for this action.
- Changing the eligibility for a team to travel by airplane by increasing the distance a team must travel by ground transportation from 350 to 400 miles. The NCAA projected a savings of \$500,000 annually for this action.
- Requiring teams to use truck or air freight versus commercial air to ship team’s equipment. The NCAA projected a savings of \$10,000 a trip for this action (Gardiner, 2008).

Transportation is another factor effecting athletic budgets. Rising travel costs are forcing teams to pay double what they have paid in the past for travel. Staples and Mandel (2008) cited the Honolulu Advertiser reported that Hawaii University paid \$85,000 last year for the football team to charter flight to California and this year the school paid \$319, 00 for the same flight. Moreover, the article quoted Steve Pederson, The University of Pittsburgh’s athletic director as saying “on average, travel accounts for 50% of our sport’s teams’ budgets” (Staples & Mandel, 2008). Increasing fuel price have

also impacted athletic departments. In September, The University of Maryland spent \$100,000 to charter a flight for members of its football team to play in game against Clemson University, this was an increase of 17% from 2006 (Sharrow, 2008).

Additionally, the University of Maryland, Baltimore County expects to pay \$1,020 for its Women's Basketball team to travel by bus to play against George Washington University, this is a 43% increase from last year (Sharrow, 2008). Furthermore, Sharrow (2008) stated the NCAA spent \$40 million, which was a 25% increase from last year to reimburse member institutions for NCAA championship tournaments.

The hardships associated with travel are also effecting the smaller institutions. Goucher College, a Division III institution has an athletic budget of \$200,000 travel costs are expected to grow by \$40,000 this year (Sharrow, 2008). Another important financial aspect that affects HBCU are institutional liability and insurance.

Transportation Liability

The safety of students is a major concern for colleges and universities and therefore providing safe transportation for student-athletes to and from athletic events is imperative. According to Pittman & Lehr (2003) "The potential for liability extends not only to transporting to and from events, but also to the vehicles in completing special tasks associated with the event and supervisory concerns before, during, and after transport" (p.157). College athletic departments have "a duty of care to those who might be harmed by hazards that could have been foreseen" (Aaron, 2004, p.21: NCAA, 2008, p.3). Furthermore, Aaron (2004) stated, "in the event of an allegation of negligence brought by a student-athlete against an institution, two people who are likely to be named in the law suit are the coach and the athletic director" (p.21). Due to the increase of

sport-related injuries in athletics the importance of having liability, insurance is imperative for an institution (Aaron, 2004).

Met Life (2006) reported that someone who is held liable for an accident “can be sued for the full cost of the damages, including property damage; hospital and medical payments; rehabilitative care; lost income; and even the pain and suffering of injured person” (p.1). Furthermore, it was stated that liability insurance assists in protecting the liable party from financial costs (Met Life, 2006, p.1).

The URMIA (2007) reported when compared to athletic injuries, event management, emergency response and youth camps, the risks that worry athletic business officers more are student transportation (p.3). Aaron (2004) cited a study developed by Gary & Crowell (1993) which examined “the consistency with which NCAA Division I athletic directors performed specific risk management behaviors within their athletic departments” (p.23). The study found athletic director’s had a tendency to react to risk issues based on their participation in athletics, coaching experience and academic major. Furthermore, the study found that athletic directors had a tendency to score lowest on the risk management behavior of documentation especially relating to facilities (p.23).

Pittman & Lehr (2003) stated, “When an organization provides transportation, it owes care with respect to such transportation” (p.157). Universities typically transport students using independent contractors, school-owned vehicles, employee vehicles, and non-employee vehicles (Pittman & Lehr, 2003, p.158). According to Pittman & Lehr, (2003) “the risk of liability is greatest when non-employee vehicles are used because the organization has the least control and liability is the lowest when independent contractors are used because “risk is transferred” (p.158). Another way institutions cope with

liability issues is through using waivers.

Many institutions require students to sign a liability waiver if they are planning to participate in university-related activities on and off campus (NCAA, 2006). A well organized waiver includes the risk that may be encountered while participating, that the activity is voluntary and the student's forgiveness to the institution for any negligence (NCAA, 2006 & Cotton, 2004). The institution may use the waiver in a legal setting to prove that the student was aware of potential risks surrounding the activity he/she participated in (NCAA, 2006).

Another way to decrease liability is through analyzing maintenance records. A comprehensive maintenance program includes the repair of any damaged vehicle, a timeline for vehicle replacements, and organized documentation (NCAA, 2006, p.38; Pittman & Lehr, 2003, p.159; Markel Insurance Company, 2002, p.4). Maintenance problems can meet minimum legal operating standards and still support a claim of negligence against the institution (NCAA, 2006, p.5). Another way to decrease liability is through having organized documentation.

Good documentation can help an institution limit their punitive damages in a legal proceeding (NCAA, 2006, p. 39; Pittman & Lehr, 2003, p.159). Many institutions require documentation from drivers, stating vehicle problems or damages before or after the return of a vehicle (NCAA, 2006). Some institutions define a driver's license as the only requirement for operating a university vehicle (NCAA, 2006, p.10). In the *Safety in Student Transportation: A Resource Guide for Colleges and Universities*, a recommended model for allowing staff to operate university vehicles include: checking if the driver has had six or more traffic violations, check for automobile accidents within the past 24

months, and check for DUI charges (NCAA, 2006).

Vehicle liability is one of the most severe risks that an institution can face (Carmichael, 2000, p.3). Due to the potential of catastrophic automobile accidents, institutions should look at carrying the highest insurance limits that they can afford (Carmichael, 2000, p.5). The URMIA report recommended that institutions should carry at least \$5 million in insurance coverage, but most institutions carry between \$5-25 million in insurance coverage (Carmichael, 2000).

Insurance Coverage

Three major factors that institutions should evaluate prior to selecting an insurance coverage are: the number and modes of transportation, the institution's desire to pay directly for damage, and rising health care and legal costs (NCAA, 2006). Carmichael (2000) recommended that institutions have their insurance policies analyzed by a certified broker in order to fully understand how it affects their students, transportation, and employees who drive university vehicles. Most auto insurance that is carried by US colleges and universities do not include coverage of foreign travel because of this foreign auto policies like Mexican auto insurance can be found near US borders (Carmichael, 2000, p.18). Furthermore, it was recommended that institution's carry at least \$10 million for aviation insurance "covering all owned, hired, and non-owned aircraft, with no per-seat passenger limitation" (Carmichael, 2000, p. 20; NCAA, 2006, p. 44).

Auburn University (2008) requires motor coach carriers to maintain commercial automobile liability insurance and provide Auburn with a certificate of insurance (p. 6). Furthermore, Auburn University requires the following:

- Auburn University be named as insured on automobile liability;

- The carrier have a minimum of \$5 million combined single limit automobile liability insurance;
- Insurance coverage must be approved by a certified insurer of the state of Alabama;
- The insurance company must have a rating of A or better (p. 6).

In regards to air travel, Auburn University requires the following:

- Aircraft owner “shall at their own expense, procure and maintain aviation liability insurance and furnish to the Auburn University athletic team travel committee a certificate of insurance prior to conducting requested flights” (p. 9).
- Auburn must be named as an additional insured on the liability policy.
- Coverage should include a minimum \$1 million per seat limit of liability.
- Insurance coverage must be issued by a State of Alabama certified insurer.

NAIA and NJCAA Study

LaVetter (2004) developed a study entitled Investigation of Transportation Policies and Practices in NAIA and NJCAA Athletic Departments in the United States. The purpose of the study was to “identify transportation policies and practices in National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) and National Junior College Athletics Association (NJCAA) (LaVetter, 2004, p. 69). The study surveyed 765 athletic directors on their department’s transportation modes, driver qualifications, and usage of 15-passenger vans (p. 63). The study found that institutions are still using 15-passenger vans and athletic directors were “ignoring the repeated warnings issued by national safety organizations regarding the propensity for rollover accident” (p. 131). Furthermore, “the

study did not find a significant relationship between department budget and various transportation issues” (p. 131). LaVetter (2004) stated that the following should be further researched:

- High school athletic department transportation policies.
- NCAA Division II and III institutions’ transportation policies.
- Whether or not intercollegiate athletic departments are following the NHTSA 15-passenger van safety regulations.
- Follow-up with NAIA and NJCAA institutions that indicated they have made changes to their transportation since 2001.
- Transportation policies of summer sports camps on college and university campuses.

Conclusion

The present chapter provided examples of the hazards concerning student transportation. This information assisted in establishing a premise in evaluating HBCU transportation policies and procedures.

Student welfare is a major concern for athletic administrators and understanding safe transportation practices is an essential aspect of lessening this issue. Currently there is no standard transportation policy manual for colleges and universities, but the NCAA has developed the Safety in Student Transportation: A Resource Guide for Colleges and Universities. The NTSB recommended that the NCAA develop a transportation policy manual for its member institutions. The recommendation came after an airplane accident in which 10 members of the OSU basketball team were killed. The NCAA enlisted the assistance of the UEI and NAIA to help develop a comprehensive manual to further

educate college administrators on the dangers associated with student transportation.

Many hazards concerning student transportation were discussed in this chapter, specifically, state and athletic accidents, student drivers, driving impairments, modes of transportation, budgets, and college liability issues and insurance coverage. Each of these components is necessary for an athletic administrator to comprehend in order to maintain safety in transporting student-athletes.

Athletes are commonly transported using 12 and 15-passenger vans, mini-buses, aircraft, and a personal vehicle, of this research has shown that 15-passenger vans are the most dangerous (NHTSA, 2005; NCAA, 2006; LaVetter, 2004; & Markel Insurance Company, 2002).

The DOT has provided numerous statistics surrounding the dangers of potential 15-passenger van rollovers. These vehicles are prone to rollovers when more than 10 passengers are in the van, tire pressure is low and drivers attempt to abruptly use maneuvers that cause the van to swerve (NHTSA, 2005; NCAA, 2006, p. 43; LaVetter, 2004, p.39; Markel Insurance Company, 2002, p. 1). Statistics has further showed that student drivers are especially reckless when driving these vehicles (NHTSA, 2007, p. 2; NHTSA, 2006, p. 2; Deery 1999, p. 225; NCAA 2006, p. 6 & Neyens 2007).

The PVAMU accident, which killed eleven members of the track team, is an example of the reckless and novice behavior that students demonstrate when driving to and from athletic events. The NTSB has presented imperative data on the risky behaviors that novice drivers exhibit while driving. Some of these behaviors are talking and/or texting on cell phones, being under the influence of drugs and/or alcohol, speeding, and demonstrating driver's fatigue. Additionally, students between the ages of 15-20 had the

highest rate of fatal crash involvement in 2006 with “59.5 fatal crashes per 100,000 licensed drivers” (NHTSA, 2008, p. 2). Even with statistics providing an overwhelming example for the hazards surrounding student drivers, some institutions continue to allow them the opportunity to operate university vehicles. A study developed by the College Athletic Administrators of New Jersey found that 80% of the surveyed athletic directors stated that they still use 15-passenger vans and 38% of athletic directors stated that they do not prohibit students from operating university vehicles (The NCAA News, 2002).

Although student drivers exhibit harmful behaviors while driving vehicles, athletic directors cannot just be consumed with these issues. They also face other issues that are just as harmful and require just as much of their attention. Many institutions are being effected by debt, a bad economy and decreasing funding opportunities. According to Kittredge, (2008) President Bush has “proposed cutting funding for HBCU by \$85 million in 2009, which will be a 35% decrease from the 2008 budget”. Furthermore, the average Division I-A program has a budget of \$35.59 million and an average total cost is \$34.57 million (Zimbalist, 2007). The NCAA is also being affected; they spent \$40 million, which was a 25% increase from last year to reimburse member institutions for NCAA championship tournaments (Sharrow, 2008).

The chapter also covered liability and insurance coverage. Pittman & Lehr (2003) stated “The potential for liability extends not only to transporting to and from events, but also to the vehicles in completing special tasks associated with the event and supervisory concerns before, during, and after transport” (p. 157). These issues were further examined in a study developed by Gary & Crowell (1993). The study found that athletic directors had a tendency to react to risk issues based on their participation in athletics,

coaching experience and academic major. Additionally, the study found that athletic directors had a tendency to score lowest on the risk management behavior of documentation especially relating to facilities (Aaron, 2004, p. 23). With sport injuries increasing, it is imperative for institutions to cover a substantial amount of insurance.

Carmichael (2000) recommended that institutions have their insurance policies analyzed by a certified broker in order to fully understand how it affects their students, transportation, and employees who drive university vehicles (p. 17). Moreover, Carmichael (2000) stated that US auto insurance might not be acceptable coverage for foreign travel (p.18). Finally, Carmichael (2000) recommended that institution's carry at least \$10 million for aviation insurance "covering all owned, hired, and non-owned aircraft, with no per-seat passenger limitation" (Carmichael, 2000, p. 20; NCAA, 2006, p. 44).

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The motivation for this study came from the following two conditions highlighted in chapter two: 1) The critical need for standards in transporting student-athletes to and from athletic events and 2) The current lack of empirical and systematic research regarding Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) intercollegiate athletic transportation policies and procedures. HBCUs were chosen for this study primarily due to the researcher's past transportation experiences as a former HBCU student-athlete, the 2001 Prairie View A&M University accident, and the lack of research on HBCU athletic programs. The purpose of this study was to examine HBCU intercollegiate athletic transportation practices and policies. In order to accomplish this purpose the following research questions were developed:

1. What are the current transportation policies, procedures and practices relative to:
 - a. Modes of transportation
 - b. Policy development and communication
 - c. Driver qualifications
 - d. Vehicle maintenance
 - e. The use of 12 & 15 passenger vans
2. What are the factors that contribute to mode of transportation?

The survey instrument used in this study to analyze these research questions was developed by LaVetter (2004).

In order to examine transportation practices, each athletic director was sent a personalized email requesting his/her participation in this study. The email explained that the study was voluntary, participants had the option to end involvement at any time, and by completing the survey the participant was giving consent to participate in the study. Nardi, (2006) stated “ways of contacting potential respondents should reflect legal and privacy guidelines that restricts sending unsolicited emails to participate in a survey” (p. 37). Nardi (2006) further stated the researcher should follow the following protocol when contacting potential participants via email:

- Participants should have reasonable expectation that they will be contacted for a survey.
- Participants should have the option to decline participation in the study.
- Participants should not be minors.
- Participants should have the option to have their email address removed from the researcher’s mailing database (p. 36-37).

Participants

All HBCU athletic directors were surveyed for this study (N=99). The researcher select to survey HBCU athletic directors because of the high response rate of these participants in past studies regarding transportation safety.

The names and email addresses for the athletic directors were obtained from the official university website directories and campus administrators.

Instrument

The instrument used in this study was a 28-question survey developed by LaVetter (2004). LaVetter (2004) stated, “The survey was developed to allow respondents to

answer questions pertaining to their organization's transportation policies, procedures and practices" (p.63). The survey contained five sections: 1) Demographics, 2) Modes of Transportation, 3) Policy Development, 4) Driver Qualifications, and 5) 12-15 passenger vans (LaVetter, 2004, p. 64).

Approval to use, solicit, and modify this survey was given by David Lavetter on September 15, 2008

Modifications that were made to the survey were:

- Question one asked "Please mark your athletic affiliation". The changes that were made included adding the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the United States Collegiate Athletic Association.
- Question six asked "What is the total athletic department budget"? The changes that were made included adding a budget range of \$0-\$19 million or more.
- Questions seven asked "Please indicate the mode of transportation most frequently used by each sport offered". The changes that were made included adding bowling and equestrian teams and excluding field hockey.
- Question Seventeen asked "

Pilot Study

The original survey was piloted, via email, to 102 California community college athletic directors. LaVetter (2004) stated these institutions were selected because they were two-year institutions, had similar athletic budgets and similar number of students enrolled to his surveyed sample of 490 NJCAA.

Additionally LaVetter (2004) reported the pilot study allowed the researcher the opportunity to: add and delete categories, find out which responses emerged commonly

and add them as a option, and make changes to the survey based on responses given in the open-ended question section of the survey (LaVetter, 2004, p. 64).

Once approval was received from the University of New Mexico, Human Subjects Committee the pilot study was sent to study participants. This pilot study was comprised of ten HBCU institutions. The pilot was conducted due to the modifications made to the original survey. The institutions were randomly selected to and were sent an electronic survey requesting information about their transportation practices. There was a 100% response rate of the pilot study. The pilot study allowed the researcher the opportunity to further modify the survey to better fit the study's population. Furthermore, it provided the researcher the opportunity to maximize the participant's understanding of survey questions and participant's response rate. From piloting the survey the researcher concluded that questions providing the participants the option of selecting other needed to be modified to allow participants the opportunity to select more than one answer. The researcher found that one these questions participants would select other just to elaborate of their policies by providing more than one answer.

Lastly, data received from the pilot study showed that participants understood the questions in the way the researcher intended and therefore no other additional changes were made to the survey.

Confidentiality

According to Nardi, (2006) confidentiality should be emphasized when "information identifying the respondent can be linked to their specific answers and is revealed only to the researcher for the main goals of the project" (p. 35). A letter of confidentiality preceded the survey. The letter explained that no information obtained from the survey

that ties the participant's answers to them or their university would be published. The letter further stated their responses would be used for research basis only, would not be used in any sort of compromising manner and their right to privacy would greatly be respected. Furthermore, participants were told that their involvement in this study was voluntary and that they could select to terminate their participation at any time, without penalty.

By using a letter of confidentiality, the researcher insured that any form of intentional harm that the participants could have incurred was eliminated (Nardi, 2006, p. 35). Additionally, to ensure confidentiality, all correspondences sent to the participants were personalized to the individual only. This provided each participant the safety of knowing, that only the researcher had access to his or her responses and emails.

Procedures

A personalized email containing a link to the study was sent to the athletic directors. The survey was posted on the Questionpro website. Questionpro is an online survey development company that helps researchers to develop and upload their surveys in order to reach their population. Questionpro also provides its users access to their participant's responses as soon as they are posted online, the ability to save results in a PDF file, and opportunity to download results in multiple formats.

An Internet based survey was selected for this study because it provides "versatility, efficiency, and generalizability" (McMillan, 2004, p. 195). In addition, the response rate is typically increased when using Internet-based surveys (Nardi, 2006 & McMillan, 2004). Some more advantages of using Internet-based surveys are:

1. The ability to study a large sample in a short period.

2. They are less expensive than using interviews or telephone surveys.
3. Due to being more pertinent for probability sampling, data generated can be generalized to a larger population.
4. Response rates tend to be higher versus mailed surveys, which have a response rate of typically 20 to 30%.
5. Researcher's bias is less likely due to participants reading questions on their own (Nardi, 2006 & McMillan, 2004).

Some disadvantages with using internet-based surveys are: The participants privacy may be invaded due to completing and submitting a survey containing personal information on the World Wide Web, the participant may not have access to the Internet and the participant may not be technically savvy (McMillan, 2004, p. 199; Nardi, 2006, p. 69). In an effort to deal with these disadvantages, the researcher provided each athletic director with a letter of confidentiality, assumed since each athletic director had a valid email address that they were technically savvy, and had access to the Internet.

The following procedures were taken in distributing the survey:

1. Each athletic director's email address was obtained from his or her official university websites. If an email address was not provided on the website, athletic administrators were contacted and the email address was requested.
2. Each athletic director was sent a personalized email briefly explaining the following:
 - a. Introduction of the study and myself.
 - b. Introduction of Dr. Todd Seidler as the faculty member contact for the study.

- c. Asked if there was an administrator other than himself or herself that was more qualified to complete the survey.
 - d. Directions for completing the survey online.
 - e. Statement of Confidentiality.
 - f. Consent to participate.
3. After one week participants that had not completed the study were contacted by the researcher by telephone.
 4. Each athletic director was sent a thank you letter for participating in the study.
 5. The survey data were collected from Questionpro and Statistical Package for the Social Services (SPSS).

Data Analysis

Quantitative data analysis procedures were used in this non-experimental, descriptive study to examine the HBCU intercollegiate athletic transportation policies and procedures. Quantitative methods “emphasizes numbers, measurements, deductive logic, control, and experiments” (McMillan, 2004, p. 9). In non-experimental methods the researcher has no direct influence of the participants or what is to be studied (McMillan, 2004, p. 9). Non-experimental quantitative studies can be classified as descriptive. In order to summarize the data, descriptive statistics were used to determine the characteristics of the population. Descriptive statistics were also used to summarize the data. Descriptive statistics allows the researcher the opportunity to describe what the data shows (Spatz, 2001, p. 2).

Due to the use of open-ended questions and sporadic responses in the instrument, frequency tables and percentages were used to describe the different transportation practices and demographic data of the survey. Frequency tables “indicate how often each score is

obtained” (McMillan, 2004, p. 128). McMillan (2004) further stated frequency tables also organize ungrouped data in order to make them easier to understand (p. 128).

Frequency tables will also analyze the difference between data showing either the actual number of observations falling in each range or the percentage of observations (Spatz, 2001, p. 26). Moreover, they provide a convenient summary and allow others to easily understand the data.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine HBCU intercollegiate athletic transportation practices and policies. Through this research, information gathered will provide information on current HBCU transportation practices and policies, as well as data regarding transportation safety issues surrounding frequently used university vehicles.

Response Rate

Sixty-seven completed surveys were received for a response rate of 67.6 percent. Participants received two invitations requesting participation in this study. The first correspondence with the participants was through email and yielded 35 responses. The second correspondence was through telephone. During this phase of correspondence, all but 15 athletic departments were reached and of this number, eight email addresses returned undeliverable.

Demographic Data

Question one the asked participants their athletic affiliation. Participants were given the option of selecting the following athletic associations: NAIA, NCAA, NJCAA, USCAA or they could select other and provide their own response. No participant selected other, but 14 (20.8%) selected NAIA, 35 (52.2%) selected NCAA, 13 (19.4%) selected NJCAA and five (7.4%) selected USCAA.

Question two asked participants the title of the person completing the survey. Participants were given the option of selecting the following titles: athletic director, assistant athletic director, coach, office/ manager assistant, athletic business specialist,

dean/PE & athletics, vice president, risk manager or they could select other and provide their own response. Two (2.9%) participants selected other and reported their title as associate provost for student affairs. Additionally, 48 (71.6%) reported their title as athletic director, one (1.4%) reported their title as assistant athletic director, five (7.4%) reported their title as athletic business specialist, four (5.9%) reported their title as vice president, three (4.4%) reported their title as dean/ PE/ athletics, and four (5.9%) reported their title as office manager/ administrative assistant.

Question three was an open-ended question that asked participants the number of student-athletes at their school. Some responses were sporadic and repetitive therefore the following is a synopsis of what was reported. The average number of HBCU student-athletes was 160. Thirty-five (52.2%) participants stated that they had at least 150 student-athletes. The highest number of reported student-athletes was 400 and the lowest was 31.

Question four was also an open-ended question that asked who was overall responsible for the athletic transportation policies. Some responses were sporadic and repetitive therefore the following is a synopsis of what was reported. The majority of the participants at 52 (77.6%) reported the athletic director as being the person responsible for athletic transportation policies. The people least selected were head coaches and security, both being selected at one (1.4%). Additionally, president and associate provost for student affairs were both selected at four (5.9%) and two (2.9%) reported vice president. Moreover, three participants reported this as dual responsibility for administrators in their department. Their responses were as follows: athletic director and vice president at one (1.4%), athletic director and chair of the physical education

department at one (1.4%), and lastly, athletic director and associate provost for student affairs at one (1.4%).

Finally, question five asked participants their total athletic budget. Participants were given a range of \$0-\$19 million or more. Forty (59.7%) participants reported that their athletic budget was less than or equal to \$4.99 million and 27 (40.3%) reported their budget was greater than \$4.99 million. The highest reported athletic budget was reported in the range of \$17 million – \$19 million and the lowest was reported in the range of \$100, 00- \$249,999.

Results

As mentioned in chapter three, the researcher proposed to answer the following research questions through using frequency tables and percentages. The first research question that guided this study was “What are the current transportation policies, procedures, and practices relative to mode of transportation”? Questions six, eight, twenty-six, and twenty-seven of the survey were used to answer this question.

Question six asked participants to indicate the mode of transportation most frequently used by each sport offered. The study results showed 15-passenger vans were used by the following teams: baseball, golf, men’s & women’s soccer and volleyball teams. Buses were used by the following teams: football, track & field, men’s & women’s basketball teams frequently used buses. Twelve passenger vans were used by the bowling, swimming & diving, and wrestling teams. The tennis and lacrosse teams frequently used mini-buses and lastly, the equestrian team frequently used personal vehicles. Table six is a visual representation of these findings.

Table 6 - Sports Mode of Transportation Use

Sport	N/A N (%)	Aircraft N (%)	P.V. N (%)	Bus N (%)	Mini-bus N (%)	12-p.van N (%)	15-p.van N (%)
Baseball	11(16.9)	0(0)	0(0)	5(7.6)	12(18.4)	12(18.4)	25(38.4)
(M) Basketball	1(1.5)	0(0)	0(0)	24(36.9)	17(26.1)	12(18.4)	11(16.9)
(W) Basketball	6(9.2)	0(0)	0(0)	23(35.3)	11(16.9)	13(20)	12(18.4)
Bowling	30(46.1)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	9(13.8)	11(16.9)	15(23)
Equestrian	64(98.4)	0(0)	1(1.5)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Football	19(29.2)	17(26.1)	0(0)	19(29.2)	4(6.1)	2(2.9)	4(6.1)
Golf	24(36.9)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	13(20)	12(18.4)	16(24.6)
Lacrosse	56(86.1)	1(1.5)	0(0)	0(0)	2(2.9)	4(6.1)	2(2.9)
(M) Soccer	26(40)	1(1.5)	0(0)	1(1.5)	3(4.6)	9(13.8)	25(38.4)
(W) Soccer	24(36.9)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	5(7.6)	12(18.4)	24(36.9)
Softball	14(21.5)	0(0)	0(0)	1(1.5)	12(18.4)	14(21.5)	24(36.9)
Swimming & Diving	60(92.3)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(1.5)	4(6.1)	0(0)
Tennis	20(30.7)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	15(23)	12(18.4)	18(27.6)
Track & Field/CC	10(15.3)	2(3)	0(0)	27(41.5)	9(13.8)	7(10.7)	10(15.3)
Volleyball	11(16.9)	0(0)	0(0)	1(1.5)	16(24.6)	12(18.4)	25(38.4)
Wrestling	62(95.3)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(1.5)	2(2.9)	0(0)

Note: N= Number of responses. N/A= Sport not offered. P.V. = Personal vehicles.

Question eight asked participants if they owned a mini-bus. Fifty (74.6%) reported yes and 15 (22.3%) reported no. Furthermore, it was reported that one (1.49%) did not own a mini-bus, but plan to purchase one next year and one (1.49%) did not own a mini-bus, but plan to purchase one in 2-3 years.

Question twenty-six asked participants about using personal vehicles. Thirty-two (47.7%) reported having no policy. Two participants selected “other” stating personal vehicles were allowed for on campus errands, but not allowed for off-campus errands.

Table seven is a visual representation of these findings.

Table 7 - Personal Vehicle Usage

Response	Count	Percentage
No policy exists	32	47.7
Only used for scouting purposes	11	16.4
Only used during recruiting	9	13.4
Only used when school vehicle not available	2	2.9
Can not use personal vehicles	11	16.4
Other	2	2.9

Lastly, question twenty-seven asked participants about their policy concerning aircraft use. Eighteen (26.8%) reported that they do not use aircraft, 31 (46.3%) reported having no aircraft policy and 11 (16.5%) reported using aircraft over certain distances.

Moreover, some participants responded twice. Three (4.4%) reported having no policy, but using aircrafts only over certain distances and two (2.9%) reported not using aircrafts

and having no policy. Additionally of that number, two participants selected “other” and reported they were currently working on a policy and they followed FAA policies and regulations. Table eight is a visual representation of these findings.

Table 8 - Aircraft Usage

Response	Count	Percentage
No policy exists	31	46.3
Only used over certain distances	11	16.5
No policy exists/ Only used over certain distances	3	4.4
Aircraft not used	18	26.8
Aircraft not used/ No policy exists	2	2.9
Only used during inclement weather		
Other		
Working on developing a policy	1	1.4
Follow FAA regulations	1	1.4

Note: Some participants selected more than one answer.

Research question 1 b): What are the current transportation policies, procedures and practices relative to policy development and communication? Questions 9, 10, and 28 were used to answer this question.

Question nine asked participants who developed the transportation policies for the athletic department. Forty-five (67.1%) reported that the athletic director develops the

transportation policy for the athletic department. Of that number Twenty-four (29.8%) solely develops the policy and twenty-one (31.3%) share this responsibility with another administrator. Lastly, two (2.9%) participants selected the “other” option and reported the associate provost of student affairs developed their transportation policy. Table nine is a visual representation of these findings.

Table 9 - Athletic Transportation Policies Development

Response	Count	Percentage
Athletic Director	24	29.8
President	2	2.9
Vice President	4	5.9
Coaches	4	5.9
Risk Management Office	7	10.4
Committee	4	5.9
Athletic Director/ President	3	4.4
Athletic Director/ President/ Committee	8	11.9
Athletic Director/ Coaches	5	7.4
Athletic Director/ Vice President	5	7.4
Other		
Associate Provost for Student Affairs	1	1.4

Note: Some participants responded more than once.

Question ten asked participants how transportation policies are commonly communicated with the departmental staff. The majority 55 (82%) of the participants reported that they communicated transportation policies through general staff meetings. The least selected answer was special transportation education seminars at eight (11.9%). Lastly, three (4.4%) participants selected the “other” option and reported that they communicated transportation policies through university meetings. Table ten is a visual representation of these findings.

Table 10 - Staff Communication Practices of Transportation Policies

Response	Count	Percentage
General staff meetings	11	16.4
Department handbook	7	10.4
Email	12	17.9
Individual memo	7	10.4
Policies displayed on bulletin board	9	13.4
Special transportation education seminar	6	8.9
General staff meetings/ Department handbook	3	4.4
General staff meetings/ Policies displayed on bulletin board	5	7.4
General staff meetings/ Email	4	5.9
Other		

NOTE: Some responded answered more than one.

Question twenty-eight was an open-ended question that asked participants since 2001 what policies or purchases at your institution have been made to improve student transportation safety? Some responses were sporadic and repetitive therefore the following is a synopsis of what was reported.

- Before leasing a vehicle, authorization must be obtained from the student affairs office.
- University purchased one 55 passenger bus, two twenty-eight passenger mini-buses and 3 12-passenger vans.
- University purchased three mini-buses.
- We now lease all of our athletic vehicles.
- Two drivers are required for any trip that requires a team to spend the night.
- Drivers are barred from driving before 6:00 a.m. or after 9:00 p.m. unless, authorization has been granted by the athletic director.
- Four participants stated that they no longer use 15- passenger vans.
- Five participants reported their institution revised their transportation policy to include department specific information.
- Charter buses are used for teams traveling a distance over 300 miles.
- Two participants stated students barred from driving personal vehicles to and from athletic events.
- Drivers were barred from driving before 5:30 a.m. and after 9:00 p.m.
- Three participants reported students are barred from driving university vehicles and transporting student-athletes to and from events.

Research question 1 c): What are the current transportation policies, procedures and

practices relative to driver qualifications? Questions 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15 were used to analyze this question.

Question eleven asked participants how does one become a qualified driver to transport students. The most reported answer was valid driver's license at (82.2%). It was also reported that 13 (20.3%) required no training for drivers. Lastly, three (4.6%) participants selected the "other" option, two reported the leasing companies provided drivers and one stated potential drivers must pass a driving test. Table 11 is a visual representation of these findings.

Table 11 - Driver Qualifications

Response	Count	Percentage
No training required	13	19.4
Valid driver's license	17	25.3
Driving test	1	1.4
Valid chauffeur's license	1	1.4
Written test	8	11.9
Video	5	7.4
Valid driver's license/ Driving test	3	4.4
Valid driver's license/ Driving test/ Video	11	16.4
Valid chauffeur's license/ Video	3	4.4
Driving test/ Video	3	4.4
Other		
Rely on leasing companies	2	2.9

Note: Some participants responded more than once.

Question twelve asked participants to indicate their policy on obtaining driving records. Sixty-three (94%) of the participants answered this question. Twenty-four (38%) reported they required no driving records. Seventeen (27%) reported that they required driving records for the last year. Lastly, two (3.1%) participants selected the “other” and stated that they currently had no policy on obtaining driving records. Table 12 is a visual representation of these findings.

Table 12 - Policy on Obtaining Driving Records

Response	Count	Percentage
No driving records required	24	38
Records for last year	17	27
Records for the last two years	14	22.2
Records for the last three years	6	9.5
Other	2	3.1

Note: Not all participants answered this question. (N=63)

Question thirteen asked participants if driving records were obtained, how many alcohol-related citations were allowed to be able to drive vehicles for team travel. Fifty-one (76.1%) of the participants answered this question. Forty (78.4%) stated they required drivers to have no alcohol related citations. Nine (17.6%) reported they allowed one citation. Lastly, two (4%) selected the “other” option and reported that they do not mandate drivers to submit this information, but it is suggested. No participant reported

information on two or three citations. Table 13 is a visual representation of these findings.

Table 13 - Alcohol Related Citations

Response	Count	Percentage
No citations	40	78.4
One citation	9	17.6
Two citations	0	0
Three citations	0	0
Other	2	4

Note: Not all participants answered this question. (N=51)

Question fourteen asked participants if licensed students drove school-owned vehicles during team travel. Forty (61.5%) reported yes, 23 (35.3%) reported no and 2 (3%) reported that they did not know. Two participants selected not to answer this question (N=65).

Finally, question fifteen asked participants the minimum age requirement for students to drive. Six (13.3%) reported students were required to be at least 18 years old. Nine (20%) reported they required students to be at least 19, eight (17.7%) reported students were required to be at least 20 year old, 16 (35.5%) required students to be at least 21 years old. Lastly, six (13.3%) selected the “other” and two (4.4%) stated they required students to be at least 22 years old and two (4.4%) reported that they have no age restrictions, but prefer students to be at least 21 years old and two (4.4%) reported that they had no age restrictions. Twenty-two participants selected not to answer this question (N=45).

Research question 1 d): What are the current transportation policies, procedures, and practices relative to vehicle maintenance? Question 24 was used to analyze this question.

Question twenty-four asked participants about who performed regular vehicle inspections and maintenance on their vehicles. The most selected response was college vehicle fleet personnel at 44 (65.6%). Additionally, 23(34.3%) reported rental agency, 16(23.8%) reported the drivers. Lastly, two (2.9%) selected “other” and stated contracted maintenance workers regularly perform vehicle inspections and maintenance on their vehicles. Table 14 is a visual representation of these findings.

Table 14 - Vehicle Maintenance and Inspections

Response	Count	Percentage
College Fleet	30	44.7
Rental agency	17	25.3
Drivers	4	5.9
College fleet/ rental agency	2	2.9
College fleet/ rental agency/ drivers	4	5.9
College fleet/ drivers	8	11.9
Other		
Contracted maintenance workers	2	2.9

Note: Some participants responded more than once.

Research question 1 e): What are the current transportation policies, procedures and practices relative to the use of 12 & 15- passenger vans? Questions 16-23 and 25 were used to analyze this question.

Question sixteen asked participants how vans are acquired for athletic travel. The highest reported responses was college fleet at 58 (86.5%) and the lowest response at 1(1.4%) was “other” which reported they are currently in transition of purchasing vehicles, but currently use personal vehicles. Table fifteen is a visual representation of these findings.

Table 15 - How Vans Are Acquired

Response	Count	Percentage
College fleet	10	14.9
Lease	1	1.4
Donated	0	0
Personal vehicle	7	10.4
College fleet/ lease	9	13.4
College fleet/ lease/ personal vehicle	25	37.3
College fleet/ personal vehicle	14	20.8
Other		
Currently using personal vehicles, but will change soon.	1	1.4

Note: Some participants responded more than once.

Question seventeen asked participants limits per day for van travel use. Thirty-one (46.2%) and 9 (13.4%) reported no miles policy. Table sixteen and seventeen are visual representations of these findings.

Table 16 - Travel Limits

Factor	Count	Percentage
No hour policy	12	17.9
No hours limit	2	2.9
No hour policy, but are restricted to 300 miles	9	13.4
No hour policy, but are restricted to 350 miles	10	14.9
3 hours	0	0
4 hours	0	0
5 hours	1	1.4
6 hours	0	0
7 hours	6	8.9
No miles policy	3	4.4
No miles policy, but are restricted to 6 hours	2	2.9
No miles policy, but restricted to 7 hours	4	5.9
No miles limit	3	4.4
150 miles	0	0
200 miles	0	0
300 miles	7	10.4
350 miles	8	11.9

Note: Some participants responded more than once.

Question eighteen asked participants how many drivers are required when using a 15-passenger van. Four-eight (82.7%) reported one driver, eight (13.7%) reported two, and no participant reported three or more drivers. Additionally, two (3.4%) participants stated that more drivers are added for longer distance trips. Nine participants selected not to answer this question, N= 58.

Question nineteen asked participants when traveling with a 15-passenger van how many occupants are allowed in the van? Two (4.3%) reported 6-9 passengers, twenty-one (45.6%) reported 10-12 and lastly, twenty-three (50%) reported 13 or more. No one selected 1-5 occupants. Twenty-one participants selected not to answer this question, N= 46.

Question twenty was an open-ended question that asked participants are there situations in which buses are used versus vans? Some responses were sporadic and repetitive therefore the following is a synopsis of what was reported. The participants reported number of passengers, distance, availability, and equipment as factors in selecting to use buses versus vans.

Question twenty-one asked participants who is allowed to drive vans during athletic travel? The most selected response was coaches 64 (42.9%) and the lowest selected response was volunteers 3 (2%). Eight participants selected "other" and reported obtaining driving records, knowledge of university rules regarding transportation safety, university hired athletic administrator, and coach's request for a additional certified driver were all factors in authorization to drive vans during athletic travel. Moreover, it

was reported by two institutions that changes are being made to this policy. Table 17 is a visual representation of these findings.

Table 17- Authorized Drivers for Away Events

Response	Count	Percentage
Coaches	20	29.8
Manager	0	0
Players	0	0
Trainers	0	0
Administrators	0	0
Volunteers	0	0
Coaches/ Managers/ Players	15	22.3
Coaches/ Managers/ Players/ Administrators	11	16.4
Coaches/ Managers/ Players/ Trainers/ Administrator	13	19.4
Coaches/ Trainers/ Administrators	2	2.9
Other		
An athletic employee that has a current driving record on file	3	4.4
Any person that the coach deems fit to stand-in for them if they are no longer able to drive.	1	1.4

NOTE: Some participants responded more than once.

Question twenty-five who typically driver the 15-passenger vans on the return home. Ninety-seven percent reported the head coach. Table 18 is a visual representation of these findings.

Table 18 - 15-passengers van drivers on the return to campus

Factor	Count	Percentage
Head coach	65	97
Assistant coach	0	0
Manager	0	0
Player	0	0
Student assistant	0	0
Trainer	0	0
Other	0	0
The driver that leaves campus is typically the one who returns driving.	1	1.4
No change is made in driver unless there is an emergency.	1	1.4

Another purpose of the study was to investigate what are the factors that contribute to mode of transportation? Question seven was used to analyze research question two. This question asked participants how mode of transportation was selected. The most selected response was number of passengers at, 24(35.8%) and the least selected answer was

athletic director's decision at one (1.4%). Table 19 is a visual representation of these findings.

Table 19 - Factors Effecting Mode of Transportation

Factor	Count	Percentage
Team budget	15	22.3
Number of passengers	24	35.8
Game scheduling	5	7.4
Coach's decision	8	11.9
Destination of athletic event	14	20.9
Athletic director's decision	1	1.4
Other	0	0

Note: Some participants responded more than once.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

Introduction

This study faced two major challenges. It sought to answer questions about a population (HBCU athletic directors) and a topic (athletic transportation safety) that both have been tragically overlooked in previous research. Due to the lack of research, this study looked to provide data on Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) intercollegiate athletic transportation policies, procedures, and practices. Given the importance of athletic transportation safety it is imperative to understand the policies, procedures, and practices that these institutions are currently using in order to provide a safer intercollegiate athletic environment. In 2007, nearly 46,000 people were killed in automobile accidents therefore a current and detailed transportation policy is mandatory for college athletic departments to have and use.

As stated in chapter one Valerie (2004) reported that the NCAA does not have an association-wide travel policy due to its member institution's varying budgets and team sizes. Consequently, due to the Oklahoma State University accident, the association developed a resource guide that provides safety tips for colleges. Moreover, it is imperative for athletic programs to have current and detailed transportation policies because the average injury award is over \$1.5 million and therefore the responsibility of providing a safe traveling environment for student-athletes should be a necessity amongst athletic administrators. Especially since this study found forty (59.7%) of HBCU athletic departments had a budget that was less than or equal to \$4.99 million.

Sadly, as stated in chapter two, many of these institutions refrain from making sufficient changes to their transportation policies until tragedy strikes. This sort of behavior was evident in the Prairie View A&M University and Oklahoma State University's (OSU) accidents. After these tragic accidents, both institutions developed policies to include the hazards experienced in both accidents. Ironically from accidents like these comes knowledge and change. This study found that some institutions made significant changes to their transportation policies after 2001. Perhaps this could be related to the PVAMU and OSU accidents, which occurred in 2000 and 2001 respectively.

In this study a variety of transportation issues were analyzed they were: transportation mode, policy development, transportation mode, 15 & 12-passenger vans, and vehicle maintenance. Through analyzing these issues a clear picture of HBCU transportation policies, practices and procedures was formed. The following sections will discuss not only the results of this study, but also how they compare to previous studies and research.

Demographic data

As head of the athletic department, it is not surprising that 71.6% of survey respondents were athletic directors and 77.6% of them are responsible for developing the transportation policies for their department. These findings are comparable to past research, LaVetter (2004) reported athletic director response rate as 81.9% and policy development at 84.1%.

As mentioned in chapter two HBCU have reported an athletic budget of \$7 million (Seymour, 2006). The study found 40 (59.7%) participants reported that their athletic

budget was less than or equal to \$4.99 million and 27 (40.3%) reported their budget was greater than \$4.99 million.

In order to gain a better understanding of the challenges that these institutions face the average Division I-A program has a budget of \$35.59 million and an average total cost is \$34.57 million (Zimbalist, 2007). Perhaps cost may be a fundamental reason why so many of these institutions continue to use 12 and 15-passenger vans.

15 – Passenger vans

As stated in chapter two, 15-passenger vans are the most dangerous vehicle used by college athletic teams (NHTSA, 2005; NCAA, 2006, p. 43; Lavetter, 2004, p.39; Market Insurance Company, 2002, p.1). These vans are considered dangerous because they are prone to rollovers when they contain ten or more passengers (NHTSA, 2005; NHTSA 2006, Pittman & Lehr, 2003, p. 166; NCAA, 2006, p.28, Lavetter, 2004, p 40). Sadly, the study found that despite the NTSB warnings against 15-passenger van use HBCU continue to use them. The study found 15-passenger vans were used by the following teams: baseball, golf, men's & women's soccer and volleyball teams. These results were equivalent to previous studies which reported similar sports teams using these vans.

As stated in chapter two, it is understandable that these institutions may not be able to financially remove 15-passenger vans from their fleet and continue athletic operation, but financial problems does not justify mis-use of these vans. The NTSB has recommended that no more than ten passengers should occupy 15-passenger vans while in use. The results confirmed that 50% of HBCU allow 13 or more passengers; tragically 82% reported only requiring one driver for these vans. Sadly, this is comparable with previous research; LaVetter (2004) reported 57.4% allowed 10 or more passengers in 15-passenger

vans. For this study twenty-one participants selected not to answer this question, so consequently this number could be higher. Perhaps the response rate for this question was so low because participants understand the hazards surrounding 15-passenger vans, but have not changed their policies to reflect the dangers. Even though the researcher disclosed to all participants the confidentiality clause of this study, lack of response for the questions proves that some participants used caution when answering this question.

12- Passenger vans

The 12-passenger vans were the most commonly used vehicle amongst HBCU for transporting student-athletes. This may be due to the NCAA 2006, recommendations for institutions to replace 15-passenger vans with 12-passenger vans. The study results showed that 12-passenger vans were used by the bowling, swimming & diving, and wrestling teams most frequently. Furthermore this could be due to the number of student-athletes. Findings in this study showed that HBCU had an average of 150 student-athletes and moreover with 35.8% of the participants reporting number of passengers as the main factor in transportation mode selection it is rationale to believe that 12-passenger vans would be the most frequently used mode of transportations by these institutions.

However research has not provided ample statistics on the dangers surrounding these vans, due to the overshadowing of the dangers surrounding 15-passenger vans. These vans could also potentially hold risks. If a 12-passenger van is overloaded it could potentially become just as dangerous as 15-passenger vans, so these institutions should refrain from overloading these vehicles and follow safety regulations provided by the NTSB when using them.

Aircraft

The NTSB (2003) made safety recommendations on air travel based on the revised transportation policy of OSU. After the tragic accident the institution revised their transportation policy with emphasis on aircraft safety. The NCAA (2006) stated that at least 200 students and accompanying staff have died from air travel since 1970. The new OSU transportation policy illustrated the importance of retaining an aviation consultant to assist the athletic administration and staff with safety decisions. Additionally the policy stated “air travel involving student athletes requires the presence of two pilots; captains and copilots must satisfy stringent requirements; maintenance personnel must have been trained within the previous five years and appropriately rated; and passengers are not allowed to enter the cockpit or distract the pilots during takeoff or landing” (NTSB, 2003, p.1).

Findings from this study showed that 26.8% reported not using aircraft and 46.3% reported having no aircraft policy. These results are comparable to previous studies which also reported low aircraft use and low numbers of institutions having an aircraft policy. A major reason for the low use is budget. The highest reported athletic budget in this study was in the range of \$17-19 million and with average operating cost at a Division IA institution being over \$35 million it is not surprising that these institutions cannot afford to use aircraft. Another reason is a number of these schools reported having no football program. Typically research has shown that the football, men’s and women’s basketball teams are the sports that typically travel via airplane. Due to a number of these institutions lacking a football team and reporting a small student-athlete population it is not surprising that HBCU typically do not use airplanes or have policies in place for

using them.

Mini-bus

Mini-buses were typically used by the tennis and lacrosse teams. Past research has also illustrated low use with these vehicles. This could be attributed to number of passengers. Seventy-four percent reported owning a mini-bus, but with having an average population of 150 student-athletes, using a 12-passenger van versus a mini-bus is a more economical choice.

Bus

The NTSB (2006) reported on average 4,000 bus companies are operating in the United States. Buses are typically selected for transportation when larger teams are traveling or when teams are traveling over 400 miles away from campus. According to Gardiner (2008) the NCAA changed the eligibility for a team to travel by airplane by increasing the distance a team must travel by ground transportation from 350 to 400 miles. This may verify why the usage rate for buses is high and the usage rate for aircraft usage is low. To further prove this point, typically the sports that use airplanes (football, men's and women's basketball) are the HBCU sports that frequently use buses.

Personal vehicles

Personal vehicles are used to transport student-athletes not only to and from athletic events, but also to and from athletic practice. Study participants also reported that personal vehicles are used by athletic administrators and students for campus errands. Student-athletes who have to travel off their main college campus to athletic facilities also traditionally use personal vehicles.

Due to the increased number of fatal accidents among athletic students and

administrators while traveling to and from events, many departments have opted to restrict the use of personal vehicles. Tragically 47.7% of stated that they do not have a policy regarding personal vehicles, but encouragingly 16.4% reported that they do not allow the use of personal vehicles.

Currently only the equestrian team reported frequently uses personal vehicles. This may be due to the institutions lack of ability to provide a substantial and safe vehicle for these students and administrators to travel with their equipment.

Policy Development

An interesting aspect of this study revolved around the issue of policy development. Participants were asked how one becomes a qualified driver to transport students. The most reported answer was valid driver's license at 82.2% this number is tremendously higher than previous research. LaVetter (2004) reported 49.3% required a driver's license, but what was comparable was institution's not requiring any driving records. This study showed 38.1% and previous studies showed 34.5%. This low number could be attributed to the coach being selected as the person most likely to transport student-athlete. As a university employee, it is rationale to believe that the university has a copy of the coach's driving record and therefore releasing the athletic department from requiring these documents. Another interesting fact found by the study was some institutions rely on the university to communicate information on transportation safety; this may also be a major factor.

Alcohol-related citations were also discussed. Forty (78.4%) stated they required drivers to have no alcohol related citations and nine (17.6%) reported they allowed one citation. These results differed from results in pervious studies, which reported 49.7%

not allowing any alcohol-related citations. The difference in results can be attributed to institutional environment. As previously, stated in chapter two most HBCU were founded on the basis of religion and therefore their environment reflects this. Moreover, due to the religious aspect of these institutions, drug and alcohol- use is generally not accepted as a part of the HBCU environment and culture. Due to this it is not surprising that this number would be higher than previous research who studied predominately white institutions that may not have this sort of religious foundation.

Another interesting fact found by this study was regarding licensed students being allowed to drive university owned vehicles during team travel. This study showed forty (61.5%) reported allowing students to drive. Furthermore the study found that the average age of this student was 21, which is comparable to previous research. Even though 35.5% in this study and 46% in previous studies are restricting age to 21 for these drivers many hazards still surround them and their driving skills.

As stated in chapter two, in 2006, 28% of young drivers who were involved in fatal automobile accidents, did not have a valid driver's license and 31% of those drivers were under the influence of drugs or alcohol (NHTSA, 2007, p.1). Moreover, these drivers develop at a slower rate when it comes to the perceptual and cognitive ability to successfully drive an automobile (Deery 1999, p.230). Due to this it is not shocking that in this study and LaVetter (2004) both found that at least twenty participants selected not to answer this question about driver's age. Perhaps this is due to participants being aware of the hazards surrounding young drivers and not having a policy regarding age. Nevertheless, allowing students to drive university vehicles is a tremendously risky

routine and institutions should look at relinquishing this practice to adopt a safer way of travel for their student-athletes.

Vehicle Maintenance

The study also addressed vehicle maintenance and found that 65.6 % relied on their college fleet for maintenance and inspections and therefore it is not surprising that 86.5% of them acquire vehicles from their college fleet. Furthermore, over 50% reported using rented/ leased vehicles which correspondences with them also relying on these companies to inspect and maintain vehicles that they use. These institutions should also look into inquiring about rented or leased vehicle's inspection and/ or maintenance records. This could allow the institutions the ability to truly understand if their students and administrators are being transported safely. The NCAA (2006) states when renting or leasing vehicles it is imperative that maintenance records are inspecting to verify the companies safety practices and policies.

Recommendations

Through the results obtained from the study the following are recommendations for HBCU athletic programs to enhance their transportation policies and practices:

- Prohibit the use of 15-passenger vans. Understanding the economic issues that many HBCU are facing it is understood that this may not be a logical option. If institutions are facing these issues they should do the following:
 - Restrict number of passengers to 10 or less occupants per the NTSB recommendations.
 - Check tire pressure prior to each usage to deter probability of being involved in a fatal roll over accident.

- Require drivers to partake in 15-passenger van safety seminars.
- Require at least two qualified drivers for each trip.
- Place occupants forward of the vans rear axle.
- Require that drivers do not travel prior to 6:00 a.m. or after 11:00 p.m.
- Require all drivers to submit driving records and restrict them from have any citations.
- Require that all occupants wear seatbelts.
- Prohibit overloading of passengers or equipment in vehicles.
- Monitor insurance coverage.
- Educate drivers on the impact of driving under the influence of alcohol and/ or drugs, driver's fatigue, excessive speeding and using a cell phone while operating a vehicle.
- Prohibit students from driving university owned vehicles to and from athletic events.
- Restrict students, coaches and administration from using personal vehicles.
- If using aircrafts design a policy based on FAA rules and regulations. That includes the following:
 - All students and coaches must depart and arrive at the airport together.
 - Require students and coaches to dress in university logo apparel.
 - Limit all passengers to one piece of luggage.
 - Limit travel to and from venue only.
 - Check the pilot certification and license to guarantee that they are up-to-date.

- Request a copy of the aircrafts inspection and maintenance activity.
- Athletic administrators and staff should attend educational seminars on transportation safety regularly.

Recommendation for Future Research

The following topics could be analyzed for future research:

- Analyze and compare the differences between transportation policies of HBCUs and predominately white institution's college athletic programs.
- Compare the transportation practices of college Olympic sports and revenue sports.
- Further analyze this study by exploring practices and policies in five years.
- Compare the accident statistics of institutions that require driving records to institutions that do not require records.

Conclusion

This study examined the policies and practices of HBCU athletic programs, prior to this study little was known about this populations athletic department. This study intended to provide a window into this population's demographics, modes of transportation, policy development, driver qualifications, and 12 and 15-passenger vans policies and practices. Results from this study showed HBCU, although affected tremendously by budget cuts, program eliminations and decreasing student populations still manage to maintain thriving and successful athletic teams and departments. These institutions continue to grow through purchasing vehicles, changing policies and restructuring their organizations.

HBCU seem to have a great support system of coaches and administrators that

encourage growth and provide assistance through performing two huge responsibilities, being coach and/or administrator and driver. Although the support is strong and encouraging, issues surrounding 15-passenger vans, personal vehicles, student drivers and driver qualifications need to be critically revisited by these institutions.

Far too many HBCU have ignored NTSB warnings concerning 15-passenger vans and student drivers. There needs to be stricter enforcement of these issues to ensure safety of not just the student-athletes, but also the administrators. Findings indicated that HBCUs are being careless by not only using 15-passenger vans, but also by allowing 13 or more passengers to occupy the vehicle. Furthermore they continue to allow students to drive personal and university owned vehicles and tragically a significant number reported having no policy on travel hours, miles, and driver qualifications. These elements allowed the researcher to better understand that HBCU are struggling with adhering to recommendations and warnings that may keep their students and administrators lives out of danger. Although HBCU are besieged with economic hardship resulting in the loss of athletic programs and more tragically the closing of institutions this does not justify their lax transportation safety policies and practices.

Lastly, athletic staff and administrators should attend educational seminars on transportation safety. This will further help the department to not only stay compliant with safety regulations, but also become more educated on issues surrounding transporting student-athletes.

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A. Transportation Survey	112
APPENDIX B. Letter of Confidentiality	117
APPENDIX C. IRB Approval	118
APPENDIX D. List of Institutions	119

APPENDIX A. Transportation Survey

Directions: By completing this survey you are giving permission to participate in this study. You may conclude your participation in this study at any time without any penalty.

Please check the box for each item that best represents the athletic department transportation policies at your institution.

Section I – Demographics

1. Please mark your athletic affiliation:

<input type="checkbox"/> NAIA	<input type="checkbox"/> NJCAA
<input type="checkbox"/> NCAA	<input type="checkbox"/> USCAA

2. Position title of person completing survey:

<input type="checkbox"/> Athletic Director	<input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Athletic Director	<input type="checkbox"/> Coach
<input type="checkbox"/> Office Manager/Assistant	<input type="checkbox"/> Vice President	<input type="checkbox"/> Risk Manager
<input type="checkbox"/> Other _____		

3. What is the number of student-athletes at your school? _____

4. Who is overall responsible for the transportation policies to be followed in the athletic department? _____

5. What is the total athletic department budget?

<input type="checkbox"/> 0-99,000	<input type="checkbox"/> 100,000-249,000
<input type="checkbox"/> 250,000-499,000	<input type="checkbox"/> 500,000-749,999
<input type="checkbox"/> 750,000-999,999	<input type="checkbox"/> 1M- 1.25M
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.26M – 1.50M	<input type="checkbox"/> 1.51M - 1.75M
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.76M – 2.0M	<input type="checkbox"/> 2.1M – 3.0M
<input type="checkbox"/> 3.1M – 4.0M	<input type="checkbox"/> 4.1 – 4.99M
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.0M – 7.0M	<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1M – 9M
<input type="checkbox"/> 9.01M-11M	<input type="checkbox"/> 11.01M-13M
<input type="checkbox"/> 13.01M-15M	<input type="checkbox"/> 15.01M-17M
<input type="checkbox"/> 17.01M-19M	<input type="checkbox"/> 19.01M- Over

Section II – Modes of Transportation

6. Please indicate the mode of transportation most frequently used by each sport offered:

Sport	Sport not offered	Bus	15-pass van	Aircraft	Mini-bus	12-pass van	Personal vehicle
M Bkb							
W Bkb							
Bowling							
Equestrian							
Football							
M Soccer							
W Soccer							
Baseball							
Softball							
Volleyball							
Golf							
Track/Field							
Swim/Dive							
Wrestling							
Tennis							
Lacrosse							

7. The decision concerning which modes of transportation each team employs most often depends upon: (please mark only one)

- Team budget
- Number of passengers
- Game scheduling
- Other _____
- Coach's decision
- Destination of athletic event
- Athletic Director's decision

8. Does the school own a minibus?

- Yes
- No, but plan to purchase in next year
- Other _____
- No, and don't plan to purchase one
- No, but plan to purchase in 2-3 years

Section III – Policy Development

9. Who develops the transportation policies for the athletic department? Mark all that apply.

- Athletic director
- Vice President
- Committee
- Other _____
- Coaches
- Risk management office
- President

10. How is the policy most commonly communicated to departmental staff? Mark all that apply.

- General staff meetings
- Department handbook
- Email
- Other _____
- Individual memo
- Policies displayed on bulletin board
- Special transportation education seminar

Section IV – Driver Qualifications

11. How does one become a qualified driver to transport students? Mark all that apply.

- No training required
- Valid chauffeur's license
- Other, please explain _____
- Valid driver's license
- Written test
- Driving test
- Video

12. Please indicate your policy on obtaining driving records of your qualified drivers.

- No driving records are required
- Records for last two years
- Other _____
- Records for last year
- Records for last three years

13. If driving records are obtained, how many alcohol-related citations are allowed to be able to drive vehicles for team travel?

- 0 citations
- Two citations
- Other _____
- One citation
- Three citations

14. Can licensed students drive school-owned vehicles during team travel?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Other, please explain _____

15. What is the minimum age requirement if students are allowed to drive?

- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21

Other _____

Section V – 12 and 15-passenger vans

16. Vans for travel to athletics events are acquired through: Mark all that apply.
- | | | |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> College vehicle fleet | <input type="checkbox"/> Lease | <input type="checkbox"/> Donated |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personal vehicles | <input type="checkbox"/> Other, please explain_____ | |
17. According to your policy, van travel per day is limited to: (Please make one check for each column).
- | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> No policy | <input type="checkbox"/> No policy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3 hours | <input type="checkbox"/> 150 miles |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4 hours | <input type="checkbox"/> 200 miles |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5 hours | <input type="checkbox"/> 250 miles |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6 hours | <input type="checkbox"/> 300 miles |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 7 hours | <input type="checkbox"/> 350 miles |
| <input type="checkbox"/> no limit | <input type="checkbox"/> no limit |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other_____ | |
18. How many qualified drivers are required to go on a trip per 15-passenger van?
- | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> Other_____ |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
19. How many passengers are allowed to occupy 15-passenger vans on any given trip?
- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1-5 occupants | <input type="checkbox"/> 6-9 occupants |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 10-12 occupants | <input type="checkbox"/> 13 or more occupants |
20. According to your policy, are there situations in which buses are required for travel rather than vans? Please explain. (i.e. inclement weather, number of passengers, etc.)
21. Who is allowed to drive the vans on away athletics events? Mark all the boxes that apply.
- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coaches | <input type="checkbox"/> Managers | <input type="checkbox"/> Players |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Trainers | <input type="checkbox"/> Administrators | <input type="checkbox"/> Volunteers |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Parents | <input type="checkbox"/> Other, please indicate_____ | |
22. What is your policy for driving vans in inclement weather during an away event?
- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> No policy | <input type="checkbox"/> Return team home immediately |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Stay the night in a hotel | <input type="checkbox"/> Wait for bad weather to clear then return same day |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other_____ | |
23. Do you have a policy regarding how far you can travel the day before a contest? Explain. (e.g. 300 miles or five hours max.)

24. Regular vehicle inspection and maintenance is performed by: (Mark all the boxes that apply).

- Rental agency
- College vehicle fleet personnel
- Drivers
- Other, please explain _____

25. Who generally drives the 15-passenger vans on the return home for the teams that normally travel in 15-passenger vans? (Mark all that apply)

- Head Coach
- Assistant Coach
- Managers
- Student Assistant
- Player
- Trainer
- Other, please explain _____

26. What is your policy regarding the use of driving personal vehicles? Mark all that apply.

- No policy exists
- Only used for scouting purposes
- Only used during recruiting
- Only used when school vehicle not available
- Cannot use personal vehicles
- Other, please explain _____

27. What is your policy regarding the use of aircraft? Mark all that apply.

- No policy exists
- Only used over certain distances
- Only used during inclement weather
- Aircraft not used
- Other, please explain _____

28. Since 2001, what policies or purchases at your institution have been made to improve student transportation safety? (e.g. driving during night, minibuses, buses, game scheduling, number of drivers, etc.).

Thank you very much for your time and input.

APPENDIX B. Letter of Confidentiality

Dear Administrator:

My name is Courtney Flowers and I am a PhD candidate at The University of New Mexico. I am conducting my dissertation study on Historically Black Colleges and Universities' athletic transportation policies. The study grew out my experience as a HBCU student-athlete and the lack of research on HBCU athletic programs. I have contacted you to request your participation in this study.

Your participation will involve completing an online survey about your athletic department's transportation policies. The survey should take about 10 minutes to complete. The survey includes questions such as "Does the school own a minibus". You are being asked to participate in this study because of your expertise in your institution's athletic transportation policies. If you feel that someone else at your institution is better suited to answer questions regarding your institution's athletic transportation practices please send me this person's email address or pass this email along to that person.

To ensure confidentiality, your e-mail or name and address will be kept separate from the data. Your involvement in the study is voluntary, and you may choose not to participate at any time. There are no names or identifying information associated with this survey. There are no known risks in this study, but some individuals may experience discomfort when answering questions. Your involvement in the study is voluntary, and you may choose not to participate at any time. There are no names or identifying information associated with this survey.

The findings from this project will provide information on historically black colleges and universities' transportation policies and procedures. If published, results will be presented in summary form only.

If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to contact me at Courtney Flowers (985) 607-4478 or clsnell@unm.edu my dissertation committee chair at tseidler@unm.edu or (505) 277-3360.

By completing this survey online, you will be agreeing to participate in the above described research study. To participate in this study please cut and paste this link or click on the following link: <http://transportationsafety.questionpro.com>

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Courtney Flowers
University of New Mexico, Graduate Student

APPENDIX C. IRB Approval



THE UNIVERSITY of
NEW MEXICO

Main Campus Institutional Review Board Human Research Protections Office
MSC08 4560 1 University of New Mexico~ Albuquerque, NM 87131-0001
<http://hsc.unm.edu/som/research/HRRC/>

29-May-2009

Responsible Faculty: Todd Seidler Investigator: Courtney Flowers Dept/College:
Health Exercise & Sports Science

*SUBJECT: IRB Determination that 45CFR46 Does Not Apply Protocol #: 09-210
Project Title: Death by Design: An Examination of Transportation Safety Policies of
Historically Black Colleges and Universities' Intercollegiate Athletic Programs. Review
Date: 29-May-2009*

The Main Campus IRB has reviewed the above-mentioned activity and determined that it does NOT meet the definitions of *research and human subject* as defined in the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) regulations (45CFR46.102(d) and 45CFR46.102(f)). Therefore, this activity is not subject to federal regulations for review as human research.

Changes to the Activity: It is the responsibility of the submitter to inform the IRB of any changes to this activity that may affect whether the activity continues to not meet the regulations definitions of human research. Reference the protocol # and title in all documents related to this protocol.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. Scott Tonigan".

J. Scott Tonigan, PhD Chair Main Campus IRB

APPENDIX D. List of Institutions

Alabama A&M University	Denmark Technical College
Alabama State University	Dillard University
Albany State University	Edward Waters College
Alcorn State University	Elizabeth City State University
Allen University	Fayetteville State University
Arkansas Baptists College	Fisk University
University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff	Florida A&M University
Benedict College	Florida Memorial University
Bennett College for Women	Fort Valley State University
Bethune-Cookman University	Gadsden State Community College
Bishop State Community College	Grambling State University
Bluefield State College	Hampton University
Bowie State University	Harris-Stowe State University
Central State University	Hinds Community College-Rankin
Cheyney State University	Hinds Community College-Raymond
Clafin University	Hinds Community College- Utica
Clark Atlanta University	Howard University
Clinton Junior College	Houston-Tillotson University
Coahoma Community College	J.F. Drake Technical College
Concordia College at Selma	Jackson State University
Coppin State University	Jarvis Christian College
Delaware State University	Johnson C. Smith University

Knoxville College	Rust College
Kentucky State University	Savannah State University
Lane College	Selma University
Langston University	Shaw University
Lawson State Community College	Shelton State Community College
LeMoyne-Owen College	South Carolina State University
Lewis College of Business	Southern University at New Orleans
Lincoln University at MO	Southern University at Shreveport
Lincoln University at PA	Southern University and A&M Coll.
Livingstone College	Southwestern Christian College
University of Maryland Eastern Shore	Spelman College
Miles College	St. Augustine's College
Morehouse College	St. Paul's College
Morgan State University	St. Phillips College
Morris College	Stillman College
Mississippi Valley State University	Talladega College
North Carolina A&T University	Texas College
Norfolk State University	Tennessee State University
Oakwood University	Tougaloo College
Paine College	Trenholm State Technical College
Paul Quinn College	Tuskegee University
Philander Smith College	Texas Southern University
Prairie View A&M University	

University of the Virgin Islands at St. Croix

University of the District of Columbia

Virginia State University

Virginia Union University

Virginia University at Lynchburg

Voorhees College

West Virginia State University

Wilberforce University

Wiley College

Winston Salem State University

Xavier University of Louisiana

REFERENCES

Aaron, T.C. (2004). Factors Affecting the Performance of Risk Management Behaviors of Florida High School Athletic Directors (Doctoral Dissertation, The Florida State University, 2004). The Florida State University Academic Press

American Council on Education mission statement. Retrieved October 25, 2008, from http://www.acenet.edu/Content/NavigationMenu/About/Mission/ACE_Mission_Statement.htm

Amistad Research Center research. Retrieved October 25, 2008, from <http://www.amistadresearchcenter.org/research.htm>

Auburn University student-athlete handbook. Retrieved October 4, 2008, from <http://auburntigers.cstv.com/>

Canfield, Owen (2001, January 29). Small – Plane Travel Part of Life in College Basketball. Oklahoma News. Retrieved October 24, 2008 from, <http://newsok.com/small-plane-travel-part-of-life-in-college-basketball/article/631107>

Center for Disease Control and Prevention statistics and data. Retrieved September 11, 2008 from, <http://www.cdc.gov/datastatistics/>

Clarendon College athletic program policies. Retrieved October 3, 2008 from, <http://www.clarendoncollege.edu/Programs/PhysEd/sports/athleticpolicies.html>

Cotton, D. (2003). Law for Recreation and Sport Managers. (Rev. ed). The United States of America: Kendall/ Hunt Publishing Company. Defenses against Liability. (p. 78-89).

Deery, H. (1999, December 14). Hazard and Risk Perception among Young Novice Drivers. Journal of Safety Research. 30, 225-236.

Department of Transportation mission. Retrieved October 25, 2008, from http://www.dot.gov/about_dot.html

Drummond, A. (1999) Managing to Reduce the Young Driver Problem: The Development of a Canberra Young Driver Action Plan Based on the Novice Driver Management System. Retrieved January 13, 2007 from, <http://noviceforum.drivers.com/papers/noviceforum4.pdf>

Elmira College Newspaper (2006, June 26). Elmira College Mourns the Loss of Laura Hurd. Retrieved March 21, 2007, from http://www.elmira.edu/about/news/2006/06/26/559_0606261631-569

Eno Transportation Foundation about us. Retrieved October 3, 2007, from, http://www.enotrans.com/index.asp?Type=B_EV&SEC={59B58976-4BBF-43AF-9CC0-14664D065FD5}

ESPN (2008, January 9). Texas Basketball Team Ok After Plane Rolls off Taxiway. Retrieved October 24, 2008, from, <http://sports.espn.go.com/ncw/news/story?id=3189170>

ESPN (2007, February 14). Illini's Carlwell, Smith Hurt When Car Hits Tree. Retrieved April 24, 2007, from <http://sports.espn.go.com/ncb/news/story?id=2763895>

Etzel, E. (2006) Understanding and Promoting College Student-Athlete Health: Essential Issues for Student Affairs Professionals. Retrieved February 3, 2008, from <http://www.naspa.org/pubs/index.cfm>

Federal Aviation Administration (2005, March 10). FAA Official Website. What We Do. Retrieved October 25, 2008, from <http://www.faa.gov/about/mission/activities/>

Federal Highway Administration. (2007, December 27). Nighttime Visibility. Retrieved March 17, 2008, from http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/roadway_dept/retro/index.htm

Federal Highway Administration. (2006, August 11). Who We Are. Retrieved October 25, 2007, from <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/whoweare/whoweare.htm>

Federal Highway Administration (2000, November). Speeding and Single Vehicle Crashes By Road Function Classification, 1995-1999. Retrieved October 25, 2008, from http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/speed_manage/docs/Single_Vehicle_Crashes_table_1-32.pdf

Fried, G.B. (1999). *Safe at First. A Guide to Help Sports Administrators Reduce their Liability*. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press

Gossett, Dave (2008, August 20). *The Intelligencer: Wheeling News - Register. Franciscan Student Athlete Mourned*. Retrieved September 30, 2008, from <http://theintelligencer.net/page/content.detail/id/513246.html>

Governors Highway Safety Administration (2008) *Graduated Driver License Laws*. Retrieved October 3, 2008, from http://www.ghsa.org/html/stateinfo/laws/license_laws.html

Heinrich, H. (1995) *Experience Without Supervision Can Be Dangerous for Beginners*. Retrieved April 22, 2007, from <http://www.noviceforum.drivers.com/articles/AMA-heinrich.html>

Hooven, F., and Sulsky, S. (2002, March 13) *Cell Phone Use and Traffic Accidents, Revisited*. National Safety Council. Retrieved March 23, 2007, from <http://www.nsc.org/issues/idrive/cellfone.htm>

Jackson, C. L., & Nunn, E. F. (2003). *Historically Black Colleges and Universities: A Reference Handbook*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, Inc. (p.225).

James, L. & Nahl, D. (n.d.). *Aggressive Driving is Emotionally Impaired Driving*. DrDriving.org. Retrieved January 31, 2007, from <http://DrDriving.org>

Kapner, D. (2003, May) *Alcohol and Other Drug Use at Historically Black Colleges and Universities*. Retrieved January 22, 2007 from, <http://www.higheredcenter.org/pubs/factsheets/hbcu.pdf>

Lavetter, D. (2004). *Investigation of Transportation Policies and Practices in NAIA and NJCAA Athletic Departments in the United States (Doctoral Dissertation, University of New Mexico, 2004)*. University of New Mexico Academic Press

Lehigh University student-athlete handbook. Retrieved October 3, 2008, from <http://www.lehighsports.com/>

Macalester College student-athlete handbook. Retrieved October 3, 2008, from www.macalester.edu/athletics/forms/05-06Handbook.doc

McMillan, James H. (2004). Educational Research Fundamentals for the Consumer. 4th Edition. Virginia Commonwealth University. Pearson Education, Inc.

Merriam- Webster Online definition. Retrieved October 25, 2008, from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/>

Nardi, P. (2006). Doing Survey Research. A Guide to Quantitative Methods. (Rev. ed.). The United States of America: Pearson Education, Inc.

National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics history of the NAIA. Retrieved October 20, 2007, from <http://naia.cstv.com/genrel/090905aai.html>

National Collegiate Athletic Association (2008). 2008-2009 NCAA Division I Manual. Indianapolis, IN: National Collegiate Athletic Association

National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2006, May). Safety in Student Transportation: A Resource Guide for Colleges and Universities. Retrieved October 23, 2007, from http://www.ncaa.org/sports_sciences/safety_in_student_transportation.pdf

National Collegiate Athletic Association NCAA CHAMPS Life Skills. Retrieved October 24, 2008, from <http://www.ncaa.org>

National Collegiate Athletic Association News Fisk Drops Varsity Athletics in Restructuring Action. Retrieved October 24, 2008, from <http://www.ncaa.org/wps/ncaa?ContentID=7719>

National Collegiate Athletic Association Research Staff (2001, June). The National Collegiate Athletic Association Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports. Retrieved March 23, 2007, from http://www.ncaa.org/library/research/substance_use_habits/2001/substance_use_habits.pdf

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (2008, August). Analysis of Speeding-Related Fatal Motor Vehicle Traffic Crashes. Retrieved March 23, 2008, from http://www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/pdf/nrd-30/NCSA/Rpts/2005/809_839/pages/809-839_Final.pdf

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (2007, January). A Compilation of Motor Vehicle Crash Data from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System and the General Estimates System. Retrieved March 23, 2007, from <http://www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/pdf/nrd-30/NCSA/TSFAnn/2003HTMLTSF/TSF2003.htm>

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (2005, August). Analysis of Speeding-Related Fatal Motor Vehicle Traffic Crashes. Retrieved March 23, 2007, from http://www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/pdf/nrd-30/NCSA/Rpts/2005/809_839/pages/809-839_Final.pdf

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration Cannabis/ Marijuana. Drugs and Human Performance Fact Sheet. Retrieved February 23, 2008, from <http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov/people/injury/research/job185drugs/cannabis.htm>

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (2001, January). Age of Drinking Onset, Driving After Drinking, and Involvement in Alcohol Related Motor Vehicle Crashes. Retrieved January 13, 2008 from, <http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov/people/injury/research/pub/age-of-drinking/pub2/index.htm>

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (n.d.). Marijuana & Alcohol Combined Increase Impairment. Traffic Safety. Retrieved February 23, 2008, from <http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov/>

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (n.d.). Tire Pressure and Loading. Safercar.com. Retrieved March 23, 2007, from <http://www.safercar.gov>
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration about us. Retrieved February 23, 2008, from <http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov/>

National Junior College Athletic Association about the NJCAA. Retrieved October 20, 2007, from <http://www.njcaa.org/history.cfm>

National Museum of American History (n.d.). America on the Move. Retrieved October 25, 2008, from http://americanhistory.si.edu/onthemove/themes/story_48_1.html

National Safety Council (2005, March 25). Drowsy Driving. Retrieved March 23, 2007, from http://www.nsc.org/library/facts/drowsy_driving.htm

National Safety Council (2004, November 15). Driving at Night. Retrieved March 23, 2007, from <http://www.nsc.org/library/facts/nightdr.htm>

National Transportation Safety Board (2006, December). Lessons Learned from a Motor Coach Accident. Retrieved January 28, 2008, from <http://www.nts.gov/events/journalist/lessons/lessons.htm>

National Transportation Safety Board. (2006, May). NTSB 15- passenger van Safety Alert. Retrieved October 25, 2008, from http://www.nts.gov/alerts/sa_001.pdf

National Transportation Safety Board (2005, July). Lessons Learned from Accident Investigations Life Saving Practices Outlined for Organizations Using 15-Passenger Vans. Retrieved January 8, 2008, from <http://www.nts.gov/events/journalists/lessons/lessons.htm>

National Transportation Safety Board. (2005, August 5). Safety Recommendations. Retrieved November 1, 2007, from http://www.nts.gov/recs/letters/2005/H05_25_26.pdf

National Transportation Safety Board. (2002, October 15). Evaluation of the Rollover Propensity of 15-passenger Vans. Retrieved December 2, 2008, from <http://www.nts.gov/publictn/2002/SR0203.pdf>

National Transportation Safety Board (2002, May 9). Highway Accident Brief. Retrieved November 1, 2007, from <http://www.nts.gov/Publictn/2002/HAB0203.htm>

National Transportation Safety Board. (2003, October 28-29). Public Forum on Driver Education and Training. Retrieved November 1, 2007, from http://www.nts.gov/events/symp_driver_ed/proceedings.pdf

- Neyens, D. & Boyle, L. (2007, June 16). The Influence of Driver Distraction on the Severity of Injuries Sustained by Teenage Drivers and their Passengers. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*. 40, 254-259
- O'Neil, Dana (2008, February 15). HBCUs Struggling to Survive. Retrieved October 24, 2008, from http://sports.espn.go.com/ncb/columns/story?columnist=oneil_dana&id=3232895
- Pearson, Douglass R., & Beckman, Joseph C. (n.d). Negligent Liability Issues Involving Colleges and Students: Balancing the Risks and Benefits of Expanded Programs and Heightened Supervision. Retrieved November 1, 2007, from <http://publications.naspa.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1535&context=naspajournal>
- Pittman, A. & Lehr, C. (2003). *Law for Recreation and Sport Managers*. (Rev. ed.). The United States of America: Kendall/ Hunt Publishing Company. Transportation.
- Prairie View A&M University (n.d.). *Prairie View A&M University Athletic Department Policies and Procedures Handbook*. Retrieved March 23, 2007, from <http://www.pvamu.edu/files/athletics/sponsors/FacultyManual.pdf>
- Rakauskas, M. (2005). *Motorcycle Methods*. Retrieved November 1, 2007, from www.nhtsa.gov
- Regan, M. & Triggs, T. (1999). A CD ROM Product for Enhancing Perceptual and Cognitive Skills in Novice Car Drivers. Retrieved January 13, 2007, from <http://noviceforum.drivers.com/papers/noviceforum1.pdf>
- Rivara, F., Relyea-Chew, A., Wang, J., Riley S., Boisvert, D. & Gomez, T. (2007). Drinking Behavior in Young Adults: The Potential Role of Designated Driver and Safe Ride Home Programs. Retrieved February 10, 2008, from <http://injuryprevention.bmj.com/cgi/content/abstract/13/3/168>
- Roach, R. (2007, February 8). The Journey for Jackson State. Retrieved October 3, 2007, from http://www.diverseeducation.com/artman/publish/article_6975.shtml
- Robinson, E & Lapchick R. (1999). *Never Before, never again*. Washington, D.C.: Macmillan

Smik, B., Ruiter, B., Lusthof, K., deGier, J., Uges, D., & Egberts, A (2005, January). Drug Use and the Severity of a Traffic Accident. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*. 37, 427-433.

Spatz, Chris. (2001). *Basic Statistics - Tales of Distributions*. (Rev. ed.). Washington D.C.: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Springfield College (2007). *Transportation Policy*. Retrieved October 3, 2008, from [http://www.spfldcol.edu/homepage/dept.nsf/C9BA69027254CC8D8525749B00601B41/\\$File/TransportationPolicy.pdf](http://www.spfldcol.edu/homepage/dept.nsf/C9BA69027254CC8D8525749B00601B41/$File/TransportationPolicy.pdf)

Strayer, D., Drews, F., Albert, R., & Johnston, W. (2002, March 13). Does Cell Phone Conversation Impair Driving Performance? National Safety Council. Retrieved March 23, 2007, from <http://www.nsc.org/issues/idrive/inincell.htm>

Sylvester M & Witosky T. (2004, February 18). Athletic Spending Grows as Academic Funds Dry Up. Retrieved March 27, 2008, from http://www.usatoday.com/sports/college/2004-02-18-athletic-spending-cover_x.htm

The Brown Foundation history. Retrieved October 25, 2008, from <http://brownvboard.org/foundation/>

The Ledger Newspaper (2006, November 23). Pickup Hits Semi; College Athlete Killed. Retrieved February 21, 2008, from <http://www.theledger.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20061123/NEWS/611230478/113>

The National Center for Drug Free Sport (2007). The National Center for Drug Free Sport Official Website. Retrieved March 23, 2007 from, <http://www.drugfreesport.com>

The White House. (2007, August 16). List of HBCUs-White House Initiative on Historically Black Colleges and Universities. Retrieved March 26, 2007, from <http://www.ed.gov/about/inits/list/whhbcu/edlite-list.html>

Total DUI, Inc. (2008). For College Athletes, DUI Penalties Extend Far Beyond Sentencing. Retrieved January 31, 2008, from http://www.totaldui.com/dui_articles_college_athletes.htm

United Educators Insurance about us. Retrieved October 29, 2008, from <http://www.ue.org/about.asp>

University of Mary Washington student-athlete handbook. Retrieved October 4, 2007, from <http://www.umw.edu/athletics/>

United Negro College Fund member colleges. Retrieved October 2, 2007, from <http://www.uncf.org/>

United States Collegiate Athletic Association handbook. Retrieved October 29, 2008, from http://www.theuscaa.com/landing/USCAA_Marketing_Packet_-08.pdf

United States Department of Agriculture. (2007, March 22). What is Rural? Retrieved October 29, 2008, from <http://www.ers.usda.gov/Briefing/Rurality/WhatisRural/>

United States Department of Education. (2008, February 28). Historically Black Colleges and Universities References and Resources. Retrieved March 19, 2008, from <http://www.higheredcenter.org/hbcu>

U.S Department of Education. (2007, March 21). Info facts Resources: College Athletes and Alcohol and Other Drug Use. The Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Retrieved March 22, 2007, from http://www.higheredcenter.org/pubs/factsheets/fact_sheet3.html

United States Department of Health and Human Services. (2007, February 14). Driving after Drug or Alcohol Use. Retrieved March 3, 2007, from <http://www.oas.samhsa.gov/driverrprt/fnlrfl11.htm>

University of California at Berkley (2008, July 9). Traffic Safety Center. Rural Road Safety. Retrieved October 24, 2008, from <http://www.tsc.berkeley.edu/research/ruralroads.html>

University Risk Management and Insurance Association. (2006). About Us. Retrieved October 25, 2007, from <https://www.urmia.org/history.cfm>

Valerie, M. (2004). Traveling Safely. Retrieved January 8, 2007, from http://www1.ncaa.org/membership/governance/division_I/management_council/2004/October/20_Att__Newsletter.pdf

van der Smissen, B. (2003). Law for Recreation and Sport Managers. (3rd Ed). Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company. Elements of Negligence. (p. 56-64).

Weinbach, J. (2007, October 19) Inside College Sports' Biggest Money Machine. Retrieved March 28, 2008 from, http://online.wsj.com/public/article/SB119275242417864220-19FByvUWY7rk_mJXuI_4TwAUy5w_20081018.html

Wilmington University. (2008). Student-athlete Handbook. Retrieved October 3, 2008, from <http://www.wilmu.edu/athletics/documents/athleticshandbook0809.pdf>

World Health Organization Department of Injuries and Violence Prevention (2007). Youth and Road Safety. Retrieved February 10, 2008, from http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2007/9241595116_eng.pdf

Young, K. (1993). Workshop to identify training requirements designed to reduce young driver risk taking and improve decision-making skills. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation.