

Certification Processes
for
Motorcycle Safety
Training Professionals

A Paper for the
5th ifz-Motorcycle Conference “Safety – Environment – Future”
Munich, Germany
September 2004

Ray Ochs, Ed.D.
Director of Training Systems
Motorcycle Safety Foundation
United States

Abstract

Certification is generally used to state or confirm that something is correct. From the education and training perspective, it is used to declare that somebody or something has passed a test or achieved a certain standard. A certificate of completion, for instance, is often used to verify that a person is endorsed by an overarching organization that has been acknowledged as a recognizable and verifiable source of knowledge. A certificate may be considered a safeguard of quality.

A certificate may be used as a process of legal sanction, authorizing the holder of a credential to perform specific services. Generally it serves the purpose of establishing and maintaining standards for the preparation of employment. In some ways though, certification creates a monopoly that could exclude potential stellar performers, and in that regard can be a self-serving mechanism for control of processes and procedures. But overall certification has earned the confidence of the public, as it is believed to ensure preparation and status of a professionally qualified individual.

An advantage of general certification is reciprocity. This is because there is an assumed level of consistency of process and results. Safeguards are necessary to ensure that the integrity of certification remains intact and does not lead to a forum for personal agendas. While certification is somewhat contextual within a given field, the recipient of services must have a level of understanding and trust. It is necessary for a certifying agency to clearly articulate what its certification means so the public can ascertain the degree of quality to be expected. The public must be protected from incompetence, and so too, a professional membership made up of certified individuals must be protected from competition from the unqualified.

This paper provides a background for certification by looking at the history of certification practices, provides a snapshot of certification procedures of select safety-related organizations, and outlines the Motorcycle Safety Foundation's certification and recertification processes for its RiderCoaches and RiderCoach Trainers.

The Motorcycle Safety Foundation's Rider Education and Training SystemSM (MSF RETS) provides the structure and processes of a complete training system designed to provide entry-level as well as lifelong learning experiences for prospective and current motorcyclists. The MSF RETS requires a quality of teacher/learner interaction that will ensure the development of learner knowledge, skills, attitude, habits and values. The efficacy and effectiveness of the Motorcycle Safety Foundation education programs, to a large extent, depends on the professional effectiveness of certified RiderCoaches and RiderCoach Trainers.

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to provide a framework for certification processes as it relates to motorcycle safety training specialists generally, and to provide the policies and procedures of the Motorcycle Safety Foundation's certification and recertification processes for its RiderCoaches and RiderCoach Trainers specifically. The paper is divided into three parts. Part 1 notes the development of educational processes in the United States, both for public schooling and for vocational training. It traces the roots of teacher certification that has become an acceptable acknowledgement of competencies and provides a credential that verifies expertise in a given discipline. Part 2 presents the findings of a limited survey of select organizations that certify personnel to conduct training. It provides a comparison of products and processes for initial certification training as well as ongoing processes for maintaining standards and vitality. Part 3 provides the fundamental structure of the Motorcycle Safety Foundation's RiderCoach Trainer Certification System, which is designed to provide initial certification and professional development opportunities for certified RiderCoaches and RiderCoach Trainers who conduct *RiderCourse*SM training related to the MSF Rider Education and Training System. MSF's certification system may serve as a template for the development of certification processes for motorcycle safety education and training specialists.

Part 1 – The Development of Teacher Certification Processes

Formalized teacher certification in the United States is a rather recent phenomenon. It was borne out of the need to ensure a community of civilized and culturally adept citizens. While European history demonstrates a dichotomy of structure that divides education into bourgeois requirements and aristocratic offerings, the United States education systems sprung from religious training needs and transformed into its current educational processes for mass development with equal opportunity and diversity. Meyer in Morris (1963, p. 17) provide a history of education in the United States and notes: "You will find, after a little bookwork and meditation, that, strictly speaking, our Republic is not graced – as are some other lands – by a national system of education." In the United States, schools are connected like rungs on a ladder from elementary to higher education and the opportunity is open to anyone. American educational developments mirrored Renaissance-type energy. There were simultaneous developments from several viewpoints. The primary issue is that development and expansion were couched in localized control, which eventually became a modern cohesive landscape as the speed and quality of media and communication processes expanded.

Religious training was the primary reason for education in the United States. In 1647 Massachusetts passed the "Old Deluder Law," a puritanical anti-Satan effort that set the stage for what was to become the American state school system. Teachers were chosen and paid most often by parents in an

unorganized system of opinion by local inhabitants. “The only specific restriction imposed by the state in the employment of teachers during the colonial period was a ‘security clearance’ on religious and political loyalty” (Kinney, 1964, p. 39). The premise that government can require parents to school their young became an acceptable practice. This was not true for all the early states though, and some like Virginia left the education of children to private enterprise and family initiatives.

In the late 1790s after the American Revolution and adoption of the United States Constitution, the American population exploded. Individuals who were considered masters would select themselves to conduct the acts of education. Most were self-proclaimed mentors or had favorable reputations from public appearances, demonstrating erudite wisdom and effective communication skills. The quality of the results led to a more organized effort to establish an educational academy. Academies were initially formalized in Philadelphia, and the privately owned academy concept expanded due to its appeal to provide what most considered useful instruction. The states began to view general education of the public as their sovereign responsibility, but lack of tax revenues hindered widespread expansion.

The 1800s gave rise to the common school, which was free and open to all. Support came from public funds and quality assurance was a function of the individual states. A primary issue for formalized schooling was the quality of the teacher; in other words there was not a structure to ensure that incompetent teachers were being employed. This led to a movement for the establishment of special training schools and the first state board of education in 1837. (Horace Mann was the first board’s secretary.) Massachusetts became the first state to establish a public normal school, which in essence was a teacher’s college. Teaching methods were borrowed from the pedagogical thinking that was occurring in Europe. But unlike Europe, the structure in the United States supported formalized education that allowed every American youngster to reach their utmost potential; Europe clung to a dual system with one body of schools reserved for the masses and another, distinct and unrelated, for the so-called elite, whether intellectual or otherwise.

Other states followed the pattern and by the late 1800s, tax-supported public schools were becoming popular in many states, as was state authority and oversight. Although this trend was popular in populated cities, rural areas still embraced the one-room schoolhouse into the early 1900s. The tiered structure of elementary, secondary and higher education had taken root. Uniformity became a standard for quality assurance. As Meyers states (Morris, 1963, p. 45): “Specializing in the gross, it was expected, like a rolling mill, to yield a standard product.” Teachers had the same preparation and the similar lesson plans. But then the art behind the science of teaching began to take hold. The role and overall competencies of a teacher took on a loftier significance, and certification became a formalized process requiring a higher degree of scrutiny as areas of

specialization grew and expectations of matriculating students took on a new significance.

Teaching was arguably becoming a profession. Some took the position that teaching was a quasi-profession because teachers were typically not self-employed but rather employees of organizations. Others espoused the view that good teachers were born, not made. By any view, the responsibilities of teachers were such that professional certification became appropriate. The similarities with other professional areas of practice such as medicine and law were often made.

Kinney (1963, p. 3) provides a school-based definition of certification: "Certification is a process of legal sanction, authorizing the holder of a credential to perform specific services in the public schools of the state." It is noteworthy that certification was not taken lightly by the profession or the public. The professions embraced certification because it brought into alignment preparation and assignment; the public liked certification because it provided at least the semblance of a guarantee of quality. Indeed, the teacher who was certified had the satisfaction of being identified as personally and professionally qualified for service, and was able to relish in the status and protection.

In the United States, it wasn't until the 1825 that certification was formalized. Although laws stipulated the qualifications of teachers previous to this time, there was little oversight in teacher performance and the value of education was declining. "Evidence on the academic qualifications of the applicant, under most circumstances, was obtainable only by interviewing the candidate" (Kinney, 1963, p. 40). Certification of teachers began to formalize when counties began to evaluate candidates using teacher examinations. Authority to examine equaled authority to certify, and the process initially was little more than a screening for literacy. Later more stringent requirements were implemented to provide public assurance of at least minimum competencies, and state oversight gained appeal. This gave birth to the National Education Association in 1870, which had the goal to elevate the character and advance the interest of the profession of teaching as well as promote the cause of popular education in the United States.

It wasn't until the early 1900s that states took primary authority in certifying teachers, and this was aided by the elimination of teacher examinations in favor of college training as a basis for certification. By 1950 there was a concerted effort to professionalize education. The movement was led by representatives of the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. The goal was to provide a continuing program for the profession in matters of recruitment, selection, preparation and advancement of professional standards. These standards affected institutions that prepared teachers, an effect that continues today. This coupled with national accreditation, which is a fairly recent occurrence, takes us to the landscape we still see today. According to Kinney (1963), "...the strength and unity of the profession in education depend on

national accreditation” and is “the keystone for professional effectiveness” (p. 94).

Standards for teaching were historically set quite low for historical and economic reasons. “When normal schools began in the 1800s, teachers knew little more than their students. American society did not require a highly educated work force. Instead, it required large numbers of people with basic skills, and the schools satisfied that need” (Wise and Leibbrand, 2000, p. 613). The next several years saw deterioration in the teaching profession and certification processes. It was during this time period that the teacher profession became undervalued. “In the early to mid-1900s, most policy makers viewed teaching as a routine activity that could be picked up ‘on the job’ with some supervision” (p. 613).

In many ways the efforts of standardized certification and accreditation of preparation programs did not keep pace with the information explosion and real time availability of facts as access to the worldwide web became pervasive. “As education became a lifelong activity, educational programs became, for adult learners, a consumer product to be purchased and, for institutional providers, a commodity for mass marketing” (Stubblefield and Keene, 1994, p. 255). Programs were devised to provide alternative certification for people who already had college degrees in fields other than education, who were older and more mature and seeking opportunities to teach in the public schools. These programs shared university-based curricula, but more emphasis was being put on pre-service programs, internships, regional service centers, school district programs and mentoring opportunities. “A combination of teacher shortages (regionally and in particular subject matter areas), the need for preparation models other than four-year undergraduate programs for those who want to enter teaching later in their careers, and criticism of traditional teacher preparation programs have made a variety of alternative routes a more attractive option for policy makers” (Hirsh and others, 1998, p. iv).

Hirsh and others (1998) provide a modern look at the American educational landscape, and have identified three distinct waves in reforming the quality of teaching beginning in 1983 with the release of *A Nation at Risk*, which warned of declining educational standards and weak to mediocre student performance. The first wave was an intensification of improved academic standards and designing new curricula. In the late 1980s a second wave emerged that focused on the structure of the teaching occupation and administration of the schools. The third and most recent wave is focused on “...improving the *quality* of teaching through, for example, better teacher preparation, higher quality professional development, teaching standards, and a more comprehensive attempt to boost the professionalism of teaching” (p. 2-3).

The history of formal public teacher education credentialing is identifiable, but in the nonpublic sector the development of processes for certificating instructors in

special interest areas is not so clear. As special-interest organizations became involved in employee training and development and as adult and continuing education programs became more prevalent, the need for non-public school teachers and instructors grew. After-school programs were implemented in community education efforts and private industry too became interested in educating the public. Developments in the 1980s included an American Society for Training and Development study that “identified areas of practice and competencies needed for training and development functions; expanded the concept of human resource development into the three domains of training and development, organization development, and career development; explored certification programs for HRD (Human Resource Development) practitioners; and developed models for graduate professional programs” (Stubblefield and Keane, 1994, p. 267-268).

From a non-formalized, non-teacher education viewpoint and considering training as basically a sophisticated form of communication, it is not out of the question to think of training processes starting with the caveman; there knowledge was transferred as needed for survival. “We can surely say that here was the first on-the-job training. Through signs and words, the developmental process which we call training was administered; and when the message was received successfully by another person, learning took place and knowledge or skill was transferred” (Miller in Craig, 1996, p. 3-4).

Even into the modern industrial age, knowledge of the crafts could only be transferred by direct instruction from the skilled to the unskilled. Underneath the culture of formal education were initiatives of a fledgling training community. It was here the apprenticeship program came to life. “There was no American system of public education to provide ‘useful knowledge’ for potential young workers in those early days of the industrial era. Out of necessity, training had to be done within a company or in a trade group.” (Miller in Craig, 1996, p.7). Later the term “vocational education” became synonymous with job training. This set the precedent for organizations to provide specialized training not provided by formal schooling.

From 1996 to 2001, in an effort to achieve and promote a globally accepted benchmark for organizations managing the qualification and certification of persons, the American National Standards Institute developed Personnel Certification Standards. The premise was that confidence in the respective certification schemes is achieved by means of a globally accepted process of assessment, subsequent surveillance and periodic re-assessments of the competency of certified persons. The proposed standards were a response to the ever-increasing velocity of technological innovation and growing specialization of personnel. This three-stage process (assessment, surveillance, reassessment) became the core template adopted by organizations that certify personnel and it can be seen in the majority of certification processes.

Part 1 has provided a look at the history of American education with special emphasis regarding teacher certification processes. It was shown that both informal and formal processes have been used to ensure a person who provides instruction is competent and ethical, and that for formal teacher certification, oversight commenced with families and local community involvement, moved to county and state bureaucracies, and then expanded with overarching accreditation processes by specialized organizations. Many specialized organizations involved in public and private training programs offer personnel credentialing to conduct specialized training. Certifications range from personal fitness instruction to scuba diving, from corporate coaching to motorcycle safety training. These certification programs have become a synthesis of the patterns used in formal teacher education programs and vocational credentialing processes. Contemporary educational programs designed to certify individuals to conduct training follow similar processes to ensure that an individual has developed and demonstrated minimum competencies related to developing an adequate knowledge base, appropriate skills sets, and an effective communication style. Part 2 will provide a snapshot of practices from select organizations that provide certification of individuals to conduct training.

Part 2 – Certification Practices of Organizations

Part 2 provides a look at select agencies and organizations that certify personnel to conduct training. Most of them provide certification of instructors for specialized training in safety or product operation for the public. Instructor is defined as someone directly responsible for conducting, presenting or otherwise facilitating a basic course or activity. A course or activity is defined generally as a unit of instruction that leads to participant improvement in cognitive, affective or psychomotor processes, or an activity that monitors or assesses performance.

The Motorcycle Safety Foundation completed a convenience survey of six select organizations involved in certifying personnel for knowledge and skill based training programs. The six agencies were: Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Division of Watercraft; American Sailing Association; Professional Ski Instructors of America (Western Division); American Riding Instructors Association; American Association of Certified Firearms Instructors; and National Association of Flight Instructors.

Information was gathered using an interview guide developed for the purpose of a structured review of each program. Specific answers to questions were discovered from direct interviews or from an organization's Internet web site. Supporting documentation such as guidelines, requirements, testing, screening and registration was assembled.

The primary topics of interest included the format and length of a basic course of instruction, steps for certification, prerequisites for acceptance and enrollment, structure and length of the certification course, internship or apprenticeship

processes, quality assurance measures, and any decertification criteria. Below are highlights of certain policies, procedures or features of each of organization's certification processes.

The Ohio Boating Education Course eight hours in length. To become certified to conduct this course, a person must pass the course itself, complete a pre-course assignment, attend a weekend instructional program, and demonstrate content knowledge and teaching skills. Prerequisites include: 21 years of age, be of good moral character, have a minimum of one year of boating experience, have a minimum of 60 hours of public speaking or teaching, be proficient in PowerPoint, and teach at least one course per year. An instructor must teach or co-teach a minimum of one course per year. An annual update, which is three to five hours in length and offered at no cost, is required to maintain certification. Instructor materials are updated annually as needed. Communication with instructors is infrequent and consists of semi-annual reminders of certification requirements and update schedules.

The American Sailing Association has a stratified certification process based on boat size. Their basic instructional course is one day. To become a certified instructor a person must be at least 18 years old, have at least three years of sailing experience, possess clear communication skills, and be currently certified in First Aid and Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation. Certification has no term but a Coast Guard Captain's license is required that needs to be renewed every five years. The association is currently revising its course and testing materials to ensure consistency. There is no direct communication with instructors and no quality assurance measures are in place.

The Professional Ski Instructors of America (PSIA) does not have a basic course, but rather only provides a certification credential. Recertification requirements vary as do decertification processes based on local employment practices by agencies that hire ski instructors. Besides requiring candidates to demonstrate the basic knowledge and skills of skiing, content of the certification course includes the history, purpose and organizational structure of PSIA, knowledge about the skiing industry, and an emphasis on the importance of professionalism.

The American Riding Instructors Association exists to recognize and certify outstanding teachers of horseback riding. The expectations for instructors are that they be safe, knowledgeable and professional. Certification is for various levels and includes competencies demonstrated by written and oral testing, with some certifications requiring submission of a videotape of personal performance. A candidate for basic certification must be at least 18 years of age and pass an essay test as well as a written test with a cut score of 80 percent. Recertification is required every five years and three- to five-hour annual updates are offered. Materials are updated and distributed annually. The association has a periodic newsletter. Decertification is not addressed.

The American Association of Certified Firearms Instructors (AACFI) customizes its certification processes to reflect and support the unique laws of the states. Their basic course is approximately six hours in length. To become a certified instructor, a person must demonstrate significant handgun experience (including a valid permit to carry), be active in a local gun club or gun rights organization, and show evidence of formal training experience. Background checks are a key prerequisite. The certification course itself is two days. A unique feature is that participants are taught to use the AACFI website support services to support personal business operations. Course materials are updated as needed and a newsletter is published periodically. Recertification varies by state.

The National Association of Flight Instructors is dedicated to raising and maintaining the professional standing of the flight instructor in the aviation community. They have several levels of certification. Basic certification prerequisites include submission of a portfolio to ensure complete qualifications. Each activity in a portfolio is evaluated and all documentation is verified. A background check is completed. Certification is valid for two years and annual half-day to full day updates are provided. Updated information is compiled and distributed annually.

Part 2 provided a look at select agencies and organizations that certify personnel to conduct training. It provided a look at what organizations require for training and recertification. Basic certification features are used by them, with some distinctions and variations such as videotaping, requiring other certifications. There were varying degrees of assessment, surveillance, and reassessment.

Part 3 – Certification Processes of the Motorcycle Safety Foundation

Part 3 presents the Motorcycle Safety Foundation's process, procedures and practices for certifying and recertifying RiderCoaches to conduct its *RiderCourses*SM and RiderCoach Trainers conducting RiderCoach Preparation courses within its Rider Education and Training System. The discussion is focused on certification to conduct the Basic *RiderCourse* (BRC) that is a 15-hour novice, learn-to-ride curriculum consisting of five hours of classroom activities and 10 hours of on-cycle training. The BRC is the cornerstone of the MSF Rider Education and Training System.

RiderCoaches are the heart of the delivery of RETS products and services because the training effects occur at the level of the RiderCoach/participant interactions. The goals set by the MSF RETS for RiderCoach certification and recertification include but are not limited to the following:

1. To develop and support for those who demonstrate personal mastery of motorcycle riding and the ability to use effective communication techniques for the education and training of course participants

2. To provide opportunities for participation in shaping ongoing expansion and improvement of the education and training system
3. To initiate a framework in which professional development, mentoring and lifelong may occur.

There are two formal levels for certification: RiderCoach and RiderCoach Trainer. RiderCoach certification is for the enthusiast who wishes to teach the *RiderCourses* and other formal training opportunities in RETS. RiderCoach Trainer certification is for RiderCoaches who wish to train new RiderCoaches.

Motorcyclists who are interested in become a RiderCoach are recruited through communications with dealership personnel, course graduates, persons who are renewing their motorcycle license, public school teachers and training professionals who ride. To qualify for RiderCoach certification, a person must meet the following criteria:

1. Be 18 years of age or older
2. Possess a valid motorcycle license
3. Be a frequent rider
4. Possess a good driving record
5. Complete an MSF RiderCoach Application Form
6. Acknowledge availability to conduct *RiderCourses* on a routine basis

Once minimum qualifications are met, a motorcyclist is eligible to enroll in a RiderCoach Preparation Course (RCP). It consists of approximately 60 clock hours of activities and is typically scheduled over three weekends, and is facilitated by an MSF certified RiderCoach Trainer. Completion requirements include the following:

1. Successful completion of a pre-course assignment
2. Complete attendance
3. Successful completion of a riding skill test
4. Successful completion of a written test on curriculum materials and methods
5. Successful completion of peer teaching
6. Successful completion of student teaching of novice riders
7. Agreement with (by signature) MSF RiderCoach Rules of Professional Conduct

A graduate receives national MSF certification, but jurisdictions may add state-specific requirements related to their laws or administrative procedures. Also supplementing the initial two-year certification are internship and mentoring opportunities in which a new RiderCoach teams up with experienced RiderCoaches to gain some real world experience. Certification maintenance includes the following minimum requirements:

1. Conduct at least two BRCs or equivalent MSF *RiderCourses*
2. Complete one professional development activity, course or workshop
3. Complete one personal learning activity

4. Complete the MSF recertification form
5. Re-sign the MSF RiderCoach Rules of Professional Conduct.

The second level of certification consists of RiderCoach Trainer certification, in which a RiderCoach advances to a train-the-train function. It is natural professional development for a RiderCoach who wishes to move to the next level of contribution in motorcycle rider education and training. With a primary purpose to form a seamless transition while simultaneously creating an environment for professional growth, MSF has instituted a RiderCoach Trainer Certification System. This system has three distinctive features: 1) It establishes a professional development opportunity for RiderCoaches who wish to develop and improve their skills and competencies, 2) It provides a formalized apprenticeship process whereby RiderCoaches may groom themselves toward the qualities of a RiderCoach Trainer, and 3) It establishes an ongoing professional development scheme for currently certified RiderCoach Trainers toward recertification.

The Motorcycle Safety Foundation (MSF) RiderCoach Trainer Certification System (RCTCS) is a performance-based program designed to establish high standards in the MSF RiderCoachSM training function and to foster RiderCoach Trainer development and excellence. The qualifying entry requirements were designated to ensure that the most experienced and motivated RiderCoaches would choose to enter into the system. Following are the entry requirements for RiderCoach applicants:

1. Be currently certified RiderCoaches who have personally conducted at least eight complete Basic *RiderCourses* (or its equivalent)
2. Complete an RiderCoach Trainer Certification System application
3. Complete a self-assessment of motorcycle safety related experiences and goals
4. Complete a personality profile assessment and describe the implications of the results
5. Provide a self-assessment of five subject matter strands integral to RiderCoach and RiderCoach Trainer competencies
6. Submit participant evaluations from two recently conducted Basic *RiderCourses* or Experienced *RiderCourses*
7. Provide evidence of being a lifelong learner by providing information about recently completed activities
8. Provide a letter of local sponsorship that identifies personal capabilities and the need for a RiderCoach Trainer.

Upon acceptance into the RCTCS, a portfolio is established that contains all application information and the ongoing submissions from required professional development activities. A person remains a RiderCoach Trainer Apprentice through a competency maintenance program that consists the completion of 60 clock hours of professional development activities that relate directly to the five subject matter strands.

Once a need is identified for additional RiderCoach Trainers, apprentices will be notified when a RiderCoach Trainer Preparation Course will be offered. This course is a 90 clock hour instructional program. For entry into the RiderCoach Trainer Preparation Course, a RiderCoach Trainer Apprentice must provide the following:

1. Complete an application form
2. Provide proof of a good driving record
3. Be endorsed by a training site, state program administrator or military coordinator
4. Provide evidence of availability to conduct RiderCoach Preparation Courses upon certification.

Requirements for completion of the RiderCoach Trainer Preparation Course include the following:

1. Successful completion of a pre-course assignment
2. Attendance at all sessions
3. Pass a riding skill test
4. Pass a written knowledge test over the curriculum
5. Pass peer teaching assignments
6. Pass student teaching assignments
7. Evidence of qualitative characteristics (Appendix C)
8. Agreement with (by signature) the MSF RiderCoach Trainer Rules of Professional Conduct

RiderCoach Trainer certification is maintained on a biannual basis by the following: Successfully conduct at least one complete RiderCoach Preparation Course (RCP) (or assist in two or more that cumulatively equal one); or conduct four MSF professional development workshops (PDWs); and successfully complete at least 60 clock hours of learning experiences that include an application statement for each experience. (In essence this is identical to the requirements for the RiderCoach Trainer Apprentice.) Successful completion is determined by MSF upon review of documentation.

Key features of the RiderCoach Trainer Certification System include portfolios, learning experiences, and application statements. Personal portfolios contain RiderCoach Trainer and RiderCoach Trainer Apprentice records. They are maintained by MSF until a person is no longer certified, and are kept current with RiderCoach Trainer Certification System related documentation. Portfolios will be accessible for review by RiderCoach Trainer Apprentices and RiderCoach Trainers. Learning experiences consist of formal and informal activities that occur after acceptance into the system and are personal to each RiderCoach Apprentice and RiderCoach Trainer. To support lifelong learning, skill sets and certifications acquired before acceptance as a RiderCoach Trainer Apprentice do not apply. Learning experiences, if not directly related to the Rider Education and Training System, must be approved in advance by MSF. Some experiences could be approved after completion, but there is no guarantee that they will be

accepted without prior approval. Each experience requires some written verification of successful completion plus a personally written application statement. Each submission is assessed by MSF with feedback provided by as appropriate.

Learning experiences encompass five subject matter strands. Because some learning experiences can be associated with more than one strand, a person may choose the strand that is most appropriate. Periodic MSF-required learning experiences will encourage balanced development. Below are the five strands with a brief description:

- 1) Safety and risk management knowledge, which refers to specific safety training that may be formal professional training, AAA traffic safety courses, National Safety Council courses, or on-the-job safety training
- 2) Adult education teaching-learning interactions knowledge, which consists of experiences such as completing a course of instruction, earning Continuing Education Units (CEUs), mentoring others, earning certificates for completion of training, or acquisition of other earned credentials
- 3) Motor skill development knowledge, which refers to experiences in which motor skill theory or practice is obtained or where a motor skill is learned or developed. Examples include personal development in a non-rider education and training venue such as sporting or leisure activities that are physically engaging
- 4) Motorcycle knowledge, which consists of general consumer information, safety-related aftermarket information, new features and technology, motorcycle and motorcyclist contemporary issues, and advanced motorcycle skills training. Included here is formal affiliation with motorcycle-related groups, clubs, or organizations that support safe and responsible motorcycling
- 5) Rider Education and Training System knowledge, which includes certifications and experiences in RETS courses and modules. Knowledge can be demonstrated by completion of a RETS course or training opportunity as a participant, earning additional RETS certifications, having direct experience teaching, and mentoring or being mentored.

An application statement consists of a brief commentary that explains the value and influence of a learning experience in developing the knowledge, skill, attitude, habits and values important in RiderCoach training and development. It is reviewed by MSF and recorded in the personal portfolio. The purpose of application statement is to ensure that a learning experience transcends surface knowledge and applies in some manner to the MSF Rider Education and Training System. An application statement is to be approximately 250 words.

RiderCoach Trainers and RiderCoach Trainer Apprentices may leave the RCTCS several ways. These include but are not limited to the following:

1. Upon request by the RiderCoach Trainer/RiderCoach Trainer Apprentice
2. Unsatisfactory completion of minimum acceptable Learning Experiences

3. Loss of RiderCoach certification
4. Documented and verifiable reports of non-compliance or substandard performance that is not in alignment with MSF or its Rider Education and Training System (RETS) mission and goals in meeting rider training participant needs
5. Deficiencies in aligning with the intention of the letter and spirit of the RiderCoach Trainer Rules of Professional Conduct.

Once a RiderCoach Trainer or RiderCoach Trainer Apprentice leaves the system, re-application is not permitted for two years from the MSF date of leaving.

The RiderCoach Trainer Certification System is designed to support continuing development of an effective and viable motorcycle rider education and training system. It is a fluid system that provides ongoing and developmental growth of RiderCoach Trainers. The result is enhanced safety training for RiderCoaches and of course, for all motorcyclists. The system represents a commitment to excellence in conducting positive learning experiences in support of safe, responsible motorcycling.

Part 3 presented the Motorcycle Safety Foundation's process, procedures and practices for certifying and recertifying RiderCoaches to conduct its *RiderCourses* and RiderCoach Trainers conducting RiderCoach Preparation courses within its Rider Education and Training System. The discussion focused on certification to conduct the Basic *RiderCourse* (BRC), which is a 15-hour novice, learn-to-ride curriculum consisting of five hours of classroom activities and 10 hours of on-cycle training. The BRC is the cornerstone of the MSF Rider Education and Training System.

Summary

The purpose of this paper was to provide a framework for certification processes as it relates to motorcycle safety training specialists generally, and to provide the policies and procedures of the Motorcycle Safety Foundation's certification and recertification processes for its RiderCoaches and RiderCoach Trainers specifically. It traced the development of education in the United States for both for public schooling and for vocational training, as well as the roots of teacher certification as it became an acceptable acknowledgement of competencies for graduation and provided a credential to verify expertise in a given discipline. Also presented were findings of a survey of select organizations that certify personnel to conduct training. It showed a baseline template of assessment, surveillance and reassessment for initial certification. Finally, presented was a description of the Motorcycle Safety Foundation's RiderCoach Trainer Certification System, which may serve as a template for the development of certification processes for motorcycle safety education and training specialists.

Resources

American National Standards Institute. (2002). Personnel certification standards. Washington, D.C.

Cervero, Ronald M. (1988). Effective continuing education for professionals. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers.

Craig, Robert L., Editor, (1996). The ASTD training and development handbook: A guide to human resource development. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Darling-Hammond, Linda and Sykes, Gary (eds.). (1999). Teaching as a learning profession. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Galluzzo, Gary R. and Pankratz, Roger S. (1990). Five attributes of a teacher education program knowledge base, Journal of Teacher Education, 41(9), 7-14.

Hart, Patricia M. and Rowley, James B. (1997). Becoming a star teacher. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press, Inc.

Hart, Patricia M. and Rowley, James B. (1999). The origins of star teachers: Implications and challenges for teacher education, Journal for a Just and Caring Education, 5(1), 203-208.

Hirsch, Eric, Koppich, Julia E., and Knapp, Michael, S. (1998). What states are doing to improve the quality of teaching, A CTP working paper, Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.

Irving, Barrie. (1999). The role of initial teacher training in the promotion of a life long learning culture: A conflict of ideas, Journal of Education and Training, 41,(9), 416-424.

Kinney, Lucien B. (1964). Certification in education. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Morris, Van Cleve and others. (1963). Becoming an educator: An introduction by specialists to the study and practice of education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Morris, Van, Meyer, Adolphe, Havighurst, Robert and others (Eds.). (1963). Becoming an educator: An introduction by specialists to the study and practice of education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Palmer, Parker J. (1998). The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publishers.

Stolovitch, Harold D. and Keeps, Erica J. (2003). Telling *ain't* training. Alexandria: American Society for Training and Development.

Stubblefield, Harold W. and Keane, Patrick. (1994). Adult education in the American experience: From the Colonial period to the present. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Wise, Arthur E. (1996). Building a system of quality assurance for the teaching profession, Phi Delta Kappan, November, 191-192.

Wise, Arthur E. and Leibbrand, Jane A. (2000). Standards and teacher quality: Entering a new millennium, Phi Delta Kappan, April, 612-621.