Procedures Manual for State Traffic Records Assessments
February 2020

Table of Contents

Table of Figures

PART 1: INTRODUCTION

A traffic records system includes the collection, management, and analysis of data within six core State data systems—crash, driver, vehicle, roadway, citation and adjudication, and injury surveillance—as well as data integration, strategic planning, and State traffic records coordinating committee management. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) offers a comprehensive approach for assessing these systems based upon the *Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory*. Developed by a diverse group of subject matter experts from across the country, the *Advisory* outlines the 'ideal' as a uniform benchmark for measurement—not necessarily a goal to be met—and provides a set of questions used to assess State capabilities in comparison to that ideal.

The assessment is a peer review of a State's traffic records system following the methodology laid out in the *Advisory*. It is an opportunity for open dialogue that is constructive and non-punitive. Neither NHTSA nor the State is involved in developing or approving assessors' ratings or recommendations. Ratings are the assessors' judgment as to whether or not the State meets, partially meets, or does not meet the ideal set forth in the *Advisory*. While States must undertake an assessment at least once every five years to remain eligible for §405(c) traffic safety data improvement grant funds, the assessment's recommendations themselves have no bearing on funding award. It behooves States, however, to be forthcoming during the assessment as the final report's utility depends on the quality of information the State provides.

Using the State Traffic Records Assessment Program (STRAP), an online data management system, State respondents enter their answers and supporting documentation to questions they have been assigned. During each assessment, State respondents have two opportunities to document their systems' capabilities. The assessors then review this information and make their initial determinations. At this time, an optional On-Site Meeting between the facilitator and respondents is available to clarify questions and ensure the information is accurate and understood by the assessors. The meeting is followed by the second and final round, during which the assessors make their final determinations and considerations before they are all packaged into the final assessment report.

The resulting assessment report is a consensus-based document providing an overview of the State's traffic records programs in comparison to the ideal set out in the *Advisory* that identifies the program's strengths as well as opportunities for improvement. States can use the assessment report to improve long range planning, focus resource allocation efforts, and generate administrative and political support for program improvement. The assessments also enable NHTSA to aggregate regional and national data on State traffic records system performance that is used to better assist States with programmatic improvements.

A successful traffic records assessment requires coordination among the State's traffic records system stakeholders, NHTSA staff, and the assessors. This document, which is a companion to the *Advisory*, describes the assessment processes as well as the roles and responsibilities of all participants.

PART 2: ASSESSMENT PROCESS

2.1   Requesting an Assessment

To initiate a STRAP assessment, an authorized State official—generally the Governor's Representative for Highway Safety—must send a formal letter of request to their NHTSA Regional Administrator. This letter should include the State's top three most desired assessment slots and identify the State coordinator—the individual responsible for overseeing State participation in the assessment. A formal letter is required in order to comply with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

A State's request should be made as far in advance of the expiration of the State's current §405(c) coverage as possible as the assessment process takes at least three months to complete and requires at least one month of lead time. NHTSA's Traffic Records (TR) Team works closely with the regional offices to actively solicit requests in a timely fashion.

NHTSA schedules assessments on a first-come, first-serve basis. In their request letters, States should identify their top two or three choices from the calendar of assessment slots provided by their NHTSA regional office. The slots are staggered to enable NHTSA to field as many concurrent assessments as possible. Once all available slots have been reserved, however, NHTSA will not be able to accommodate additional assessment requests.

Once the State's assessment request has been received by their regional NHTSA office it will be forwarded to the National Driver Register and Traffic Records Division at NHTSA headquarters. The NHTSA TR Team will review the assessment schedule and provide the State formal, written confirmation of their selected assessment slot. A copy of the *Advisory* and this manual will be provided at that time.

2.2   Pre-Assessment Planning Calls

Once a State request has been received by the NHTSA TR Team and the assessment slot confirmed, the appointed NHTSA TR Team representative for that State will schedule the first of several pre-assessment conference calls. At minimum, there will be two calls: an initial orientation call immediately following confirmation of the State's assessment slot and a second call one month prior to the kickoff meeting. There may be additional calls should either the State or NHTSA deem them necessary.

2.2.1   Initial Orientation Call

The initial assessment orientation call will include the State coordinator, the NHTSA TR Team representative, the NHTSA regional office, and other interested parties from the State as determined by the State coordinator. The primary goal of this call is to familiarize the State coordinator with the assessment process and finalize the schedule. Specifically, the initial call is used to establish the assessment's internal timelines, review the pre-assessment checklist items (Appendix 4.1 Pre-Assessment Checklist), and answer any initial questions the State may have.

While the State will already know when its assessment is scheduled to take place in general, having received confirmation of their slot, States must confirm their assessment's internal timelines during the initial conference call. The active period of an assessment is a 13-week period that runs from the formal kickoff meeting to delivery of the final report. A basic sample schedule can be seen in Table 1. This sample has been optimized to provide State respondents with time during the workweek, to provide assessors with time during weekends, and ensure transitions between rounds do not occur on weekends to avoid scheduled server maintenance. States are encouraged to follow this model as closely as possible.

Recognizing many assessment slots will include holidays or other State commitments, a degree of flexibility has been built into the process. During the initial planning call, States may elect to move certain dates within the assessment and expand or contract the State respondent periods. States may not shorten the periods in which the assessors are at work.

	Upon NHTSA TR Team receipt of request	Initial pre-assessment conference call
	1 month prior to kickoff meeting	Facilitator introduction pre-assessment conference call
	Between facilitator conference call and kickoff	State coordinator assigns questions, enters contact information into STRAP, and builds initial document library
Assessment	Monday, Week 1	Kickoff meeting
	Tuesday, Week 1 – 7pm EST, Friday, Week 3	**Round One Data Collection**: State answers standardized assessment questions
	Friday, Week 3 – Wednesday, Week 5	**Round One Analysis**: Assessors review State answers and rate the responses and, if needed, request necessary clarifications
	Thursday, Week 5 – Tuesday, Week 7	**On-Site Preparation**: State coordinator and facilitator gather questions, issues, clarification to prepare for On-Site Meeting
	Wednesday, Week 7	**On-Site Meeting**: facilitator, State coordinator and selected respondents meet on-site to discuss assessment results
	Thursday, Week 7 – 7pm EST, Friday, Week 9	**Round Two Data Collection**: State provides final response to the assessors' ratings
	Friday, Week 9 – Sunday, Week 12	**Round Two Analysis**: Assessors review additional information from the State and, if needed, adjust initial ratings
	Monday, Week 12 – Sunday, Week 13	Facilitator prepares final report
	Week 13	NHTSA delivers final report to State and Region
	(After completion of assessment, date set by State)	NHTSA hosts webinar to debrief State participants

Table 1: Sample Traffic Records Assessment Timetable

Any alterations to the basic schedule must be made during the initial planning call. While STRAP can accommodate schedule changes under certain emergency circumstances, it is generally discouraged. Furthermore, once the assessment has advanced from one phase to the next (from Round One Data Collection to Round One Analysis, for example), the process cannot be reversed.

During the initial orientation call, the State coordinator will also decide whether or not to designate any module managers. Module managers play a role similar to that of the module leaders on the assessment teams, assisting the State coordinator with the management of a specific assessment module and ensuring the questions in their modules are answered adequately. Module managers have the same view and edit rights the State coordinator possesses. Module managers are optional, and States may elect to have managers for all, some, or none of the modules in their assessments. Many States choose to have at least one or two module managers in areas that have many questions—injury surveillance, for example—or that the State coordinator is not directly involved. This helps to reduce the State coordinator's workload, ensures all questions are answered in each module in a timely manner, and provides a familiar point of contact for questions or concerns.

Participants in the initial planning call will also review the following critical topics:

- *State Traffic Records Assessment Procedures and Policy Manual*
- Basic STRAP operating procedures
- Identification of a venue for the kickoff meeting that will accommodate the appropriate number of attendees and provide requisite connectivity (Cat5 Internet in addition to a landline)
- Identification of State attendees for the kickoff meeting
- Pre-Kickoff Meeting Checklist (see Appendix 4.1 Pre-Assessment Checklist)
- Scheduling details for the one-month call

In the time between the initial planning call and the one-month planning call, the NHTSA TR Team will identify the assessment facilitator and assessors from a pool of qualified subject matter experts.

2.2.2   One-Month Planning Call

The one-month planning call will generally occur one month prior to the assessment kickoff meeting and will include the assessment facilitator, the State coordinator, the NHTSA TR Team representative, the NHTSA regional office, any module managers designated by the State, and other interested parties as determined by the State coordinator. Participants in the one-month planning call will be introduced to the facilitator, confirm the identity and participation of any module managers, review preparations to-date, and address any outstanding logistical issues regarding the kickoff meeting.

The one-month planning call marks the beginning of the assessment facilitator's active involvement in an assessment. These individuals possess broad expertise in traffic records and exceptional management skills. Facilitators coordinate assessor activities and provide the State coordinator with hands-on support from the one-month planning call through the conclusion of the assessment. This support includes assistance with identifying State respondents, entering their information into STRAP, clarifying any confusion respondents may have about their assigned questions, and offering advice on how to elicit appropriate responses from State

respondents in a timely fashion. At the end of the assessment, the facilitator will also package and review the assessment report. The facilitators do not, as a matter of course, directly influence the assessors' ratings of State responses.

If the State has elected to use module managers, their identities and participation should be confirmed at the one-month planning call. STRAP State coordinator training is usually conducted via webinar during the second half of the one-month planning call. While there will be a STRAP demonstration at the kickoff meeting, the State coordinator and module managers have expanded rights and responsibilities, so this targeted training is highly recommended.

The logistical arrangements for the kickoff meeting itself—to include date, time, agenda, and any audio-visual needs—should be finalized and confirmed at this time. The one-month call also marks the beginning of a more active phase of preparations—particularly for the State coordinator and facilitator.

2.3   Pre-Kickoff Preparations

State coordinators are encouraged to coordinate closely with the facilitator during this critical period as adequate preparation will improve the assessment process immeasurably for the State participants, the assessors, and those assigned to manage the process. State coordinators are expected to, with the facilitator's assistance, undertake the following items between the one-month call and the kickoff meeting:

- Review the list of questions (Appendix 4.4 Master List of Assessment Questions and Respondents), identify the State respondents, enter their information into STRAP, and assign the questions to them.
- Review the list of suggested resource documents (Appendix 4.2 Suggested Document Library) and upload applicable documents to the STRAP Document Library. STRAP may be accessed for this purpose by the State coordinator using the token sent via email.

2.3.1   Review and Assign Questions

As soon as the assessment has been scheduled, the State coordinator should review the questions in the *Advisory* and begin to identify appropriate respondents for each. Shortly after the one-month call, and after consulting with the facilitator, the State coordinator will be granted access to STRAP and should begin entering the respondent's information into the system and assigning them specific questions. It's a good idea to have at least one person assigned to each question by the kickoff meeting.

The responses provided by the selected State personnel determine whether or not the State's data and data systems meet the ideal described in the *Advisory*. Thus, it is imperative these State respondents are knowledgeable about the data system they are being asked to describe, they enter their answers into the STRAP software within the scheduled timeframes, and they

include the appropriate supporting documents. Appendix 4.4 Master List of Assessment Questions and Respondents lists the assessment questions and suggests roles or job titles of individuals that should be able to answer each question.

In selecting respondents and assigning questions, NHTSA encourages States to consider the widest possible distribution of questions as it helps ensure the question is not only answered, but answered by the most appropriate, knowledgeable State personnel. In many cases, this will mean single questions are assigned to multiple respondents. Identifying multiple respondents is particularly important for questions involving data use/analysis, data collection, and data maintenance and management. The knowledge and experience of all three groups—users, managers, and collectors—help the assessors understand the data, its availability, and how it is used within the State. This then enables them to determine data quality and the potential for data improvement in each component of the system.

The State coordinator should contact each respondent prior to the kickoff meeting so they are aware of their role in the assessment and which questions will be asked of them. This is vital to ensure the chosen respondent is capable of answering the assigned questions. Additionally, the State coordinator should make him or herself available to review the pertinent questions and suggested evidence with each respondent. This review provides respondents with a more complete understanding of the amount of time and effort required to complete their assigned questions and gather the necessary evidence documentation. Awareness of the effort required will help to prevent respondent's waiting until the last day the STRAP system is available, then finding that not enough time has been set aside to complete comprehensive responses and upload supporting documentation.

Respondents are expected to provide appropriate evidence and documentation as specified in the *Advisory* for each question they answer. The time commitment necessary to complete these tasks must be taken into account by the State coordinator when determining the number of questions assigned to each respondent.

A State's assessment will generally be set up in the STRAP system prior to the one-month call. Providing the State coordinator has already identified the respondents and collected their contact information, it is then quick work to enter the respondents and assign questions in-system. While the STRAP system can add additional respondents mid-assessment, it is very much preferred that as many of the respondents as possible be entered into STRAP with contact information confirmed and questions assigned prior to the kickoff meeting and the initiation of Round One Data Collection.

2.3.2 State Document Library

State coordinators can also prepare for their traffic records assessment prior to the kickoff meeting by beginning to assemble the document library—the documents that the respondents and assessors will need to reference during the assessment. These can then be uploaded to the Document Library once STRAP is made available to the State coordinator. This will make it

easier for respondents to find and cite critical evidence from basic documents like crash forms and data dictionaries. All documents uploaded during prior assessments (STRAP, MMUCC Mappings, Pedestrian & Bicyclist assessment, etc.) will be available within the Document Library.

"Reponses that do not include suggested evidence documentation described in the *Advisory* will be more likely to receive a 'Does Not Meet' or 'Partially Meets' rating.

2.4   Kickoff Meeting

The on-site kickoff meeting is hosted by the State coordinator, led by the TR Team representative, and—to the extent possible—attended by the State's assessment respondents, TRCC members (both executive and working level), and any other key State personnel. The State coordinator should also invite the State's FHWA and FMCSA representatives, if applicable. The kickoff meeting explains why and how the assessment is being undertaken, demonstrates the STRAP system for the respondents in particular, and provides an opportunity for face-to-face interaction. Generally, the meeting itself takes between 90 minutes and two hours, though the TR Team representative is happy to spend more time with the State coordinator or other State staff should they need further assistance.

The kickoff meeting is tailored to the State's needs and the type and order of events may be altered based on State preferences so long as these core objectives are achieved.

It is imperative the State coordinator secures a room suitable for the kickoff meeting. At minimum, it must be large enough to accommodate all participants; have full teleconferencing capabilities; high-speed, hardwired internet access; and associated AV equipment to accommodate the STRAP demonstration (laptop, projector and screen, etc.).

2.4.1   Suggested Kickoff Outline

To date, NHTSA has found the following to be the most efficient and effective way to conduct the assessment kickoff, but per the above, the State coordinator and TR Team representative may make alterations to suit State-specific circumstances. The meeting begins with a general presentation and discussion session appropriate to both management and staff-level participants, followed by a more in-depth STRAP demonstration for State respondents. This arrangement encourages greater attendance by allowing higher-level staff to attend the first portion of the meeting, but not all of it. A meeting agenda corresponding to this outline can be found in Appendix 4.3 Draft Agenda for Assessment Kickoff Meeting.

Set-Up & Pre-brief

The first session is a pre-brief at the meeting's primary location to review the day's agenda, troubleshoot any issues, and finish set-up for the kickoff. This informal session generally will include the NHTSA TR Team representative, the NHTSA regional program manager, the facilitator (via webinar), the State coordinator, and the State Traffic Records Coordinator (if not

the same person as the State coordinator), along with any other State representatives the coordinator deems necessary.

At minimum, the TR Team representative and State coordinator (or designee) should arrive on-site at least half an hour before the start of the meeting to ensure the room is ready for the meeting. Open square or other non-classroom style seating arrangements are preferred. Internet connectivity and AV display abilities should also be tested at this time.

Presentation & Discussion
Following the set-up and pre-brief session, the formal portion of the kickoff will begin with the NHTSA TR Team representative delivering a high-level presentation that covers the administrative aspects of the system as well as the content of the *Advisory* and assessment. The session will include a presentation that provides an overview of Traffic Records Assessment, explains the purpose of the assessment, the procedures and schedule, important deadlines, and describes the contents of the final report. This session is geared towards all TRCC members, data system managers, users, and respondents.

The discussion period that follows is used to address any of the State's questions or concerns about the assessment process and any current issues that would help give the assessors a clear picture of the State's situation at the time of the assessment. If executive-level committee members and other managers are not going to serve as respondents, they may wish to leave following the conclusion of this session. If they will be answering questions themselves, they should participate in the next session as well.

STRAP Demonstration
Following the presentation and discussion session, a demonstration of the State Traffic Records Assessment Program (STRAP) will be delivered. When possible, this will be a live demonstration delivered by the STRAP user support specialist via webinar. The webinar will present in detail the functions of the STRAP interface, how to use STRAP to respond to assessment questions, and information flows during the assessment.

Wrap-Up & Question Assignment Review
Following the STRAP demo, the formal portion of the kickoff will come to an end. The facilitator, State coordinator, and NHTSA TR Team representative will remain available to address any further questions from the respondents and engage in a more detailed review of the assessment questions for each section of the *Advisory*. Most question assignments should have been completed prior to the kickoff meeting, but any questions remaining unassigned must be assigned by the end of the kickoff meeting.

2.5   Conduct the Assessment

Following the conclusion of the kickoff meeting, the active phase of the assessment begins. The assessment consists of 328 standardized questions the State will answer, providing appropriately cited evidence to support their responses. These questions are rooted explicitly in the *Advisory* text and are the basis of the exchange between the State respondents and assessors that is spread over two iterative response cycles.

State respondents are reminded the assessment process is not meant to be an audit or judgment of the State's data, but a means by which to determine where the State excels and where progress or upgrades are needed and feasible. Such ratings are meant to assist the State in prioritizing system upgrades, based on need and criticality of the data. As a result, it is imperative responses paint an accurate picture of the state of traffic records. Anything less will hamper efforts to improve traffic safety within the State.

Modules	Questions
TRCC Management & Strategic Planning	27
Crash	48
Roadway	34
Driver	41
Vehicle	36
Citation and Adjudication	50
Injury Surveillance	80
Data Use and Data Integration	12
Total	**328**

Table 2: Breakdown of Assessment Questions

If a State respondent requires more information on a specific question, he or she should first examine the suggested evidence that accompanies the question and refer back to the germane portion of the descriptive *Advisory* text. If additional support is needed, the respondent should contact the State coordinator, who will then contact the facilitator and the NHTSA TR Team as required.

If any State response is unclear to the assessor, a request for clarification will be included in the module leader's finding. The State coordinator will be able to view the module leader's finding and specific request for clarification. After two exchanges and an On-Site Meeting, the assessors make their final rating for each question. Specifically, the assessors will examine how States address each question to determine how closely a State's capabilities match those described in the ideal. For each question, the assessors will determine if a State (a) meets the description of the ideal traffic records system, (b) partially meets the ideal description, or (c) does not meet the ideal description.

If no response to the question is received, STRAP will automatically generate a finding of does not meet.   However, it must be noted that States who do not provide an answer to EVERY question by the end of the second-round response cycle of the assessment will not be eligible for Section 405(c) grant funding. Any appropriate answer is acceptable, but every question must be answered.

The State coordinator will have access to a number of management reports that will be organized by module. The reports will show the number of questions assigned out of the total for that module, whether or not all have been assigned, the number of respondents assigned to questions within the module, the number of responses submitted out of the number expected and whether or not all responses have been submitted. These reports will assist the State coordinator in monitoring the progress of the assessment.

2.5.1 Round One Data Collection

Each respondent entered into STRAP and assigned a question will be emailed a link (or token) which will authenticate their identity and allow them to log into STRAP and answer their assigned questions. Each person's token is unique (delineates identity and access) and may not be shared with others. Questions may be assigned to more than one respondent; nevertheless, respondents should submit their responses to each question individually. All assigned questions can be found on the respondent's tab. Within this tab, questions can be narrowed down by module and sub-module.

Respondents may partially enter an answer and save their work prior to submission. This is particularly useful when respondents discover they need to attach additional information prior to submitting their answers. Once the respondents begin to submit their responses, their list of questions can be further narrowed down to show only those that have or have not been submitted.

Past Responses
If the State has completed a previous assessment in STRAP, respondents will have access to view the past responses for their assigned questions. The only exception being questions new to the 2018 Advisory.

The past response(s) will be displayed on the Respondent Answer/Update screen along with any attached documents.

Share, Forward, Decline
Respondents may feel they are not the appropriate person to answer an assigned question, or there is a person more qualified to answer the question. In these cases, respondents have several options. They may answer the question and then share it with another respondent, by selecting the "share" button and choosing a respondent already in the system or by entering a new respondent's name and email. If the respondent has nothing to contribute to a question, he or she may forward the question to a better qualified respondent by selecting the "forward" button and choosing a respondent already in the system or by entering a new respondent's name and email. Respondents should be aware that forwarding a question removes it from their queue for the remainder of the assessment. As a last resort, when the respondent cannot answer the question or forward to a more appropriate respondent, he or she may decline the question. This will remove the question from their queue completely. Should respondents need to decline a question, they should notify the State coordinator so a replacement respondent can be found. As all questions must have at least one response in order for the assessment to

be validated for grant purposes, declining questions is strongly discouraged. Questions removed from a respondent by forwarding or declining the question cannot be returned to the initiating respondent.

The *Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory* should be reviewed by respondents in order to assist with the context of questions they are assigned. If more assistance is required, the State coordinator and the facilitator may be contacted for clarification.

Providing Evidence

To ensure assessments are uniform and reliable, STRAP provides respondents and assessors with suggested evidence to support the responses for each question. In most cases, State respondents are asked to document their answers to the assessment questions.

Evidence should be uploaded to the document library and linked to the question response in STRAP. If the evidence to be uploaded is a multi-page document, the response must include the page number and location of the relevant part of the document (or the respondent may cut-and-paste the relevant part of the document into a separate document, listing its source, then upload and link it to the question). States are encouraged to provide screen shots and sample data runs instead of web links. States are free to provide alternative evidence, but in order to garner a "meets" rating it must support the State's assertions with enough clarity that the assessor can make an accurate judgement and, further, the response and alternative evidence would pass muster with any program auditors.

Providing High Quality Answers

The assessment questions are designed to elicit information that will allow the assessors to make a comparison of the State's systems with the ideal system described in the *Advisory*. As an example, the *Advisory* describes an ideal crash system in part:

> *The State maintains accurate and up-to-date documentation—including process flow diagrams—that details the policies and procedures for key processes governing the collection, submission, processing (e.g., location coding), posting, and maintenance of crash data.*

Question 47 relates directly to that ideal description:

> *Does the State maintain accurate and up-to-date documentation detailing the policies and procedures for key processes governing the collection, reporting, and posting of crash data—including the submission of fatal crash data to the State FARS unit and commercial vehicle crash data to SafetyNet?*

The suggested evidence related to this question:

Please document key processes governing the collection, reporting, and posting of crash data—including the submission of fatal crashes to the State FARS unit and commercial vehicle crashes to SafetyNet. If the State has existing documentation (process flow diagrams, reports, etc.), please submit the relevant document or an excerpt thereof. If the State does not have existing documentation, a brief narrative may be submitted instead.

When answering, respondents should keep in mind the assessors are unfamiliar with the State's processes and they should strive to provide complete information, rather than short or one-word answers.

For example, an inadequate response to Question 47 would be:

Yes. Policy attached.

While this is responsive to the question, it does not provide all the details the assessor needs to make a rating determination. For example, does the policy provided apply to all law enforcement officers within the State or is it a State Police/Patrol policy only? A better response would be:

Yes, the State uses a single Uniform Crash Report and Officer's Manual for Crash Reporting. The Manual is updated whenever the report is revised. FARS reporting is included in the Manual as is commercial motor vehicle crash reporting. SafetyNet reporting is done centrally at the crash data repository and information about that process is included in the crash data entry policy and procedure manual which is updated semi-annually, with interim changes being added to the Manual in the form of memoranda to the staff until the change is formally incorporated by the semi-annual update.

2.5.2 Round One Analysis

The assessment team evaluates the State's performance compared to the ideal specified in the *Advisory*. At the end of the first State response period (Round One Data Collection), access to the STRAP State respondents tab is disabled and the assessor tab is activated. These qualified SMEs review the State's response to each question and rate each as (a) meets the description of the ideal traffic records system, (b) partially meets the ideal description, or (c) does not meet the ideal description. At least two assessors examine each question.

Upon accessing the assessor tab in STRAP, the assessor should see instructions, reports and a listing of the questions and answers they will need to evaluate. Assessors and module leaders will review the State's answers and supporting documentation before making their rating selections from a drop-down menu: "meets", "partially meets", or "does not meet". In addition to the rating, assessors also provide a ballot for each question. This brief narrative accompanies and justifies the ballot selection for each question. Assessors may also include clarification

requests as part of the ballot. This should be used if the assessor needs more information in order to verify a State's answer is not supported by the supplied documentation.

Using the Suggested Evidence & Assessor Guidance
The assessors for each module will independently complete ballots to rate whether each State-supplied response indicates the State meets the ideal outlined in the *Advisory* and findings, which delineate the reasoning of the assessor in making the rating, and note the evidence provided. The assessors use the suggested evidence guidance to help them determine whether there is sufficient evidence to determine whether a capability or critical element exists, is being implemented, or does not exist. It is, however, entirely possible a State may have provided evidence sufficient for the assessor to make an accurate evaluation about a question without providing the evidence specified. It is up to the assessor and module leader to make such determinations. In the interests of transparency and efficiency, the suggested evidence and assessor guidelines are also made available to State respondents. See Table 3 for guidelines used by assessors to develop ratings.

Using the guidelines found in Table 3, assessors review the State's answer and supporting evidence provided for the question. It is imperative any documentation be linked to the appropriate answer. A rating of "meets" requires that the State indicate it is in compliance with the *Advisory* ideal <u>and</u> provide sufficient documentation for the assessor to determine the validity of the State's claim.

In some circumstances, assessors may possess outside knowledge of the State undergoing an assessment. Ratings must be made based solely on the information the State provides via STRAP for the current assessment. Assessors are encouraged to use their external knowledge in requesting additional information of the State, but unless the State actively confirms the assessors' assumptions and provides sufficient evidence in STRAP, the initial rating must stand. Such incidents should be highlighted in the narrative module summaries, e.g. "The assessment team is fairly confident the State meets this requirement of the ideal system, but as no evidence was provided, the team was unable to grant a 'meets' rating."

Assessors will also have access to view the previous assessment's responses for each question. These will be displayed for both assessors and module leaders on the Edit/Update Ballot/Finding screens. As with external knowledge, the past response can be used to request additional information of the State, but the rating must be based on the response(s) entered in STRAP for the current assessment.

Assessors are also permitted to include a "clarification request" as part of the ballot if the State's answer or supporting documentation is unclear. When including a request for clarification, the assessor should provide a narrative of the additional information sought in the space available. Assessors should note the selected rating was awarded based upon the information supplied and specify what missing information is needed to award a rating in keeping with the State claim.

Prior to the conclusion of Round One Analysis, the facilitator may host a conference call for all assessors to discuss any major issues and compare notes. While the assessors for each module will already be in regular contact, this is an important opportunity to share insights across modules.

Response	Rating			Ballot Comment
	DNM	PM	M	
No answer provided	X			System generates response.
Positive answer, no evidence	X			Request evidence.
Positive answer, substituted evidence other than that suggested by the *Advisory*	X	X	X	Rating will depend on the quality of the substitute evidence, and the information provided by the substitute evidence. If the substitution is verifiable, and serves to prove the response, the rating should be the same as if the suggested evidence were submitted. If the evidence is lacking, clarification should be requested.
If a system is under development, but has not been implemented	X	X		Note with the rating the State is in the process of development in order to both give the State credit and to provide information to future assessments. Many development projects are abandoned or fail. Ratings should not reflect "what might be."
Positive answer, "cannot obtain" evidence	X			Seek clarification for the lack of evidence, request alternate evidence. Rate on evidence provided.
Positive answer without adequate information	X			Seek clarification. Rate on evidence provided.
For answers to system-wide questions States claim "meets" except for "one or a few small agencies", etc.		X		Meets: 100% electronic capture and/or submission.
If the question is partially answered.	X			Request additional information.

Table 3: Guidelines for Assessor Ratings

Providing High-Quality Analysis

Assessor ratings and ballots must stand alone grammatically and in terms of content. They should be written in full sentences, which explain the evidence provided, and how it was ranked.

An inadequate rating/finding:

> *The State reported 'no'.*

Or

> *The State meets the ideal.*

It is better that findings are specific to the question/response:

> *The State indicated that no timeliness performance measures are in place in the Department of Public Safety.*

Other examples of appropriate findings are:

> *The data dictionary does not address the edit checks. Based upon the schema extract provided, it appears that the edit checks and data collection guidelines exist, but the narrative did not include a detailed description to establish that it meets the ideal.*

> *Documented procedures are in place for returning data to the individual agency for correction/clarification. The State provided a description of the process used to request data corrections from the collecting agency.*

> *Documents were provided and the responses show that the technical level TRCC's recommendations are referred up to the executive level for approval. The TRCC charter loosely describes this relationship but the State might benefit from tighter coupling in this area.*

Combining Ratings and Ballots into Ratings and Findings

After the assessors have completed their ratings and ballots, the module leader will review both and incorporate them into a single rating and narrative finding for each question. If the assessors and module leader are unable to reach consensus, the facilitator will help make the determination.

The module leader will be the assessors' point of contact for the assessment process. Module leaders will work with the assessment facilitator to communicate with the State. While the respondents' names will not be available to the assessors, their agency, office and title will be accessible when available, in order to assist the assessor in determining the respondent's point of view, either as a data user, collector, or manager; this background information will also help assessors who need clarification to formulate their queries based on the expertise of the respondent.

The combined rating and finding for each "partially meets" and "does not meet" answer will be returned to the State at the beginning of Round Two Data Collection for additional information.

Questions which met the ideal in Round One answers are removed from the respondents' queues. If the Round One answer or evidence was deemed inadequate, the module leader may include a specific clarification request within the finding for additional information or clarification.

The ratings and findings sent to the State are prepared as a synthesis of those made by the assessors and module leader individually. Once consensus has been reached, the module leader will enter in the finalized rating and finding for Round One. At the close of the round, all questions must have a rating and narrative finding.

The assessors, module leaders, and facilitator should agree on timeframes for completion of the work assigned to each. Assessors should be aware that their ratings must be complete prior to the end-date of each round in order to provide adequate time for review by module leaders.

2.5.3   On-Site Preparation: Week of Review

Immediately following the close of Round 1: Analysis, the State coordinator and respondents will receive view-only access to the initial module leader rating and narrative finding for each question. The State coordinator and respondents should review the initial findings and determine the questions and areas needing further discussion.

During this time, the facilitator should also consult with the module leaders to confirm specific questions or topics needing further clarification. The module leaders should also bring attention to any potential issues so they can be addressed and possibly resolved prior to the second and final round.

The facilitator and State coordinator should then compare the items relayed by both the respondents and module leaders and create an On-Site Meeting agenda. This should include time for state participants to provide general feedback on the process as well as an organized schedule for addressing each module. The State coordinator should invite respondents who wish to discuss their concerns and/or can provide additional information.

2.5.4   On-Site Meeting

The On-Site Meeting should be held the week following on-site preparation. The length of the meeting will vary, depending on the number of questions to cover, but should last no longer than one business day. The meeting date should be scheduled far enough in advance to ensure respondent participation, ideally prior to the assessment kickoff.

Similar to the Kickoff, the On-Site Meeting is hosted by the State coordinator. The coordinator should arrange for a meeting room large enough to accommodate all participants; have full teleconferencing capabilities; high-speed, hardwired internet access; and associated AV equipment to accommodate the presentation of notes, responses and other materials.

The State coordinator and respondents should come prepared to discuss specific questions, by module, as determined during the on-site preparation. The facilitator will attend the meeting in person along with a rapporteur who will document the agenda and related discussions.

Following the meeting, the State coordinator will be provided with the meeting notes recorded by the rapporteur. The meeting notes will also be provided to the assessment team and uploaded to the Document Library.

2.5.5   Round Two Data Collection

Following the close of the On-Site meeting, the respondents will have their second and final opportunity to respond and/or provide additional information or evidence to support their responses to the questions the assessors rated as partially meets, or do not meet the ideal described in the *Advisory*.

Respondents should provide any additional information or clarification agreed upon during the On-Site meeting or is specifically requested by assessors in the finding narrative. The respondent may contact the State coordinator to assist with any inquiries about the clarification requested, prior to submitting a response. The State respondent will also have the opportunity to provide additional information in cases where the respondent feels it might impact the rating. If a respondent finds the answer provided in the previous round was incorrect or incomplete, the initial response should not be deleted, but a notation should be made in the subsequent round response that it is a "correction or clarification" of the previous response. When responses change from one round to the next and the previous response is gone, assessors have no means to account for an upgraded rating.

If the rating is low but correct and respondents have no further information, it would be helpful for the State to indicate the rating is accurate, and no further data will be forthcoming. To do so, respondents may add a note to their answers: "Round Two, no further information" or "Round Two, agree with rating", etc. This will speed the process for assessors and clarify no further information is available.

This is the State respondents' last chance to provide information to the assessors and there is no further opportunity for the State to review the assessment report prior to its final release.

2.5.6   Round Two Analysis

At the end of the given timeframe for responses, the respondent tab will again be disabled, and the assessors will be able to review questions/responses that have additional information or clarification provided and provide their final ballots and ratings. The assessors should also consider any information provided during the On-Site meeting. For questions where additional documentation or clarification was requested but none was provided, the assessor will rate the

State based on the information given but may note in the finding a higher rating would be possible with specific documentation or clarification.

The module leader confirms the ratings and combines the ballots into brief narrative findings which are finalized for each of the questions the State has answered. The module leader's final findings should be self-explanatory. Anyone should be able to read the finding for each question without having to refer back to the *Advisory* and understand what was assessed, how the State's performance was rated, and why that rating was assigned. This also encourages the module leader to think through the implications of each rating individually as part of the entire module. From these analyses, the final report is drafted.

2.5.7 Drafting the Final Report

After the module leaders have finalized each question's rating and findings in Round Two, they will be tasked with writing considerations and a summary of the State's performance for each module. A new tab will be accessible from the Module Leader page, titled "Final Report" where the narratives and considerations should be recorded.

This narrative summary will include critical considerations that add depth and context to the recommendations developed from the question ratings for each module. This summary should note areas where the State has been successful in its efforts and deserves recognition for those efforts. The narrative overview of the modules may include elaborations on the specific considerations assessors have written.

Considerations are specific actions or resources the assessors may wish to share with the State. These "considerations" are distinct from both the findings developed during the assessment process and the recommendations provided in the executive summary. The State will only need to specifically address the recommendations in their annual updates and strategic plans per the §405(c) grant requirements.

Once the module leaders have submitted their final ratings, considerations, and summaries, the facilitator reviews all completed segments, edits as needed and drafts an introductory statement before notifying the TR Team representative the assessment is complete. To aid in their review, the facilitator may wish to export a draft of the document. Once the TR Team representative has been notified by the facilitator the assessment is complete, he or she will export a copy of the assessment report and make one last review—being sure to update the table of contents and standardize the forms of address in the participants list in particular.

2.6   Delivering the Final Report

The TR Team representative will then provide the State coordinator with a digital copy of the final report and an accompanying cover letter via email. A paper copy can be mailed at the State coordinator's request.

The traffic records assessment report provides an overview of the status of the State's TRCC and each of the component data systems. The report will be arranged according to the organization of the *Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory* with separate sections covering TRCC management, strategic planning, crash, vehicle, driver, roadway, citation and adjudication, injury surveillance, and data use and integration.

The report is divided into three parts: the introduction, the results and the methodology and background. The introduction is where the aggregate ratings for the assessment are found, along with the rating changes from the previous assessment. The results section includes the recommendations, considerations and the module leader's narrative summary for each module that provides an overview of how the State compares to the *Advisory's* described ideal system. The methodology and background section contains the final rating and narrative assessor conclusions for each question individually. If the State would like additional assistance, a GO Team should be considered. More information on GO Teams is found in Section 2.8 Requesting Optional Technical Assistance.

2.7   Report-Out Webinar

After the assessment has been completed and the final report delivered, the facilitator will present the final report and summarize the assessment's recommendations and conclusions to the States' TRCC via a webinar. Broadcasting the recommendations and conclusions via webinar will enable broader audience participation than an on-site visit by the assessment team. The TRCC and the State coordinator will be able to publicize the webinar and invite other interested parties as they see fit. Staff from NHTSA's Traffic Records Team and NHTSA Regional Program Managers (RPMs) will participate in these webinars, and NHTSA RPMs may wish to travel to the State, particularly when they are scheduled to coincide with a full TRCC meeting.

State officials involved in the assessment will know the general contents of this report in advance because of the iterative nature of the assessment, which provides early feedback to the State on each question.

2.8   Requesting Optional Technical Assistance

NHTSA's Traffic Records GO Team program aims to help States improve their traffic records systems by deploying teams of subject matter experts to deliver tailored traffic records-related technical assistance and training based on States' specific needs. This program is designed to provide additional resources and assistance for State traffic records professionals as they work to improve their traffic records data collection, management, and analysis capabilities.

States are encouraged to submit GO Team requests that address a specific traffic records improvement need, either highlighted during a State's traffic records assessment or identified by the State's Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (TRCC) and Highway Safety Office.

A State may request specific technical assistance that (1) focuses on addressing a targeted problem in the traffic records system, or (2) provides technical training to State traffic records program managers in an area identified by the State. Key assistance topics should address an issue identified in the State's traffic records strategic plan or identified during the State's most recent traffic records assessment.

Technical Assistance
The GO Team will travel to the State to adequately diagnose the State's problem and provide appropriate technical assistance as needed. The GO Team leader will draft a final technical report that diagnoses the problem with the State's traffic records system and recommends a course of action for the State to undertake to resolve this problem. The GO Team will submit this report to NHTSA staff, who will host a closeout webinar where the State and NHTSA will be debriefed on the GO Team's conclusions.

Technical Training
The GO Team will work with the appropriate State traffic records professionals to design a curriculum to meet their training needs. The training should be no longer than 3 days and is not meant to supplant courses offered through the Transportation Safety Institute. The GO Team will travel to the State to provide instruction only as needed. Whenever appropriate, the GO Team will attempt to deliver this training via webinar.

Requesting a GO Team
A State interested in requesting a GO Team will complete the brief application for technical assistance or training and submit it to NHTSA via the appropriate regional office. Applications should be submitted by a State-designated representative and approved by both the State's Highway Safety Office (SHSO) and TRCC. States should contact their RPM for assistance in applying.

Applications can be found on the NHTSA Traffic Records website:
http://www.nhtsa.gov/DOT/NHTSA/NVS/TrafficRecords/Training_Technical_Assistance_Application.docx

The application request should include the following information:
- A detailed description of the technical problem the GO Team will need to address;
- A description of the specific technical assistance being requested from the GO Team;
- A description of the current and past efforts to address this problem;
- An explanation of how the GO Team assistance fits into the TRCC's Strategic Plan;
- The anticipated improvements the GO Teams are likely to provide to the State's traffic records data systems; and

- The contact information of the State officials who will be tasked to work with the GO Team to address this problem.

The RPM will review the application to ensure the State has (a) described the technical problem in sufficient detail that NHTSA can identify the most appropriate subject matters experts, and (b) requested assistance is within the scope of NHTSA's traffic records purview.

The NHTSA Traffic Records (TR) Team will review the request and identify up to three subject matter experts as the GO Team to address the State's request. The NHTSA TR Team will then host a conference call with the State applicant, the GO Team members, and the RPM to discuss the State's request.

Following this initial conference call, the GO Team will contact the designated representative to gather more information to diagnose the State's problem and recommend a course of action. Approximately one week after the initial conference call, NHTSA's TR Team will host a second teleconference where the GO Team will present their work plan, proposed schedule of activities, milestones, and deliverables to the State representatives, NHTSA's TR Team and RPM.

PART 3:   ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

3.1   NHTSA Traffic Records Team
- Provides NHTSA Regional Offices with a list of upcoming grant-cycle assessments and conducts informal discussions regarding upcoming assessments with regions and States
- Schedules assessment date upon receipt of State request
- Advises on facilitator selection and consults on assessment team members
- Coordinates with Regional staff, facilitator, and State coordinator to conduct pre-assessment conference calls to set the assessment schedule, discuss participant roles, and how the State has addressed items in the pre-assessment checklist
- Leads the assessment kickoff meeting in-person, coordinates with the program manager for STRAP training webinar and State coordinator on logistical details (meeting location, WiFi, projector, etc.). Ensures the appropriate Regional staff is invited
- If necessary, works with State coordinator, Region staff, and facilitator to compile a list of respondents to answer specific assessment questions
- Sends the final report to the State coordinator and NHTSA Region office and sets up conference call to discuss the report prior to the webinar report out
- Participates in the report out via webinar. Ensures the appropriate Regional staff is invited
- Reviews the State's request for a GO Team to provide technical assistance
- Updates assessment standards as necessary
- Ensures the *State Traffic Records Assessment Procedures & Policy Manual* is current

3.2   NHTSA Regional Program Managers
- Markets program assessments to States
- Notifies the State when their assessment is due within the next 12 months. In the event the State contacts the Region before that time, forwards a request to NHTSA TR team
- Several months in advance of a probable assessment, participates in any interactions between NHTSA TR team and the State, where long-range timelines and general preparedness for the assessment are discussed
- Facilitates, as needed, communication between NHTSA TR Team and State coordinator or State Highway Safety Office staff
- Coordinates with NHTSA TR Team, facilitator, and State coordinator to conduct a pre-assessment conference call and set tentative schedule / milestones for the assessment. (About 1 month prior to the projected kickoff meeting)
- If necessary, works with State coordinator, NHTSA TR Team, and facilitator to compile a list of respondents to answer specific assessment questions
- Monitors assessment progress via STRAP and assists the facilitator and NHTSA TR Team as necessary to keep the activities on schedule
- Along with the State coordinator, receives the final report from the NHTSA TR Team representative
- Attends the webinar report out

- Assists State in addressing assessment recommendations. The NHTSA Regional office will maintain a list of all recommendations given to States and should check in with the state at least once annually to see if they are addressing the recommendations, and if not, determine if technical assistance or training is needed.
- Reviews the State's request for GO Team technical assistance and/or training

3.3   State Personnel

3.3.1   State Assessment Coordinator
- Submits request for a traffic records program assessment to NHTSA Region staff, if not previously contacted by the Region
- Several months in advance of a probable assessment, participates in conversations with NHTSA TR team and the Region, where long-range timelines and general preparedness for the assessment are discussed
- Coordinates with Regional staff, facilitator, and NHTSA TR Team to conduct a pre-assessment conference call and set tentative schedule/milestones for the assessment
- Selects and briefs all respondents well in advance of the assessment to ensure they understand their role and the importance of their efforts, including inclusion of evidence documents in their responses
- Distributes the *State Traffic Records Assessment Procedures & Policies Manual* to the State Traffic Records Coordinating committee members prior to the assessment kickoff meeting. Works with facilitator, Regional Program Manager and State TRCC to identify assessment respondents
- Invites State TRCC, and other responsible parties to the assessment kickoff meeting
- Develops and finalizes detailed agenda with NHTSA Regional Program Manager, facilitator, and State TRCC, which will include a listing of participants and their organizational affiliation
- Hosts assessment kickoff meeting
- If assigned questions, answers them and provides evidence.
- Monitors assessment progress via STRAP, in conjunction with the facilitator. The facilitator and State coordinator are the 2nd and 1st in line, respectively, to ensure the timeline is on track. The NHTSA TR Team and Region staff are available to assist, if needed.
- Participates in conference calls to review the monthly status of the assessment, if needed
- Hosts On-Site meeting
- Attends final webinar report out and distributes final report prior to that meeting
- Briefs Headquarters and Regional staff on reasons/needs for requesting GO Team Support– provides a brief overview of program
- Identifies location and prepares logistical set up for Webinar or GO Team debriefings
- If questions arise, directs questions to the facilitator

3.3.2 State Module Manager (Optional)

- Provides oversight and assistance to State respondents within an individual module; this is an optional role per the preference and designation of the State coordinator
- Assists the State coordinator with assignment, oversight and coordination of individual assessment modules
- Is the primary point of contact for State respondents, ensuring timely completion and submission of responses
- Resolves conflicts in two or more answers to a single question that are the result of misunderstanding. Conflicting answers caused by differing perspectives of users versus collectors, however, should not be altered.

3.3.3 State Respondent

- Responds to questions assigned and provides documentation to support responses if such documentation is not part of the pre-established document library. Provides specific location, i.e., page number, of relevant information in the documentation to direct assessors to that information efficiently
- Responds to requests for clarifications from the assessment team
- If questions arise, directs questions to the State coordinator
- Is invited to attend the webinar report out at the conclusion of the assessment

3.4 Assessment Team

3.4.1 Program Manager

- Monitors, updates, and maintains STRAP and user manuals
- Sets up webinar connections for all meetings, ensures invites are sent to the NHTSA TR Team and facilitator
- Provides STRAP training for all parties
- Maintains lists of qualified subject matter experts to serve as assessors and keeps internal notes on their performance
- Consults with facilitator and NHTSA TR Team on assessor assignments
- Initializes and closes out assessments in STRAP
- Provides facilitator with appropriate system documentation
- Troubleshoots STRAP and provides follow-up support
- Works with NHTSA on STRAP updates
- Provides assistance to the assessment team as directed by NHTSA TR team

3.4.2 Facilitator

- Is the leader and spokesperson of the assessment team

- Is the first point of contact for all content-oriented questions from the State coordinator, assessors and module leaders. Upon request, performs consensus decision-making with assessors, or seeks a third-party expert opinion
- Trains the State coordinator and the State respondents on the procedures for participating in the assessment and the final report briefings
- Consults with Program Manager and NHTSA TR Team on assessor assignments
- Leads the 1-month pre-assessment call with the Regional staff and State coordinator. (Call organized by the appropriate TR Team representative.) Participates on any further calls prior to the kickoff
- Participates in the assessment kickoff meeting
- Disseminates finalized milestones to the Assessment Team; the Region staff, NHTSA TR Team, and State coordinator will have been consulted on the creation of milestones so all parties are well-aware of the timeline
- If necessary, works with State coordinator, Region staff, and NHTSA TR Team to compile a list of respondents to answer specific assessment questions
- Monitors assessment progress via STRAP and assists the State coordinator. The facilitator and State coordinator are the 2nd and 1st in line, respectively, to ensure the timeline is on track. The NHTSA TR Team and Region staff are available to assist, if needed
- Ensures, with State coordinator that EVERY question is answered in some fashion during the course of the assessment
- Prepares for and attends the On-Site Meeting
- Manages assessor tokens after they are initially issued
- Reviews the status of the assessment with the assessment team and State coordinator via email and/or conference calls
- Schedules conference calls with assessors to discuss any questions by the assessors or potential internal inconsistency in the report
- Reviews the draft assessment final report for clerical and grammatical errors, and to ensure internal consistency among and between modules
- Schedules, prepares for and presents the webinar report out to State. Ensures meeting invite is sent to the State coordinator for distribution
- Provides technical assistance and training on STRAP to the States upon request
- Reports problems with or potentials for increased functionality of STRAP to NHTSA's TR team
- Tracks respondents' difficulty with assessment questions, and assessor requests for additional information, to assist in suggesting clarification of question verbiage, or additional or replacement questions
- Is responsible for mentoring and training other assessment team members to become facilitators.

3.4.3 Module Leader
- Creates summary findings for the module, based on findings/ratings of the assessors

- Consults with assessors to develop a schedule for completion of ballots and findings that will allow the module leader to synthesize the ratings and findings within each round's scheduled timeframe
- Contacts the facilitator if questions arise or when an irreconcilable disagreement on a finding occurs. The facilitator will act as the tie breaker.
- Writes a module summary to be included in the final report, which outlines the overall picture for the data system or function which includes strengths and weaknesses—opportunities for improvements
- Writes considerations to be included in the final report

3.4.4 Assessor
- Reviews responses and synthesizes information from respondents, completes ballot, develops findings, or notes the need for clarification, and provides input to the final report
- Consults module leader on a schedule for each round of ratings and ensures all work is completed in a timely manner, allowing the module leader adequate time to finish the compilation of assessor ratings that will be returned to the State
- Complies with Assessor Guidelines when rating State systems
- Provides input and may participate in assessment debriefing
- Contacts the facilitator if questions arise

Federal Roles and Responsibilities by Assessment Task

FEDERAL	Request Assessment	Pre-Assessment Conference Calls	Kickoff Meeting	Assessment	On-Site Meeting	Final Report	Debrief
NHTSA TR TEAM	Provides regions with assessment slots and States with upcoming assessments Discusses assessment preparedness with State and RPMs Approves facilitator and assessors	Hosts calls, reviews assessment process and various roles Schedules kickoff date and establishes assessment timeline	Leads meeting, presents kickoff presentation	Oversight/ trouble-shooting	Oversight/ participates in conference call	Reviews final report and transmits it to the State, cc'ing the RPM	Hosts report out via webinar Discusses possible request for GO Team

NHTSA RPMs	Provides States assessment slot options Tracks States with upcoming assessments Discusses assessment preparedness with State and RPMs	Participates in conference call	Participant/ resource	Oversight/ trouble-shooting	Participates in meeting via conference call	Receives final report	Attends debrief via webinar and follows up with any State requests for Go Team Technical Assistance Conveys any State feedback to NHTSA TR Team
FHWA	n/a	n/a	Invited if applicable, attendance optional	n/a	n/a	n/a	Invited if applicable, attendance optional
FMCSA	n/a	n/a	Invited if applicable, attendance optional	n/a	n/a	n/a	Invited if applicable, attendance optional

Table 4: Federal Roles and Responsibilities by Assessment Task

State Roles and Responsibilities by Assessment Task

STATE	Request Assessment	Pre-Assessment Conference Calls	Kickoff Meeting	Assessment	On-Site Meeting	Final Report	Debrief
STATE COORDINTOR	n/a	Identifies respondents, or people to delegate respondents for each assessment question Uploads documents to Document Library for respondents to reference	Assigns questions to respondents prior to meeting, forwards invitations to appropriate participants, attends kickoff	Tracks Assessment Progress, first point of contact for respondents	Invites appropriate participants, works with facilitator to determine agenda	Disseminates Final Report to all State Representatives	Forwards invitations to interested/appropriate participants. attends debrief
RESPONDENTS	n/a	n/a	Attends Kickoff Meeting	Responds to assigned assessment questions	Applicable respondents attend meeting	Reviews, updates applicable questions	Attends Debrief

Table 5: State Roles and Responsibilities by Assessment Task

Assessment Team Roles and Responsibilities by Assessment Task

Assessment Team	Assessment Request	Pre-Assessment Conference Calls	Kickoff Meeting	Assessment	On-Site Meeting	Final Report	Debrief
PROGRAM MANGER	Initialize assessment in STRAP, identify candidate facilitator and assessors	Participate in calls; confirm staffing, conduct State coordinator training	Deliver STRAP respondent training during kickoff via webinar	Oversight/trouble-shooting, provide support as needed	Attends meeting, acts as rapporteur	Oversight/trouble-shooting	Attends debrief via webinar
FACILITATOR	n/a	Participates in 1-month call, subsequent calls, works with State coordinator to identify respondents, assign questions, and plan Kickoff meeting, briefs module leaders and assessors	Reviews each assessment question and the evidence, attends kickoff via webinar	First point of contact for assessors and State coordinator Tracks assessment progress and works with State coordinator If assessors disagree, serves as tie-breaker for ratings	Attends meeting, leads discussion, clarifies questions	Creates introduction, reviews and edits final report content Transmits final report to NHTSA TR Team	Presents assessment debrief via webinar
ASSESSOR	Contracts to participate in assessment	n/a	n/a	Examines State answers and documentation, provides ratings and ballots for module leader review in each round	Provide feedback on questions/issues to facilitator	n/a	Possibly participates in Go-Teams following the debrief
MODULE LEADER	Contracts to participate in assessment	n/a	n/a	Based on assessor ballots and ratings, writes synthesized findings and ratings in each round	Provide feedback on questions/issues to facilitator	Creates module narratives and considerations	n/a

Table 6: Assessment Team Roles and Responsibilities by Assessment Task

PART 4:   APPENDICES

4.1   Pre-Assessment Checklist
- ❑ Determine State's due-by date for Traffic Records Assessment
- ❑ Contact NHTSA Regional Program Manager to request a listing of available Traffic Records Assessment timeslots
- ❑ Send official letter to the NHTSA RA requesting an assessment, specifying the top three timeslot choices
- ❑ Review the *State Traffic Records Assessment Program Advisory* and the *Procedures Manual for State Traffic Records Assessments*
- ❑ Once a date for the assessment is agreed upon, set a time for a pre-assessment conference call, hosted by NHTSA, to discuss milestones and establish schedule for the Assessment
- ❑ Well in advance of the kickoff meeting, review the assessment questions in the *Advisory* and select State employees or traffic safety advocates and data users to respond to each question, ensuring a combination of data users, collectors and mangers are assigned to provide various perspectives on the State's traffic records system
- ❑ Once selected, ensure all chosen respondents are listed in the STRAP contact file, including contact information, particularly e-mail addresses
- ❑ Ensure job title, agency and office are known for each respondent for entry into the system (This provides assessors with background on the respondents' capabilities to answer any requests for clarification or to perhaps suggest a more suitable respondent, based on job duties)
- ❑ Ensure all respondents will be available to meet the deadlines set for the assessment
- ❑ Arrange for a meeting space for the Assessment Kickoff Meeting which will enable conferencing capabilities
- ❑ Invite the TRCC, both executive and technical representatives, to the Kickoff meeting, assigning one technical level member as a trainer for anyone who misses the STRAP training session
- ❑ Provide call-in information for Kickoff meeting for those that cannot attend in person
- ❑ Ensure the meeting location is convenient to hotels and airport transportation for those who will travel from out of town for the meeting
- ❑ Arrange for a meeting space for the On-Site Meeting which will enable conferencing capabilities
- ❑ Invite the TRCC, both executive and technical representatives, to the On-Site Meeting, assigning one technical level member as a trainer for anyone who misses the STRAP training session
- ❑ Provide call-in information for Kickoff meeting for those that cannot attend in person
- ❑ Begin to compile and upload documents to the document library (Most questions also require a narrative description of process or activity, which will be the responsibility of the individual respondents)

4.2   Suggested Document Library

This list is not exhaustive and is meant to suggest useful documents a State can include as part of their document library.

General Documents	Supports Question(s)
TRCC Charter and/or MOU, dated (and signed if appropriate)	1, 2, 4, 5
TRCC Roster with the name, affiliation, title, and what systems they represent for executive and technical level TRCC members.	1
Most recent *State Strategic Plan for Traffic Records Improvement*	3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 14,15, 17-27, 40, 319
List of Performance Measures for the core systems: timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, accessibility, with numeric goals, if applicable	8, 62-68, 105-111, 141-147, 179-185, 220-234, 251-257, 278-284, 297-303
Minutes for the two most recent Technical TRCC meetings (dated)	9, 13, 15, 27, 115, 151
Traffic Records System Inventory- System inventory specifying all traffic records data sources, system custodians, data elements and attributes, linkage variables, linkages useful to the State, and data access policies.	10
Position Description for TRCC Chair	11
Position Description for Traffic Records Coordinator	12
Past year's TRCC meeting schedule	13
List of Tech TRCC subcommittees including meeting dates and purpose	13
Inventory of funds used for TR Improvement	16

Table 7: General Documents and Supporting Question(s)

Crash System Documents	Supports Question(s)
Describe the crash database and identify the custodian	28, 29
State statute outlining crash reporting requirements	30-34
Police Crash Report Form	28-44
Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP)	38
State Highway Plan (HSP)	38
Policy/Procedure for crash reporting for PDO, Injury, Fatal, Non-traffic way crashes	30-34
Data Dictionary for Crash Database	41-44
List of edit checks for crash database if not included in the data dictionary	42
Narrative description of the use of MMUCC elements and attributes included in the crash database and on the Police Crash Report.	39

Narrative description of the use of ANSI D.16 to define data elements included in the crash database and on the Police Crash Report.	40
List of elements and attributes collected from all reporting agencies	45
List of data fields that are linked to traffic records system databases.	44, 98, 202, 203
Percentage of total crashes collected/submitted and percentages of agencies collecting/submitting electronically	50, 51
Crash data process flow diagrams: crash form review process, collection/reporting/posting of crash data, quality assurance and quality control, validation processes/rules	46-48, 52
Crash report retention and archival policies	49
Sample data quality management report. Specify how frequently they are issued to the TRCC	75

Table 8: Crash Documents and Supporting Question(s)

Driver System Documents	Supports Question(s)
Description of the driver database and identification of the custodian	76
Data dictionary for the driver file	80 - 83
Process flow diagrams for driver system: Key process flows, Initial event to (licensure, traffic violation) entry; error correction and handling; purging records; how court actions are posted; administrative license suspension	84-88
Driver licensing procedures related to access and security	96 - 97

Table 9: Driver Documents and Supporting Question(s)

Vehicle System Documents	Supports Question(s)
Describe the vehicle system database, including whether it resides in a single location, and whether data are processed in real time. Identify the custodian	117, 138
Sample documents identifying information encoded on all barcode forms in use	119
NMVTIS query processing instructions and manner of transmittal	120, 121
List of State title brands/ procedures for their application	122
Data dictionary for the Vehicle database	124
Listing of edit check and data collection guidelines	125
Process flow diagrams for vehicle system: Initial event(reg/title) to entry, showing alternate flows and the time needed to complete each step; Error corrections and handling; How title brand is applied	127-134
Description of interfaces with other traffic record system databases	135-137
Sample quality management report for vehicle system and note frequency of its provision to the TRCC	152

Roadway System Documents	Supports Question(s)
Map displaying all public roads that represents system capabilities. ID what percentage of public road system is state maintained, explain location referencing systems in place	153
Map displaying roadway features and traffic volume for all public roads representative of system capabilities	154
Map displaying crash locations representative of system capabilities statewide	156
List of Fundamental Data Elements collected for each public road type	158
List of MIRE Data Elements collected	158, 159
Description of the Location Reference System and files that use it. If more than one LRS, description of each and the files that use them	156, 170
Data dictionary for the roadway system	160-163
Process flows for the roadway system: Steps for incorporating new elements into the roadway system; steps for updating roadway information; steps for updating traffic volume and roadway feature elements; process for archiving and accessing historical roadway inventory; procedures for local agency data, managing, and submitting data; means by which compatibility between local and state data is achieved; collection of data elements in the state data dictionary	164-169
Sample data quality report for the Roadway system	175
Narrative report that describes interface linkages between the State's roadway information systems	171

Table 11: Roadway Documents and Supporting Question(s)

Citation/Adjudication System Documents	Supports Question(s)
Flow chart/audit report showing how court dispositions are posted to the driver file	190
Data dictionary for the statewide citation tracking system, if there are two or more repositories of citation data, please provide data dictionaries for the two largest	197, 199
Data dictionary for the court case management system most commonly used within the State	198, 200
Process flows for administrative handling of payment in lieu of court appearance, tracking administrative driver penalties and sanctions, annual list of numbers and types of citations issued to juvenile offenders, handling of deferrals and dismissals	205, 206, 208

Documentation of interfaces between citation and adjudication systems and other traffic record system databases	214-219

Table 12: Citation/Adjudication Documents and Supporting Question(s)

Injury Surveillance System Documents	Supports Question(s)
Data dictionaries for Emergency Department and Hospital Discharge databases	265, 271
Data dictionary for the Trauma Registry	291, 293
Data dictionary for the EMS system	244
Data dictionary for the Vital Records dataset	310
Data access policies and use agreements for all ISS data and datasets	246, 267, 273, 294, 311
Distribution of AIS and ISS scores for the most recent year available	274, 292
Data exchange agreements for ISS data	315, 316
Demonstration of submission to NEMSIS and relevant state statutes or regulations	243
Sample Quality Management reports for each component of the ISS system	261, 287, 306, 314
Sample quality control review for each component of the ISS system	258, 285, 304, 313

Table 13: Injury Surveillance Documents and Supporting Question(s)

Data Use and Integration	Supports Question(s)
Sample of program specific analysis performed by behavioral program managers for problem ID, program evaluation, priority setting	317
Description of Data Governance policy, including how it supports traffic safety data integration and formal data quality management	318, 319
Documentation of integrative links between each of the traffic records system's component systems, i.e., crash and driver.	320 - 326
List of analytical resources available to decision-makers and which decision-makers have access	327
List of analytical resources available to the public	328

Table 14: Data Use and Integration Documents and Supporting Question(s)

4.3   Draft Agenda for Assessment Kickoff Meeting

<<State>> Traffic Records Assessment
Kickoff Meeting

<<Date>>   <<Time>>   <Location>>
<<Call-in Information>>

08:30-09:00   Pre-Meeting/Setup
Attendees: State coordinator, facilitator (via webinar), TR Team rep, logistics support

09:00-9:30   Introduction & Assessment Overview
Attendees: State coordinator, facilitator (via webinar), TR Team rep, TRCC, system managers, respondents

9:30 -10:00   STRAP Demo / Respondent Q&A
Attendees: State coordinator, facilitator (via webinar), TR Team rep, respondents

10:00-10:30   Post-meeting/Availability for Final Questions
Attendees**:** State coordinator, facilitator (via webinar), TR Team rep

Contacts		<<State>> TR Assessment Schedule

Contacts

State coordinator
<<Name>>
<<Phone>>
<<Email>>

Facilitator
<<Name>>
<<Phone>>
<<Email>>

TR Team Rep
<<Name>>
<<Phone>>
<<Email>>

Month 1

Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

Month 2

Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

Month 3

Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

Month 4

Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Schedule legend:
- Kickoff
- R1: State answers questions
- R1: Assessors make initial ratings
- On-Site Prep and On-Site Meeting
- R2: State makes final response
- R2: Assessors make final ratings
- Facilitator Round
- NHTSA   Review
- Report Out

4.4   Master List of Assessment Questions and Respondents

Traffic Records Coordinating Committee	2018 Suggested Respondent
1. Does the TRCC membership include executive and technical staff representation from all six data systems?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
2. Do the executive members of the TRCC regularly participate in TRCC meetings and have the power to direct the agencies' resources for their respective areas of responsibility?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
3. Do the custodial agencies seek feedback from the TRCC members when major projects or system redesigns are being planned?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
4. Does the TRCC involve the appropriate State IT agency or offices when member agencies are planning and implementing technology projects?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
5. Is there a formal document authorizing the TRCC?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
6. Does the TRCC provide the leadership and coordination necessary to develop, implement, and monitor the State Traffic Records Strategic Plan?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
7. Does the TRCC advise the State Highway Safety Office on allocation of Federal traffic records improvement grant funds?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
8. Does the TRCC identify core system performance measures and monitor progress?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
9. Does the TRCC enable meaningful coordination among stakeholders and serve as a forum for the discussion of the State's traffic records programs, challenges, and investments?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
10. Does the TRCC have a traffic records inventory?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
11. Does the TRCC have a designated chair?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
12. Is there a designated Traffic Records Coordinator?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
13. Does the TRCC meet at least quarterly?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
14. Does the TRCC review quality control and quality improvement programs impacting the core data systems?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
15. Does the TRCC assess and coordinate the technical assistance and training needs of stakeholders?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
16. Do the TRCC's program planning and coordination efforts reflect traffic records improvement funding sources beyond §405(c) funds?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
Strategic Planning for Traffic Records Systems	**2018 Suggested Respondent**
17. Does the State Traffic Records Strategic Plan address existing data and data systems areas of opportunity and document how these are identified?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator

18. Does the State Traffic Records Strategic Plan identify countermeasures that address at least one of the performance attributes (timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, and accessibility) for each of the six core data systems?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
19. Does the TRCC have a process for identifying at least one performance measure and the corresponding metrics for the six core data systems in the State	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
20. Does the TRCC have a process for prioritizing traffic records improvement projects in the State Traffic Records Strategic Plan?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
21. Does the TRCC identify and address technical assistance and training needs in the State Traffic Records Strategic Plan?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
22. Does the TRCC have a process for establishing timelines and responsibilities for projects in the State Traffic Records Strategic Plan?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
23. Does the TRCC have a process for integrating and addressing State and local (to include Federally recognized Indian Tribes, where applicable) data needs and goals into the State Traffic Records Strategic Plan?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
24. Does the TRCC consider the use of new technology when developing and managing traffic records projects in the State Traffic Records Strategic Plan?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
25. Does the State Traffic Records Strategic Plan consider lifecycle costs in implementing improvement projects?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
26. Does the State Traffic Records Strategic Plan make provisions for coordination with key Federal traffic records data systems?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
27. Is the TRCC's State Traffic Records Strategic Plan reviewed, updated and approved annually?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
Crash Data System	
28. Is statewide crash data consolidated into one database?	Crash file manager/custodian
29. Is the statewide crash system's organizational custodian clearly defined?	Crash file manager/custodian
30. Does the State have criteria requiring the submission of fatal crashes to the statewide crash system?	Crash file manager/custodian
31. Does the State have criteria requiring the submission of injury crashes to the statewide crash system?	Crash file manager/custodian
32. Does the State have criteria requiring the submission of property damage only (PDO) crashes to the statewide crash system?	Crash file manager/custodian
33. Does the State have statutes or other criteria specifying timeframes for crash report submission to the statewide crash database?	Crash file manager/custodian
34. Does the statewide crash system record crashes occurring in non-trafficway areas (e.g., parking lots, driveways)?	Crash file custodian, State and local law enforcement, State and local Traffic Engineers, MPOs
35. Is data from the crash system used to identify crash risk factors?	State and local Traffic Engineers, MPOs, State Safety Engineer, State and local law enforcement

36. Is data from the crash system used to guide engineering and construction projects?	State and local Traffic Engineers, MPOs, State Safety Engineer, State and local law enforcement
37. Is data from the crash system regularly used to prioritize law enforcement activity?	SHSO, State/local Traffic Engrs, State/local LE, MPOs
38. Is data from the crash system used to evaluate safety countermeasure programs?	SHSO, State/local Traffic Engrs, MPOs, State/local law enf., State Safety Engineer
39. Is there a process by which MMUCC is used to help identify what crash data elements and attributes the State collects?	Persons/Entity responsible for designing the State crash form
40. Is there a process by which ANSI D.16 is used to help identify the definitions in the crash system data dictionary?	Persons/Entity responsible for designing the State crash form
41. Does the data dictionary provide a definition for each data element and define that data element's allowable values/attributes?	Crash file manager/custodian, Crash file IT manager
42. Does the data dictionary document the system edit checks and validation rules?	Crash file manager/custodian, Crash file IT manager
43. Is the data dictionary up-to-date and consistent with the field data collection manual, coding manual, crash report, database schema and any training materials?	Crash file manager/custodian Crash file IT manager
44. Does the crash system data dictionary indicate the data elements populated through links to other traffic records system components?	Crash file manager/custodian, Crash file IT manager
45. Does the State collect an identical set of data elements and attributes from all reporting agencies, independent of collection method?	Crash file manager/custodian, Crash file IT manager
46. Does the State reevaluate their crash form at regular intervals?	Crash file manager/custodian, Crash file IT manager
47. Does the State maintain accurate and up-to-date documentation detailing the policies and procedures for key processes governing the collection, reporting, and posting of crash data— including the submission of fatal crash data to the State FARS unit and commercial vehicle crash data to SafetyNet?	Crash file manager/custodian, State/local Traffic Engrs, MPOs, FARS analyst, SAFETYNET, SHSO
48. Are the quality assurance and quality control processes for managing errors and incomplete data documented?	Crash file manager/custodian, Crash file data entry supervisor
49. Do the document retention and archival storage policies meet the needs of safety engineers and other users with a legitimate need for long-term access to the crash data reports?	Crash file manager, crash data users, State/local Traffic Engineers, MPOs, State Epidemiologist, Injury prevention staff, State Safety Engineer
50. Do all law enforcement agencies collect crash data electronically?	Law Enforcement Agencies, State and local, crash file custodian
51. Do all law enforcement agencies submit their data to the statewide crash system electronically?	Law Enforcement Agencies, State and local, crash file custodian
52. Do all law enforcement agencies collecting crash data electronically in the field apply validation rules consistent with those in the statewide crash system prior to submission?	Law Enforcement agencies using e-crash (small, large, urban, rural), crash file custodian

53. Does the crash system have a real-time interface with the driver system?	Crash file custodian/manager, driver file manager/custodian
54. Does the crash system have a real-time interface with the vehicle system?	Crash file manager/custodian, vehicle file manager/custodian
55. Does the crash system interface with the roadway system?	Crash file manager/custodian, State Engineering file managers
56. Does the crash system interface with the citation and adjudication systems?	Crash file manager/custodian, Administrative Office of the Courts
57. Does the crash system have an interface with EMS?	Crash file manager/custodian, TRCC Chair, CODES, Managers of various ISS databases
58. Are there automated edit checks and validation rules to ensure that entered data falls within a range of acceptable values and is logically consistent among data elements?	Crash file manager/custodian, Crash file IT manager, Crash data entry supervisor
59. Is limited State-level correction authority granted to quality control staff working with the statewide crash database to amend obvious errors and omissions without returning the report to the originating officer?	Crash file manager/custodian, Crash data entry supervisor
60. Are there formally documented processes for returning rejected crash reports to the originating officer and tracking resubmission of the report in place?	Crash file manager/custodian, Crash data entry supervisor
61. Does the State track crash report changes after the original report is submitted by the law enforcement agency?	Crash file manager/custodian, Crash data entry supervisor
62. Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Crash file manager/custodian, TRCC Chair or TRC
63. Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Crash file manager/custodian, TRCC Chair or TRC
64. Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Crash file manager/custodian, TRCC Chair or TRC
65. Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Crash file manager/custodian, TRCC Chair or TRC
66. Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Crash file manager/custodian, TRCC Chair or TRC
67. Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Crash file manager/custodian, TRCC Chair or TRC
68. Has the State established numeric goals—performance metrics—for each performance measure?	Crash file manager/custodian, TRCC Chair or TRC
69. Is there performance reporting that provides specific timeliness, accuracy, and completeness feedback to each law enforcement agency?	Crash file manager/custodian, TRCC Chair or TRC
70. Are detected high-frequency errors used to prompt revisions, update the validation rules, and generate updated training content and data collection manuals?	Crash file manager/custodian, TRCC Chair or TRC, crash file IT manager
71. Are quality control reviews comparing the narrative, diagram, and coded contents of the report considered part of the statewide crash database's data acceptance process?	Crash file manager/custodian, TRCC Chair or TRC, crash file IT manager

72. Are sample-based audits periodically conducted for crash reports and related database content?	Crash file manager/custodian, TRCC Chair or TRC, Crash file IT manager
73. Are periodic comparative and trend analyses used to identify unexplained differences in the data across years and jurisdictions?	Crash file manager/custodian, State/local Traffic Engrs, MPOs, Crash data users, Custodians of Health Dept. databases, TRCC Chair, crash file IT manager
74. Is data quality feedback from key users regularly communicated to data collectors and data managers?	Crash file manager/custodian, State/local Traffic Engrs, MPOs, Crash file IT manager, TRCC Chair
75. Are data quality management reports provided to the TRCC for regular review?	Crash file manager/custodian, Crash file IT manager, TRCC Chair, TRC
Driver Data System	**Suggested Respondent**
76. Does custodial responsibility for the driver data system—including commercially-licensed drivers—reside in a single location?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
77. Does the driver data system capture details of novice driver, motorcycle, and driver improvement (remedial) training histories?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
78. Does the driver data system capture and retain the dates of original issuance for all permits, licensing, and endorsements (e.g., learner's permit, provisional license, commercial driver's license, motorcycle license)?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
79. Is driver information maintained in a manner that accommodates interaction with the National Driver Register's PDPS and CDLIS?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
80. Are the contents of the driver data system documented with data definitions for each field?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
81. Are all valid field values—including null codes—documented in the data dictionary?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
82. Are there edit checks and data collection guidelines for each data element?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
83. Is there guidance on how and when to update the data dictionary?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
84. Does the custodial agency maintain accurate and up-to-date documentation detailing: the licensing, permitting, and endorsement issuance procedures; reporting and recording of relevant convictions, driver education, driver improvement course; and recording of information that may result in a change of license status (e.g., sanctions, withdrawals, reinstatement, revocations, cancellations and restrictions) including manual or electronic reporting and timelines, where applicable?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
85. Is there a process flow diagram that outlines the driver data system's key data process flows, including inputs from other data systems?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file

86. Are the processes for error correction and error handling documented for: license, permit, and endorsement issuance; reporting and recording of relevant convictions; reporting and recording of driver education and improvement courses; and reporting and recording of other information that may result in a change of license status?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
87. Are there processes and procedures for purging data from the driver data system documented?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
88. In States that have the administrative authority to suspend licenses based on a DUI arrest independent of adjudication, are these processes documented?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
89. Are there established processes to detect false identity licensure fraud?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
90. Are there established processes to detect internal fraud by individual users or examiners?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
91. Are there established processes to detect CDL fraud?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
92. Does the State transfer the Driver History Record (DHR) electronically to another State when requested due to a change in State of Record?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
93. Does the State obtain the previous State of Record electronically upon request?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
94. Does the State run facial recognition prior to issuing a credential?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
95. Does the State exchange driver photos with other State Licensing agencies upon request?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
96. Are there policies and procedures for maintaining appropriate system and information security?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
97. Are there procedures in place to ensure that driver system custodians track access and release of driver information?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
98. Does the State post at-fault crashes to the driver record?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file, driver license IT manager
99. Does the State's DUI tracking system interface with the driver data system?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
100. Is there an interface between the driver data system and: the Problem Driver Pointer System, the Commercial Driver Licensing System, the Social Security Online Verification system, and the Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlement system?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file, driver license IT manager
101. Does the custodial agency have the capability to grant authorized law enforcement personnel access to information in the driver system?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file, driver license IT manager
102. Does the custodial agency have the capability to grant authorized court personnel access to information in the driver system?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file, Driver license IT manager
103. Is there a formal, comprehensive data quality management program for the driver system?	Driver license manager, custodian of the driver file

104. Are there automated edit checks and validation rules to ensure entered data falls within a range of acceptable values and is logically consistent among data elements?	Driver license manager, custodian of the driver file
105. Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Driver license manager, custodian of the driver file
106. Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Driver license manager, custodian of the driver file
107. Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Driver license manager, custodian of the driver file
108. Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Driver license manager, custodian of the driver file
109. Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Driver license manager, custodian of the driver file
110. Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Driver license manager, custodian of the driver file
111. Has the State established numeric goals—performance metrics—for each performance measure?	Driver license manager, custodian of the driver file
112. Is the detection of high frequency errors used to generate updates to training content and data collection manuals, update the validation rules, and prompt form revisions?	Driver license manager, custodian of the driver file
113. Are sample-based audits conducted periodically for the driver reports and related database contents for that record?	Driver license manager, custodian of the driver file
114. Are periodic comparative and trend analyses used to identify unexplained differences in the data across years and jurisdictions?	Driver license manager, custodian of the driver file
115. Is data quality feedback from key users regularly communicated to data collectors and data managers?	Driver license manager, custodian of the driver file
116. Are data quality management reports provided to the TRCC for regular review?	Driver license manager, custodian of the driver file
Vehicle Data System	**Suggested Respondent**
117. Does custodial responsibility of the identification and ownership of vehicles registered in the State—including vehicle make, model, year of manufacture, body type, and adverse vehicle history (title brands)—reside in a single location?	Titles/Registration manager, vehicle file custodian
118. Does the State or its agents validate every VIN with a verification software application?	Titles/Reg manager, vehicle file custodian
119. Are vehicle registration documents barcoded—using at a minimum the 2D standard—to allow for rapid, accurate collection of vehicle information by law enforcement officers in the field using barcode readers or scanners?	Titles/Reg manager, vehicle file custodian
120. Does the vehicle system provide title information data to the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System (NMVTIS) at least daily?	Titles/Reg manager, vehicle file custodian
121. Does the vehicle system query NMVTIS before issuing new titles?	Titles/Reg manager, vehicle file custodian

122. Does the State incorporate brand information recommended by AAMVA and/or received via NMVTIS on the vehicle record, whether the brand description matches the State's brand descriptions?	Titles/Reg manager, vehicle file custodian
123. Does the State participate in the Performance and Registration Information Systems Management (PRISM) program?	Title/Reg file manager, vehicle file custodian, International Registration Plan manager
124. Does the vehicle system have a documented definition for each data field?	Title Reg file manager, vehicle file custodian, vehicle file IT manager
125. Does the vehicle system include edit check and data collection guidelines that correspond to the data definitions?	Title Reg file manager, vehicle file custodian, vehicle file IT manager
126. Are the collection, reporting, and posting procedures for registration, title, and title brand information formally documented?	Title Reg file manager, vehicle file custodian, vehicle file IT manager
127. Is there a process flow that outlines the vehicle system's key data process flows, including inputs from other data systems?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
128. Does the vehicle system flag or identify vehicles reported as stolen to law enforcement authorities?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
129. If the vehicle system does flag or identify vehicles reported as stolen to law enforcement authorities, are these flags removed when a stolen vehicle has been recovered or junked?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
130. Does the State record and maintain the title brand history (previously applied to vehicles by other States)?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
131. Are the steps from initial event (titling, registration) to final entry into the statewide vehicle system documented?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
132. Is the process flow annotated to show the time required to complete each step?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
133. Does the process flow show alternative data flows and timelines?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
134. Does the process flow include processes for error correction and error handling?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
135. Are the driver and vehicle files unified in one system?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
136. Is personal information entered into the vehicle system using the same conventions used in the driver system?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
137. When discrepancies are identified during data entry in the crash data system, are vehicle records flagged for possible updating?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
138. Is the vehicle system data processed in real-time?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
139. Are there automated edit checks and validation rules to ensure that entered data falls within a range of acceptable values and is logically consistent among data elements?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
140. Are statewide vehicle system staff able to amend obvious errors and omissions for quality control purposes?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents

141. Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
142. Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
143. Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
144. Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
145. Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
146. Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
147. Has the State established numeric goals—performance metrics—for each performance measure?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
148. Is the detection of high frequency errors used to generate updates to training content and data collection manuals, update the validation rules, and prompt form revisions?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
149. Are sample-based audits conducted for vehicle reports and related database contents for that record?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
150. Are periodic comparative and trend analyses used to identify unexplained differences in the data across years and jurisdictions within the State?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
151. Is data quality feedback from key users regularly communicated to data collectors and data managers?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
152. Are data quality management reports provided to the TRCC for regular review?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
Roadway Data System	**Suggested Respondent**
153. Are all public roadways within the State located using a compatible location referencing system?	State/local traffic engineers, MPOs
154. Are the collected roadway and traffic data elements located using a compatible location referencing system (e.g., LRS, GIS)?	State/local traffic engineers, MPOs
155. Is there an enterprise roadway information system containing roadway and traffic data elements for all public roads?	State/local traffic engineers, MPOs
156. Does the State have the ability to identify crash locations using a referencing system compatible with the one(s) used for roadways?	State/local traffic engineers, MPOs
157. Is crash data incorporated into the enterprise roadway information system for safety analysis and management use?	State/local traffic engineers, MPOs
158. Are all the MIRE Fundamental Data Elements collected for all public roads?	State Traffic Engineers
159. Do all additional collected data elements for any public roads conform to the data elements included in MIRE?	DOT Road file managers, Roadway file IT manager

160. Are all the MIRE Fundamental Data Elements for all public roads documented in the enterprise system's data dictionary?	DOT Road file managers, Roadway file IT manager
161. Are all additional (non-Fundamental Data Element) MIRE data elements for all public roads documented in the data dictionary?	DOT Road file managers, Roadway file IT manager
162. Does local, municipal, or tribal (where applicable) roadway data comply with the data dictionary?	DOT Road file managers, Roadway file IT manager
163. Is there guidance on how and when to update the data dictionary?	DOT Road file managers, Roadway file IT manager
164. Are the steps for incorporating new elements into the roadway information system (e.g., a new MIRE element) documented to show the flow of information?	State Traffic Engineers
165. Are the steps for updating roadway information documented to show the flow of information?	State Traffic Engineers
166. Are the steps for archiving and accessing historical roadway inventory documented?	State Traffic Engineers
167. Are the procedures used to collect, manage, and submit local agency roadway data (e.g., county, MPO, municipality, tribal) to the statewide inventory documented?	State/local Traffic Engineers
168. Are procedures for collecting and managing the local agency (to include tribal, where applicable) roadway data compatible with the State's enterprise roadway inventory?	State/local Traffic Engineers
169. Are there guidelines for collection of data elements as they are described in the State roadway inventory data dictionary?	State/local Traffic Engineers
170. Are the location coding methodologies for all State roadway information systems compatible?	State Traffic Engineers
171. Are there interface linkages connecting the State's discrete roadway information systems?	State Traffic Engineers
172. Are the location coding methodologies for all regional, local, and tribal roadway systems compatible?	State Traffic Engineers
173. Do roadway data systems maintained by regional and local custodians (e.g., MPOs, municipalities, and Federally recognized Indian Tribes) interface with the State enterprise roadway information system?	State/local Traffic Engineers
174. Does the State enterprise roadway information system allow MPOs and local transportation agencies (to include Federally recognized Tribes, where applicable) on-demand access to data?	State/local Traffic Engineers
175. Do Roadway system data managers regularly produce and analyze data quality reports?	DOT Roadway file managers
176. Is there a formal program of error/edit checking for data entered into the statewide roadway data system?	DOT Roadway file managers
177. Are there procedures for prioritizing and addressing detected errors?	DOT Roadway file managers

178. Are there procedures for sharing quality control information with data collectors through individual and agency-level feedback and training?	DOT Roadway file managers
179. Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	DOT Roadway file managers
180. Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	DOT Roadway file managers
181. Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	DOT Roadway file managers
182. Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	DOT Roadway file managers
183. Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	DOT Roadway file managers
184. Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	DOT Roadway file managers
185. Has the State established numeric goals—performance metrics—for each performance measure?	DOT Roadway file managers
186. Are data quality management reports provided to the TRCC for regular review?	DOT Roadway file managers
Citation and Adjudication Systems	**Suggested Respondents**
187. Is citation and adjudication data used for the prosecution of offenders; adjudication of cases; traffic safety analysis to identify problem locations, problem drivers, and issues related to the issuance of citations; and for traffic safety program planning purposes?	State Traffic Engineers, State Court Administrator, Program Managers at SHSO, Local and State law enforcement
188. Is there a statewide authority that assigns unique citation numbers?	State law enforcement, State Court Administrator
189. Are all citation dispositions—both within and outside the judicial branch—tracked by a statewide citation tracking system?	State Court Administrator
190. Are final dispositions (up to and including the resolution of any appeals) posted to the driver data system?	Driver License Manager, Driver file custodian, State Court Administrator
191. Are the courts' case management systems interoperable among all jurisdictions within the State (including tribal, local, municipal, and State)?	State Court Administrator
192. Is there a statewide system that provides real-time information on individuals' driving and criminal histories?	Law Enforcement agencies, prosecutors, State criminal investigation bureau, State Court Administrator
193. Do all law enforcement agencies, parole agencies, probation agencies, and courts within the State participate in and have access to a system providing real-time information on individuals driving and criminal histories?	State Criminal Investigation Bureau, State Law Enforcement Telecommunications Manager, Prosecutors, State Court Administrator, Law enforcement agencies

194. Are DUI convictions and traffic-related felonies reported according to Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) guidelines?	Local/State law enforcement
195. Do the appropriate portions of the citation and adjudication systems adhere to the NIEM Justice domain guidelines?	Courts and State Law Enforcement IT managers
196. Does the State use any National Center for State Courts (NCSC) guidelines for court records?	State Court Administrator
197. Does the statewide citation tracking system have a data dictionary?	State Court Administrator, TSRP, Courts IT manager
198. Do the courts' case management system data dictionaries provide a definition for each data field?	Courts IT manager
199. Do the citation data dictionaries clearly define all data fields?	Courts IT manager
200. Do the courts' case management system data dictionaries clearly define all data fields?	Courts IT manager
201. Are the citation system data dictionaries up-to-date and consistent with the field data collection manual, training materials, coding manuals, and corresponding reports?	Courts IT manager
202. Do the citation data dictionaries indicate the data fields that are populated through interfaces with other traffic records system components?	Courts IT manager
203. Do the courts' case management system data dictionaries indicate the data fields populated through interface linkages with other traffic records system components?	Courts IT manager
204. Does the State track citations from point of issuance to posting on the driver file?	State Court Administrator
205. Does the State distinguish between the administrative handling of court payments in lieu of court appearances (mail-ins) and court appearances?	State court administrator, prosecutors
206. Does the State have a system for tracking administrative driver penalties and sanctions?	Driver license manager, State court administrator
207. Does the State track the number and types of traffic citations for juvenile offenders?	Driver license manager, State court administrator
208. Are deferrals and dismissals tracked by the court case management systems or on the driver history record (DHR) to insure subsequent repeat offenses are not viewed as first offenses?	State court administrator, prosecutors, driver file custodian
209. Are there State and/or local criteria for deferring or dismissing traffic citations and charges?	State Court Administrator, municipal court clerks' association, prosecutors
210. Are the processes for retaining, archiving or purging citation records defined and documented?	State Court Administrator, Court IT manager, driver file custodian,
211. Are there security protocols governing data access, modification, and release in the adjudication system?	State Court Administrator, prosecutors, Court IT manager

212. Does the State have an impaired driving data tracking system that uses some or all the data elements or guidelines of NHTSA's Model Impaired Driving Records Information System (MIDRIS), which provides a central point of access for DUI Driver information from the time of the stop/arrest through adjudication, sanctions, rehabilitation, prosecution and posting to the driver history file?	State Court Administrator, driver license manager, driver file custodian, driver control/ improvement section manager, SHSO program managers
213. Does the DUI tracking system include BAC and any drug testing results?	State Court Administrator, driver license manager
214. Does the citation system interface with the driver system to collect driver information to help determine the applicable charges?	Driver license manager, driver file custodian, driver control/ improvement manager, prosecutors, State court administrator
215. Does the citation system interface with the vehicle system to collect vehicle information and carry out administrative actions (e.g., vehicle seizure, forfeiture, interlock)?	State court administrator, vehicle file custodian
216. Does the citation system interface with the crash system to document violations and charges related to the crash?	State court administrator, crash file custodian
217. Does the adjudication system interface with the driver system to post dispositions to the driver file?	State court administrator, driver file custodian
218. Does the adjudication system interface with the vehicle system to collect vehicle information and carry out administrative actions (e.g., vehicle seizure, forfeiture, interlock mandates, and supervision)?	State court administrator, vehicle file custodian
219. Does the adjudication system interface with the crash system to document violations and charges related to the crash?	State court administrator, crash file custodian
220. Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of citation systems managers and data users?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, courts IT manager
221. Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of citation systems managers and data users?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, courts IT manager
222. Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of citation systems managers and data users?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, courts IT manager
223. Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of citation systems managers and data users?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, courts IT manager
224. Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of citation systems managers and data users?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, courts IT manager
225. Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of citation systems managers and data users?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, courts IT manager
226. Has the State established numeric goals—performance metrics—for each citation system performance measure?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, courts IT manager
227. Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of adjudication systems managers and data users?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, courts IT manager
228. Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of adjudication systems managers and data users?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, courts IT manager

229. Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of adjudication systems managers and data users?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, courts IT manager
230. Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of adjudication systems managers and data users?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, courts IT manager
231. Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of adjudication systems managers and data users?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, courts IT manager
232. Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of adjudication systems managers and data users?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, courts IT manager
233. Has the State established numeric goals—performance metrics—for each adjudication system performance measure?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, courts IT manager
234. Does the State have performance measures for its DUI Tracking system?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, DUI tracking system manager
235. Are sample-based audits conducted periodically for citations and related database content for that record?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, courts IT manager
236. Are data quality management reports provided to the TRCC for regular review?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, courts IT manager
Injury Surveillance System	**Suggested Respondents**
237. Is there an entity in the State that quantifies the burden of motor vehicle injury using EMS, emergency department, hospital discharge, trauma registry and vital records data?	State health department division responsibility for injury surveillance
238. Are there any other statewide databases that are used to quantify the burden of motor vehicle injury?	CODES, Traffic Records Coordinator
239. Do the State's privacy laws allow for the use of protected health information to support data analysis activities?	State hospital association, State department of information technology
240. Is there a statewide EMS database?	SHSO program managers, Traffic Records Coordinator, Dept. of Health, EMS, CODES
241. Does the EMS data track the frequency, severity, and nature of injuries sustained in motor vehicle crashes in the State?	EMS, CODES
242. Is the EMS data available for analysis and used to identify problems, evaluate programs, and allocate resources?	SHSO program managers, CODES, EMS
243. Does the State have a NEMSIS-compliant statewide database?	EMS, Traffic Records Coordinator, CODES
244. Does the EMS system have a formal data dictionary?	EMS
245. Is there a single entity that collects and compiles data from the local EMS agencies?	EMS
246. Is aggregate EMS data available to outside parties (e.g., universities, traffic safety professionals) for analytical purposes?	EMS
247. Are there procedures in place for the submission of all EMS patient care reports to the Statewide EMS database?	EMS

248. Are there procedures for returning data to the reporting EMS agencies for quality assurance and improvement (e.g., correction and resubmission)?	EMS
249. Are there automated edit checks and validation rules to ensure that entered EMS data falls within a range of acceptable values and is logically consistent among data elements?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
250. Are there processes for returning rejected EMS patient care reports to the collecting entity and tracking resubmission to the statewide EMS database?	EMS
251. Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of EMS system managers and data users?	EMS
252. Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of EMS system managers and data users?	EMS
253. Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of EMS system managers and data users?	EMS
254. Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of EMS system managers and data users?	EMS
255. Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of EMS system managers and data users?	EMS
256. Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of EMS system managers and data users?	EMS
257. Has the State established numeric goals—performance metrics—for each EMS system performance measure?	EMS
258. Are quality control reviews conducted to ensure the completeness, accuracy, and uniformity of injury data in the EMS system?	EMS
259. Are periodic comparative and trend analyses used to identify unexplained differences in the EMS data across years and agencies?	EMS
260. Is data quality feedback from key users regularly communicated to EMS data collectors and data managers?	EMS
261. Are EMS data quality management reports produced regularly and made available to the State TRCC?	EMS
262. Is there a statewide emergency department (ED) database?	SHSO program managers, Traffic Records Coordinator, Dept. of Health, EMS, CODES, Hospital Association
263. Does the emergency department data track the frequency, severity, and nature of injuries sustained in motor vehicle crashes in the State?	EMS, CODES
264. Is the emergency department data available for analysis and used to identify problems, evaluate programs, and allocate resources?	Hospital Assoc, CODES, Dept. of Health
265. Does the emergency department dataset have a formal data dictionary?	Hospital Association, Department of Health

266. Is there a single entity that collects and compiles data on emergency department visits from individual hospitals?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
267. Is aggregate emergency department data available to outside parties (e.g., universities, traffic safety professionals) for analytical purposes?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
268. Is there a statewide hospital discharge database?	SHSO program managers, Traffic Records Coordinator, Dept. of Health, EMS, CODES, Hospital Association
269. Does the hospital discharge data track the frequency, severity, and nature of injuries sustained in motor vehicle crashes in the State?	Hospital association, CODES, Dept. of Health Prevention Sections
270. Is the hospital discharge data available for analysis and used to identify problems, evaluate programs, and allocate resources?	Hospital Assoc, CODES, Dept. of Health
271. Does the hospital discharge dataset have a formal data dictionary?	Hospital Association, Department of Health
272. Is there a single entity that collects and compiles data on hospital discharges from individual hospitals?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
273. Is aggregate hospital discharge data available to outside parties (e.g., universities, traffic safety professionals) for analytical purposes?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
274. Are Abbreviated Injury Scale (AIS) and Injury Severity Score (ISS) derived from the State emergency department and hospital discharge data for motor vehicle crash patients?	Hospital Association, CODES, Dept. of Health
275. Are there procedures for collecting, editing, error-checking, and submitting emergency department and/or hospital discharge data to the statewide repository?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
276. Are there automated edit checks and validation rules to ensure that entered data falls within a range of acceptable values and is logically consistent among data elements?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
277. Are there processes for returning rejected emergency department and/or hospital discharge records to the collecting entity and tracking resubmission to the statewide emergency department and hospital discharge databases?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
278. Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of emergency department and/or hospital discharge database managers and data users?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
279. Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of emergency department and/or hospital discharge database managers and data users?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
280. Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of emergency department and/or hospital discharge database managers and data users?	Department of Health, Hospital Association

281. Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of emergency department and/or hospital discharge database managers and data users?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
282. Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of emergency department and/or hospital discharge database managers and data users?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
283. Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of emergency department and/or hospital discharge database managers and data users?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
284. Has the State established numeric goals—performance metrics—for each emergency department and/or hospital discharge database performance measure?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
285. Are quality control reviews conducted to ensure the completeness, accuracy, and uniformity of injury data in the emergency department and/or hospital discharge databases?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
286. Is data quality feedback from key users regularly communicated to emergency department and/or hospital discharge data collectors and data managers?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
287. Are emergency department and/or hospital discharge data quality management reports produced regularly and made available to the State TRCC?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
288. Is there a statewide trauma registry database?	SHSO program managers, Traffic Records Coordinator, Dept. of Health, Trauma Registry, CODES,
289. Does the trauma registry data track the frequency, severity, and nature of injuries sustained in motor vehicle crashes in the State?	Trauma Registry, CODES
290. Is the trauma registry data available for analysis and used to identify problems, evaluate programs, and allocate resources?	Trauma registry, CODES
291. Does the State's trauma registry database adhere to the National Trauma Data Standards?	Trauma Registry
292. Are AIS and ISS derived from the State trauma registry for motor vehicle crash patients?	Trauma Registry, CODES
293. Does the trauma registry have a formal data dictionary?	Trauma Registry
294. Is aggregate trauma registry data available to outside parties (e.g., universities, traffic safety professionals) for analytical purposes?	Trauma Registry
295. Are there procedures for returning trauma data to the reporting trauma center for quality assurance and improvement (e.g., correction and resubmission)?	Trauma Registry
296. Are there automated edit checks and validation rules to ensure that entered trauma registry data falls within a range of acceptable values and is logically consistent among data elements?	Trauma Registry

297. Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of trauma registry managers and data users?	Trauma Registry
298. Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of trauma registry managers and data users?	Trauma Registry
299. Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of trauma registry managers and data users?	Trauma Registry
300. Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of trauma registry managers and data users?	Trauma Registry
301. Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of trauma registry managers and data users?	Trauma Registry
302. Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of trauma registry managers and data users?	Trauma Registry
303. Has the State established numeric goals—performance metrics—for each trauma registry performance measure?	Trauma Registry
304. Are quality control reviews conducted to ensure the completeness, accuracy, and uniformity of injury data in the trauma registry?	Trauma Registry
305. Is data quality feedback from key users regularly communicated to trauma registry data collectors and data managers?	Trauma Registry
306. Are trauma registry data quality management reports produced regularly and made available to the State TRCC?	Trauma Registry
307. Is there a statewide vital records database?	SHSO program managers, Traffic Records Coordinator, CODES, Vital Records
308. Does the vital records data track the occurrence of motor vehicle fatalities in the State?	Vital Records, CODES, Dept. of Health
309. Is the vital records data available for analysis and used to identify problems, evaluate programs, and allocate resources?	Vital Records, CODES, Dept. of Health
310. Does the vital records system have a formal data dictionary?	Vital Records, Medical Examiner
311. Is aggregate vital records data available to outside parties (e.g., universities, traffic safety professionals) for analytical purposes?	Vital Records, Medical Examiner
312. Are there automated edit checks and validation rules to ensure that entered vital records data falls within a range of acceptable values and is logically consistent among data elements?	Vital Records, Medical Examiner, Department of Health
313. Are quality control reviews conducted to ensure the completeness, accuracy, and uniformity of injury data in the vital records?	Vital Records, Medical Examiner, Department of Health
314. Are vital records data quality management reports produced regularly and made available to the State TRCC?	Vital Records, Medical Examiner, Department of Health
315. Is there an interface among the EMS data and emergency department and hospital discharge data?	EMS, Department of Health, Hospital Association, CODES
316. Is there an interface between the EMS data and the trauma registry data?	EMS, Trauma Registry, CODES

Data Use and Integration	Suggested Respondent
317. Do behavioral program managers have access to traffic records data and analytic resources for problem identification, priority setting, and program evaluation?	SHSO program managers
318. Does the State have a data governance process?	State Central IT or State CIO
319. Does the TRCC promote data integration by aiding in the development of data governance, access, and security policies for integrated data?	TRCC Chair
320. Is driver data integrated with crash data for specific analytical purposes?	Crash file manager, driver file custodian, driver license manager, TRCC Chair, driver license and crash file IT managers
321. Is vehicle data integrated with crash data for specific analytical purposes?	Crash and title and registration file managers
322. Is roadway data integrated with crash data for specific analytical purposes?	DOT roadway file managers, crash file manager
323. Is citation and adjudication data integrated with crash data for specific analytical purposes?	Driver file and crash file managers
324. Is injury surveillance data integrated with crash data for specific analytical purposes?	Crash file manager, crash file IT manager, Injury prevention staff, CODES, Traffic Records Coordinator
325. Are there examples of data integration among crash and two or more of the other component systems?	Crash file manager, TRCC chair
326. Is data from traffic records component systems—other than crash—integrated for specific analytical purposes?	Traffic Records Coordinator, data users
327. For integrated datasets, do decision-makers have access to resources—skilled personnel and user-friendly access tools—for use and analysis?	Crash file manager, Traffic Records Coordinator, IRP manager, DOT roadway file managers, SHSO program managers, Titles/Reg file manager, vehicle file manager, State court administrator
328. For integrated datasets, does the public have access to resources—skilled personnel and user-friendly access tools—for use and analysis?	DOR roadway file IT managers, crash file IT manager, vehicle file IT manager, driver file IT manager, IT manager for State law enforcement, SHSO program managers, Department of Health, Traffic Records Coordinator

4.5   Glossary of Terms

Assessor
A Subject Matter Expert who evaluates the State's responses to the assessment questions and the associated evidence to provide ratings and ballots that will become part of the assessment final report.

Ballot
The determination made by an assessor of whether the State does not meet, partially meets, or fully meets the *Advisory's* description of an ideal traffic record system pursuant to the information provided. Assessors select one of the following in a STRAP drop down menu: "meets", "partially meets", or "does not meet", and provide a brief narrative that accompanies and describes the ballot selection for each question.

BTS
Bureau of Transportation Statistics

Clarification Request
A request from assessor(s) to the appropriate State respondent(s), asking for information not provided or not clear in response to a question, or when two respondents provided conflicting answers to a single question or separate questions.

Conclusions
A brief narrative analysis drafted by the assessor and edited by the module leaders that is provided to the State in the final report on a question-by-question basis.

Facilitator
The person responsible for oversight of the assessors and the assessment process. Assists the State coordinator and compiles and edits the final traffic records assessment report.

FHWA
Federal Highway Administration

Finding
The brief narrative, based on assessor comments and written by the module leader, that accompanies and describes the rating given each question, during the data collection phases of the assessment. These are replaced by conclusions in the final report.

FMCSA
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

HIPAA
Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act. Federal legislation enacted in 1996 that addresses security and privacy requirements for health data.

KABCO
An injury severity scale used by police to note injuries to drivers and others involved in traffic crashes: K-killed, A-disabling injury, B-evident injury, C-possible injury, O-no apparent injury

Module
The eight topic areas explored in the traffic records assessment: Crash, Driver (licensing & history), Vehicle (registration & titling), Roadway, Citation / Adjudication, Injury Surveillance (EMS, emergency department, hospital discharge, trauma, and vital records), Traffic Records Coordinating Committee Management and Strategic Planning, and Data Use and Integration

Module Leader
The assessor designated as the leader for each module. This role is responsible for combining assessor ballots into ratings and findings, creating considerations and module summaries.

Module Manager
State-designated individuals with additional oversight over a State's responses to a specific module. This role is optional and serves to support the State coordinator.

NHTSA
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Rating
The combined assessor and module leader evaluation of whether the State does not meet, partially meets, or fully meets the *Advisory's* description of an ideal traffic record system pursuant to the information provided. Assessors select one of the following in a STRAP drop down menu: "meets", "partially meets", or "does not meet" and provide a brief narrative that accompanies and describes the ballot selection for each question.

Respondent
A State employee or private citizen who has been asked to answer one or more questions.

SHSO
State Highway Safety Office

SME
Subject Matter Expert. An individual who has been recognized as an expert in at least one of the nine *Advisory* modules.

State Coordinator
The Individual within the State designated to oversee the State's participation in the Traffic Records Assessment process. Primary point of contact for State on all assessment-related work. The brief narrative, based on assessor comments and written by the module leader, that accompanies and describes the rating given each question, during the data collection phases of the assessment. These are replaced by conclusions in the final report.

STRAP

State Traffic Records Assessment Program – A set of documents, procedures and software solutions that combine to provide a framework for the performance of a state traffic records program assessment.

Traffic Records Assessment

A peer review of a State's traffic records system in comparison to the current *Advisory*.

Traffic Records Coordinator

Individual within each State that coordinates all traffic records activity within that State. May act as State assessment coordinator.

Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory

The *Advisory* describes an ideal traffic records system including program function and capabilities.

Traffic Records Team

NHTSA group that manages the traffic records (TR) program area for NHTSA: John Siegler, Sarah Weissman Pascual and Tom Bragan.

TRCC

Traffic Records Coordinating Committee. The group of safety data owners, collectors and users within a State who are responsible for coordination and improvement of state safety data and traffic records component systems.