Procedures Manual for State Traffic Records Assessments

October 2015

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* (DOT HS 811 644). 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 that are 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 Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) §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.

During each assessment, State respondents have three opportunities to document their systems' capabilities. 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. The assessors then review this information and make their initial determinations. There are two additional rounds of this question-and-answer process to ensure the information is accurate and understood by the assessors. At the conclusion of the third round, assessors make their final determinations and recommendations 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 an 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 assessment 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 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 Traffic Records 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 15-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 that 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 that 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.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Upon NHTSA TR Team receipt of request</td><td>Initial pre-assessment conference call</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">1 month prior to kickoff meeting</td><td>Facilitator introduction pre-assessment conference call</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Between Facilitator conference call and kickoff</td><td>State Coordinator assigns questions, enters contact information into STRAP, and builds initial document library</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="8">Assessment</td><td>Monday, Week 1</td><td>On-site kickoff meeting</td></tr>
<tr><td>Tuesday, Week 1 –
12pm EST, Friday, Week 3</td><td>Round One Data Collection: State answers standardized assessment questions</td></tr>
<tr><td>Friday, Week 3 –
Wednesday, Week 5</td><td>Round One Analysis: Assessors review State answers and rate the responses and, if needed, request necessary clarifications</td></tr>
<tr><td>Thursday, Week 5 –
12pm EST, Friday, Week 7</td><td>Round Two Data Collection: State responds to the assessors' initial ratings and requests for more information and clarification</td></tr>
<tr><td>Friday, Week 7 –
Wednesday, Week 9</td><td>Round Two Analysis: Assessors review additional information from the State and, if needed, adjust initial ratings</td></tr>
<tr><td>Thursday, Week 9 –
12pm EST, Friday, Week 11</td><td>Round Three Data Collection: State provides final response to the assessors' ratings</td></tr>
<tr><td>Friday, Week 11 –
Monday, Week 13</td><td>Round Three Analysis: make final ratings</td></tr>
<tr><td>Tuesday, Week 13 –
Monday, Week 14</td><td>Facilitator prepares final report</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Week 15</td><td>NHTSA delivers final report to State and Region</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">(After completion of assessment,
date set by State)</td><td>NHTSA hosts webinar to debrief State participants</td></tr>
</table>

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 Analysis to Round Two Data Collection, 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 that the questions in their modules are answered adequately. Module managers have the same view and edit rights that the State Coordinator possesses for their assigned module. 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 with. This helps to reduce the State Coordinator's workload, ensures that 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, leading the kickoff meeting, 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' rankings 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. A special STRAP training webinar for these individuals and the State Coordinator will also be scheduled if requested. 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 module manager training webinar is generally scheduled for a week prior to the kickoff meeting at the convenience of the State.

The logistical arrangements for the kickoff meeting itself—to include date, time, agenda, and any AV 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 391 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 standard described in the *Advisory*. Thus, it is imperative that these State respondents are knowledgeable about the data system they are being asked to describe, that they enter their answers into the STRAP software within the scheduled timeframes, and that they include the appropriate standards of evidence documents. Appendix 4.2 Suggested Document Library 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 that the question is not only answered, but answered by the most appropriate, knowledgeable State personnel. In many cases, this will mean that 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 that 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 requirements 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 the required 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 two weeks prior to the kickoff meeting. 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 refer to during the assessment. These can then be uploaded to STRAP once it 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. Responses that do not include the appropriate evidence documents will be rated negatively, whether or not the State's answer meets the *Advisory* standards.

2.3.3 Coordinator & Module Manager STRAP Training

Particularly in States that have will use module managers to assist in the State Coordinator's oversight and management of the assessment, additional training on STRAP's management tools can be very useful. This one-hour webinar is generally scheduled one to two weeks prior to the kickoff meeting.

2.4 Kickoff Meeting

The on-site kickoff meeting is hosted by the State Coordinator, led by the Facilitator, 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. 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 with the assessment management team. Generally, the meeting itself takes between 90 minutes and two hours, though the assessment team 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. While the Facilitator leads the kickoff meeting, NHTSA will be represented by either the appropriate TR Team member or a regional program manager, if not both, as funding permits.

It is imperative that the Facilitator and State Coordinator work together to secure 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, television, 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 Facilitator 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 member, the NHTSA regional program manager, the Facilitator, the State Coordinator, and the State traffic records coordinator (if not the same person as the Assessment Coordinator), along with any other State representatives the Coordinator deems necessary.

At minimum, the Facilitator and State Coordinator or designee should arrive on-site at least half an hour before the start of the meeting to ensure that 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 Facilitator 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 Assessments, 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 rep 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 391 standardized questions that the State will answer, providing appropriately cited evidence to support their responses. These questions rooted explicitly in the *Advisory* text and are the basis of the exchange between the State respondents and assessors that is spread over three iterative response cycles.

State respondents are reminded that 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 that responses paint an accurate picture of the state of traffic records. Anything less will hamper efforts to improve traffic safety within the State.

	Questions
TRCC Management & Strategic Planning	35
Crash	44
Roadway	38
Driver	45
Vehicle	39
Citation and Adjudication	54
Injury Surveillance	123
Data Use and Data Integration	13
Total	**391**

Table 2: Breakdown of Assessment Questions

If a State respondent requires more information on specific question, he or she should first examine the suggested "standard of 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 sent directly to the person who submitted the response during the next respondent round. The State Coordinator will be able to view the module leader's initial finding and specific request for clarification. After three exchanges, 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 negative finding. However, it must be noted that States who do not provide an answer to EVERY question by the end of the third round response cycle of the assessment will not be eligible for MAP-21 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 that 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. The State Coordinator (and State module managers, if assigned) can only view responses once they have been submitted to the assessors. If the State Coordinator and module managers have been granted review access (See Section 2.2.2 One-Month Planning Call), they can review responses before they have been sent to the assessors and can choose to return the answer to the respondent for clarification before submitting each question to the assessors.

Share, Forward, Decline

Respondents may feel that they are not the appropriate person to answer an assigned question, or that 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. As a last resort, when the respondent cannot answer the question or think of anyone to defer it to, 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 be answered in order for the assessment to be validated for grant purposes, declining questions is strongly discouraged.

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

Providing Evidence

To ensure that assessments are uniform and reliable, the *Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory* provides respondents and assessors with suggested standards of evidence to support the responses for each question. In most cases, State respondents are asked to document their answers to the assessment questions. The suggested standard of evidence for each question is provided in STRAP as well.

Evidence should be uploaded to the document library and linked to the question response in STRAP. If the evidence required 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, that it 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 55 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 *Advisory* also lists the suggested standard of evidence related to this question:

Provide a process flow diagram (preferred) or narrative description documenting key processes governing the collection, reporting and posting of crash data—including the submission of fatal crashes to the State FARS unit and commercial motor vehicle crash data to SafetyNet. Evidence can include the Manual for Crash Reporting by Law Enforcement and/or policy & procedure manual or memos for FARS and SafetyNet Analysts.

When answering, respondents should keep in mind that 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 55 would be:

Yes. Policy attached.

While this is responsive to the question, it does not provide all the details that the assessor needs to make a 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. In Round One, assessors may also select "clarification request" as a rating option. This should be used if the assessor needs more information in order to verify a State's answer that is not supported by the supplied documentation.

Using the Standard of Evidence & Assessor Guidance

The assessors for each module will independently complete ballots to rate whether each State-supplied response indicates that the State meets the standard 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 standards of 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 that a State may have provided evidence sufficient for the assessor to make an accurate evaluation about a question without providing the evidence specified in the standard. It is up to the assessor and module leader to make such determinations. In the interests of transparency and efficiency, these standards of 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 that any documentation be linked to the appropriate answer. A rating of "meets the standard" 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. 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 that the State meets this requirement of the ideal system, but as no evidence was provided, the team was unable to grant a 'meets the standard' rating."

Assessors are also permitted to submit a "clarification request" in place of an explicit "meets", "partially meets", or "does not meet" rating during the first round if the State's answer or supporting documentation is unclear. When submitting a clarification request, the assessor should also provide a narrative of the additional information sought in the space available. This option is not allowed in later analysis rounds. Assessors should note that 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 required 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 required 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 that the State is in 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 that States claim “meets” except for “one or a few small agencies”, etc.		X		To ensure consistency and equity of ratings, ratings for electronic capture and/or submission are: Meets: States with a pop. of over 6M require 99% electronic capture and submission; States whose pop. is 2M to 6M require 98% electronic capture and submission; States with less than 2 million population will require 95% electronic capture and 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 that explain the evidence provided, and how it was ranked.

An inadequate rating/finding:

> *The State reported 'no'.*

Or

> *The State meets the standard. Evidence provided.*

An adequate rating/finding might be:

> *The State does not meet the standard of evidence. No examples of performance measures were provided.*

However, 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 standard.*
>
> *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 job functions and the department in which they are employed 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 whose Round One answers met the standard are removed from the respondents' queues. If the Round One answer or evidence was deemed inadequate, the module leader may attach a specific clarification request for additional information or clarification, in lieu of providing a rating. This request will be passed on to the State by the module leader.

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 for Round One. When this rating is submitted, the assessors' initial rating will be updated to match the consensus rating for Round One.

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 Round Two Data Collection

Once the Round One ratings and findings have been completed by the Module Leaders, they are returned to the State Coordinator and respondents, who then have their second of three opportunities to respond and/or provide additional information or evidence to support their responses to the questions that the assessors rated as partially meets, or do not meet the standard described in the *Advisory*. The assessor may have deferred the rating in favor of requesting more information or clarification of the response or the documentation.

Respondents should provide any additional information or clarification that is specifically requested by assessors, where ratings have been deferred for that purpose. 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 even in cases where ratings have been issued, but the respondent feels that the assessor might benefit from additional information.

If the rating is low but correct and respondents have no further information, it would be helpful for the State to indicate that 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 Three, agree with rating”, etc. This will speed the process both for assessors and the respondents in subsequent rounds.

2.5.4 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. If a respondent finds that 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.

For questions where additional documentation or clarification was requested but none was provided, the assessor will rate the State based on the information that has been given, but may note in the finding that a higher rating would be possible with specific documentation or clarification. Assessors may not defer ratings during the second round, but can provide a rating with the explanation that certain additional information might improve that rating.

Once the assessors and module leader have reached a consensus on each question, the module leader will enter in the finalized rating for Round Two. When this rating is submitted, the assessors’ initial ratings will be updated to match the consensus rating for Round Two.

2.5.5 Round Three Data Collection

Following the second round of assessor balloting, all questions will be rated and the State will have one final opportunity to provide additional information that it feels might impact the rating of the remaining “does not meet” and “partially meets” responses. 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.

Again, if the rating is low but correct and respondents have no further information, it would be helpful for the State to indicate that there is no further information and the rating is accurate. To do so, respondents may add a note to their answers: “Round Two, no further information” or “Round Three, agree with rating”, etc. This will speed the process both for assessors and the respondents in subsequent rounds.

2.5.6 Round Three Analysis

At this point, the assessors produce their final ballots and ratings as well as any "considerations"—specific actions or resources that the assessors may wish to share with the State. These "considerations" are distinct from both the interim 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. The assessor considerations combine the assessors' finalized narrative findings for each question with any direct advice that the assessors would like to provide the State. The considerations are tied to the questions in the final report, but significant ones can be highlighted by the module leader in their final module summaries.

The module leader confirms the ratings and combines the ballots into brief narrative findings which are finalized for each of the questions that the State has answered. The module leader's final ratings will again update the assessors' initial Round Three ratings. 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 conclusions in Round Three, they will be tasked with writing a summary of the State's performance for each module. A new tab will be accessible from the Module Leader page, titled "Final Report." 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 in their final Round Three submissions.

Once the Module Leaders have submitted their final ratings, considerations, and summaries, the facilitator reviews all completed segments before notifying the TR Team representative that 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 that 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 two parts: the executive summary and the results. The executive summary is where the aggregate ratings for the assessment are found, along with the recommendations. The results section includes 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 and may offer "considerations", suggested courses of action that the State may wish to undertake as they work to improve their systems. In addition to the module summaries, the results section also includes 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, and an application in Appendix 4.5 GO Team Application.

2.7 Report-Out Webinar

After the assessment has been completed and the final report delivered, the assessment Facilitator will present the final report and summarize the assessment's recommendations and conclusions to the States' TRCC via a webinar. Broadcasting the recommendations 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. If the State Coordinator has elected to invite assessors as well, they may also participate. Dependent upon resources, it may be possible to hold an on-site final report and debrief at the request of the State.

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.

<u>Technical Assistance</u>
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.

<u>Technical Training</u>
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 (See Appendix 4.5 GO Team Application) for technical assistance or training and submit it to NHTSA via TRIPRS. 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.

The application request should include the following information:

- A detailed description of the technical problem that 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 that 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 that 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.
- Chooses the Assessment Facilitator and consults with that person 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.
- Attends assessment kickoff meeting.
- 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.
- Hosts the webinar report out.
- 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 Regional staff, 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 Assessment 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 Team Member.
- Attends the webinar report out.
- Assists State in addressing assessment conclusions. The NHTSA Regional office will maintain a list of all conclusions given to States, and should check in with the state at

least once annually to see if they are addressing the conclusions, 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.
- Updates TRIPRS with current data and completes the steps in the pre-assessment checklist (Appendix 4.1 Pre-Assessment Checklist), preferably prior to the kickoff meeting.
- Coordinates with Regional staff, Assessment 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 that 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 Assessment 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, Assessment 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 Assessment Facilitator. The Assessment 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.
- Attends final webinar report out and distributes final report prior to that meeting. May request an on-site report out if resources are available.
- 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 Assessment 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 that are 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.
- Maintains lists of qualified subject matter experts to serve as assessors, and keeps internal notes on their performance.
- Provides STRAP training at kickoff meeting.
- Initializes and closes out assessments in STRAP.

3.4.2 Assessment 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 NHTSA TR Team on assessor assignments.
- Coordinates with Regional staff and State Coordinator to conduct the 1-month pre-assessment conference call. Participates on any further calls prior to the kickoff.

- Leads the assessment kickoff meeting, including coordination with program manager for STRAP training webinar and State Coordinator on logistical details.
- 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 that 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 Assessment 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.
- Manages Assessor tokens after they are initially issued.
- Schedules conference calls to review the monthly status of the assessment.
- 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.
- Prepares for and presents the webinar report out to State.
- 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 Assessment Facilitator if questions arise or when an irreconcilable disagreement on a finding occurs. The Assessment 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.

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.

3.4.5 STRAP Help Desk

- Monitors, updates, and maintains STRAP and user manuals.
- Provides Facilitator with appropriate system documentation for training.
- Troubleshoots STRAP and provides follow-up support.
- Provides STRAP training for all parties.
- Works with NHTSA on STRAP updates.
- Posts final assessment data to appropriate tables in TRIPRS.
- Provides assistance to the assessment team as directed by NHTSA TR team.

Federal Roles and Responsibilities by Assessment Task

FEDERAL	Request Assessment	Pre-Assessment Conference Calls	Kickoff Meeting	Assessment	Final Report	Debrief
NHTSA TR TEAM	Provides regions with list of 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	Participant/ resource	Oversight/ trouble-shooting	Reviews final report and transmits it to the State, cc'ing the RPM	Hosts webinar report out Discusses possible request for GO Team
NHTSA RPMs	Provides States list of assessment slots Tracks States with upcoming assessments Discusses assessment preparedness with State and RPMs	Participates in conference call	Participant/ resource	Oversight/ trouble-shooting	Receives final report	Attends debrief 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	n/a	n/a	Invited
FMCSA	n/a	n/a	Invited	n/a	n/a	Invited

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	Final Report	Debrief
STATE COORDINTOR	n/a	Identifies respondents, or people to delegate respondents for each assessment question Uploads documents to STRAP Library for respondents to reference	Provides NHTSA TR team with Master list of respondents for each question	Tracks Assessment Progress	Disseminates Final Report to all State Representatives	Forwards invitations to interested people in State
TRCC MEMBERS	n/a	Identifies respondents, or possible delegated respondents for each question	Invited	Responds to assigned questions		Reads and takes part in Strategic Planning Follow up with request for optional technical assistance Provides Feedback to NHTSA on the Assessment Process
RESPONDENTS	n/a	n/a	Attends Kickoff Meeting	Responds to assigned assessment questions	Reviews	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	Final Report	Debrief
PROGRAM MANGER	Create assessment shell in STRAP, identify candidate Facilitator and assessors	Participate in calls; confirm assessment staffing	Deliver STRAP training webinar during kickoff	Oversight/ trouble-shooting	Oversight/ trouble-shooting	
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 for it Attends and prepares for kick off meeting	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	Reviews module summary reports Edits final report Transmits final report to NHTSA TR Team	Presents assessment debrief
ASSESSOR	Contract	n/a	n/a	Examines State answers and documentation, provides ratings and ballots for module leader review in each round	n/a	Possibly participates in Go-Teams following the debrief
MODULE LEADER	n/a	n/a	n/a	Based on assessor ballots and ratings, writes synthesized findings and ratings in each round		n/a
STRAP HELP DESK	n/a	Deliver STRAP training webinar to module managers on request	n/a	Provides support to as needed; elevates serious issues to NHTSA IT group	n/a	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 TRIPRS contact file, including contact information, particularly e-mail addresses
- ❑ List all respondents by question, to include job title, State or local Department or other entity where employed (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)
- ❑ Determine whether the State Coordinator wants to review all responses from the State prior to their being sent to the assessors, or if the responses are to be transmitted prior to the Coordinator’s review
- ❑ Ensure that all respondents will be available to meet the deadlines set for the assessment
- ❑ Arrange for a meeting space for the Assessment Kickoff Meeting
- ❑ Invite the TRCC, both executive and technical levels to the Kickoff meeting, assigning one technical level member as a trainer for anyone who misses the STRAP training session
- ❑ Ensure the meeting location is convenient to hotels and airport transportation for those who will travel from out of town for the meeting
- ❑ Contact respondents to ensure they received their access tokens and answer any preliminary questions about the process and their responsibilities
- ❑ 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

General Documents	Supports Question(s)
TRCC Charter and/or MOU, dated (and signed if appropriate)	1, 2, 6, 11
TRCC Roster with the name, affiliation, title, and what systems they represent for executive and technical level TRCC members.	1, 2, 4
Most recent *State Strategic Plan for Traffic Records Improvement*	7, 20-35, 382
List of Performance Measures for the core systems: timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, accessibility, with numeric goals, if applicable	10, 66-71, 107-113, 152-158, 190-201, 244-255, 318-325, 334-340, 351-356, 366-372
Minutes for the two most recent Technical TRCC meetings (dated)	11,17,18
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.	12,381
Position Description for TRCC Chair	13
Position Description for Traffic Records Coordinator	14
Past 2 years' Executive TRCC meeting schedule	15
Past year's Technical TRCC meeting schedule	16
List of Tech TRCC subcommittees including meeting dates and purpose	16
Inventory of Federal Funds used for TR Improvement	19

Table 7: General Documents and Supporting Question(s)

Crash System Documents	Supports Question(s)
Describe the crash database and identify the custodian	36-37
State statute outlining crash reporting requirements	38-41
Police Accident Report Form	36-51
Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP)	45
State Highway Plan (HSP)	45
Policy/Procedure for crash reporting for PDO, Injury, Fatal, Non-traffic way crashes	38-41
Data Dictionary for Crash Database	48-51
List of edit checks for crash database if not included in the data dictionary	49
Narrative description of the use of MMUCC elements and attributes included in the crash database and on the Police Accident Report.	46
Narrative description of the use of MMUCC elements and attributes included in the crash database and on the Police Accident Report.	47
List of data fields that are linked to traffic records system databases.	51,143-145,222,225,312-314
List of all reporting agencies and specify their data collection methods	52
Crash data process flow diagrams: Transmitting and utilizing key users' data quality feedback to inform program changes, Entry for crashes, paper and electronic and citing the percentages of each, Fatal crashes to the state FARS data collection unit, and CMV crashes to SafetyNet	53-56
Crash report retention policy	57
Sample data quality management report. Specify how frequently they are issued to the TRCC	79

Table 8: Crash Documents and Supporting Question(s)

Vehicle System Documents	Supports Question(s)
Description of the driver database and identification of the custodian	119
Data dictionary for the driver file or table of contents and sample elements, edit checks	125-128
Process flow diagrams for driver system: Initial event to (licensure, traffic violation) entry; error correction and handling; purging records; how court actions are posted; administrative license revocation	129-137
Driver licensing procedures related to access and security	141-142

Table 9: Vehicle Documents and Supporting Question(s)

Driver 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	80-81, 104
Sample documents and descriptions of information encoded on all barcode forms in use	82
NMVTIS query processing instructions	84
List of State title brands/ procedures for their application	85
Data dictionary for the Vehicle database	87
Listing of edit and validation checks not included in the Vehicle system data dictionary	88
Process flow diagrams for vehicle system: Initial event(reg/title) to entry, showing alternate flows and the time needed to complete each step; Procedures for purging records; Error corrections and handling; How title brand is applied	90-98
Description of linkages with other traffic record system databases	99-103
Sample quality management report for vehicle system and note frequency of its provision to the TRCC	118

Table 10: Driver Documents and Supporting Question(s)

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	164
Map displaying roadway features and traffic volume for all public roads that is representative of system capabilities	165
Map displaying crash locations that is representative of system capabilities statewide	167
List of Fundamental Data Elements that are collected	169
List of MIRE Data Elements collected	169-170
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	167, 181
List of all MIRE elements collected, and on which roads	170
Data dictionary for the roadway system	171-174
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; local agency procedures for collecting, managing, and submitting data; means by which compatibility between local and state data is achieved; collection of data elements in the state data dictionary	175-180
Sample data quality report for the Roadway system	186
Narrative report that describes interface linkages between the State's roadway information systems	182

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	206
Data dictionary for the citation systems	219
List of court Case Management Systems, and whether each has a data dictionary	223
Data dictionaries for 3 largest case management systems	224
Process flows for Citations: citation life cycle, including issuance to citation tracking systems to posting disposition on the driver file; DUI processes, both criminal and administrative; linking toxicology reports to driver records; tracking administrative penalties; tracking juvenile citations; tracking deferrals and dismissals; timing and conditions for purging records; security protocols ; administrative handling of payment in lieu of court appearance	226,228,229,232-234
List of fields in citation and adjudication systems linked to other traffic record system databases	238-243

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	274,283,285
Data dictionary for the Trauma Registry	275
State Statutes related to privacy of medical data	280
Data dictionary for the EMS system	281
Data dictionary for the Vital Records dataset	289
Flow chart for EMS data	294
Flow chart for Emergency Department data	295
Flow chart for Hospital Discharge data	296
Flow chart for Trauma Registry data	297
Data access policies for all ISS data	307-311
Data use agreements for all ISS datasets	307-311
Data exchange agreements for ISS data	312-314
Demonstration of submission to NEMSIS and relevant state statutes or regulations	280
State law that supersedes HIPAA	273
Sample Quality Management reports for each component of the ISS system	330,346,362,375,378
State Roadway Data Capability Assessment, Section 4	385
Sample of data specific analysis performed by behavioral program managers for problem ID, program evaluation, priority setting	379
Description of Data Governance policy , including how it supports traffic safety data integration and formal data quality management	380, 382
Documentation of linkage variables between each of the traffic records system's component systems, i.e., crash and driver.	383-389
List of analytical resources available to decision-makers and which decision-makers have access	390
List of analytical resources available to the public	391

Table 13: Injury Surveillance 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
State Coordinator, Facilitator, TR Team rep, logistics support

09:00-10:30 Introduction & Assessment Overview
State Coordinator, Facilitator, TR Team rep, TRCC, system managers respondents

10:30-10:45 Break

10:45-12:00 STRAP Demo / Respondent Q&A
State Coordinator, Facilitator, TR Team rep, respondents

12:00-13:00 Post-meeting/Availability for Final Questions
State Coordinator, Facilitator, TR Team rep

Contacts

State Coordinator
<<Name>>
<<Phone>>
<<Email>>

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

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

<<State>> TR Assessment Schedule

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		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					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						
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

Kickoff R1: State
answers questions
questions R1:
Assessors make initial
ratings, clarification
requests R2: State
provides clarifications
R2:
Assessors refine
ratings R3: State
makes final response
reviews
R3:
Assessors make final
ratings Report

finalized Delivery

4.4 Master List of Assessment Questions and Respondents

Traffic Records Coordinating Committee		Suggested Respondent
1.	Does the State have both an executive and a technical TRCC?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
2.	Do the executive TRCC members have the power to direct their agencies' resources for their respective areas of responsibility?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
3.	Does the executive TRCC review and approve actions proposed by the technical TRCC?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
4.	Does the TRCC include representation from the core data systems at both the executive and technical levels?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
5.	Does the TRCC consult with the appropriate State IT agencies or offices when planning and implementing technology projects?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
6.	Is there a formal document authorizing the TRCC?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
7.	Does the TRCC provide the leadership and coordination necessary to develop, implement, and monitor the TRCC strategic plan?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
8.	Does the TRCC influence policy decisions that impact the State's traffic records system?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
9.	Does the TRCC allocate federal traffic records improvement grant funds?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
10.	Does the TRCC identify core system performance measures and monitor progress?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
11.	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
12.	Does the TRCC have a traffic records inventory?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
13.	Does the technical TRCC have a designated chair?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
14.	Does the TRCC have a designated coordinator?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
15.	Does the executive TRCC meet at least once annually?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
16.	Does the technical TRCC meet at least quarterly?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
17.	Does the TRCC oversee quality control and quality improvement programs impacting the core data systems?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
18.	Does the TRCC address technical assistance and training needs?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
19.	Does the TRCC use a variety of federal funds to strategically allocate resources for traffic records improvement projects?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator

Table 14: TRCC List of Assessment Questions and Respondents

Strategic Planning for Traffic Records Systems		Suggested Respondent
20.	Does the TRCC develop the TRCC strategic plan?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
21.	Does the TRCC strategic plan address existing data and data systems deficiencies and document how these deficiencies are identified?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
22.	Does the TRCC strategic plan identify strategies that address the timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, and accessibility of the six core data systems?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
23.	Does the TRCC strategic plan indicate what funds are used to undertake efforts detailed in the plan and describe how these allocations contribute to the plan's stated goals?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
24.	Does the TRCC have a process for prioritizing traffic records improvement projects in the TRCC strategic plan?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
25.	Does the TRCC have a process for identifying performance measures and corresponding metrics for the six core data systems in the TRCC strategic plan?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
26.	Does the TRCC have a process for identifying and addressing technical assistance and training needs in the TRCC strategic plan?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
27.	Does the TRCC have a process for leveraging federal funds and assistance programs in the TRCC strategic plan?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
28.	Does the TRCC have a process for establishing timelines and responsibilities for projects in the TRCC strategic plan?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
29.	Does the TRCC have a process for integrating State and local data needs and goals into the TRCC strategic plan?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
30.	Does the TRCC consider the use of new technology when developing and managing traffic records projects in the strategic plan?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
31.	Does the TRCC consider lifecycle costs in implementing improvement projects?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
32.	Is the strategic plan responsive to the needs of all stakeholders, including local users?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
33.	Does the strategic plan make provisions for coordination with key federal traffic records data systems?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
34.	Are there any impediments to coordination with key federal traffic records data systems?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator
35.	Is the TRCC's strategic plan reviewed and updated annually?	TRCC Chair, Traffic Records Coordinator

Table 15: Strategic Planning List of Assessment Questions and Respondents

Description and Contents of the Crash Data System		Suggested Respondent
36.	Is statewide crash data consolidated into one database?	Crash file manager/custodian
37.	Is the statewide crash system's organizational custodian clearly defined?	Crash file manager/custodian
38.	Does the State have fatal crash reporting criteria?	Crash file manager/custodian
39.	Does the State have injury crash reporting criteria?	Crash file manager/custodian
40.	Does the State have PDO crash reporting criteria?	Crash file manager/custodian
41.	Does the statewide crash system record crashes occurring in non-	Crash file custodian, State and local

	traffic way areas (e.g., parking lots, driveways)?	law enforcement, State and local Traffic Engineers, MPOs
42.	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
43.	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
44.	Is data from the crash system regularly used to prioritize law enforcement activity?	SHSO, State/local Traffic Engrs, State/local LE, MPOs
45.	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
Applicable Guidelines for the Crash Data System		**Suggested Respondent**
46.	Is MMUCC a primary source for identifying what crash data elements and attributes the State collects?	Persons/Entity responsible for designing the State crash form
47.	Are the ANSI D-16 and ANSI D-20 used as sources for the definitions in the crash system data dictionary?	Persons/Entity responsible for designing the State crash form
Data Dictionary for the Crash Data System		**Suggested Respondent**
48.	Does the data dictionary provide a definition for each data element and define that data element's allowable values?	Crash file manager/custodian Crash file IT manager
49.	Does the data dictionary document the system edit checks and validation rules?	Crash file manager/custodian Crash file IT manager
50.	Is the data dictionary up to date and consistent with the field data collection manual, coding manual, crash report, and any training materials?	Crash file manager/custodian Crash file IT manager
51.	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
Procedures and Process Flows for Crash Data Systems		**Suggested Respondent**
52.	Do all law enforcement agencies collect crash data electronically in the field?	Law Enforcement Agencies, State and local, crash file custodian
53.	Do all law enforcement agencies collecting crash data electronically in the field also submit the data to the statewide crash system electronically?	Law Enforcement Agencies, State and local, crash file custodian
54.	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
55.	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
56.	Are the processes for managing errors and incomplete data documented?	Crash file manager/custodian, Crash file data entry supervisor
57.	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

Crash Data Systems Interface with Other Components		Suggested Respondent
58.	Does the crash system interface with the driver system?	Crash file custodian/manager, driver file manager/custodian
59.	Does the crash system interface with the vehicle system?	Crash file manager/custodian, vehicle file manager/custodian
60.	Does the crash system interface with the roadway system?	Crash file manager/custodian, State Engineering file managers
61.	Does the crash system interface with the citation and adjudication systems?	Crash file manager/custodian, Administrative Office of the Courts
62.	Does the crash system interface with the injury surveillance system?	Crash file manager/custodian, TRCC Chair, CODES, Managers of various ISS databases
Data Quality Control Programs for the Crash System		**Suggested Respondent**
63.	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
64.	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
65.	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
66.	Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Crash file manager/custodian, TRCC Chair or TRC
67.	Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Crash file manager/custodian, TRCC Chair or TRC
68.	Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Crash file manager/custodian, TRCC Chair or TRC
69.	Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Crash file manager/custodian, TRCC Chair or TRC
70.	Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Crash file manager/custodian, TRCC Chair or TRC
71.	Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Crash file manager/custodian, TRCC Chair or TRC
72.	Has the State established numeric goals—performance metrics—for each performance measure?	Crash file manager/custodian, TRCC Chair or TRC
73.	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
74.	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?	Crash file manager/custodian, TRCC Chair or TRC, crash file IT manager
75.	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
76.	Are independent sample-based audits periodically conducted for crash reports and related database contents?	Crash file manager/custodian, TRCC Chair or TRC, Crash file IT manager

77. 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
78. 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
79. Are data quality management reports provided to the TRCC for regular review?	Crash file manager/custodian, Crash file IT manager, TRCC Chair, TRC

Table 16: Crash List of Assessment Questions and Respondents

Description and Contents of the Vehicle Data System	Suggested Respondent
80. 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
81. Does the State or its agents validate every VIN with a verification software application?	Titles/Reg manager, vehicle file custodian
82. 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
Applicable Guidelines for the Vehicle Data System	**Suggested Respondent**
83. Does the vehicle system provide title information to the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System (NMVTIS) at least daily?	Titles/Reg manager, vehicle file custodian
84. Does the vehicle system query the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System (NMVTIS) before issuing new titles?	Titles/Reg manager, vehicle file custodian
85. Does the State incorporate brand information on the vehicle record that is recommended by AAMVA and/or received through NMVTIS, whether or not the brand description matches the State's brand descriptions?	Titles/Reg manager, vehicle file custodian
86. 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
Vehicle System Data Dictionary	**Suggested Respondent**
87. Does the vehicle system have a documented definition for each data field?	Title Reg file manager, vehicle file custodian, vehicle file IT manager
88. 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
89. 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
Procedures and Process Flows for the Vehicle Data System	**Suggested Respondent**
90. Is there a process flow diagram describing the vehicle data system?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
91. Does the vehicle system flag or identify vehicles reported as stolen to law enforcement authorities?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents

92. 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
93. 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
94. Are the steps from initial event (titling, registration) to final entry into the statewide vehicle system documented in a process flow diagram?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
95. Is the process flow diagram or narrative annotated to show the time required to complete each step?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
96. Does the process flow diagram or narrative show alternative data flows and timelines?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
97. Does the process flow diagram or narrative include processes for error correction and error handling?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
98. Does the process flow diagram or narrative explain the timing, conditions, and procedures for purging records from the vehicle system?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
Vehicle Data System Interface with Other Components	**Suggested Respondent**
99. Are the driver and vehicle files unified in one system?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
100. If the driver and vehicle files are separate, 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
101. Can vehicle system data be used to verify and validate the vehicle information during initial creation of a citation or crash report?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
102. 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
103. Are VIN, title number, and license plate number the key variables used to retrieve vehicle records?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
Data Quality Control Programs for the Vehicle Data System	**Suggested Respondent**
104. Is the vehicle system data processed in real-time?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
105. 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
106. Is limited state-level correction authority granted to quality control staff working with the statewide vehicle system to amend obvious errors and omissions?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
107. Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
108. Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
109. Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
110. Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
111. Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
112. Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of	Title/Reg file manager,

data managers and data users?	county/local/private agents
113. Has the State established numeric goals—performance metrics—for each performance measure?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
114. 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
115. Are independent sample-based audits conducted periodically for vehicle reports and related database contents for that record?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
116. Are periodic comparative and trend analyses used to identify unexplained differences in the data across years and jurisdictions?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
117. Is data quality feedback from key users regularly communicated to data collectors and data managers?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents
118. Are data quality management reports provided to the TRCC for regular review?	Title/Reg file manager, county/local/private agents

Table 17: Vehicle List of Assessment Questions and Respondents

Description and Contents of the Driver Data System	Suggested Respondent
119. Does custodial responsibility for the driver system—including commercially-licensed drivers—reside in a single location?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
120. Can the State's DUI s data system be linked electronically to the driver system?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
121. Does the driver system capture novice drivers' training histories, including provider names and types of education (classroom or behind-the-wheel)?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
122. Does the driver system capture drivers' traffic violation and/or driver improvement training histories, including provider names and types of education (classroom or behind-the-wheel)?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
123. Does the driver 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
Applicable Guidelines for the Driver Data System	**Suggested Respondent**
124. Is driver information maintained in a manner that accommodates interaction with the National Driver Register's Problem Driver Pointer System (PDPS) and the Commercial Driver's License Information System (CDLIS)?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
Data Dictionary for the Driver Data System	**Suggested Respondent**
125. Are the contents of the driver system documented with data definitions for each field?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
126. Are all valid field values—including null codes—documented in the data dictionary?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
127. Are there edit checks and data collection guidelines for each data element?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
128. Is there guidance on how and when to update the data dictionary?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
Procedures and Process Flows for the Driver Data System	**Suggested Respondent**
129. Does the custodial agency maintain accurate and up to date documentation detailing the licensing, permitting, and	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file

	endorsement issuance procedures (manual and electronic, where applicable)?	
130.	Does the custodial agency maintain accurate and up to date documentation detailing the reporting and recording of relevant citations and convictions (manual and electronic, where applicable)?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
131.	Does the custodial agency maintain accurate and up to date documentation detailing the reporting and recording of driver education and improvement courses (manual and electronic, where applicable)?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
132.	Does the custodial agency maintain accurate and up to date documentation detailing the reporting and recording of other information that may result in a change of license status (manual and electronic, where applicable)?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
133.	Does the custodial agency maintain accurate and up to date documentation detailing any change in license status (e.g., sanctions, withdrawals, reinstatement, revocations, and restrictions)?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
134.	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
135.	Are the processes for error correction and error handling documented for: license, permit, and endorsement issuance; reporting and recording of relevant citations and 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
136.	Are processes and procedures for purging data from the driver system documented?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
137.	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
138.	Are there established processes to detect false identity licensure fraud?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
139.	Are there established processes to detect internal fraud by individual users or examiners?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
140.	Are there established processes to detect CDL fraud (including hazmat endorsements)?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
141.	Are there policies and procedures for maintaining appropriate system and information security?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
142.	Are there procedures in place to ensure that driver system custodians track access and release of driver information adequately?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file
Driver System Interface with Other Components		**Suggested Respondent**
143.	Can the State's crash system be linked to the driver system electronically?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file, driver license IT manager
144.	Can the State's citation system be linked to the driver system electronically?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file, driver license IT manager
145.	Can the State's adjudication system be linked to the driver system	Driver License Manager, custodian of

	electronically?	the driver file, driver license IT manager
146.	Is there an interface link between the driver system and: the Problem Driver Pointer System, the Commercial Driver Licensing System, the Social Security Online Verification system, and the Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements system?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file, driver license IT manager
147.	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
148.	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
149.	Does the custodial agency have the capability to grant authorized personnel from other States access to information in the driver system?	Driver License Manager, custodian of the driver file, driver license IT manager
Data Quality Control Programs for the Driver System		**Suggested Respondent**
150.	Is there a formal, comprehensive data quality management program for the driver system?	Driver license manager, custodian of the driver file
151.	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
152.	Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Driver license manager, custodian of the driver file
153.	Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Driver license manager, custodian of the driver file
154.	Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Driver license manager, custodian of the driver file
155.	Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Driver license manager, custodian of the driver file
156.	Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Driver license manager, custodian of the driver file
157.	Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?	Driver license manager, custodian of the driver file
158.	Has the State established numeric goals—performance metrics—for each performance measure?	Driver license manager, custodian of the driver file
159.	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
160.	Are independent sample-based audits conducted periodically for the driver reports and related database contents for that record?	Driver license manager, custodian of the driver file
161.	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
162.	Is data quality feedback from key users regularly communicated to data collectors and data managers?	Driver license manager, custodian of the driver file
163.	Are data quality management reports provided to the TRCC for regular review?	Driver license manager, custodian of the driver file

Table 18: Driver List of Assessment Questions and Respondents

Description and Contents of the Roadway Data System	Suggested Respondent
164. Are all public roadways within the State located using a compatible location referencing system?	State/local traffic engineers, MPOs
165. Are the roadway and traffic data elements located using a compatible location referencing system (e.g., LRS, GIS)?	State/local traffic engineers, MPOs
166. Is there an enterprise roadway information system containing roadway and traffic data elements for all public roads?	State/local traffic engineers, MPOs
167. 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
168. Is crash data incorporated into the enterprise roadway information system for safety analysis and management use?	State/local traffic engineers, MPOs
Applicable Guidelines for the Roadway Data System	**Suggested Respondent**
169. Are all the MIRE Fundamental Data Elements collected for all public roads?	State Traffic Engineers
170. 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
Data Dictionary for the Roadway Data System	**Suggested Respondent**
171. 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
172. Are all additional MIRE data elements for any public roads documented in the data dictionary?	DOT Road file managers, Roadway file IT manager
173. Does roadway data imported from local or municipal sources comply with the data dictionary?	DOT Road file managers, Roadway file IT manager
174. Is there guidance on how and when to update the data dictionary?	DOT Road file managers, Roadway file IT manager
Procedures and Process Flows for the Roadway Data System	**Suggested Respondent**
175. 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
176. Are the steps for updating roadway information documented to show the flow of information?	State Traffic Engineers
177. Are the steps for archiving and accessing historical roadway inventory documented?	State Traffic Engineers
178. Are the procedures that local agencies (e.g., county, MPO, municipality) use to collect, manage, and submit roadway data to the statewide inventory documented?	State/local Traffic Engineers
179. Are local agency procedures for collecting and managing the roadway data compatible with the State's enterprise roadway inventory?	State/local Traffic Engineers
180. Are there guidelines for collection of data elements as they are described in the State roadway inventory data dictionary?	State/local Traffic Engineers
Intrastate Roadway System Interface	**Suggested Respondent**
181. Are the location coding methodologies for all State roadway information systems compatible?	State Traffic Engineers
182. Are there interface linkages connecting the State's discrete roadway information systems?	State Traffic Engineers
183. Are the location coding methodologies for all regional and local roadway systems compatible?	State Traffic Engineers
184. Do roadway data systems maintained by regional and local custodians (e.g., MPOs, municipalities) interface with the State enterprise	State/local Traffic Engineers

roadway information system?	
185. Does the State enterprise roadway information system allow MPOs and local transportation agencies on-demand access to data?	State/local Traffic Engineers
Data Quality Control Programs for the Roadway Data System	**Suggested Respondent**
186. Do Roadway system data managers regularly produce and analyze data quality reports?	DOT Roadway file managers
187. Is the overall quality of information in the Roadway system dependent on a formal program of error/edit checking as data is entered into the statewide system?	DOT Roadway file managers
188. Are there procedures for prioritizing and addressing detected errors?	DOT Roadway file managers
189. Are there procedures for sharing quality control information with data collectors through individual and agency-level feedback and training?	DOT Roadway file managers
190. Is there a set of established quality control metrics for the timeliness of the State enterprise roadway information system?	DOT Roadway file managers
191. Is there a set of established quality control metrics for the timeliness of the roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians (municipalities, MPOs, etc.)?	DOT Roadway file managers
192. Is there a set of established quality control metrics for the accuracy of the State enterprise roadway information system?	DOT Roadway file managers
193. Is there a set of established quality control metrics for the accuracy of the roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians (municipalities, MPOs, etc.)?	DOT Roadway file managers
194. Is there a set of established quality control metrics for the completeness of the State enterprise roadway information system?	DOT Roadway file managers
195. Is there a set of established quality control metrics for the completeness of the roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians (municipalities, MPOs, etc.)?	DOT Roadway file managers
196. Is there a set of established quality control metrics for the uniformity of the State enterprise roadway information system?	DOT Roadway file managers
197. Is there a set of established quality control metrics for the uniformity of the roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians (municipalities, MPOs, etc.)?	DOT Roadway file managers
198. Is there a set of established quality control metrics for the accessibility of State enterprise roadway information systems?	DOT Roadway file managers
199. Is there a set of established quality control metrics for the accessibility of the roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians (municipalities, MPOs, etc.)?	DOT Roadway file managers
200. Is there a set of established quality control metrics for the integration of State enterprise roadway information systems and other critical data systems?	DOT Roadway file managers
201. Is there a set of established quality control metrics for the integration of the roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians (municipalities, MPOs, etc.) and other critical systems?	DOT Roadway file managers

Table 19: Roadway List of Assessment Questions and Respondents

Description and Contents of the Citation and Adjudication Data Systems	Suggested Respondents
202. 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
203. 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
204. Is there a statewide authority that assigns unique citation numbers?	State law enforcement, State Court Administrator
205. Are all citation dispositions—both within and outside the judicial branch—tracked by the statewide data system?	State Court Administrator
206. 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
207. Are the courts' case management systems interoperable among all jurisdictions within the State (including local, municipal, and State)?	State Court Administrator
208. Is citation and adjudication data used for traffic safety analysis to identify problem locations, areas, problem drivers, and issues related to the issuance of citations, prosecution of offenders, and adjudication of cases by courts?	State Traffic Engineers, State Court Administrator, Program Managers at SHSO, Local and State law enforcement
Applicable Guidelines and Participation in National Data Exchange Systems for the Citation and Adjudication Systems	**Suggested Respondents**
209. Do the appropriate components of the citation and adjudication systems adhere to the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) data guidelines?	NLETS Administration, Local/State law enforcement
210. Do the appropriate portions of the citation and adjudication systems adhere to the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program guidelines?	Local/State law enforcement
211. Do the appropriate portions of the citation and adjudication systems adhere to the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) guidelines?	Local/State law enforcement
212. Do the appropriate portions of the citation and adjudication systems adhere to the National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (NLETS) guidelines?	State NLETS administrator
213. Do the appropriate portions of the citation and adjudication systems adhere to the National Law Enforcement Information Network (LEIN) guidelines?	Courts/driver license IT managers
214. Do the appropriate portions of the citation and adjudication systems adhere to the Functional Requirement Standards for Traffic Court Case Management?	State Court Administrator
215. Do the appropriate portions of the citation and adjudication systems adhere to the NIEM Justice domain guidelines?	Courts and State Law Enforcement IT managers
216. Does the State use the National Center for State Courts guidelines for court records?	State Court Administrator
217. Does the State use the Global Justice Reference Architecture (GRA)?	State Court Administrator
218. Does the State have an impaired driving data tracking system that	State Court Administrator, driver

meets the specifications of NHTSA's Model Impaired Driving Records Information System (MIDRIS)?	license manager, driver file custodian, driver control/ improvement section manager, SHSO program managers
Citation and Adjudication Systems Data Dictionary	**Suggested Respondents**
219. Does the citation system have a data dictionary?	State Court Administrator, TSRP, Courts IT manager
220. Do the citation data dictionaries clearly define all data fields?	Courts IT manager
221. 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
222. Do the citation data dictionaries indicate the data fields that are populated through interface linkages with other traffic records system components?	Courts IT manager
223. Do the courts' case management system data dictionaries provide a definition for each data field?	Courts IT manager
224. Do the courts' case management system data dictionaries clearly define all data fields?	Courts IT manager
225. 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
226. Do the prosecutors' information systems have data dictionaries?	Courts IT manager, prosecutors
Procedures and Process Flows for the Citation and Adjudication Data Systems	**Suggested Respondents**
227. Can the State track citations from point of issuance to posting on the driver file?	State Court Administrator
228. Does the State measure compliance with the process outlined in the citation lifecycle flow chart?	State Court Administrator, driver license manager, driver file custodian
229. Is the State able to track DUI citations?	State Court Administrator, driver license manager
230. Does the DUI tracking system include BAC and any drug testing results?	State Court Administrator, driver license manager
231. Does the State have a system for tracking administrative driver penalties and sanctions?	Driver license manager, State court administrator
232. Does the State have a system for tracking traffic citations for juvenile offenders?	Driver license manager, State court administrator
233. 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
234. Does the State track deferral and dismissal of citations?	State court administrator, prosecutors, driver file custodian
235. Are there State and/or local criteria for deferring or dismissing traffic citations and charges?	State Court Administrator, municipal court clerks' association, prosecutors
236. If the State purges its records, are the timing, conditions, and procedures documented?	State Court Administrator, Court IT manager, driver file custodian,
237. Are the security protocols governing data access, modification, and release officially documented?	State Court Administrator, prosecutors, Court IT manager
Citation and Adjudication Systems Interface with other	**Suggested Respondents**

Components	
238. Is citation data linked with the driver system to collect driver information, to carry out administrative actions (e.g., suspension, revocation, cancellation, interlock) and determine the applicable charges?	Driver license manager, driver file custodian, driver control/ improvement manager, prosecutors, State court administrator
239. Is adjudication data linked with the driver system to collect certified driver records and administrative actions (e.g., suspension, revocation, cancellation, interlock) to determine the applicable charges and to post the dispositions to the driver file?	State court administrator, prosecutors
240. Is citation data linked with the vehicle file to collect vehicle information and carry out administrative actions (e.g., vehicle seizure, forfeiture, interlock)?	State court administrator, vehicle file custodian
241. Is adjudication data linked with the vehicle file to collect vehicle information and carry out administrative actions (e.g., vehicle seizure, forfeiture, interlock mandates and supervision)?	State court administrator, vehicle file custodian
242. Is citation data linked with the crash file to document violations and charges related to the crash?	State court administrator, crash file custodian
243. Is adjudication data linked with the crash file to document violations and charges related to the crash?	State court administrator, crash file custodian
Quality Control Programs for the Citation and Adjudication Systems	**Suggested Respondents**
244. Is there a set of established quality control measures for the timeliness of the citation systems?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, courts IT manager
245. Is there a set of established quality control measures for the accuracy of the citation systems?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, courts IT manager
246. Is there a set of established quality control measures for the completeness of the citation systems?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, courts IT manager
247. Is there a set of established quality control measures for the uniformity of the citation systems?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, courts IT manager
248. Is there a set of established quality control measures for the integration of the citation systems?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, courts IT manager
249. Is there a set of established quality control measures for the accessibility of the citation systems?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, courts IT manager
250. Is there a set of established quality control measures for the timeliness of the adjudication systems?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, courts IT manager
251. Is there a set of established quality control measures for the accuracy of the adjudication systems?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, courts IT manager
252. Is there a set of established quality control measures for the completeness of the adjudication systems?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, courts IT manager
253. Is there a set of established quality control measures for the integration of the adjudication systems?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, courts IT manager
254. In States that have an agency responsible for issuing unique citation numbers, is information on intermediate dispositions (e.g., deferrals, dismissals) captured?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, courts IT manager
255. Do the State's DUI tracking systems have additional quality control procedures to ensure the accuracy and timeliness of the data?	Driver file custodian, State court administrator, DUI tracking system manager

Table 20: Citation/Adjudication List of Assessment Questions and Respondents

Description and Contents of the Injury Surveillance System	Suggested Respondents
256. Does the injury surveillance system include EMS data?	SHSO program managers, Traffic Records Coordinator, Dept. of Health, EMS, CODES
257. Does the injury surveillance system include emergency department (ED) data?	SHSO program managers, Traffic Records Coordinator, Dept. of Health, EMS, CODES, Hospital Association
258. Does the injury surveillance system include hospital discharge data?	SHSO program managers, Traffic Records Coordinator, Dept. of Health, EMS, CODES, Hospital Association
259. Does the injury surveillance system include trauma registry data?	SHSO program managers, Traffic Records Coordinator, Dept. of Health, Trauma Registry, CODES,
260. Does the injury surveillance system include rehabilitation data?	SHSO program managers, Traffic Records Coordinator, Dept. of Health, Trauma Registry, CODES
261. Does the injury surveillance system include vital records data?	SHSO program managers, Traffic Records Coordinator, CODES, Vital Records
262. Does the injury surveillance system include other data?	CODES, Traffic Records Coordinator
263. Does the EMS system track the frequency, severity, and nature of injuries sustained in motor vehicle crashes in the State?	EMS, CODES
264. Does the emergency department data track the frequency, severity, and nature of injuries sustained in motor vehicle crashes in the State?	EMS, CODES
265. 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
266. Does the trauma registry data track the frequency, severity, and nature of injuries sustained in motor vehicle crashes in the State?	Trauma Registry, CODES
267. Does the vital records data track the frequency, severity, and nature of injuries sustained in motor vehicle crashes in the State?	Vital Records, CODES, Dept. of Health
268. Is the EMS data available for analysis and used to identify problems, evaluate programs, and allocate resources?	SHSO program managers, CODES, EMS
269. Is the emergency department data available for analysis and used to identify problems, evaluate programs, and allocate resources?	Hospital Assoc, CODES, Dept. of Health
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. Is the trauma registry data available for analysis and used to identify problems, evaluate programs, and allocate resources?	Trauma registry, CODES
272. Is the vital records data available for analysis and used to identify problems, evaluate programs, and allocate resources?	Vital Records, CODES, Dept. of Health
Applicable Guidelines for the Injury Surveillance System	**Suggested Respondent**
273. Does the State have a NEMSIS-compliant statewide database?	EMS, Traffic Records Coordinator, CODES
274. Does the State's emergency department and hospital discharge data conform to the most recent uniform billing standard?	Hospital Association, CODES, Dept. of Health
275. Does the State's trauma registry database adhere to the National Trauma Data Standards?	Trauma Registry
276. Are Abbreviated Injury Scale (AIS) and Injury Severity Scores (ISS)	Hospital Association, CODES, Dept. of

derived from the State emergency department and hospital discharge data for motor vehicle crash patients?	Health
277. Are Abbreviated Injury Scale (AIS) and Injury Severity Scores (ISS) derived from the State trauma registry for motor vehicle crash patients?	Trauma Registry, CODES
278. Does the State EMS database collect the Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) data for motor vehicle crash patients?	Hospital Association, CODES, Dept. of Health
279. Does the State trauma registry collect the Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) data for motor vehicle crash patients?	Trauma Registry, CODES
280. Are there State privacy and confidentiality laws that supersede HIPAA?	SHSO, Dept. of Health, EMS
Data Dictionaries and Coding Manuals for the Injury Surveillance System	**Suggested Respondent**
281. Does the EMS system have a formal data dictionary?	EMS
282. Does the EMS system have formal documentation that provides a summary dataset—characteristics, values, limitations and exceptions, whether submitted or user created—and how it is collected, managed, and maintained?	EMS
283. Does the emergency department dataset have a formal data dictionary?	Hospital Association, Department of Health
284. Does the emergency department dataset have formal documentation that provides a summary dataset—characteristics, values, limitations and exceptions, whether submitted or user created—and how it is collected, managed, and maintained?	Hospital Association, Department of Health
285. Does the hospital discharge dataset have a formal data dictionary?	Hospital Association, Department of Health
286. Does the hospital discharge dataset have formal documentation that provides a summary dataset—characteristics, values, limitations and exceptions, whether submitted or user created—and how it is collected, managed, and maintained?	Hospital Association, Department of Health
287. Does the trauma registry have a formal data dictionary?	Trauma Registry
288. Does the trauma registry dataset have formal documentation that provides a summary dataset—characteristics, values, limitations and exceptions, whether submitted or user created—and how it is collected, managed, and maintained?	Trauma Registry
289. Does the vital records system have a formal data dictionary?	Vital Records, Medical Examiner
290. Does the vital records system have formal documentation that provides a summary dataset—characteristics, values, limitations and exceptions, whether submitted or user created—and how it is collected, managed, and maintained?	Vital Records, Medical Examiner
Processes and Procedures for the Injury Surveillance System	**Suggested Respondent**
291. Is there a single entity that collects and compiles data from the local EMS agencies?	EMS
292. Is there a single entity that collects and compiles data on emergency department visits from individual hospitals?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
293. Is there a single entity that collects and compiles data on hospital discharges from individual hospitals?	Department of Health, Hospital Association

294. Is there a process flow diagram that outlines the EMS system's key data process flows, including inputs from other systems?	EMS
295. Is there a process flow diagram that outlines the emergency department data's key data process flows, including inputs from other systems?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
296. Is there a process flow diagram that outlines the hospital discharge data's key data process flows, including inputs from other systems?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
297. Is there a process flow diagram that outlines the trauma registry's key data process flows, including inputs from other systems?	Trauma Registry
298. Are there separate procedures for paper and electronic filing of EMS patient care reports?	EMS
299. Are there procedures for collecting, editing, error-checking, and submitting emergency department and hospital discharge data to the statewide repository?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
300. Does the trauma registry have documented procedures for collecting, editing, error-checking, and submitting data?	Trauma Registry
301. Are there procedures for collecting, editing, error-checking, and submitting data to the statewide vital records repository?	Vital Records, Medical Examiner
302. Are there documented procedures for returning data to the reporting EMS agencies for quality assurance and improvement (e.g., correction and resubmission)?	EMS
303. Are there documented procedures for returning data to the reporting emergency departments for quality assurance and improvement (e.g., correction and resubmission)?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
304. Are there documented procedures for returning hospital discharge data to the reporting hospitals for quality assurance and improvement (e.g., correction and resubmission)?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
305. Are there documented procedures for returning trauma data to the reporting trauma center for quality assurance and improvement (e.g., correction and resubmission)?	Trauma Registry
306. Are there documented procedures for returning data to the reporting vital records agency for quality assurance and improvement (e.g., correction and resubmission)?	Vital Records, Medical Examiner
307. Is aggregate EMS data available to outside parties (e.g., universities, traffic safety professionals) for analytical purposes?	EMS
308. Is aggregate emergency department data available to outside parties (e.g., universities, traffic safety professionals) for analytical purposes?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
309. Is aggregate hospital discharge data available to outside parties (e.g., universities, traffic safety professionals) for analytical purposes?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
310. Is aggregate trauma registry data available to outside parties (e.g., universities, traffic safety professionals) for analytical purposes?	Trauma Registry
311. Is aggregate vital records data available to outside parties (e.g., universities, traffic safety professionals) for analytical purposes?	Vital Records, Medical Examiner
Data Interfaces Within the Injury Surveillance System	**Suggested Respondent**
312. Is there an interface among the EMS data and emergency department and hospital discharge data?	EMS, Department of Health, Hospital Association, CODES

313. Is there an interface between the EMS data and the trauma registry data?	EMS, Trauma Registry, CODES
314. Is there an interface between the vital statistics and hospital discharge data?	Department of Health, Hospital Association, Vital Records, Medical Examiner, CODES
Quality Control Programs for the Injury Surveillance System Emergency Medical Services Component	**Suggested Respondent**
315. 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
316. Is limited state-level correction authority granted to quality control staff working with the statewide EMS database in order to amend obvious errors and omissions without returning the report to the originating entity?	EMS
317. Are there formally documented processes for returning rejected EMS patient care reports to the collecting entity and tracking resubmission to the statewide EMS database?	EMS
318. Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of EMS system managers and data users?	EMS
319. Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of EMS system managers and data users?	EMS
320. Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of EMS system managers and data users?	EMS
321. Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of EMS system managers and data users?	EMS
322. Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of EMS system managers and data users?	EMS
323. Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of EMS system managers and data users?	EMS
324. Has the State established numeric goals (performance metrics) for each EMS system performance measure?	EMS
325. Is there performance reporting for the EMS system that provides specific timeliness, accuracy, and completeness feedback to each submitting entity?	EMS
326. Are high frequency errors used to update EMS system training content, data collection manuals, and validation rules?	EMS
327. Are quality control reviews conducted to ensure the completeness, accuracy, and uniformity of injury data in the EMS system?	EMS
328. Are periodic comparative and trend analyses used to identify unexplained differences in the EMS data across years and agencies?	EMS
329. Is data quality feedback from key users regularly communicated to EMS data collectors and data managers?	EMS
330. Are EMS data quality management reports produced regularly and made available to the State TRCC?	EMS
Emergency Department and Hospital Discharge Component	**Suggested Respondent**
331. 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
332. Is limited state-level correction authority granted to quality control staff working with the statewide emergency department and hospital	Department of Health, Hospital Association

discharge databases in order to amend obvious errors and omissions without returning the report to the originating entity?	
333. Are there formally documented processes for returning rejected emergency department and hospital discharge records to the collecting entity and tracking resubmission to the statewide emergency department and hospital discharge databases?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
334. Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of emergency department and hospital discharge database managers and data users?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
335. Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of emergency department and hospital discharge database managers and data users?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
336. Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of emergency department and hospital discharge database managers and data users?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
337. Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of emergency department and hospital discharge database managers and data users?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
338. Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of emergency department and hospital discharge database managers and data users?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
339. Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of emergency department and hospital discharge database managers and data users?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
340. Has the State established numeric goals (performance metrics) for each emergency department and hospital discharge database performance measure?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
341. Is there performance reporting for the emergency department and hospital discharge databases that provides specific timeliness, accuracy, and completeness feedback to each submitting entity?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
342. Are high frequency errors used to update emergency department and hospital discharge database training content, data collection manuals, and validation rules?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
343. Are quality control reviews conducted to ensure the completeness, accuracy, and uniformity of injury data in the emergency department and hospital discharge databases?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
344. Are periodic comparative and trend analyses used to identify unexplained differences in the emergency department and hospital discharge data across years and agencies?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
345. Is data quality feedback from key users regularly communicated to emergency department and hospital discharge data collectors and data managers?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
346. Are emergency department and hospital discharge data quality management reports produced regularly and made available to the State TRCC?	Department of Health, Hospital Association
Trauma Registry Component	**Suggested Respondent**
347. 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?	Trauma Registry
348. Is limited state-level correction authority granted to quality control	Trauma Registry

staff working with the statewide trauma registry in order to amend obvious errors and omissions without returning the report to the originating entity?	
349. Are there formally documented processes for returning rejected data to the collecting entity and tracking resubmission to the statewide trauma registry?	Trauma Registry
350. Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of trauma registry managers and data users?	Trauma Registry
351. Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of trauma registry managers and data users?	Trauma Registry
352. Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of trauma registry managers and data users?	Trauma Registry
353. Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of trauma registry managers and data users?	Trauma Registry
354. Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of trauma registry managers and data users?	Trauma Registry
355. Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of trauma registry managers and data users?	Trauma Registry
356. Has the State established numeric goals (performance metrics) for each trauma registry performance measure?	Trauma Registry
357. Is there performance reporting for the trauma registry that provides specific timeliness, accuracy, and completeness feedback to each submitting entity?	Trauma Registry
358. Are high frequency errors used to update trauma registry training content, data collection manuals, and validation rules?	Trauma Registry
359. Are quality control reviews conducted to ensure the completeness, accuracy, and uniformity of injury data in the trauma registry?	Trauma Registry
360. Are periodic comparative and trend analyses used to identify unexplained differences in the trauma registry data across years and agencies?	Trauma Registry
361. Is data quality feedback from key users regularly communicated to trauma registry data collectors and data managers?	Trauma Registry
362. Are trauma registry data quality management reports produced regularly and made available to the State TRCC?	Trauma Registry
Vital Records	**Suggested Respondent**
363. 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?	Vital Records, Medical Examiner, Department of Health
364. Is limited state-level correction authority granted to quality control staff working with vital records in order to amend obvious errors and omissions without returning the report to the originating entity?	Vital Records, Medical Examiner, Department of Health
365. Are there formally documented processes for returning rejected data to the collecting entity and tracking resubmission?	Vital Records, Medical Examiner, Department of Health
366. Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of vital records managers and data users?	Vital Records, Medical Examiner, Department of Health
367. Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of vital records managers and data users?	Vital Records, Medical Examiner, Department of Health
368. Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of vital records managers and data users?	Vital Records, Medical Examiner, Department of Health
369. Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of vital records managers and data users?	Vital Records, Medical Examiner, Department of Health

370. Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of vital records managers and data users?	Vital Records, Medical Examiner, Department of Health
371. Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of vital records managers and data users?	Vital Records, Medical Examiner, Department of Health
372. Has the State established numeric goals (performance metrics) for each vital records performance measure?	Vital Records, Medical Examiner, Department of Health
373. Is there performance reporting for vital records that provides specific timeliness, accuracy, and completeness feedback to each submitting entity?	Vital Records, Medical Examiner, Department of Health
374. Are high frequency errors used to update vital records training content, data collection manuals, and validation rules?	Vital Records, Medical Examiner, Department of Health
375. 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
376. Are periodic comparative and trend analyses used to identify unexplained differences in the vital records data across years and agencies?	Vital Records, Medical Examiner, Department of Health
377. Is data quality feedback from key users regularly communicated to vital records data collectors and data managers?	Vital Records, Medical Examiner, Department of Health
378. Are vital records data quality management reports produced regularly and made available to the State TRCC?	Vital Records, Medical Examiner, Department of Health

Table 21: Injury Surveillance List of Assessment Questions and Respondents

Data Use and Integration	Suggested Respondent
379. Do behavioral program managers have access to traffic records data and analytic resources for problem identification, priority setting, and program evaluation?	SHSO program managers
380. Does the State have a data governance process?	State Central IT or State CIO
381. Does the State have a formal traffic records system inventory that identifies linkages useful to the State and data access policies?	TRCC Chair
382. Does the TRCC promote data integration by aiding in the development of data governance, access, and security policies for integrated data?	TRCC Chair
383. 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
384. Is vehicle data integrated with crash data for specific analytical purposes?	Crash and title and registration file managers
385. Is roadway data integrated with crash data for specific analytical purposes?	DOT roadway file managers, crash file manager
386. Is citation and adjudication data integrated with crash data for specific analytical purposes?	Driver file and crash file managers
387. 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
388. Are there examples of data integration among crash and two or more of the other component systems?	Crash file manager, TRCC chair
389. Is data from traffic records component systems—excluding crash—integrated for specific analytical purposes?	Traffic Records Coordinator, data users
390. Do decision-makers have access to resources—skilled personnel and user-friendly access tools—for the use and analysis of integrated	Crash file manager, traffic records coordinator, IRP manager, DOT

datasets?	roadway file managers, SHSO program managers, Titles/Reg file manager, vehicle file manager, State court administrator
391. Does the public have access to resources—skilled personnel and user-friendly access tools—for the use and analysis of integrated datasets?	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

Table 22: Data Use and Integration List of Assessment Questions and Respondents

4.5 GO Team Application

NHTSA GO Teams Application – p.1

State: 6T <u>State Point of Contact</u> Name: 6T Phone: 6T Email: 6T	Date: 6T NHTSA Regional Program Manager Name: 6T Phone: 6T Email: 6T

Please select the type of GO Team requested: Technical Assistance ☐ Training ☐

<u>RPM Tracking</u> Date of receipt: 6T Priority? **Yes** ☐ No ☐ **RPM Recommendation on page two**	<u>TR Team Tracking</u> Date of receipt: 6T Priority? **Yes** ☐ No ☐ Notes: **6T**

For technical assistance requests, please provide a narrative addressing the following:

- Describe the specific technical issue the State wishes to address.
- Describe the specific technical assistance the State requires.
- Describe the desired outcome of this technical assistance.
- Provide the details of the State officials that will work with the Go Team on this issue.
- Describe in detail the specific actions the State has already taken to address this issue?
- Describe how a GO Team for this issue supports the State TRCC's Strategic Plan?
- Describe how will this technical assistance improve the performance of the State's traffic records data systems?

For training requests, please provide a narrative addressing the following:

- Describe the specific training needs.
- Describe any previous training or experience related to this subject has the State received.
- Who are the participants that will take this training and what are their backgrounds?
- Does the State have an appropriate training facility available?
- Provide the details of the person from the State that will coordinate the administrative aspects of this training (if different from the above designated State Point of Contact)?
- Describe how this training will support the State TRCCs strategic plan.
- Describe how this training will improve the performance of the State's traffic records data systems.

NHTSA GO Teams Application – p.2

State Narrative:

State Narrative: *Box will expand with text* 6T

RPM Comments and Recommendation:

RPM Narrative: *Box will expand with text* 6T

TR Team Review:

TR Team Narrative: *Box will expand with text* 6T

4.6 Glossary of Terms

Assessment 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.
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", "does not meet", or (in Round One) "clarification request" and provide a brief narrative that accompanies and describes the ballot selection for each question.
BTS	Bureau of Transportation Statistics
Clarification Request	An interim ranking and 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.
Clarification Response	The State's response to a clarification request.
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.
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 designated assessment team leader for each module: combines assessor ballots into ratings; drafts findings, conclusions, and module summaries; and serves as the sole point of contact with the State for that module.
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", "does not meet", or (in Round One) "clarification request" 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
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.

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.
State Traffic Records Program Advisory	The *Advisory* describes an ideal traffic records system including program function and capabilities.
SME	Subject Matter Expert. An individual who has been recognized as an expert in at least two of the eight *Advisory* modules.
Traffic Records Assessment	A peer review of a State's traffic records system in comparison to the current *Advisory*.
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.
Traffic Records Coordinator	Individual within each State that coordinates all traffic records activity within that State. May act as State Assessment Coordinator.
Traffic Records Team	NHTSA group that manages the traffic records (TR) program area for NHTSA: Sean McLaurin, Karen Scott, Luke Johnson, John Siegler and Sarah Weissman Pascual.
TRIPRS	Traffic Records Improvement Program Reporting System. A set of software tools for the management of state traffic records improvement activities by States and USDOT.