

Guidance for Reviewing the *Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory*

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the update of NHTSA's *Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory*. Informed comment is critical to success of the *Advisory* and the new traffic records assessment. This effort is key to the larger upgrades being made to DOT's traffic records programming and will directly impact the new State traffic records assessment process. The *Advisory* is being expanded beyond the current edition's description of model traffic records systems and basic guidance for assessing States' traffic records systems. This document provides information on how to provide input.

In order to participate, you must register via the below link before Friday, December 2, 2011:

<http://www.regonline.com/builder/site/Default.aspx?EventID=1027108>

In addition to refreshing the *Advisory's* current content, this review will also develop the questions that will populate the new, web-enabled assessment system. The questions will relate to the model system described in the *Advisory*, which will also include relative weights and standards of evidence. (For more information on the new assessment process, please see the enclosed fact sheet.)

For the purposes of the rewrite, the *Advisory* had been broken into eight sections: one on TRCC management, one on data integration, and one for each of the six critical data systems. Each section will be examined in an iterative nine-week review process, which will be staggered over the course of the next few months.

There will be three opportunities for comment on each section:

1. During **Weeks 1&2**, comments will be sought on the current text of the *Advisory*.
2. During **Weeks 4&5**, comments will be sought on (1) the initial revisions to the *Advisory* text, and (2) the initial draft assessment questions. In addition, participants will be asked to (3) suggest standards of evidence for each question that will ultimately be used by States when answering each question and by assessors when evaluating State responses to each question.
3. During **Week 8**, edits to the final draft of (1) the *Advisory* text, (2) the assessment questions, and (3) the standards of evidence for each assessment question.

Section	Round 1 (Wks 1&2)	Round 2 (Wks 4&5)	Round 3 (Wk 8)
Driver	11/28/11 to 12/9/11	12/19/11 to 1/6/12	1/23/12 to 1/30/12
Vehicle	12/5/11 to 12/16/11	12/22/11 to 1/13/12	1/30/12 to 2/6/12
Roadway	12/12/11 to 12/23/11	1/13/12 to 1/27/12	2/13/12 to 2/20/12
Crash	12/19/11 to 1/ 6/12	1/12/12 to 2/3/12	2/20/12 to 2/27/12
EMS/Injury	12/27/11 to 1/13/12	1/30/12 to 2/10/12	2/27/12 to 3/5/12
Citation/Adjudication	1/9/12 to 1/20/12	2/6/12 to 2/17/12	3/12/12 to 3/19/12
TRCC Management	1/23/12 to 2/3/12	2/10/12 to 2/24/12	3/19/12 to 3/26/12
Data Integration	1/30/12 to 2/10/12	2/21/12 to 3/2/112	3/26/12 to 4/2/12

The review process will be managed using Basecamp, a web-based document management program that will be the primary platform for comment. Basecamp will also send registered users comment deadline reminders for each section.

Please note that a user's access to later edit rounds will be contingent on participation in the prior round. For example, a user MUST have provided comment on Round 1 of the Crash system edits in order to gain access to the Round 2 Crash system edits.

Upon completion of this process, the entire document will undergo NHTSA's agency review before being published as a notice in the *Federal Register*.

Round 1 (Wks 1&2)

The first round will examine the current edition of the *Advisory*. Comments will be submitted via Basecamp in a text format. Please consider the following points when commenting on the *Advisory* during this round:

- Identify critical elements that should be added to the *Advisory* to reflect current ideal systems and practices. For example, updated content will need to include recommendations for measuring timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, and accessibility for the State's crash, driver, vehicle, roadway, citation and adjudication, and injury-surveillance data systems. In this case, these recommendations will need to harmonize with the recently released performance measures report.
- Identify any ambiguous text that needs clarification, bearing in mind that the audience for this document will be traffic records information professionals that manage State traffic records and conduct the traffic records assessments.
- Identify text that can be eliminated because it no longer reflects current ideal practices.
- Identify opportunity to add topics to the *Advisory*. This would help consolidate the State Traffic Records assessment and data audits from other DOT modes, such as CDIP, RDIP, MIDRIS, etc.
- For each section, determine which information in the *Advisory* represents a fundamental or critical element of the traffic records system that a State should prioritize and what information represents the optimal ideal.
- Remember, anything in the *Advisory* will need to be able to be extrapolated into a measurable assessment factor.

Round 2 (Wks 4&5)

The second round will examine (1) the first edits to the *Advisory* text, and (2) draft assessment questions linked to specific parts of the *Advisory*¹. Participants should also (3) suggest standards of evidence for assessors to use in rating States' responses. Please consider the following points during the second review period:

- Identify questions that are ambiguous and suggest how they can be clarified.
- Identify questions that do not relate to the *Advisory* or are redundant and should be eliminated.
- Identify areas of the *Advisory* that need an assessment question.
- Are there too many assessment questions for this section of the *Advisory* that would pose a heavy burden for States? If so, what questions can be eliminated or combined together? How would these changes affect the *Advisory* text?

¹ The assessment questions will be formatted as yes-or-no questions that States will need to answer and support with evidence.

- Describe the standard of evidence for each question so an assessor can determine whether an answer should be rated yes or no.
- The standards of evidence must be sufficient for an assessor to determine what evidence would support the answer to each question.
- The standards of evidence must be sufficient to enable States to provide said evidence.
- Not all assessment questions are equally important. Rate each question as (1) not important, (2) somewhat important, or (3) very important to the assessment.
- What information in TRIPRS or other DOT databases, can NHTSA use to pre-populate the assessment questionnaire to help the State provide evidence to support their answers and provide background to the assessors?

Round 3 (Wk 8)

The third and final round will examine the final drafts of (1) the *Advisory* text, (2) the assessment questions, and (3) the standards of evidence for each assessment question. Please consider the following:

- The audience will be State officials who will need to answer the assessment questions, and assessors who will need guidance when evaluating the State responses to the assessment questions.
- The clarity and conciseness of the language.
- Are the standards of evidence sufficient for an assessor to determine what evidence can support the answer to each question?
- Are the standards of evidence sufficient to guide States to provide the evidence that can sufficiently support the answer to each question?