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Executive Summary
Out of 391 assessment questions, Nebraska met the Advisory ideal for 186 questions (47.6%), partially met the Advisory ideal for 44 questions (11.3%), and did not meet the Advisory ideal for 161 questions (41.2%).

As Figure 1 illustrates, within each assessment module, Nebraska met the criteria outlined in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory 84.2% of the time for Traffic Records Coordinating Committee Management, 93.8% of the time for Strategic Planning, 40.9% of the time for Crash, 51.3% of the time for Vehicle, 48.9% of the time for Driver, 34.2% of the time for Roadway, 25.9% of the time for Citation / Adjudication, 48.8% of the time for EMS / Injury Surveillance, and 61.5% of the time for Data Use and Integration.

Figure 1: Rating Distribution by Module
### Figure 2: Assessment Section Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description and Contents</th>
<th>Crash</th>
<th>Vehicle</th>
<th>Driver</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Citation / Adjudication</th>
<th>EMS / Injury Surveillance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicable Guidelines</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Dictionaries</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures / Process Flow</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfaces</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Quality Control Programs</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Overall                  | 64.9% | 67.7% | 68.9% | 61.3% | 57.4% | 69.1% |

| Traffic Records Coordinating Committee Management | Overall 95.3% |
| Strategic Planning for the Traffic Records System | Overall 98.4% |
| Data Use and Integration | Overall 71.7% |

### Recommendations

Figure 2 shows the aggregate ratings by data system and assessment module. Each question’s score is derived by multiplying its rank and rating (very important = 3, somewhat important = 2, and less important = 1; meets = 3, partially meets = 2, and does not meet = 1). The sum total for each module section is calculated based upon the individual question scores. Then, the percentage is calculated for each module section as follows:

\[
\text{Section average} \times \% = \frac{\text{Section sum total}}{\text{Section total possible}}
\]

The cells highlighted in red indicate the module sub-sections that scored below that data system’s weighted average. The following priority recommendations are based on improving those module subsections with scores below the overall system score.

According to 23 CFR Part 1200, §1200.22, applicants for State traffic safety information system improvements grants are required to maintain a State traffic records strategic plan that—
“(3) Includes a list of all recommendations from its most recent highway safety data and traffic records system assessment; (4) Identifies which such recommendations the State intends to implement and the performance measures to be used to demonstrate quantifiable and measurable progress; and (5) For recommendations that the State does not intend to implement, provides an explanation.”

Nebraska can address the recommendations below by implementing changes to improve the ratings for the questions in those section modules with lower than average scores. Nebraska can also apply for a NHTSA Traffic Records GO Team, for targeted technical assistance.

---

**Crash Recommendations**

- Improve the data dictionary for the Crash data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.
- Improve the procedures/process flows for the Crash data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.
- Improve the interfaces with the Crash data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.
- Improve the data quality control program for the Crash data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.

**Vehicle Recommendations**

- Improve the procedures/process flows for the Vehicle data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.
- Improve the data quality control program for the Vehicle data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.

**Driver Recommendations**

- Improve the data dictionary for the Driver data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.
- Improve the data quality control program for the Driver data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.

**Roadway Recommendations**

- Improve the procedures/process flows for the Roadway data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.
- Improve the data quality control program for the Roadway data system to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.
### Citation / Adjudication Recommendations

Improve the data dictionary for the Citation and Adjudication systems to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.

Improve the interfaces with the Citation and Adjudication systems to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.

Improve the data quality control program for the Citation and Adjudication systems to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.

### EMS / Injury Surveillance Recommendations

Improve the data dictionary for the Injury Surveillance systems to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.

Improve the interfaces with the Injury Surveillance systems to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.

Improve the data quality control program for the Injury Surveillance systems to reflect best practices identified in the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory.
Introduction
A traffic records system consists of data about a State’s roadway transportation network and the people and vehicles that use it. The six primary components of a State traffic records system are: Crash, Driver, Vehicle, Roadway, Citation/Adjudication, and Injury Surveillance. These components address driver demographics, licensure, behavior and sanctions; vehicle types, configurations, and usage; engineering, education, enforcement measures; crash-related medical issues and actions; and how they affect highway traffic safety.

Quality traffic records data exhibiting the six primary data quality attributes—timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, and accessibility—is necessary to improve traffic safety and effectively manage the motor vehicle transportation network, at the Federal, State, and local levels. Such data enables problem identification, countermeasure development and application, and outcome evaluation. Continued application of data-driven, science-based management practices can decrease the frequency of traffic crashes and mitigate their substantial negative effects on individuals and society.

State traffic records systems are the culmination of the combined efforts of collectors, managers, and users of data. Collaboration and cooperation between these groups can improve data and ensure that the data is used in ways that provide the greatest benefit to traffic safety efforts. Thoughtful, comprehensive, and uniform data use and governance policies can improve service delivery, link business processes, maximize return on investments, and improve risk management.

Congress has recognized the benefit of independent peer reviews for State traffic records data systems. These assessments help States identify areas of high performance and areas in need of improvement in addition to fostering greater collaboration among data systems. In order to encourage States to undertake such reviews regularly, Congress’ Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) legislation requires States to conduct or update an assessment of its highway safety data and traffic records system every 5 years in order to qualify for §405(c) grant funding. The State’s Governor’s Representative must certify that an appropriate assessment has been completed within five years of the application deadline.

Background
In 2012, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration published an updated Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory (Report No. DOT HS 811 644). This Advisory was drafted by a group of traffic safety experts from a variety of backgrounds and affiliations, including: State highway safety offices, the Governors Highway Safety Association (GHSA) and the Association of Transportation Safety Information Professionals (ATSIP), as well as staff from NHTSA, FMCSA, and FHWA. The Advisory provides information on the contents, capabilities, and data quality of effective traffic records systems by describing an ideal that supports quality data driven decisions and improves highway safety. In addition, the Advisory describes in detail the importance of quality data in the identification of crash causes and outcomes, the development of effective interventions, implementation of countermeasures that prevent crashes and improve crash outcomes, updating traffic safety programs, systems, and policies, and evaluating progress in reducing crash frequency and severity.

The Advisory is based upon a uniform set of questions derived from the ideal model traffic records
Methodology
A State initiates the assessment process by submitting a formal request to its NHTSA Regional Administrator. Once that request is passed onto the NHTSA National Center for Statistics and Analysis Traffic Records Team, it appoints an assessment facilitator to work with the State Governor’s Representative to identify a State assessment coordinator and appropriate State respondents for each assessment question. Respondents enter the data into NHTSA’s State Traffic Records Assessment Program (STRAP), the Web-based application for the assessment. The assessment facilitator works with the State assessment coordinator to prepare for the assessment and establish a schedule consistent with the example outlined in Figure 3. Actual schedules can vary as dates may be altered to accommodate State-specific needs.
Figure 3: Traffic Records Assessment Time Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upon NHTSA TR Team receipt of request</td>
<td>Initial pre-assessment conference call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 month prior to kickoff meeting</td>
<td>Facilitator introduction pre-assessment conference call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>Monday, Week 1</td>
<td>On-site kickoff meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, Week 1 – 12pm EST, Friday, Week 3</td>
<td><strong>Round 1 Data Collection</strong>: State answers standardized assessment questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, Week 3 – Wednesday, Week 5</td>
<td><strong>Round 1 Analysis</strong>: 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><strong>Round 2 Data Collection</strong>: 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><strong>Round 2 Analysis</strong>: 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><strong>Round 3 Data Collection</strong>: State provides final response to the assessors’ ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, Week 11 – Monday, Week 13</td>
<td><strong>Round 3 Analysis</strong>: make final ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, Week 13 – Monday, Week 14</td>
<td>Facilitator prepares final report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 15</td>
<td>NHTSA delivers final report to State and Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(After completion of assessment, date set by State)</td>
<td>NHTSA hosts webinar to debrief State participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(After completion of assessment)</td>
<td>(OPTIONAL) State may request GO Team targeted technical assistance or training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following a kickoff meeting that explains the assessment process, schedule, and confirms question assignments, each respondent is sent an email with a token enabling them to log onto STRAP and answer assessment questions that had been assigned to them. The respondents may (a) answer a question, (b) answer the question and refer that question to another person to answer it as well, (c) refer the question—decline the question and send the question to someone else to answer—or (d) decline the question.

The traffic records assessment is an iterative process that includes three question-answer cycles. In each, State respondents have the opportunity to answer each question assigned to them before the assessors examine their answers and supporting evidence, at which point the
assessors rate each response. The second and third question and answer cycles are used to clarify responses and provide the most accurate rating for each question. In an attempt to prioritize the capabilities of each system being assessed, each question is ranked as "very important," "somewhat important" or "less important." To assist the State in responding to each question, the Advisory also provides State respondents with standards of evidence that identify the specific information necessary to answer each assessment question.

A group of qualified independent assessors rates the responses and determines how closely a State’s capabilities match those of the ideal system outlined in the Advisory. Each system component is evaluated independently by two or more assessors, who reach a consensus on the ratings. Specifically, the assessors rate each response and 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. The assessors write a brief narrative to explain their rating for each question.

In order for NHTSA to accept and approve an assessment each question must have an answer. When appropriate, however, a State may answer questions with "no, we do not have this capability/use this practice" etc. These responses constitute an acceptable answer and will receive a "does not meet" rating. An assessment with unanswered or blank questions will not be acceptable and cannot be used to qualify for §405 grant funds.

The complete traffic records assessment process is outlined in Figure 5 below.

States are encouraged to use the conclusions of this report as a basis for the State data improvement program strategic planning process, and are encouraged to review the conclusions at least annually to gauge how the State is addressing the items in this report. NHTSA can provide support in addressing these conclusions by means of GO Teams. NHTSA's Traffic Records GO Team program helps States improve their traffic records systems by deploying teams of subject matter experts to deliver tailored technical assistance and training based on States' actual needs.
Figure 4: State Schedule for the Traffic Records Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kickoff</td>
<td>September 14, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin first Q&amp;A Cycle</td>
<td>September 14, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End first Q&amp;A Cycle</td>
<td>October 02, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin second Q&amp;A Cycle</td>
<td>October 15, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End second Q&amp;A Cycle</td>
<td>October 30, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin third Q&amp;A Cycle</td>
<td>November 12, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End third Q&amp;A Cycle</td>
<td>November 27, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessors’ Final Results Complete</td>
<td>December 09, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report Due</td>
<td>December 18, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debrief</td>
<td>January 04, 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5: State Traffic Records Assessment Process
Results

For each question, a rating was assigned based on the answers and supporting documentation provided by the State. The ratings are shown as three icons, depicting ‘meets’, ‘partially meets’, or ‘does not meet’.

Legend:

Meets  Partially meets  Does not meet
Traffic Records Coordinating Committee Management

The Nebraska Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (TRCC) was established in 2006 and created as an ad hoc group of key multidisciplinary highway and traffic records data collectors, custodians, operators, and users of traffic records systems throughout the State. As outlined in the Nebraska Traffic Safety Information System Strategic Plan, Nebraska’s TRCC consists of an Executive Committee, a Core Team, and Technical Subcommittees. Each committee or Team has defined roles and responsibilities. The Executive Committee has the responsibility to designate or assign individuals from their agencies, thus giving the committee the authority to direct resources to carry out TRCC initiatives and the Strategic Plan.

Nebraska’s Executive Committee, Core Team, and Technical Subcommittee create a systematic forum and provide the necessary leadership and coordination to develop, implement, and monitor the Nebraska Traffic Safety Information System Strategic Plan, updated April 2015. The Plan was created by the TRCC membership (Core Team and Technical Subcommittees) and final approval was provided by the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee also reviews and approves TRCC actions proposed by the Core Team and Technical Subcommittees of the TRCC.

Nebraska’s TRCC composition, inclusive of representation from the core data systems, allows the membership to recommend and influence policy decisions that impact the traffic records system. The TRCC identifies and evaluates core system performance measures, conducts continuous monitoring of the projects, and provides assistance as necessary. The State has done a great job improving their core systems through the establishment of performance measures and progress monitoring mechanisms. Nebraska’s TRCC allows its membership to participate in meaningful coordination and serves as a forum for the discussion of traffic records programs, challenges, and investments. It is very evident the TRCC works together to establish the Strategic Plan priorities and goals, and discusses the status of the projects to achieve these goals.

The TRCC, under the direction of the Nebraska Office of Highway Safety, chaired by the Governor’s Highway Safety Representative, is responsible for scheduling/facilitating meetings, providing information to participating agencies, coordinating Traffic Records Assessments, managing and directing special projects, and managing funds. The TRCC meets at least quarterly to address traffic records initiatives, provide technical assistance, address training needs, and address federal funding support, as reported in Nebraska’s performance-based Strategic Traffic Safety Plan.

Observations/Opportunities

Although the TRCC does not allocate federal traffic records improvement grant funds, the TRCC is responsible for identifying the traffic records projects and initiatives that are supported by these funds. The Section 405 Traffic Records funding allocations are the responsibility of the Nebraska Office of Highway Safety (NOHS). The NOHS relies upon the TRCC for recommendations and support for the projects submitted for approval. All projects are subject to the availability of federal highway safety funding. The State should be commended for implementing these practices, in lieu of the TRCC directly allocating federal funds.

An effort to establish an accurate traffic records inventory is in progress. The TRCC has recently assigned that responsibility to its members and they plan to complete the process by the end of
It appears the Executive TRCC does not meet at least once annually; however, the TRCC chair regularly communicates with the Executive Agency leaders regarding the actions and progress of the TRCC through correspondence (primarily email). A majority of the Executive Committee members also serve as the Executive Leadership members of the Strategic Highway Safety Planning (SHSP) Group which meets annually where the TRCC Chair routinely provides updates. In addition, the Executive Committee members also receive copies of the NOHS Annual Report. Although not in the literal sense, but in the spirit of an annual meeting, Nebraska does make an effort to keep their executive TRCC well informed.

Although the TRCC does discuss updates to keep projects on track, accomplish goals, and complete projects in a timely manner, the State does not have a formal quality control process in place. The State may want to consider creating a more formal quality control program for which TRCC provides oversight. Consideration should be made in making quality control metrics a part of the technical TRCC’s regular meetings. The TRCC could choose to monitor a set of performance measures already included in the Traffic Records Strategic Plan, or opt to create some new measures of performance related to its priority projects. NHTSA’s documentation, "Model Performance Measures for State Traffic Records Systems," can be used to help structure Nebraska’s quality control process.

Question 1:
Does the State have both an executive and a technical TRCC?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a charter and/or MOU. Also provide a roster with all members’ names, affiliations, and titles for both the executive and technical TRCC.

Assessor conclusions:
As outlined in the Nebraska Traffic Safety Information System Strategic Plan, Nebraska's TRCC consists of an Executive Committee, a Core Team, and Technical Subcommittees. Each committee or team has defined roles and responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 2:
Do the executive TRCC members have the power to direct the agencies' resources for their respective areas of responsibility?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a charter and/or memorandum of understanding (MOU). Also provide a roster with all members' names, affiliations, and titles for the executive TRCC.

Assessor conclusions:
As indicated in the Strategic Plan, the Executive Committee has the responsibility to designate or assign individuals from their agencies, thus giving the committee the authority to direct resources to carry out TRCC initiatives and the Strategic Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 3:
Does the executive TRCC review and approve actions proposed by the technical TRCC?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative example of recent actions or programs approved by the executive TRCC (e.g., an approved project or funding proposal).

Assessor conclusions:
It appears the Executive Committee reviews and approves actions proposed by the technical TRCC. The State provided a fine example of this process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 4:
Does the TRCC include representation from the core data systems at both the executive and technical levels?

Standard of Evidence:
Identify the executive and technical TRCC members that represent the core data systems: crash, driver, vehicle, roadway, citation and adjudication, and injury surveillance.

Assessor conclusions:
Nebraska provided a complete roster and a Strategic Plan listing and outlining TRCC membership representing the core data systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 5:
Does the TRCC consult with the appropriate State IT agency or offices when planning and implementing technology projects?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative example of the TRCC's process of consulting the appropriate IT agency or offices. Identify the appropriate agency or offices and their responsibilities.

Assessor conclusions:
Nebraska provided evidence indicating the TRCC includes and consults with the appropriate IT staffs when planning and implementing TRCC technology projects. Most IT contacts are listed in the TRCC roster.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 6:**
Is there a formal document authorizing the TRCC?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the authorizing document (e.g. MOU, charter).

**Assessor conclusions:**
The Nebraska TRCC was established in 2006 and was created as an ad-hoc group of key multidisciplinary highway and traffic records data collectors, custodians, operators, and users of traffic records systems throughout the State.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 7:**
Does the TRCC provide the leadership and coordination necessary to develop, implement, and monitor the TRCC strategic plan?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative describing the TRCC's role in developing the TRCC strategic plan as well as implementation of a project detailed in the plan.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Nebraska’s Executive Committee, Core Team, and Technical Subcommittee creates a systematic forum and provides the necessary leadership and coordination to develop, implement, and monitor the Nebraska Traffic Safety Information System Strategic Plan, updated April 2015. The Plan is created by the TRCC membership (Core Team and Technical Subcommittees) and final approval is provided by the Executive Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 8:
Does the TRCC influence policy decisions that impact the State's traffic records system?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative describing a specific example of how the TRCC is engaged by component agencies in the course of their decision-making processes.

Assessor conclusions:
Nebraska's TRCC composition allows the membership to recommend and influence policy decisions that impact the traffic records system. The State provided examples that support influences imposed by the TRCC collaboration to policy changes, revisions, modifications, and new projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 9:
Does the TRCC allocate federal traffic records improvement grant funds?

Standard of Evidence:
Specify what funds the TRCC is responsible for allocating (e.g., §405(c)) and provide a narrative describing how the TRCC allocated the most recent program year's funding.

Assessor conclusions:
Although the TRCC does not allocate federal traffic records improvement grant funds, the TRCC is responsible for identifying the traffic records projects and initiatives that are funded by these funds. The Section 405 Traffic Records Funding allocations are the responsibility of the Nebraska Office of Highway Safety (NOHS). The NOHS Administrator is the Chair of the TRCC and has the overall responsibility for the TRCC. The NOHS relies upon the TRCC for their recommendations and support related to projects that are submitted for approval. All projects are subject to the availability of federal highway safety funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 10:
Does the TRCC identify core system performance measures and monitor progress?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide at least one performance measure for each of the six core systems and describe how the TRCC identified it and has tracked its progress over time.

Assessor conclusions:
The TRCC provides a forum for identifying and evaluating core system performance measures, conducts continuous monitoring and provides assistance. The State has done a great job with improving their core systems through establishing performance measures and monitoring progress. The narrative showed the State established performance measures in 5 of the 6 core systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 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?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the charter or MOU and minutes from the two most recent technical TRCC meetings.

Assessor conclusions:
Nebraska's TRCC composition allows the membership to participate in meaningful coordination and serves as a forum for the discussion of TRCC programs, challenges, and investments. The TRCC works together to establish the Strategic Plan priorities and goals and discusses the status of the projects in process to achieve these goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 12:
**Does the TRCC have a traffic records inventory?**

**Standard of Evidence:**

Provide the traffic records inventory.

**Assessor conclusions:**

An effort to establish an accurate traffic records inventory is in progress. The TRCC has recently assigned that responsibility to its members and they plan to complete the process by the end of the year. The State should be commended for partially meeting the advisory by assigning TRCC members and completing a template for completing this task.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 13:
**Does the technical TRCC have a designated chair?**

**Standard of Evidence:**

Provide a position description, identify the individual, and describe the chair's responsibilities.

**Assessor conclusions:**

Fred Zwonechek, Director of the Nebraska Office of Highway Safety and the Governor's Highway Safety Representative is the chair of the TRCC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 14:
Does the TRCC have a designated coordinator?

Standard of Evidence:

Provide a position description, identify the individual, and describe the coordinator's responsibilities.

Assessor conclusions:
Bill Kovarik, Traffic Safety Specialist, Nebraska Office of Highway Safety, is the designated coordinator and is responsible for scheduling/facilitating meetings, providing information to participating agencies, coordinating TR Assessments, managing and directing special projects, and managing funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Question 15:
Does the executive TRCC meet at least once annually?

Standard of Evidence:

Provide a schedule of executive meeting dates from the past two program years.

Assessor conclusions:
Although the executive TRCC does not meet at least once annually, the TRCC chair regularly communicates with the Executive Agency leaders regarding the actions and progress of the TRCC through correspondence (primarily email). A majority of the Executive Committee members also serve as the Executive Leadership members of the Strategic Highway Safety Planning (SHSP) Group which meets annually where the NOHS Administrator (TRCC Chair) routinely provides updates. In addition, the Executive Committee members also receive copies of the NOHS Annual Report. Although not in the literal sense but in the spirit of an annual meeting, Nebraska does make an effort to keep their executive TRCC well informed.

| Respondents assigned | 2 | Responses received | 1 | Response rate | 50% |
Question 16:
Does the technical TRCC meet at least quarterly?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a schedule of technical TRCC meeting dates for the past program year. If the TRCC has topical sub-committees, identify these groups, their purposes, and meeting dates as well.

Assessor conclusions:
The TRCC meeting schedules indicate the Committee met at least quarterly in 2014. The committee has met 3 times in 2015 and should meet one more time before the year ends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 17:
Does the TRCC oversee quality control and quality improvement programs impacting the core data systems?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide meeting minutes or reports that document the quality control activities that the TRCC undertakes regularly.

Assessor conclusions:
It appears the TRCC does discuss updates for TRCC projects during each meeting to keep projects on track, accomplish goals, and complete projects in a timely manner. These activities are reflected in the TRCC meeting minutes. The State does not have a formal QC and QA process in place where the TRCC oversees these programs. The State may want to consider creating a more formal quality control program for which TRCC provides oversight. Consideration should be made in making quality control metrics a part of the technical TRCC’s regular meetings. The TRCC could choose to monitor a set of performance measures already included in the Traffic Records Strategic Plan, or opt to create some new measures of performance related to its priority projects. NHTSA has a document "Model Performance Measures for State Traffic Records Systems" that can be used to help structure Nebraska's QC and QA process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 18:**
Does the TRCC address technical assistance and training needs?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Document TRCC discussion of technical assistance and training needs with meeting agendas or minutes.

**Assessor conclusions:**
A narrative was provided that demonstrated the TRCC’s ability to address technical assistance and training needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Somewhat Important

---

**Question 19:**
Does the TRCC use a variety of federal funds to strategically allocate resources for traffic records improvement projects?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide an inventory of federal funds used to support traffic records improvement projects in the last program year.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The TRCC uses 402 and 405d funds as well as local, State and other federal funds to support traffic records, as reported in Nebraska’s Performance-based Strategic Traffic Safety Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Very Important
Strategic Planning

Nebraska's Executive Committee, Core Team, and Technical Subcommittee provide the necessary leadership and coordination to develop, implement, and monitor the Nebraska Traffic Safety Information System Strategic Plan, updated April 2015. The Plan is created by the Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (TRCC) membership (Core Team and Technical Subcommittees) and final approval is provided by the Executive Committee.

The TRCC Core Team has conducted a baseline evaluation of each of the six systems and identifies deficiencies within the Traffic Records Strategic Plan. Baselines, goals/objectives, and performance measures have been identified for the quality categories and deficiencies identified. The TRCC created performance measures addressing these deficiencies based upon review of the Traffic Records Assessment (TRA) conducted in 2011. The State utilized the 2011 Assessment as the primary source for identifying system, data, or process deficiencies. Identified goals/objectives are the TRCC’s priorities for improving the traffic records system over the next five years. Performance measures have been identified and will be used to measure progress towards achieving the goals/objectives set for each system. The Plan identifies strategies, addressing the timeliness, accuracy, completeness, consistency, accessibility, and data integration of each component.

The Strategic Plan reflects projects identified by the TRCC. The Plan lists candidate projects for funding and implementation. The Plan also includes details for estimated funding/budget and measurable goals, as described in the 2016 Nebraska's Performance Based Strategic Traffic Safety Plan. A comprehensive, systematic process has been established by the TRCC to develop project priorities with each lead agency responsible for updating project progress, creating specific goals, and establishing timelines for the projects. Each project is monitored monthly to ensure implementation is conducted in accordance with project goals, objectives, and timelines, while remaining consistent with estimated budgeted cost and expenditures. Members of the TRCC are invited to attend a special Strategic Highway Safety Plan meeting to review the current Traffic Records Program priority programs and projects identified for consideration and/or implementation. The TRCC meets to discuss, review, and reach a consensus regarding the priority listing of projects.

Nebraska has established formal processes for identifying technical assistance and training needs to address various strategies and goals, leveraging federal funds and assistance programs, in support of the Strategic Plan. In addition, the TRCC has implemented a process to include projects, when approved, into the Strategic Plan for continuous monitoring of timelines, budget, and progress. All approved projects are tracked and updated within the Strategic Plan and performance measures for each are established. The TRCC does a great job integrating Federal, State and local data and technology needs into the Strategic Plan with assistance from Federal, State, and local stakeholders. These stakeholders are integral in identifying and addressing impediments, issues, and providing solutions.
**Question 20:**
Does the TRCC develop the TRCC strategic plan?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Document the process undertaken by the TRCC in developing the strategic plan.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Nebraska's Executive Committee, Core Team, and Technical Subcommittee provides the necessary leadership and coordination to develop, implement, and monitor the Nebraska Traffic Safety Information System Strategic Plan, updated April 2015. The Plan is created by the TRCC membership (Core Team and Technical Subcommittees) and final approval is provided by the Executive Committee.

**Question Rank:**
Very Important

**Respondents assigned**
2
**Responses received**
1
**Response rate**
50%

---

**Question 21:**
Does the TRCC strategic plan address existing data and data systems deficiencies and document how these deficiencies are identified?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Identify, with appropriate citations, how the strategic plan addresses existing data and data systems deficiencies and documents how they were identified.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The TRCC Core Team has conducted a baseline evaluation of each of the six systems and identified additional deficiencies within the TR Strategic Plan, dated April 2015. The Plan contains the six data quality categories, and a status for each quality category for each system. Baselines, goals/objectives and performance measures were identified for quality categories where projects were identified to address deficiencies.

**Question Rank:**
Very Important

**Respondents assigned**
2
**Responses received**
1
**Response rate**
50%
Question 22:
Does the TRCC strategic plan identify strategies that address the timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, and accessibility of the six core data systems?

Standard of Evidence:
Identify, with appropriate citations, how the strategic plan identifies strategies that address the timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, and accessibility of the six core data systems.

Assessor conclusions:
The TRCC Core Team has conducted a baseline evaluation of each of the six systems and identified additional deficiencies within the TR Strategic Plan, dated April 2015. The Strategic Plan contains the six data quality categories, and a status for each quality category for each system. Baselines, goals/objectives and performance measures were identified for quality categories where projects were identified to address deficiencies. The goals identified are the TRCC’s priorities for improving the traffic records system over the next five years. The performance measures will be used to measure progress towards achieving the goals for each system. The Plan identifies strategies that address the timeliness, accuracy, completeness, consistency, accessibility, and data integration of each component.

Responses assigned 2  Responses received 1  Response rate 50%

Question 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?

Standard of Evidence:
Identify, with appropriate citations, how efforts detailed in the plan are funded and explain how these allocations address the plan’s stated goals as specified in the strategic plan.

Assessor conclusions:
The TRCC Strategic Plan reflects projects identified by the TRCC. The Plan lists candidate projects for funding and implementation. The Plan also includes details of funding, expenditures, and the goals associated with the funds described in the 2016 Nebraska’s Performance Based Strategic Traffic Safety Plan.

Responses assigned 2  Responses received 1  Response rate 50%
Question 24:
Does the TRCC have a process for prioritizing traffic records improvement projects in the TRCC strategic plan?

Standard of Evidence:
Identify, with appropriate citations, how the TRCC prioritizes traffic records improvement projects as specified in the strategic plan.

Assessor conclusions:
The TRCC establishes specific projects for each priority within the plan. The projects are assigned to a lead agency/contact that is responsible to update the TRCC membership with a progress report for each project. Each project is created with a specific goal, timeline and funding if necessary. All projects awarded federal highway safety grant Sections 402 or 405b, through the NOHS, are assigned to appropriate NOHS Traffic Safety Specialist staff members where each project is monitored monthly (reports are required of the grantee) to ensure implementation is conducted in accordance with project goals, objectives, and timelines while remaining consistent with estimated budgeted cost items. Members of the TRCC are invited to attend a special Strategic Highway Safety Plan meeting to review the current Traffic Records Program priority programs and projects list when a potential program or project may be brought to the TRCC Chair for consideration. This is presented by an Executive Committee member(s) or any member of the TRCC. The TRCC meets to discuss, review, and reach a consensus regarding the priority listing of projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 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?

Standard of Evidence:
Identify, with appropriate citations, how the TRCC identifies performance measures and any corresponding metrics for each of the six core data systems as specified in the strategic plan.

Assessor conclusions:
The TRCC has created performance measures addressing deficiencies based upon review of the Traffic Records Assessment (TRA) conducted in 2011. The State utilized the 2011 Assessment as the primary source for identifying system, data or process deficiencies. In addition to the TRA, the TRCC Core Team conducted a baseline evaluation of each of the six systems and identified additional deficiencies. Baselines, goals/objectives and performance measures were identified for quality categories where projects were identified to address deficiencies. The goals identified are the TRCC’s priorities for improving the traffic records system over the next five years. The performance measures will be used to measure progress towards achieving the goals for each system.

Respondents assigned 2  
Responses received 1  
Response rate 50%

Question 26:
Does the TRCC have a process for identifying and addressing technical assistance and training needs in the TRCC strategic plan?

Standard of Evidence:
Identify, with appropriate citations, how the TRCC identifies and addresses technical assistance and training needs as specified in the strategic plan.

Assessor conclusions:
Nebraska’s TRCC does have a process for identifying and addressing technical assistance and training needs in the TRCC strategic plan for the different strategies and goals in place. For example, regarding the crash records system, there is a formal method of tracking errors with feedback provided to the different law enforcement agencies. In the case of an error, training assistance is provided. For any errors found by users, they are noted, and addressed in training. The Core Team is responsible for addressing the technical assistance needs.

Respondents assigned 2  
Responses received 1  
Response rate 50%
**Question 27:**
Does the TRCC have a process for leveraging federal funds and assistance programs in the TRCC strategic plan?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Identify, with appropriate citations, how the TRCC leverages federal funds and assistance programs as specified in the strategic plan.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Nebraska's TRCC has a process for leveraging federal funds and assistance programs in the TRCC strategic plan. The TRCC Executive Committee identifies funding as appropriate in order to support and improve the Strategic Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 28:**
Does the TRCC have a process for establishing timelines and responsibilities for projects in the TRCC strategic plan?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Identify, with appropriate citations, how the TRCC establishes timelines and responsibilities for projects in the plan.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The TRCC has implemented a process to include projects, when approved, into the Strategic Plan for continuous monitoring of timelines and responsibilities. All approved projects are tracked within the Strategic Plan and updated, at least annually, at TRCC meetings. Performance measures are also included in the Plan. The projects for improving any of the measures are noted within the Plan as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 29:
Does the TRCC have a process for integrating State and local data needs and goals into the TRCC strategic plan?

Standard of Evidence:
Identify, with appropriate citations, how the TRCC integrates State and local data needs and goals into the TRCC strategic plan.

Assessor conclusions:
The TRCC has a process for integrating State and local data needs into the TRCC strategic plan. The Core Team of the TRCC is made up of representatives from both State and local agencies that have the responsibility and authority to review and recommend improvements to the integration of State and local data.

Question 30:
Does the TRCC consider the use of new technology when developing and managing traffic records projects in the strategic plan?

Standard of Evidence:
Identify, with appropriate citations, a project or projects in the strategic plan whose development included the application or consideration of new technology.

Assessor conclusions:
Through the TRCC module, Nebraska provided evidence indicating the TRCC does include and consult with the appropriate IT staffs when planning and implementing TRCC technology projects. Because the TRCC is responsible for the Strategic Plan, it does appear the TRCC considers the use of new technologies when developing and managing traffic records projects in the Strategic Plan.
Question 31:
Does the TRCC consider lifecycle costs in implementing improvement projects?

Standard of Evidence:
Identify, with appropriate citations, a project or projects in the strategic plan whose development included consideration of lifecycle costs.

Assessor conclusions:
The State indicated the TRCC does not consider lifecycle costs in implementing traffic records projects, however, the Strategic Plan does address costs and funding for each project. All projects are implemented annually with a one year budget.

Question 32:
Is the strategic plan responsive to the needs of all stakeholders, including local users?

Standard of Evidence:
Identify, with appropriate citations, specific instances demonstrating that local stakeholder needs are incorporated into the TRCC's strategic plan.

Assessor conclusions:
Input to the Strategic Plan involves traffic records stakeholders and the TRCC is the forum for their involvement, sharing, and collaboration. The Strategic Plan addresses projects from the six components, therefore indicating stakeholders and users are being considered. It is built into Nebraska's mission and goals to improve all traffic records data systems in all areas. Representatives from all stakeholder groups, including local users, have input when making plan updates and improvements.
Question 33:
Does the strategic plan make provisions for coordination with key federal traffic records data systems?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative demonstrating how the strategic plan coordinates with key federal traffic records data systems. Provide citations from the strategic plan if appropriate.

Assessor conclusions:
An updated TRCC Roster with descriptions was added. It appears Nebraska involves NHTSA, FHA, and FMCA membership. All are active participants in TRCC meetings and discussions. Nebraska’s strategic plan does make provisions for coordination with key federal traffic records data systems. The recommendations from the NHTSA Traffic Records Assessment were followed and used as guidance. The MMUCC recommendations are also taken into consideration for crash records database updates.

Question Rank: Somewhat Important

Respondents assigned 2 Responses received 1 Response rate 50%

Question 34:
Does the TRCC have a process for identifying and addressing impediments to coordination with key Federal traffic records data systems?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative detailing the processes used by the TRCC to identify and address impediments to coordination with key Federal traffic records data systems. Provide citations from the strategic plan if appropriate.

Assessor conclusions:
It appears NHTSA, FHWA, FMCA are involved in identifying and addressing impediments with key federal traffic records data systems through their involvement and active membership in the TRCC. Nebraska utilizes past assessments and it's recommendations to develop and update current Strategic Plans.

Question Rank: Very Important

Respondents assigned 2 Responses received 1 Response rate 50%
Question 35: Is the TRCC’s strategic plan reviewed and updated annually?

Standard of Evidence:

Provide a narrative detailing the frequency and depth of strategic plan reviews and updates. Identify the stakeholder agencies represented in the review process. Provide a schedule or cite the plan itself if appropriate.

Assessor conclusions:
The TRCC Strategic Plan is updated annually. The Plan will be completely rewritten and revised every five years after each Traffic Records Assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Question Rank: Very Important
Crash

Nebraska is well served by its centralized crash data system which meets many of the attributes described in the ideal system of the Advisory. Custodial responsibilities and reporting requirements are spelled out in State statutes, and the data is used to identify problems, select and evaluate countermeasures, as well as describe the safety situation as documented in the State’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP), Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), High Accident Location Analysis, and High Risk Rural Roads Programs. It is especially noteworthy that Nebraska has developed a single electronic field data collection solution that is made available to statewide law enforcement agencies at no cost. Nebraska is commended for achieving approximately 93% electronic crash report submissions. The State is encouraged to adopt a plan to implement electronic crash reporting for those remaining paper submitting agencies.

Nebraska’s Accident Reporting System (ARS) was originally developed in 2002, and with the exception of implementing electronic field data collection, has remained mostly unchanged. The ARS centralized database is documented by a complete but somewhat technical data dictionary (Accident Code Book). The data dictionary includes all crash data element and attributes. It, along with the “Data Entry Instruction Manual”, is the primary documentation for the crash reporting system. Nebraska has recently initiated an effort to develop a new crash form based on the Model Minimum Uniform Crash Criteria (MMUCC) Fourth Edition. The new, more MMUCC compliant, crash form and database will require updating of the current crash system. Nebraska would be well served to improve the crash data dictionary as part of the crash form re-design. The new dictionary should include the edit checks/validation rules, detailed text-based descriptions of data elements and attributes, and note which data elements are captured through linkage (and how the linkages are accomplished). In addition, the improved documentation could provide a process for keeping the dictionary, manuals, and guides in sync as well as be the foundation for a formal traffic records inventory. A formal traffic records inventory provides an opportunity to facilitate further development of data governance procedures and integration projects.

Nebraska is commended for developing the Nebraska Department of Roads (NDOR) Electronic Accident Form (EAF). The EAF, as noted above, is the State supported electronic field crash data collection solution. Law enforcement agencies submitting electronic crash reports use the EAF or one of at least three other systems available in the State. All electronically submitted crash data must use the NDOR’s edit checks and validation rules. The XML/XSD process is used as part of the data acceptance process and crash report data not conforming to the edit checks are returned to the agency for correction and resubmission. Overall, Nebraska’s crash data quality management relies almost exclusively on these edit checks. These are limited to range edits—checks to ensure that required fields have data in them that fall within the allowed range of values for that data element. It is not clear whether edits include cross-field edit checking for logical agreement among two or more data elements. The EAF does not currently include real time interfaces to the driver, vehicle, or roadway systems which can further improve crash data quality. The State hopes to develop these capabilities in future releases of the system. In addition, the processes for handling errors are not formally documented. In fact, overall the most important shortcomings of the Nebraska crash system stem from the lack of a formal, comprehensive data quality management process. The Assessment Advisory describes the components of such a management process, and while the assessment team strongly recommends implementing all of the components of a formal, comprehensive data quality management program for crash data, we also want to acknowledge that Nebraska has succeeded in implementing a process to use all
sections of the crash report including the narrative and diagram to improve data quality. Nebraska uses the OnBase document imaging system to scan paper submitted reports and to store an image of electronically submitted reports. Quality control staff reviews each report and compares the narrative, diagram, and coded contents of the report as part of the statewide crash database's data acceptance process. This is definitely an important and necessary first step toward a more complete data quality management program, and the State is to be commended for this accomplishment and encouraged to do more. In particular, the State has not yet implemented a set of data quality performance measures. Performance measures should be tailored to the needs of data managers and address the concerns of data users. The measures, once established, provide the basis for regular reporting to the TRCC on the quality of the crash data. They should be based on a series of standardized measures of the six-pack of data quality attributes (timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, and accessibility). The TRCC should identify measures from the Model Performance Measures for State Traffic Records Systems report (NHTSA, 2010) that best suit the committee’s strategic goals.

Another easily implemented improvement in the crash data management program would be to develop a set of periodic comparative and trend analyses. The State reported that comparative trend analyses are currently conducted, however, the results are used to identify specific crash patterns, and in some predictive models, not to assess data quality. These could be based on the aggregate reports presented to individual law enforcement agencies (the aggregate reports showing data attribute distributions), with expansion to other analyses as needed. Sharing these reports with the TRCC would be useful in keeping that group informed and thus better able to cooperatively support the crash data improvement process.

Finally, the assessors strongly recommend that the Accident Records Bureau work through the TRCC and in cooperation with a representative group of law enforcement agencies to “tighten up” the crash report rejection and resubmission processes. It is not clear if the edit checks are adequate to trigger a report rejection at present—the TRCC should be involved in reviewing the edits as well as helping decide which of the various edit checks rise to the level where a violation means the report should be rejected and returned to the law enforcement agency for correction. The State also needs a way to track the resubmission of rejected reports. Law enforcement agencies should be given a set number of days to comply (e.g., 30 days for PDO or minor injury crashes; 45 days for serious injury or fatal crashes) and any agency that fails to resubmit a corrected report in that time frame should be contacted with a reminder notice. Performance in resubmitting reports in a timely fashion should be measured and reported as an additional data quality measurement.
**Question 36:**
Is statewide crash data consolidated into one database?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a description of the statewide database and specify how the data is consolidated.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Nebraska's consolidated crash database is a relational DB2 database hosted on the State's mainframe computer. The State indicated the crash data is organized into logical groups - Crash level, Vehicle Level, Driver Level, Occupant Level, etc. It would be helpful if the State established and supported a detailed process flow diagram illustrating the processes and procedures starting at the crash event to the point of posting the data to the consolidated database.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 37:**
Is the statewide crash system's organizational custodian clearly defined?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Identify what agency has the custodial responsibility for the statewide crash system, detail the extent of the agency's role, and provide all relevant statutes.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Nebraska Rev. Statutes 60-695 clearly defines the “Accident Records Bureau of the Department of Roads” as the crash system's organizational custodian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 38:**
Does the State have criteria requiring the submission of fatal crashes to the statewide crash system?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the fatal crash inclusion criteria for the statewide crash system.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Nebraska Rev. Statutes 60-695 requires law enforcement to submit an original report of their investigation for all accidents resulting in injury or death to any person in which estimated damage exceeds one thousand dollars. The report must be submitted to the Accident Records Bureau of the Department of Roads within ten days after such an accident. Further, the State indicated, for fatal crashes, the criteria must meet the ANSI D-16 definition of a traffic accident and an involved party (driver, occupant, pedestrian, bicyclist, etc.) must die from injuries that resulted from the crash within 30 days of the crash.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:**
Very Important

---

**Question 39:**
Does the State have criteria requiring the submission of injury crashes to the statewide crash system?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the injury crash inclusion criteria for the statewide crash system.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Nebraska Rev. Statute 60-695 requires law enforcement to submit an original report of their investigation of all accidents resulting in injury or death to any person in which estimated damage exceeds one thousand dollars. The report must be submitted to the Accident Records Bureau of the Department of Roads within ten days after such an accident. Further, the State indicated, for injury crashes, the crash criteria must meet the ANSI D-16 definition of a traffic accident and an involved party must receive serious, visible, or possible injuries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:**
Very Important
### Question 40:
Does the State have criteria requiring the submission of PDO crashes to the statewide crash system?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the PDO crash submission criteria for the statewide crash system.

**Question Rank:** Very Important

**Assessor conclusions:**
Nebraska Rev. Statute 60-695 requires law enforcement to submit an original report of their investigation of all accidents resulting in injury or death to any person in which estimated damage exceeds one thousand dollars. The report must be submitted to the Accident Records Bureau of the Department of Roads within ten days after such accident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 41:
Does the statewide crash system record crashes occurring in non-trafficway areas (e.g., parking lots, driveways)?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the non-trafficway reporting criteria for the statewide crash system.

**Question Rank:** Somewhat Important

**Assessor conclusions:**
Nebraska’s crash system and consolidated database accepts and processes non-traffic crashes (private property) when submitted by law enforcement agencies. However, the State statute does not require reporting of non-traffic crashes. The crash system provides the ability for users to include or exclude these crashes in their Statewide statistics or location based analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 42:**
Is data from the crash system used to identify crash risk factors?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide example reports and/or analyses that examine locations, roadway features, behaviors, driver characteristics, or vehicle characteristics as they relate to crash risk. If referencing large documents like the SHSP, please cite relevant page numbers.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Nebraska uses crash data to identify crash risk factors in support of the Strategic Highway Safety Plan, Highway Safety Improvement Program, High Accident Location Analysis, High Risk Rural Roads Program, and NHTSA’s Highway Safety Plan. A number of example scenarios were presented in the narrative and supporting evidence to demonstrate the use of the crash system in identifying crash risk factors in the SHSP emphasis areas, location based analysis, roadway features, driver characteristics, and behavior program areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 43:**
Is data from the crash system used to guide engineering and construction projects?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Describe the State's network screening and countermeasure selection processes. Describe how construction projects are funded based on the analysis of crash data. If referencing large documents like the SHSP, please cite relevant page numbers.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The Nebraska crash data system is used to guide engineering and construction projects. The Nebraska Department of Roads (NDOR) uses Clarity project management software to manage highway construction projects. As a part of the project management system, Traffic Engineers perform a crash history review and develop a safety recommendation for all major projects. These recommendations are submitted to project engineers for consideration in the design of the project. Additionally, accident studies are completed at sites identified as high crash locations and are considered by the NDOR's various safety committees when making plans for spending federal HSIP funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 44:
Is data from the crash system regularly used to prioritize law enforcement activity?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a sample location-based analysis and any associated law enforcement activities. If a State DDACTS program exists, provide details.

Assessor conclusions:
Two examples were provided to demonstrate the use of the crash system to regularly prioritize law enforcement activity. The Nebraska State Patrol’s Research & Planning Office regularly receive crash data summarized by location and showing driver contributing circumstances and alcohol involvement. Other law enforcement agencies are regularly provided standard summary reports to direct selective enforcement activites.

Respondents assigned 1  Responses received 1  Response rate 100%

Question 45:
Is data from the crash system used to evaluate safety countermeasure programs?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe how crash data is used to evaluate safety countermeasure programs. If referencing large documents like the SHSP, HSP, or Crash Facts, please cite relevant page numbers.

Assessor conclusions:
Before-and-after crash data is used to evaluate all projects built under the HSIP program and is also used to evaluate the effect of systemic programs. An example of before-and-after analysis was provided demonstrating the countermeasures evaluation.

Respondents assigned 1  Responses received 1  Response rate 100%
Question 46:
Is MMUCC a primary source for identifying what crash data elements and attributes the State collects?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative description of the process by which MMUCC was used to identify what crash data elements and attributes are included in the crash database and on the Police Accident Report (PAR).

Assessor conclusions:
Nebraska indicated their current crash form dated January 2002 was developed using MMUCC Version 1. A current effort is now working on a new crash form design using MMUCC Version 4. The MMUCC Mapping Team Charter describes the team composition and process used to identify new data elements and attributes recommended for use on the new form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 47:
Are the ANSI D-16 and ANSI D-20 used as sources for the definitions in the crash system data dictionary?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative description of the process by which ANSI D-16 and ANSI D-20 were used to define data elements in the crash system's data dictionary and user manual.

Assessor conclusions:
Nebraska uses ANSI D-16 standards as sources for definitions in the crash system data dictionary. ANSI D-20 standards are used for the purpose of comparing to MMUCC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 48:
Does the data dictionary provide a definition for each data element and define that data element's allowable values?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a copy of the crash system data dictionary.

Assessor conclusions:
Nebraska's Accident Code Book was provided as the crash system's data dictionary. It includes the data elements and attributes showing their allowable values.

Response rates:
Respondents assigned: 1, Responses received: 1, Response rate: 100%

Question 49:
Does the data dictionary document the system edit checks and validation rules?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a copy of the crash system data dictionary. If the crash system edit checks and validation rules are documented elsewhere, provide the appropriate document.

Assessor conclusions:
The Nebraska Crash System data dictionary (Accident Code Book) does not contain the edit checks or validation rules. Nebraska might consider developing a less technical non-IT document for use by the crash system users showing data elements, attributes, edit checks/validation rules, and any data elements populated through linkages to other traffic record components. This documentation could be become a critical component of a formal traffic records inventory.

Response rates:
Respondents assigned: 1, Responses received: 1, Response rate: 100%
Question 50:
Is the data dictionary up to date and consistent with the field data collection manual, coding manual, crash report, and any training materials?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe the processes to update the crash system's data dictionary, field data collection manual, coding manual, crash report, and training manuals. Specify which of the documents exist and describe processes to keep them consistent with each other.

Assessor conclusions:
There have been few changes made to the crash system since the original development in 2002. As changes occur, the corresponding modifications are reflected within other documents. It does not appear formal processes are in place to update the data dictionary and corresponding documentation. As the new MMUCC compliant form is designed and developed, formal processes should be considered.

Question 51:
Does the crash system data dictionary indicate the data elements populated through links to other traffic records system components?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a list of data elements that are populated in the crash system through linkages to other traffic records system components (e.g., the driver file, the vehicle file, the roadway inventory, or statewide mapping system).

Assessor conclusions:
The Investigator's Instruction Manual was offered as supporting evidence. Data elements populated through links to other traffic records system components such as driver or vehicle information are usually accomplished by a real time interface by entering the driver license number or vehicle registration number (plate number). The State suggests the only elements generated from other traffic records components come from the roadway systems. There were a few Roadway type data elements, such as, the population code and the National Functional Class code that the data dictionary (Accident Code Book) noted as computer generated from 'IHI' tables. It is not clear if these data elements come from the roadway file or internal accident reporting system tables.
Question 52:
Do all law enforcement agencies collect crash data electronically?

Standard of Evidence:

Provide a list of all reporting agencies and specify their data collection methods. Specify any State plans for achieving 100% electronic in-field data collection.

Assessor conclusions:
Nebraska provides the electronic reporting system (EAF) developed by NDOR to all law enforcement agencies at no cost. There are at least three other electronic field data collection crash solutions being used throughout the State. Currently the State receives 93% of all crash reports electronically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 53:
Do all law enforcement agencies submit their data to the statewide crash system electronically?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe—using a narrative or flow diagram—all data submission processes used to transmit data from collecting agencies to the statewide crash data system. Include the percentage of total data submitted for each specified method.

Assessor conclusions:
Currently the State receives 93% of all crash reports electronically. It appears that all data collected in the field electronically is also submitted to the consolidated database electronically. The State is recognized for this accomplishment and is encouraged to develop a plan to adopt an electronic solution for those remaining paper submitting agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 54:
Do all law enforcement agencies collecting crash data electronically apply validation rules that are consistent with those in the statewide crash system prior to submission?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe the validation processes used by the collecting agencies. Specify if the validation rules are applied to the data prior to submission to the statewide crash system. Include, in the description, how the validation rules are distributed to the collecting agencies and how the State checks the submitted data for consistency to rules in the statewide crash system.

Assessor conclusions:
Nebraska provides all agencies with the NDOR required edit checks/validation rules. The XML/XSD process is required to be used for all electronically submitted crash reports and is tested as part of data acceptance. Any report that doesn't pass validation is sent back to the reporting agency with an electronic message instructing the agency on the "issue". Reports are then corrected and resubmitted.

Respondents assigned 2  Responses received 2  Response rate 100%

Question 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?

Standard of Evidence:
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 vehicle crashes to SafetyNet.

Assessor conclusions:
Nebraska does not appear to have formal documentation detailing the policies and procedures for key processes governing the collection, reporting, and posting of their crash data. This documentation can be a valuable asset when considering new technology and as training materials during staffing changes.

Respondents assigned 1  Responses received 1  Response rate 100%
### Question 56:
Are the processes for managing errors and incomplete data documented?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a process flow diagram (preferred) or narrative description documenting the processes for managing errors and incomplete data.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The processes for managing errors and managing incomplete data are not documented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Very Important

### Question 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?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a copy of the retention policy.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Nebraska indicated their data retention policy meets the needs of safety engineers and other users with a legitimate need for long-term access to the crash data reports. The data retention worksheet was provided to support the evidence requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Somewhat Important
Question 58: Does the crash system interface with the driver system?

Standard of Evidence:

Provide narrative description of the crash-to-driver system interfaces that enable: verification and validation of the driver’s personal information, access to driver records, identification of inconsistencies between the crash and driver records, and/or identification of the driver’s prior crash involvement?

Assessor conclusions:

The Nebraska crash system database is linked to the Department of Motor Vehicle's driver records system. After a crash report is accepted by the crash system, the link posts the crash information to the involved drivers’ record through a nightly batch process. A crash system to driver system interface as described by the ideal system suggests a real time interface that supports auto-population of driver information (driver name, address etc.) electronically to the crash report after either entering the license number or scanning key data from a magnetic strip/bar code on the driver license. The interface is typically available to the officer at the traffic stop and enables verification and validation of the driver's personal information, access to driver records, identification of inconsistencies between information at the crash scene and driver records, and/or identification of the driver's prior crash involvement. Nebraska does not interface with the driver file and does not move driver information to the accident file. The State hopes to develop this capability in future releases of the system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 59: Does the crash system interface with the vehicle system?

Standard of Evidence:

Provide narrative descriptions of the crash-to-vehicle system interfaces that enable: verification and validation of the vehicle information, access to vehicle records, and/or identification of inconsistencies between the crash and vehicle records.

Assessor conclusions:

Nebraska does not currently support a real time interface to the vehicle file that enables verification and validation of the vehicle information, access to vehicle records, and/or identification of inconsistencies between information available at the crash scene and vehicle records.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 60:
Does the crash system interface with the roadway system?

Standard of Evidence:

Provide narrative descriptions of the crash-to-roadway interfaces that enable: verification and validation of the roadway information, and/or identification of inconsistencies between the crash and roadway records.

Assessor conclusions:
Nebraska does not currently support a crash system interface to the roadway system that will auto-populate location information on the crash report or offer verification and validation of the roadway information observed at the crash scene compared to available data from the roadway records.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Rank: Somewhat Important

Question 61:
Does the crash system interface with the citation and adjudication systems?

Standard of Evidence:

Provide narrative descriptions of the crash-to-citation and -adjudication interfaces that enable: verification and validation of citations and/or alcohol or drug test information in the crash record; identification of any inconsistencies between crash and citation records; and access to criminal history, contact history, and location history.

Assessor conclusions:
Nebraska’s crash system does not currently support an interface to the citation and adjudication system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Rank: Somewhat Important
Question 62:
Does the crash system interface with the injury surveillance system?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide narrative descriptions of the crash-to-injury surveillance interfaces that enable: verification and validation of EMS information, and identification of inconsistencies between crash and EMS records.

Assessor conclusions:
Nebraska's crash system does not currently support an interface to the injury surveillance system.

Question 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?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which automated edit checks or validation rules ensure entered data falls within the range of acceptable values and is logically consistent between fields.

Assessor conclusions:
Nebraska provides all agencies with the NDOR required edit checks/validation rules. The XML/XSD process is required to be used for all electronically submitted crash reports and is tested as part of data acceptance. The automated edit checks and validation rules ensure that entered data falls within a range of acceptable values and is logically consistent among data elements. System managers are encouraged to continuously monitor data accuracy and receive data quality feedback from key users in order to add to and improve the existing edit checks and validation rules effectiveness.
Question 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?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which limited state-level correction authority is granted to quality control staff working with the statewide crash database.

Assessor conclusions:
Nebraska indicated that raw data transmitted to the DB2 database is modified to reflect NDOR’s requirements. It appears NDOR staff have the authority to amend obvious errors and omissions in the crash report. When changes are made, the law enforcement agency submitting the report is notified regarding the modifications. It is not clear if the notification to the agency results in re-submission of a corrected report, and there does not appear to be a formal methodology in place to describe when and what errors can be changed.

Question 65:
Are there formally documented processes for returning rejected crash reports to the originating officer and tracking re-submission of the report in place?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which rejected crash reports are returned to the originating officer and then resubmitted to the statewide crash database.

Assessor conclusions:
Nebraska does not support formally documented processes for returning rejected crash reports to the originating officer and when crash reports are returned there is no process to assure its timely re-submission. A letter is sent to the reporting officer or agency with the rejected reports, but follow-up is not done to assure the corrected report is returned.
**Question 66:**
Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of crash system timeliness measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Nebraska does not support timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of data users and managers. The Model Performance Measures for State Traffic Records Systems report (NHTSA, 2010) defines timeliness as follows: “Timeliness reflects the span of time between the occurrence of an event and entry of information into the appropriate database”. The report describes the value of identifying performance measures for each of the quality attributes (timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, and accessibility). Performance measures support an accountable outcome based system and establishes the metric, the baseline measurement, and the ability to track and report progress over time to managers, data users, and the TRCC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Very Important

---

**Question 67:**
Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of crash system accuracy measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Nebraska does not support accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of data users and managers. The Model Performance Measures for State Traffic Records Systems report (NHTSA, 2010) defines the value of identifying performance measures for each of the quality attributes (timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, and accessibility). Performance measures support an accountable outcome based system and establishes the metric, the baseline measurement, and the ability to track and report progress over time to managers, data users, and the TRCC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Question 68:
Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of crash system completeness measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

Assessor conclusions:
Nebraska does not support completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of data users and managers. The Model Performance Measures for State Traffic Records Systems report (NHTSA, 2010) defines the value of identifying performance measures for each of the quality attributes (timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, and accessibility). Performance measures support an accountable outcome based system and establishes the metric, the baseline measurement, and the ability to track and report progress over time to managers, data users, and the TRCC.

Respondents assigned 1  Responses received 1  Response rate 100%

Question 69:
Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of crash system uniformity measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

Assessor conclusions:
Nebraska does not support uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of data users and managers. The Model Performance Measures for State Traffic Records Systems report (NHTSA, 2010) defines the value of identifying performance measures for each of the quality attributes (timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, and accessibility). Performance measures support an accountable outcome based system and establishes the metric, the baseline measurement, and the ability to track and report progress over time to managers, data users, and the TRCC.

Respondents assigned 1  Responses received 1  Response rate 100%
Question 70:
Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of crash system integration measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

Assessor conclusions:
Nebraska does not support integration performance measures tailored to the needs of data users and managers. The Model Performance Measures for State Traffic Records Systems report (NHTSA, 2010) defines the value of identifying performance measures for each of the quality attributes (timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, and accessibility). Performance measures support an accountable outcome based system and establishes the metric, the baseline measurement, and the ability to track and report progress over time to managers, data users, and the TRCC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 71:
Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of crash system accessibility measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

Assessor conclusions:
Nebraska does not support accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of data users and managers. The Model Performance Measures for State Traffic Records Systems report (NHTSA, 2010) defines the value of identifying performance measures for each of the quality attributes (timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, and accessibility). Performance measures support an accountable outcome based system and establishes the metric, the baseline measurement, and the ability to track and report progress over time to managers, data users, and the TRCC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 72:
Has the state established numeric goals—performance metrics—for each performance measure?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the specific, State-determined numeric goals associated with each performance measure in use.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Nebraska has not established numeric goals—performance metrics—for each performance measure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 73:
Is there performance reporting that provides specific timeliness, accuracy, and completeness feedback to each law enforcement agency?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a sample report, list of receiving law enforcement agencies, and specify the frequency of issuance.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Nebraska does not provide performance reporting of specific timeliness, accuracy, and completeness feedback to each law enforcement agency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 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?

#### Standard of Evidence:
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which high frequency errors are used to generate new training content and data collection manuals, update the validation rules, and prompt form revisions.

#### Assessor conclusions:
Nebraska does not support a formal process of identifying high frequency errors used to generate updates to training content, data collection manuals, updates to the validation rules, and form revisions. However, on an ad-hoc basis when errors are discovered, they are corrected and all manuals and documentation pertaining to the errors and processes are updated to reflect the change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 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?

#### Standard of Evidence:
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which quality control reviews comparing the narrative, diagram, and coded contents of the report are considered part of the statewide crash database's data acceptance process.

#### Assessor conclusions:
Nebraska uses all sections of the crash report including the narrative and diagram to validate, locate, and enter the crash information. Nebraska uses the OnBase document imaging system to scan paper submitted reports and to store an image of electronically submitted reports. Quality control staff review each report and compare the narrative, diagram, and coded contents of the report as part of the statewide crash database's data acceptance process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 76:
Are independent sample-based audits periodically conducted for crash reports and related database contents?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Describe the formal audit methodology, provide a sample report or other output, and specify the audits' frequency.

**Assessor conclusions:**
NDOR staff review crash reports as part of their routine use of the data. It was reported that helmet use and truck/bus data are examples of audited information, however documentation to support the audits were not provided. It does not appear that independent sample-based audits are conducted periodically to understand and improve data quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 77:
Are periodic comparative and trend analyses used to identify unexplained differences in the data across years and jurisdictions?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Describe the analyses, provide a sample report or other output, and specify the analyses' frequency.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Nebraska conducts periodic comparative trend analysis to analyze patterns and help identify the probability of future events. The purpose of the trend analyses was not reported to assess data quality or unexplained differences in the data across years and jurisdictions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 78:**
Is data quality feedback from key users regularly communicated to data collectors and data managers?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Describe the process for transmitting and utilizing key users’ data quality feedback to inform changes.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Data users are free to report data issues or anomalies. The information is related back to the data manager to verify and resolve the issue. If it is determined the issue is related to the way the data is being collected, notification is relayed to those collecting the data along with a request to resolve the problem.

| Respondents assigned | 1 | Responses received | 1 | Response rate | 100% |

**Question 79:**
Are data quality management reports provided to the TRCC for regular review?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a sample quality management report and specify how frequently they are issued to the TRCC.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Data quality management reports are not provided to the TRCC for regular review.

| Respondents assigned | 1 | Responses received | 1 | Response rate | 100% |
Vehicle

The State of Nebraska’s vehicle titling and registration activities are administered by the Nebraska Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). Vehicle titling and registration transactions are conducted by DMV title clerks. Commercial vehicle registration activities are also performed by the DMV through the Interstate Registration Program. The Nebraska vehicle and title system is independent from the driver system and data is not linked nor are the data elements consistent between the systems.

Strengths:

The Nebraska Title and Registration system is used to process vehicle titling and registration transactions. Titling and registration transactions are processed in real time. Data entered into the system is validated through field and logical edits to ensure that accurate information is entered. Vehicle Identification Number (VIN) information is validated on title transactions via third party software and other data elements are defined in the data dictionary. Nebraska title clerks are provided operating procedure manuals to assist them in processing vehicle title and registration transactions. Nebraska title clerks run manual NMVTIS checks prior to processing vehicle title transactions. Nebraska uses NMVTIS title brands, and brand history is recorded and maintained in the vehicle system from previous states. Records in the registration and title database may be searched by VIN, title number, or license plate number.

Vehicles reported stolen are flagged in the vehicle system when an NCIC stolen vehicle report is completed by law enforcement. No title transactions for stolen vehicles can be completed until the stolen vehicle flag is removed. When a stolen vehicle is reported recovered in NCIC the flag is removed from the vehicle record.

Vehicle records are available to law enforcement and registration documents contain bar codes that can be decoded and the information used to complete crash and citation records.

Opportunities

The State of Nebraska participates in the Performance and Registration Information Systems Management (PRISM) and but does not deny registration of reincarnated motor carriers. There is an opportunity for the State of Nebraska to enhance highway safety by denying the registration of reincarnated motor carriers who have demonstrated a lack of effective safety measures and are suspended from operation by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.

The Nebraska title and registration system is not supported by documentation that describes primary workflows and alternate workflows for processing transactions. Further, there are no high level system diagrams describing the interfaces between the vehicle system and other data system integrations (i.e. NMVTIS, NCIC, IRP, etc.). There is an opportunity for the State of Nebraska to create workflow documentation that will identify processing roadblocks or system issues to aid them in enhancing system inefficiencies. Likewise, the development of high level system documentation and interfaces can aid system managers in prioritizing projects to enhance system interfaces to improve timeliness and/or data quality.

There are no documented vehicle system performance measures for timeliness, accuracy,
completeness, uniformity, integration and accuracy. There is an opportunity for the State of Nebraska to ensure that the vehicle system contains complete and accurate information that is available and useful to its customers and highway safety professionals through the establishment and monitoring of vehicle system performance in these six areas.

There is no analysis of high error rates in the vehicle system to determine if there are training needs or if policies need to be evaluated. There is an opportunity for the DMV to use error analysis to evaluate training needs for users or to identify policies that may need to be revised.

There is an opportunity to adopt periodic comparative trend analyses to determine if there are unexplained differences in data across years and jurisdictions and to identify errors that have not been previously discovered.

There is an opportunity for the State of Nebraska to establish a system to receive and review user feedback to identify problems or to create efficiencies in the vehicle system processes. User feedback can be a valuable asset in discovering system problems and increasing efficiencies.

There is an opportunity for the State of Nebraska to coordinate with other traffic safety agencies within the State through active participation in the TRCC as they develop the new vehicle title and registration program update. Notable areas to consider include: standardizing data requirements and data elements; automating current system interfaces; identifying any additional system interfaces; making vehicle data accessible to law enforcement, crash data entry operators, and the driver system; and providing vehicle data to highway safety researchers to aid in the development of crash countermeasure programs.

**Question 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?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the custodial agency's name.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The vehicle file for Nebraska is a single data system which is managed by the Nebraska Department of Motor Vehicles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Somewhat Important
Question 81:
Does the State or its agents validate every VIN with a verification software application?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe the circumstances in which the VIN is validated and used.

Assessor conclusions:
A proprietary software is used during title transactions to verify Vehicle Identification Numbers added to the vehicle data system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 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?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a sample document, and identify the information encoded.

Assessor conclusions:
The vehicle registration documents in Nebraska are barcoded to allow for rapid, accurate collection of vehicle information by law enforcement officers in the field using barcode readers or scanners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 83:
Does the vehicle system provide title information data to the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System (NMVTIS) at least daily?

Standard of Evidence:
Explain how and how often the State uploads data to NMVTIS, specifying the manner of transmittal and its frequency (e.g., real-time, nightly, weekly).

Assessor conclusions:
Batch updates containing title information are transmitted via SFTP for upload to NMVTIS on a daily basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 84:**
Does the vehicle system query the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System (NMVTIS) before issuing new titles?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the NMVTIS query processing instructions or provide a screen print of the query tool.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Nebraska policy and procedures require query of NMVTIS prior to issuing a title for a vehicle previously titled / registered in another State, or when no title is available. This is a manual query, not one embedded within the State vehicle system. Although this process meets the Department of Justice rules, it is not as envisioned in the Advisory ideal, since the embedded query will not allow titling without this important information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 85:**
Does the State incorporate brand information on the vehicle record that are recommended by AAMVA and/or received through NMVTIS, whether or not the brand description matches the State's brand descriptions?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the list of the State's title brands and their definitions.

**Assessor conclusions:**
NMVTIS-reported brands and any brand listed on a surrendered title document are included on the Nebraska title.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 86:
Does the State participate in the Performance and Registration Information Systems Management (PRISM) program?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the PRISM processing instructions or a screen print.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Nebraska has been participating in the Performance and Registration Information Systems Management (PRISM) Program since 2002 and was fully PRISM compliant in 2003. Documentation provided indicates that Nebraska currently does not deny registration to reincarnated motor carriers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 87:
Does the vehicle system have a documented definition for each data field?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative description of the data dictionary and provide an extract.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The vehicle system has a documented definition for each data field. Field definitions are provided in the DMV FTR manual.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 88:** Does the vehicle system include edit check and data collection guidelines that correspond to the data definitions?

**Standard of Evidence:** Provide a narrative description of the data dictionary's edit check and data collection guidelines and provide an extract.

**Assessor conclusions:** The vehicle system includes edit check and data collection guidelines that correspond to the data definitions. An example of the system error code was provided for the entry of an invalid ZIP code in an address field for a particular county.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 89:** Are the collection, reporting, and posting procedures for registration, title, and title brand information formally documented?

**Standard of Evidence:** Provide a narrative description of the data dictionary's procedure for applying title brands and provide a copy of the brands applied.

**Assessor conclusions:** Procedures for title brand processing and a list of State brands have been provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 90:** Is there a process flow diagram describing the vehicle data system?

**Standard of Evidence:** Provide the process flow diagram.

**Assessor conclusions:** There are no process flow diagrams describing the Nebraska vehicle data system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 91:**
Does the vehicle system flag or identify vehicles reported as stolen to law enforcement authorities?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative description of the procedures for flagging and identifying vehicles reported as stolen. Provide the appropriate excerpt from the instruction manual.

**Assessor conclusions:**
A stolen flag is embedded into the automated process in the vehicle system where the stolen flag is turned on and off by entries into NCIC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:**
Very Important

---

**Question 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?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative description of how the flags are removed. Provide the appropriate excerpt from the instruction or procedures manual.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Flags for stolen vehicles are removed by the system as a result of vehicle data system programming. A report is produced daily indicating when stolen flag removal has failed and the flag is then removed manually from the system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:**
Very Important
**Question 93:**
Does the State record and maintain the title brand history (previously applied to vehicles by other States)?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative description of how title brand information is applied.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Title brand history previously applied to vehicles by other States is recorded and maintained in the vehicle system. A narrative of how brands are applied were provided in the "MV Title Brands" manual.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Very Important

---

**Question 94:**
Are the steps from initial event (titling, registration) to final entry into the statewide vehicle system documented in a process flow diagram?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the process flow diagram. If diagram does not exist, provide a narrative describing the process in detail.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no process flow diagrams indicating steps from initial event (titling, registration) to final entry into the Nebraska statewide vehicle system but the State is seeking a consultant to produce one as part of plans for replacement of the Vehicle Title and Registration system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Very Important
Question 95:
Is the process flow diagram or narrative annotated to show the time required to complete each step?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the process flow diagram. If diagram does not exist, provide a narrative describing the process in detail.

Assessor conclusions:
There are no process flow diagrams or narratives indicating the time required to complete each step in the Nebraska vehicle title or registration processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 96:
Does the process flow diagram or narrative show alternative data flows and timelines?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the process flow diagram that specifies alternative data flows and timelines. If diagram does not exist, provide a narrative describing the process in detail.

Assessor conclusions:
There are no process flow diagrams or narratives describing alternative workflows and indicating the time required to complete each step in the vehicle title or registration processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 97:
Does the process flow diagram or narrative include processes for error correction and error handling?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the process flow diagram that specified the processes for error correction and error handling. If diagram does not exist, provide a narrative describing the process in detail.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no process flow diagrams or narratives specifying the processes for error correction and error handling in the vehicle title or registration processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 98:
Does the process flow diagram or narrative explain the timing, conditions, and procedures for purging records from the vehicle system?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the process flow diagram that specifies the schedule and process for purging records. If diagram does not exist, provide a narrative describing the process in detail.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Vehicle record purge procedures and criteria exist and are conducted annually in January. Purge criteria was provided in a narrative description.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 99:
Are the driver and vehicle files unified in one system?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative description of the unified system's main components and identify the variables that link the vehicle and driver files.

Assessor conclusions:
The Nebraska driver and vehicle files are not unified in one system at this time but planning is underway for unifying the files in a system replacement.

Question 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?

Standard of Evidence:
When the driver and vehicle systems are separate, provide extracts from the driver and vehicle system manuals detailing the data entry conventions for each.

Assessor conclusions:
Naming conventions are not consistent for the driver and vehicle files. Implementation of uniform naming conventions for both vehicle and driver systems is planned for the near future and will be of benefit to both State staff and law enforcement, in an effort to determine which vehicles are registered to, or owned by, which drivers. Uniform naming conventions are particularly helpful in separate driver and vehicle data systems if ignition interlock programs require device installation on all vehicles owned by a restricted driver. New legislation will serve to improve the uniformity of data collection in these systems.
Question 101:
Can vehicle system data be used to verify and validate the vehicle information during initial creation of a citation or crash report?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative description of the procedures governing the use of vehicle system data to verify and validate vehicle information during initial creation of a citation or crash report. ALTERNATIVE EVIDENCE: Describe how the vehicle system is accessed, if it is, to validate and verify vehicle information during crash report creation.

Assessor conclusions:
Data from the Nebraska Justice Information System is available to law enforcement officers on the street during the creation of a citation or crash report. It is particularly helpful if such data can be copied and pasted onto crash/citation documents or when it is programmed to auto-populate those forms. Such programming helps prevent data entry errors which are particularly likely when copying license plate numbers and vehicle identification numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Question 102:
When discrepancies are identified during data entry in the crash data system, are vehicle records flagged for possible updating?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide an appropriate extract from the vehicle system manual that details the process for addressing a record flagged by the crash system.

Assessor conclusions:
Personnel from the Nebraska Crash Records Management Section address any discrepancies through contact with the vehicle owner or law enforcement officer who prepared the report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Question 103:**
Are VIN, title number, and license plate number the key variables used to retrieve vehicle records?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Identify the key variables used to retrieve vehicle records.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Nebraska uses VIN, title number and plate number as key variable to locate and retrieve its vehicle records.

| Respondents assigned | 1 | Responses received | 1 | Response rate | 100% |

**Question Rank:** Very Important

**Respondents assigned**
1

**Responses received**
1

**Response rate**
100%

---

**Question 104:**
Is the vehicle system data processed in real-time?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative statement explaining the answer.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Nebraska vehicle data is processed in real time.

| Respondents assigned | 1 | Responses received | 1 | Response rate | 100% |

**Question Rank:** Very Important

**Respondents assigned**
1

**Responses received**
1

**Response rate**
100%

---

**Question 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?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which automated edit checks or validation rules ensure entered data falls within the range of acceptable values and is logically consistent between fields.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The Nebraska vehicle system contains 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. Several examples of validation edits were provided.

| Respondents assigned | 1 | Responses received | 1 | Response rate | 100% |

**Question Rank:** Very Important

**Respondents assigned**
1

**Responses received**
1

**Response rate**
100%
**Question 106:**
Is limited state-level correction authority granted to quality control staff working with the statewide vehicle system to amend obvious errors and omissions?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Name the authority that allows quality control staff to correct the statewide vehicle database.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The Department of Motor Vehicles allows limited state-level correction authority by quality control staff working with the statewide vehicle system to amend obvious errors and omissions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 107:**
Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of vehicle system timeliness measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Nebraska has no timeliness measures for its vehicle system. Even though the system is real time, performance measures for timeliness could include number of days from vehicle purchase to update of the registration data in the file or something similar. One of the benefits of system performance measures is that when a new system is implemented, the State will have baseline data to verify the improvements that the new system provided. Such information can often be used to justify the expense of system upgrades or replacement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 108:
Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of vehicle system accuracy measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Nebraska has no accuracy performance measures for the vehicle data system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 109:
Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of vehicle system completeness measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Nebraska's vehicle data system is not supported by performance measurement of data completeness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 110:
Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of vehicle system uniformity measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Nebraska does not have vehicle system uniformity measures. Uniformity of data entry can improve the usefulness of data to those who use it for traffic safety purposes. Measures help to identify where data entry is non-uniform and improvements could result.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 111:**
Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of vehicle system integration measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Nebraska has no integration measures for its vehicle system. Integration measures can be as simple as the number of other traffic record component systems that are linked, interfaced or integrated with the vehicle data system.

| Respondents assigned | 1 | Responses received | 1 | Response rate | 100% |

**Question 112:**
Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of vehicle system accessibility measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

**Assessor conclusions:**
No accessibility performance measures are in place for the Nebraska vehicle data system. As there are a number of approved users of vehicle data, it would be simple to count the number of requests made for vehicle data by authorized users versus the number of those requests that the State was able to fulfill.

| Respondents assigned | 1 | Responses received | 1 | Response rate | 100% |
Question 113:
Has the State established numeric goals—performance metrics—for each performance measure?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the specific, State-determined numeric goals associated with each performance measure in use.

Assessor conclusions:
There are no established performance measures nor numeric goals—performance metrics—for the vehicle system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 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?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which high frequency errors are used to generate new training content and data collection manuals, update the validation rules, and prompt form revisions.

Assessor conclusions:
When the type of error which could be indicative of a larger problem is discovered an analysis of the data contained in the database is conducted to determine the size of the issue. If the data indicates the presence of a larger issue, steps are taken to correct the validation rules, correct the existing records, and update the motor vehicle offices responsible for the data collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 115:
Are independent sample-based audits conducted periodically for vehicle reports and related database contents for that record?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe the formal audit methodology, provide a sample report or other output, and specify the audits' frequency.

Assessor conclusions:
No independent sample-based audits are conducted periodically to determine that vehicle reports and related database contents for that record are correct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 116:
Are periodic comparative and trend analyses used to identify unexplained differences in the data across years and jurisdictions?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe the analyses, provide a sample report or other output, and specify the analyses’ frequency.

Assessor conclusions:
Data is not used for year-to-year and jurisdiction-to-jurisdiction comparisons of data in the Nebraska vehicle system. Such analyses are helpful in determining where data errors might have been made and are, as yet, not discovered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 117:
Is data quality feedback from key users regularly communicated to data collectors and data managers?

#### Standard of Evidence:
Describe the process for transmitting and utilizing key users’ data quality feedback to inform changes.

#### Assessor conclusions:
Data quality feedback from users is not collected and communicated to data collectors and managers. This might be less important to the vehicle data system than other traffic record system components since many types of vehicle system errors come to light either by virtue of use of VIN verification software or notification by vehicle owners or lien holders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 118:
Are data quality management reports provided to the TRCC for regular review?

#### Standard of Evidence:
Provide a sample quality management report and specify how frequently they are issued to the TRCC.

#### Assessor conclusions:
Data quality reports regarding vehicle data are not presented to the TRCC. Discussion of data quality for the core data systems in the TRCC helps to familiarize all traffic safety partners with the data in all the core systems, which, in turn, helps to stimulate interest in data linkages and integration, as well as generating interest in various safety-related projects using multiple data sources that serve to save lives by virtue of effective analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Driver

The custodial agency, the Nebraska Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), has the responsibility for the Nebraska driver record system where both the commercial and non-commercial driver records are maintained.

The State does not have a separate DUI system; however, the driver system does track DUI convictions. The DUI conviction data is only available to law enforcement personnel and courts upon request.

The driver system collects information for all driver education or driver improvement classes that are completed. The provider name, type of class completed, and date of completion are recorded on the certificate. The completion date is manually added to the record and the certificate is scanned into an electronic file folder for that driver. Drivers’ traffic violations are also reflected on the driver history. The driver system captures and retains original issuance dates for all permits, licenses or endorsements that have been issued for up to 10 years. Issuances that occur after 10 years overwrite the oldest issuance date. Maintaining original issuance dates older than 10 years should be considered for future enhancements to the driver system.

Driver information is maintained in a manner that accommodates interaction with Commercial Driver’s License Information System (CDLIS) and Problem Driver Pointer System (PDPS) system before issuance of any license. The DMV does not maintain a data dictionary with documented definitions for the driver system. The only system edit checks that were provided as evidence was for the 2 point credit that is allowed every 5 years; however, the driver system may have additional edit checks.

The DMV has an electronic policy and procedure manual that details the licensing, permitting, and endorsement issuance process. It was not clear how often or by what process this manual is updated. They also maintain procedures for recording of citations, convictions, sanctions, and other information that may result in a change of license status. This is done both manually and electronically. The procedures for these processes are updated by the individuals that are responsible for performing these duties.

The State does not have a process flow diagram that depicts the key data process flows between the driver system and other data systems. Error correction to driver records is completed manually with all evidence for changes documented and maintained for future reference if necessary. There are established processes in place for purging data from the driver system. Nebraska has administrative authority to suspend licenses based on a DUI arrest and they have comprehensive documented procedures for this process.

Nebraska has placed into practice both electronic and manual screening processes to detect, deter, and identify potential license fraud. The use of facial recognition software in conjunction with central driver license issuance along with requiring all Driver Licensing Service staff to complete Level I and Level II fraudulent document recognition training helps to prevent license fraud. Supervisors review weekly reports for possible written or driver examination fraud. Covert auditing of staff occurs yearly and CDL audits are performed on a regular basis by four compliance officers with the use of a monitoring system.
The State has in-depth policies and procedures for maintaining appropriate system and information security. The Department of Motor Vehicles follows the State of Nebraska Information and Technology Policies and Guidelines that are developed, approved, and adopted by the Nebraska Information Technology Commission. The driver system custodians track access and release of driver information both manually and electronically.

The State’s crash system and citation adjudication system are linked to the driver system electronically. The crash system is linked through the driver license number and registers and maintains crash information on the driver record for three years. The State’s adjudication system is linked by the driver license number, name, and date of birth. A separate citation system does not exist; however, citations are submitted to the court both electronically and manually. All citation convictions are electronically sent to the DMV from the courts.

There is an interface link between the driver system and the PDPS, CDLIS, the Social Security Online Verification (SSOLV), and the Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE) system. All law enforcement agencies have access the Driver Data System via the Nebraska State Patrol and Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice who are responsible for allowing access. Access to the driver data is also available to the courts via the Supreme Court; however, the Supreme Court has not requested access to the driver system. Authorized personnel for other states may access driver licensing information through the American Association of Motor Vehicles Administrators network from PDPS and CDLIS.

Nebraska does not have a formal, comprehensive, data quality management program for the driver system as defined in the Advisory. There are automated edit checks or validation rules to ensure entered data falls within a range of acceptable values and is logically consistent among data elements; however, it was not clear specifically what these edit checks or validation rules are.

The DMV reported that no timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, or accessibility measures have been established. Likewise, no accompanying numeric goals (performance metric) for each measure have been considered. There is a process for detection of errors to prompt review of updates to data collection manuals, validation rules or training. However, there is not any formal process for review of driver database contents of records.

Data quality is not reviewed using comparative trend analyses reports and is not regularly communicated to data collectors and data managers. Data quality management reports are not currently provided to the Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (TRCC).

The custodial agency, the Nebraska Department of Motor Vehicles has the responsibility for the Nebraska driver record system and has established a good foundation on which to continue to build and enhance their driver record system.

Opportunities:

Consideration should be given to document key data process flows of the driver system (flow chart) and to develop a data dictionary that includes definitions of the data elements.

A major area for improvement of the Nebraska driver data system is within the data quality control
programs. The State could consider developing a concept for a data quality management program for the driver data system which will give the State a greater ability to fully understand the quality of their data. Nebraska should establish performance measures for qualities of the data system including timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration and accessibility as outlined in the Advisory. Once formed, such a data quality control program will be a great tool for data managers and users to quickly and easily recognize areas that need improvement. Also, the State should consider performing periodical independent sample-based audits to examine driver reports and conducting periodic comparative and trend analyses to identify unexplained differences in data across years and jurisdictions. Finally, data quality reports based on performance measures should be created and provided to the State’s TRCC committee for regular review.

Question 119:
Does custodial responsibility for the driver system—including commercially-licensed drivers—reside in a single location?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative identifying the custodial agency.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The Nebraska Department of Motor Vehicles is the custodian of the driver license system, which includes commercially licensed drivers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question 120:**
Can the State’s DUI s data system be linked electronically to the driver system?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative explanation of a State’s linking protocols that demonstrated how a citation on the DUI data system is linked to a record on the driver system. Include identification of the linkage portal and organizations responsible for maintaining the link and the linking fields used.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State does not have a separate DUI system; however, the driver system does track DUI convictions. A separate DUI system would allow courts, probation, and providers to access DUI information on the defendant.

| Respondents assigned | 1 | Responses received | 1 | Response rate | 100% |
Question 121:
Does the driver system capture novice drivers’ training histories, including provider names and types of education (classroom or behind-the-wheel)?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative documenting the availability of novice driver training history (including motorcycle and commercial license training), and specify the pertinent data fields and audit checks in the data dictionary or provide a sample system report.

Assessor conclusions:
The driver system captures and maintains the school name, instructor number and date of completion of approved driver training schools.

Question Rank: Less Important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 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)?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative documenting the availability of traffic violation and/or driver improvement training history, including motorcycle and commercial license training, by specifying the pertinent data fields and audit checks in the data dictionary or provide a sample report.

Assessor conclusions:
The driver system captures traffic violations and completion of driver improvement course information. The provider name is not included on the driver record but is accessible within the State's files. Motorcycle training is also captured in driver system.

Question Rank: Less Important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 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)?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative documenting the availability of original issuance dates for all permits, licensing, and endorsements by specifying the pertinent data fields and audit checks in the data dictionary or provide a sample report.

Assessor conclusions:
The driver system does not retain original issuance dates for permits, licenses and endorsements beyond a 10 year period.

Question Rank: Somewhat Important

Respondents assigned 1  Responses received 1  Response rate 100%

Question 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)?

Standard of Evidence:
Demonstrate functional integration with the PDPS and CDLIS. AAMVA audit reports can be provided as supporting documentation.

Assessor conclusions:
The Nebraska driver system is functionally integrated with both Problem Driver Pointer System (PDPS) and the Commercial Driver's License Information System (CDLIS). PDPS is accessed in real time while CDLIS updates are performed in a batch process daily.

Question Rank: Very Important

Respondents assigned 3  Responses received 1  Response rate 33.3%
Question 125: Are the contents of the driver system documented with data definitions for each field?

**Standard of Evidence:** Provide, at a minimum, a table of contents and sample elements from the data dictionary or a sample data dictionary report.

**Assessor conclusions:** The Nebraska driver system does not have a data dictionary documenting the definitions of each field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Very Important

---

Question 126: Are all valid field values—including null codes—documented in the data dictionary?

**Standard of Evidence:** Provide sample valid data field values from the data dictionary.

**Assessor conclusions:** The Department of Motor Vehicles does not have a data dictionary for the driver system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Very Important

---

Question 127: Are there edit checks and data collection guidelines for each data element?

**Standard of Evidence:** Provide an example edit check and data collection guideline.

**Assessor conclusions:** The only system edit check is for the 2 point credit that is allowed every 5 years. The driver system should have additional edit checks or data collection guidelines to ensure accurate data is collected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Very Important
Question 128:
Is there guidance on how and when to update the data dictionary?

Standard of Evidence:

Provide a narrative explanation of the controls and procedures that ensure the data dictionary is kept up to date.

Assessor conclusions:
The Department of Motor Vehicles does not have a data dictionary for the driver system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 129:
Does the custodial agency maintain accurate and up to date documentation detailing the licensing, permitting, and endorsement issuance procedures (manual and electronic, where applicable)?

Standard of Evidence:

Provide a process flow document for this specific process area, or provide a narrative explaining how these processes are documented and how that documentation is maintained. Include the percentage of reporting that is accomplished manually and electronically.

Assessor conclusions:
The DMV has an electronic policy and procedures manual that details the licensing, permitting, and endorsement issuance process. However, there were not any process flow documents detailing the licensing, permitting, and endorsement issuance procedures. It is also not clear how the manual is updated and the percentage of reporting that is accomplished manually and electronically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 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)?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a process flow document for this specific process area, or provide a narrative explaining how these processes are documented and how that documentation is maintained. Include the percentage of reporting that is accomplished manually and electronically.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State's courts electronically notify the Department of Motor Vehicles of convictions, usually by the next business day. A narrative was provided explaining the process for reporting and recording of the convictions. Authority to provide the convictions electronically was provided as well as authority for the State to take action on certain dispositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 131:**
Does the custodial agency maintain accurate and up to date documentation detailing the reporting and recording of driver education and improvement course (manual and electronic, where applicable)?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a process flow document for this specific process area, or provide a narrative explaining how these processes are documented and how that documentation is maintained. Include the percentage of reporting that is accomplished manually and electronically.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Driver education and improvement course information is received and recorded manually. The completion date is entered into the driver system and completion certificate is scanned into an electronic file folder for that driver.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 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)?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a process flow document for this specific process area, or provide a narrative explaining how these processes are documented and how that documentation is maintained. Include the percentage of reporting that is accomplished manually and electronically.

Assessor conclusions:
The Nebraska driver system is programmed to process conviction information and/or court findings to change the license status of drivers. The system will implement or remove driver sanctions electronically based on business rules and produce notices for drivers. Additionally, a file is created manually in the driver system for documenting and processing crash related suspension activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 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)?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative or flow diagram describing the processes and procedures governing the actual change to the license status, including timelines for each type of change.

Assessor conclusions:
The driver system updates license status information through automated processes. However, some reinstatement requirements must be updated manually and the system processes reinstatement requirements nightly. Manual reports of compliance activities are stored or imaged for retrieval in an electronic driver folder. The procedures for these processes are kept up to date by the individuals that are responsible for performing these duties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 134:
Is there a process flow diagram that outlines the driver data system's key data process flows, including inputs from other data systems?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the process flow diagram.

Assessor conclusions:
The DMV does not have a process flow diagram that outlines the driver data system's key data process flows.

Question 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?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the documentation or flow diagram that describes the processes and procedures for error correction and error handling in each of the listed process areas.

Assessor conclusions:
Corrections to Nebraska driver records are performed manually based on documented reports or updated records. Documentation used to update driver records is kept in digital image files referenced to the driver record and the update event is recorded in a notes section of the driver history. The driver history note contains both the date of the correction and the name of the employee making the correction.
Question 136:
Are there processes and procedures for purging data from the driver system documented?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the documentation or flow diagram that describes the processes and procedures for purging data and the timelines for these actions.

Assessor conclusions:
Driver records are purged annually according to a formally established criteria. The driver record purge criteria was provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 137:
In States that have the administrative authority to suspend licenses based on a DUI arrest independent of adjudication, are these processes documented?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the documentation or flow diagram that describes the processes and procedures for administrative license suspension.

Assessor conclusions:
Nebraska has the administrative authority to suspend licenses based on a DUI arrest independent of adjudication. The processes were fully described including timelines for processing and methods for retention of case records.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 138:**
Are there established processes to detect false identity licensure fraud?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative describing the systems or processes used to detect individuals attempting licensure under a new identity.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The DMV utilizes facial recognition in conjunction with a central driver license issuance process to deter identity fraud. Additionally, all Driver Licensing Services staff receive both Level I and Level II fraudulent document recognition training to deter the issuance of licenses to persons with altered or forged identity source documents.

### Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 139:**
Are there established processes to detect internal fraud by individual users or examiners?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative describing the systems or processes used to detect internal fraud by individual users or examiners.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are established processes to detect internal fraud by individual users or examiners. There is a weekly report that is reviewed by a supervisor for possible written or driver examination fraud. Covert auditing of staff occurs yearly and CDL audits are performed on a regular basis by compliance officers.

### Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 140:**
Are the established processes to detect CDL fraud (including hazmat endorsements)?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative describing the systems or processes used to detect commercial driver's license fraud, including for hazmat endorsements.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State has four compliance officers that monitor all CDL activity. This is done through a monitoring system and consists of a daily review of documents and exams completed for all CDL issuances from the previous day. Daily CDLIS reports are also monitored and errors resolved by the CDLIS Help Desk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 141:**
Are there policies and procedures for maintaining appropriate system and information security?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide copies of the relevant policies and procedure manuals.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The Department of Motor Vehicles follows the State of Nebraska Information and Technology Policies and Guidelines that are developed, approved, and adopted by the Nebraska Information Technology Commission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 142:
Are there procedures in place to ensure that driver system custodians track access and release of driver information adequately?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide copies of the relevant procedures or manuals.

Assessor conclusions:
The DMV has procedures in place to ensure that driver system custodians track access and release of driver information. This includes a detailed policy manual and an employee acknowledgement of privacy requirements. Records obtained electronically may be tracked for audit purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 143:
Can the State's crash system be linked to the driver system electronically?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative explanation of a State's linkage protocols that demonstrates how records in the crash system are linked to the driver record. Include identification of the linkage portal and the organization responsible for maintaining the link and the linking fields used.

Assessor conclusions:
The State response indicates that the driver system and the crash system are linked through the driver license number and that crash reports are recorded on the driver history and maintained for three years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 144:
Can the State's citation system be linked to the driver system electronically?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative explanation of a State's linkage protocols that demonstrates how records in the citation system are linked to the driver record. Include identification of the linkage portal and the organization responsible for maintaining the link and the linking fields used.

Assessor conclusions:
Citations are sent both electronically and manually to the courts and all traffic convictions are electronically received from the courts. There is not a separate citation system that tracks citations from inventory, issuance, and disposition and that links to the driver system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 145:
Can the State's adjudication system be linked to the driver system electronically?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative explanation of a State's linkage protocols that demonstrates how records in the adjudication system are linked to the driver record. Include identification of the linkage portal and the organization responsible for maintaining the link and the linking fields used.

Assessor conclusions:
The State's adjudication system is linked to the driver system by license number, name and date of birth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 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 Entitlement system?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative description of the policy for checking the PDPS, CDLIS, SSOLV, and SAVE for licensing commercial and non-commercial drivers (both original issuances and renewals).

Assessor conclusions:
The Nebraska driver systems interfaces with UNI to access PDPS, CDLIS, SSOLV, and SAVE through a mainframe application. All systems are queried, as applicable, each time a license document is issued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 147:
Does the custodial agency have the capability to grant authorized law enforcement personnel access to information in the driver system?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative description of the protocols granting authorized law enforcement personnel access to information in the driver system.

Assessor conclusions:
The DMV authorizes access to information in the driver system to the Nebraska State Patrol and the Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. Those two agencies are then responsible for allowing access to other law enforcement agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 148:**
Does the custodial agency have the capability to grant authorized court personnel access to information in the driver system?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative description of the protocols granting authorized law enforcement personnel access to information in the driver system.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The DMV can provide driver system information to the Nebraska Supreme Court who is the statewide court administrator. However, the Supreme Court has not requested access to the driver system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 149:**
Does the custodial agency have the capability to grant authorized personnel from other States access to information in the driver system?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative description of the protocols granting authorized law enforcement personnel access to information in the driver system.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Access to driver data is provided via NLETS through the Nebraska State Patrol.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 150:**
Is there a formal, comprehensive data quality management program for the driver system?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative description of the driver system's data quality management programs and the most recent data quality reports issued.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The DMV does not have a formal, comprehensive data quality management program for the driver system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 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?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which automated edit checks or validation rules ensure entered data falls within the range of acceptable values and is logically consistent between fields.

**Question Rank:** Very Important

**Assessor conclusions:**
Data is checked by computer programs when it is processed into the driver system whether it is received electronically or manually entered. However, no information regarding specific instances of the edit checking or data validation was provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 152:
Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of driver system timeliness measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

**Question Rank:** Very Important

**Assessor conclusions:**
The DMV does not have any timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 153:
Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of driver system accuracy measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The DMV does not have any accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Very Important

---

### Question 154:
Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of driver system completeness measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The DMV does not have any completeness performance measure tailored to the needs of data managers and data users for the driver system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Very Important

---

### Question 155:
Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of driver system uniformity measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The DMV does not have any uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users for the driver system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Very Important
### Question 156:
Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of driver system integration measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The DMV does not have any integration performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users for the driver system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 157:
Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of driver system accessibility measures the State uses, including the most current baseline and actual values for each.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The DMV does not have any accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of data managers and data users for the driver system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 158:
Has the state established numeric goals—performance metrics—for each performance measure?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the specific, State-determined numeric goals associated with each performance measure in use.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The DMV has not established any numeric goals or performance metrics for each performance measure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 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?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which high frequency errors are used to generate new training content and data collection manuals, update the validation rules, and prompt revisions.

Assessor conclusions:
The detection of errors are used to make programming and procedural changes. Programming changes that require training or notification are done through email or an online training platform.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 160:
Are independent sample-based audits conducted periodically for the driver reports and related database contents for that record?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe the formal audit methodology, provide a sample report or other output, and specify the audits' frequency.

Assessor conclusions:
Independent sample-based audits are not conducted for driver reports and related database contents for that record.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 161:
Are periodic comparative and trend analyses used to identify unexplained differences in the data across years and jurisdictions?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe the analyses, provide a sample report or other output, and specify the analyses' frequency.

Question Rank: Very Important

Assessor conclusions:
Periodic comparative and trend analysis are not used to identify unexplained differences in data across years and jurisdictions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 162:
Is data quality feedback from key users regularly communicated to data collectors and data managers?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe the process for transmitting and utilizing key users' data quality feedback to inform changes.

Assessor conclusions:
Data quality feedback is not obtained from key users for regular communication with data collectors and data managers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 163:
Are data quality management reports provided to the TRCC for regular review?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a sample quality management report and specify how frequently they are issued to the TRCC.

Assessor conclusions:
Data quality management reports are not provided to the TRCC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Roadway

The Nebraska Department of Roads (NDOR) is the agency that is responsible for the planning, development, design, construction, maintenance and administration of the State highway system. Preserving the billions of dollars Nebraskans have invested in their State highway system, making the highways safe and efficient, and accomplishing this in a timely and cost-effective manner are the goals of the State Department of Roads. The Department of Roads is responsible for overseeing and maintaining an infrastructure network that includes nearly 10,000 miles of highways, more than 3,500 bridges, 599 buildings in 119 locations, and an equipment fleet of over 2,100 cars, pickups, trucks and graders.

NDOR use the Integrated Highway Inventory (IHI) mainframe system for roadway and traffic data elements. Crashes are locatable on State and Federal highways by the use of the NDOR reference post system. Additionally, each crash is GIS coded. AADT and AADT Year for roadway segments in MPO areas are collected by MPOs. NDOR accepts this data for use in the statewide roadway database. The MPO data is provided to NDOR in map format and NDOR manually enters the data into the database.

NDOR does have a data dictionary for the data elements collected in IHI. The data dictionary for all elements collected by the traffic analysis unit is maintained and updated by the NDOR IT department whenever any data elements are added, removed, or changed. The Nebraska Traffic Monitoring System Documentation (TMS) describes the controls and procedures for updating the guidelines for data collected by the traffic analysis unit. NDOR collects 36 of the 38 MIRE Fundamental Data Elements (FDE). However these are only collected for State highways. NDOR also collects 32 non-FDE elements. It was indicated that these elements are only collected for State routes. It was stated that NDOR does not have methods for incorporating new elements into the roadway information system (e.g., a new MIRE element).

Crash data is tied with roadway information for a number of purposes. The information is included in the State Highway Needs Assessment, which breaks down every State highway by small segments. Crash data is also imported into the Department's GIS system, Nectar, where it can be studied by anyone with Nectar access.

Opportunities

The Nebraska Department of Roads could work with regional and local custodians by allowing these groups access to the NDOR roadway information system. This could include allowing access of data for the groups to consume and also update the IHI system.

NDOR is very close to collecting all the MIRE Data Elements. It would be advisable for the State to work on collecting the remaining elements and incorporating those into the IHI. It is advisable for NDOR to create formal processes for adding new data elements into the system and updating the data dictionary.

Another opportunity Nebraska can work toward is improving their performance measures. The NDOR may consider establishing additional performance measures as they provide a tool for assessing data quality, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, accessibility, and integration. Model performance measures can be found in the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s
(NHTSA), “Model Performance Measures for State Traffic Records Systems”. A follow-up document has also been published by FHWA titled, “Performance Measures for Roadway Inventory Data”. NDOR can use these documents to assist in developing performance measures for the roadway inventory data. Other options are to use the RDIP or Go-Team assistance. The TRCC can assist with this effort.

**Question 164:**
Are all public roadways within the State located using a compatible location referencing system?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a map displaying all public roads that represents the system's statewide capabilities. Identify what percentage of the public road system is State owned or maintained. Explain whether the State uses a single compatible location referencing system for all public roads or if it has a set of compatible location referencing systems. Prior reports are acceptable.

**Assessor conclusions:**
All public roadways within the State are located using a compatible location referencing system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 165:**
Are the roadway and traffic data elements located using a compatible location referencing system (e.g., LRS, GIS)?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a map displaying roadway features and traffic volume (FDEs) for all public roads (State and non-State routes) that is representative of the system’s statewide capabilities. Explain whether the State uses a single compatible location referencing system for all public roads or if it has a set of compatible location referencing systems. Prior reports are acceptable.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State has provided a screen shot that displays a GIS map that is representative of the State's capabilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 166:**
Is there an enterprise roadway information system containing roadway and traffic data elements for all public roads?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Describe the enterprise roadway information system, which should enable linking between the various roadway information systems including: roadway, traffic, location reference, bridge, and pavement data.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State utilizes an enterprise roadway information system containing roadway and traffic data elements for all public roads. The State uses the Integrated Highway Inventory (IHI) mainframe system for roadway and traffic data elements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 167:**
Does the State have the ability to identify crash locations using a referencing system compatible with the one(s) used for roadways?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a map displaying crash locations on all public roads that is representative of the system's statewide capabilities. Explain whether the State uses a single compatible location referencing system for crash, roadway features, and traffic volume on all public roads or if it has a set of compatible location referencing systems. Prior reports are acceptable.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State can identify crash locations using the NDOR reference post system. Additionally, each crash is GIS coded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 168:
Is crash data incorporated into the enterprise roadway information system for safety analysis and management use?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe how the crash data is incorporated into the enterprise roadway information system and provide an example of how it is used for safety analysis.

Assessor conclusions:
Crash data is incorporated into the enterprise roadway information system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 169:
Are all the MIRE Fundamental Data Elements collected for all public roads?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a list of FDEs collected and their definitions. Specify if the data collected is for all public roads or State roads only. If the State wishes to cite the data dictionary directly, please identify the FDEs.

Assessor conclusions:
The State collects 36 of the 38 MIRE Fundamental Data Elements. However these are only collected for State highways.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 170:**
Do all additional collected data elements for any public roads conform to the data elements included in MIRE?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a list of additional MIRE data elements collected beyond the FDEs. Specify if the data elements are collected for all public roads or State roads only.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State collects 32 non-FDE elements. It was indicated that these elements are only collected for State routes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 171:**
Are all the MIRE Fundamental Data Elements for all public roads documented in the enterprise system's data dictionary?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Identify, with appropriate citations, the MIRE FDE-related contents of the enterprise system's data dictionary. Specify if the data dictionary applies to all public roads or to State roads only.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The data dictionary exists for all MIRE data elements collected. It does not, however, include data collection guidelines nor all public roads.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 172:
Are all additional (non-Fundamental Data Element) MIRE data elements for all public roads documented in the data dictionary?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Identify, with appropriate citations, the additional (non-FDE) MIRE data elements included in the data dictionary. Specify if the data dictionary applies to all public roads or to State roads only.

**Assessor conclusions:**
All additional MIRE data elements are in the data dictionary. However, data collection guidelines are not included, nor is it for all public roads.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 173:
Does roadway data imported from local or municipal sources comply with the data dictionary?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative statement explaining, how and if any roadway data are accepted and included in the statewide roadway database from local or municipal sources. Describe if the data from local or municipal sources meet the data dictionary standards.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State does accept data from local MPOs. The supporting document describes the incorporation of Lincoln MPO data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 174:**
Is there guidance on how and when to update the data dictionary?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative explanation of the controls and procedures that ensure the data dictionary is kept up to date.

**Assessor conclusions:**
A data dictionary for all elements collected by the traffic analysis unit is maintained and updated by the NDOR IT department whenever any data elements are added, removed, or changed. The Nebraska Traffic Monitoring System documentation (TMS) describes the controls and procedures for updating the data collection guidelines for data collected by the traffic analysis unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 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?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide documentation or a narrative explaining the process for adding new data elements (e.g., a new MIRE element) to the roadway system. Identify who is responsible for each step in the process.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no documented steps showing the flow of information for incorporating new elements into the roadway information system (e.g., a new MIRE element).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 176:
Are the steps for updating roadway information documented to show the flow of information?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide documentation or a narrative explaining the process for updating data elements in the roadway system. Identify who is responsible for each step in the process.

**Assessor conclusions:**
No steps are documented to show the process used to update roadway information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 177:
Are the steps for archiving and accessing historical roadway inventory documented?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide documentation or a narrative explaining the process of archiving and accessing historical roadway data. Identify who is responsible for each step in the process.

**Assessor conclusions:**
While there are no steps for archiving historical roadway inventory data, all historical roadway inventory data information exists in the roadway system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 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?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide documentation or a narrative explaining the local agency procedures for collecting, managing, and submitting data to the State roadway inventory. Identify who is responsible for each step in the process.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are procedures that local agencies use to collect, manage, and submit roadway data to the statewide inventory system. The State has provided guidelines for the lane mile which shows the State’s capabilities in this regard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 179:**
Are local agency procedures for collecting and managing the roadway data compatible with the State’s enterprise roadway inventory?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide official documentation or a narrative explanation of how compatibility between local data systems and the State roadway inventory is achieved. Identify who is responsible for each step in the process.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Local agencies do not collect data for the IHI system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 180:
Are there guidelines for collection of data elements as they are described in the State roadway inventory data dictionary?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the guidelines and cite an example of data collection pursuant to the data dictionary.

Assessor conclusions:
There are no guidelines for the collection of data elements as they are described in the State roadway inventory data dictionary.

Question Rank: Very Important

Respondents assigned 3  Responses received 1  Response rate 33.3%

Question 181:
Are the location coding methodologies for all State roadway information systems compatible?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe the location referencing system and the information systems that use it. If there is more than one location referencing system in use, list each and the associated systems.

Assessor conclusions:
The State uses a single LRS system that consists of a route number, beginning reference point, ending reference point, and log miles.

Question Rank: Very Important

Respondents assigned 3  Responses received 1  Response rate 33.3%
Question 182:
Are there interface linkages connecting the State's discrete roadway information systems?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative that describes the interface links connecting the State's roadway information systems. Provide the result of a single query (e.g., table, view) that includes both roadway features and traffic data for a segment of road.

Assessor conclusions:
There are interfacing linkages connecting the State's discrete roadway information systems. The State provided a screen shot of their mainframe interface and it shows several discrete roadway system data elements linked together.

Respondents assigned 3  Responses received 1  Response rate 33.3%

Question 183:
Are the location coding methodologies for all regional and local roadway systems compatible?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative describing the location referencing system and the associated regional and local roadway systems. If there is more than one location referencing system in use, list each and the associated regional and local systems.

Assessor conclusions:
The State uses a single LRS system. The LRS consists of a route number, beginning reference point, ending reference point, and log miles.

Respondents assigned 3  Responses received 1  Response rate 33.3%
### Question 184:
Do roadway data systems maintained by regional and local custodians (e.g., MPOs, municipalities) interface with the State enterprise roadway information system?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative that describes the interface links connecting the regional or local roadway information systems to the State's enterprise roadway information system. Provide the result of a single query (e.g., table, view) that includes both roadway features and traffic data for a local road segment.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Access to the mainframe (the State enterprise roadway information system) is restricted to NDOR personnel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Somewhat Important

### Question 185:
Does the State enterprise roadway information system allow MPOs and local transportation agencies on-demand access to data?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative that describes the system or process that enables localities to query the data system.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State does not allow MPOs and local transportation agencies access to on-demand data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Somewhat Important

### Question 186:
Do Roadway system data managers regularly produce and analyze data quality reports?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a sample report and specify the release schedule for the reports.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Roadway system data managers regularly produce and analyze data quality reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Very Important
Question 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?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe the formal program of error/edit checking, to include specific procedures for both automated and manual processes.

Assessor conclusions:
No formal processes for error/edit checking as data is entered into the statewide system were described.

Question Rank:
Very Important

Respondents assigned: 3
Responses received: 1
Response rate: 33.3%

Question 188:
Are there procedures for prioritizing and addressing detected errors?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe the procedures for prioritizing and addressing detected errors in both automated and manual processes. Please specify where these procedures are formally documented.

Assessor conclusions:
The State has indicated that there are no procedures for prioritizing and addressing detected errors in the system.

Question Rank:
Very Important

Respondents assigned: 3
Responses received: 1
Response rate: 33.3%

Question 189:
Are there procedures for sharing quality control information with data collectors through individual and agency-level feedback and training?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe all the procedures used for sharing quality control information with data collectors.

Assessor conclusions:
All data collectors receive edit reports and have to correct their own errors.

Question Rank:
Very Important

Respondents assigned: 3
Responses received: 1
Response rate: 33.3%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 190:</th>
<th>Is there a set of established performance measures for the timeliness of the State enterprise roadway information system?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard of Evidence:</td>
<td>Provide the metrics used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor conclusions:</td>
<td>There are no set performance measures for timeliness in regards to the State enterprise roadway information system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents assigned</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 191:</th>
<th>Is there a set of established performance measures for the timeliness of the roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians (municipalities, MPOs, etc.)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard of Evidence:</td>
<td>Provide the metrics used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor conclusions:</td>
<td>There are no set performance measures for the timeliness of the roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians (municipalities, MPOs, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents assigned</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 192:</th>
<th>Is there a set of established performance measures for the accuracy of the State enterprise roadway information system?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard of Evidence:</td>
<td>Provide the metrics used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor conclusions:</td>
<td>There are no set of established performance measures for the accuracy of the State enterprise roadway information system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents assigned</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 193:**
Is there a set of established performance measures for the accuracy of the roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians (municipalities, MPOs, etc.)?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the metrics used.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no set performance measures for the accuracy of the roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians (municipalities, MPOs, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 194:**
Is there a set of established performance measures for the completeness of the State enterprise roadway information system?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the metrics used.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no set performance measures for the completeness of the State enterprise roadway information system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 195:**
Is there a set of established performance measures for the completeness of the roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians (municipalities, MPOs, etc.)?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the metrics used.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no established performance measures for the completeness of the roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians (municipalities, MPOs, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 196:</td>
<td>Is there a set of established performance measures for the uniformity of the State enterprise roadway information system?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard of Evidence:</strong></td>
<td>Provide the metrics used.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessor conclusions:</strong></td>
<td>There are no performance measures for the uniformity of the State enterprise roadway information system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondents assigned</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responses received</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response rate</strong></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 197:</th>
<th>Is there a set of established performance measures for the uniformity of the roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians (municipalities, MPOs, etc.)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard of Evidence:</strong></td>
<td>Provide the metrics used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessor conclusions:</strong></td>
<td>There are no performance measures for the uniformity of the roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians (municipalities, MPOs, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondents assigned</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responses received</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response rate</strong></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 198:</th>
<th>Is there a set of established performance measures for the accessibility of State enterprise roadway information systems?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard of Evidence:</strong></td>
<td>Provide the metrics used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessor conclusions:</strong></td>
<td>There are no performance measures for the accessibility of State enterprise roadway information systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondents assigned</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responses received</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response rate</strong></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 199:**
Is there a set of established performance measures for the accessibility of the roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians (municipalities, MPOs, etc.)?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the metrics used.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no performance measures for the accessibility of the roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians (municipalities, MPOs, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 200:**
Is there a set of established performance measures for the integration of State enterprise roadway information systems and other critical data systems?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the metrics used.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no performance measures for the integration of State enterprise roadway information systems and other critical data systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 201:**
Is there a set of established performance measures for the integration of the roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians (municipalities, MPOs, etc.) and other critical data systems?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the metrics used.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no performance measures for the integration of the roadway data maintained by regional and local custodians (municipalities, MPOs, etc.) and other critical data systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Citation / Adjudication

Nebraska’s citation and adjudication systems have a number of positive aspects as follows:
- All appropriate users have access to both criminal and driver history information. The Administrative Office of Courts (AOC) provides statewide oversight and manages centralized citation numbering to ensure there are no duplicate numbers in the system. The AOC also defines data elements and their formats for the courts’ system.
- State courts have a single Case Management System, JUSTICE. Approximately 40 percent of the State’s municipal courts also use the JUSTICE system, providing for a great deal of interoperability statewide.
- Driver history information is used by courts to ensure sanctions are appropriate.
- The State has developed a number of the data elements of a Model Impaired Driver Record Information System (MIDRIS).
- The State has adopted a variety of guidelines developed or supported by the National Center for State Courts.

These strong aspects of the citation and adjudication data systems serve to provide a basis for some opportunities for the State to further improve these systems. The State is developing an electronic citation system which can serve as the infrastructure for a great deal of data related to the amount and type of traffic enforcement in the State. If the e-citations and crash reports use harmonized location referencing systems, it will be possible to overlay the statewide enforcement patterns with the statewide crash incidence to determine whether enforcement efforts are effective in preventing crashes or mitigating their severity in the State.

The e-citation system should also utilize the currently-developed aspects of a DUI tracking system as the backbone for a more complete and interactive DUI tracking system, which is available to those who interact with and provide services to impaired drivers, to include: alcohol/drug evaluators, education and therapy/treatment providers and those who develop curricula, probation departments, ignition interlock providers, prosecutors and adjudicators and the driver licensing authority. A comprehensive DUI tracking system can provide the data the State needs to optimally handle impaired driving cases, providing the most effective services to prevent recidivism, assessing driving behaviors that tend to be predicates to impaired driving charges, determining the blood alcohol level that requires treatment along with education, tracking fines and fees, and ensuring that court-ordered sanctions are complied with or completed prior to reinstatement of the driving privilege. The DUI tracking system should also encompass vehicle sanctions and include administrative sanctions to gauge whether all criminal cases or administrative cases are received by those who manage the driver history file.

The DUI tracking system can be separate from, or a part of, a more comprehensive citation tracking system that accounts for all citations written within the State to provide a full picture of the traffic enforcement efforts statewide as well as how they are adjudicated. The citation tracking system should include the lifecycle of each citation from the time it is issued until the adjudicated charge is entered on the driver history file. Citation tracking should ensure that all citations issued are sent to the courts, whether or not the prosecutor opted to file the charges or whether they were plea-bargained or deferred, what rate of recidivism is to be expected with deferred charges, and whether courts handle charges differently in various geographic areas of the State.

The DUI tracking and citation tracking systems can help the State use its enforcement data to
better focus on problem identification to help ensure that the most pressing problems are the focus of data-driven enforcement efforts.

It is important that the systems have robust and complete data dictionaries and data collection manuals. This type of documentation promotes uniformity of data and of data collection methods. As a result, users have data that they can more fully depend upon and, using the same documentation, users can evaluate the weaknesses or aberrations in the data.

Managing the health of the citation and adjudication data systems is accomplished more easily with system performance measures that keep a finger on the pulse of the systems’ accuracy, completeness, timeliness and uniformity as well as the level of integration and accessibility. Even when the State has mandated submission timelines or performs daily data transmission, these factors do not serve as actual performance measures. Mandates are not always complied with and they are sometimes exceeded. Knowing the exact number of days on average that it takes data to be entered into and made available in the system is imperative. Should that number rise, the cause of the degradation of timeliness can be immediately investigated and corrected. The same is true for embedded edits in system data entry formats. The errors that are caught by the edits should be identified and counted, so that refresher training or improved training can be developed to mitigate future errors.

The State of Nebraska has an excellent foundation upon which to build as it upgrades its citation and adjudication systems by virtue of the e-citation development.

**Question 202:**
Is there a statewide system that provides real-time information on individuals' driving and criminal histories?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative description of the statewide system that provides real-time information on individuals' driving and criminal histories.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Nebraska’s Criminal Justice Information System provides real time information on driver and criminal histories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Very Important
Question 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?

Standard of Evidence:
Name the groups that have real time access and describe the system that these agencies use to access driver or criminal histories, i.e., police dispatch, direct system access, telephone help desk.

Assessor conclusions:
The State Driver System works in conjunction with NCJIS to provide real-time driver and criminal history information to agencies statewide, with over 8,000 statewide agencies as users.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 204:
Is there a statewide authority that assigns unique citation numbers?

Standard of Evidence:
Identify the agency responsible and describe the protocols used to generate and assign unique citation numbers. Provide a copy of the relevant statute or gubernatorial order.

Assessor conclusions:
The Administrative Office of Courts (AOC) in Nebraska is responsible for assignment of citation numbers throughout the State but no details have been provided regarding the protocols used by the AOC nor has a statutory cite been provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 205:
Are all citation dispositions—both within and outside the judicial branch—tracked by the statewide data system?

Standard of Evidence:
If a statewide data tracking system exists, describe the means by which citation dispositions are transmitted and posted. If the system is the driver history file, note if deferrals or dismissals are posted. If the statewide system is managed through the courts, indicate whether all courts that handle traffic violations report to the same tracking system.

Assessor conclusions:
Criminal dispositions are available through NCJIS, which receives the data from the Courts through a standardized, automated information system, a court case management system, JUSTICE. These systems also link with DMV and driver history files.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Rank: Somewhat Important

Question 206:
Are final dispositions (up to and including the resolution of any appeals) posted to the driver data system?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a flow chart or audit report documenting how all types of dispositions are posted to the driver file.

Assessor conclusions:
The court case management system, JUSTICE, provides disposition of traffic charges for inclusion on the Driver History file. The response lacks the requested evidence for review and verification of the process to ensure it meets the Advisory ideal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Rank: Somewhat Important
Question 207:
Are the courts’ case management systems interoperable among all jurisdictions within the State (including local, municipal and State)?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the number of case management systems in use in the State and detail which are interoperable. Indicate if the State has a unified judicial system and if municipal or other local level courts share the same case management system.

Assessor conclusions:
Nebraska has a single statewide case management system in its courts, JUSTICE, which is a stand alone system in each court, maintained by the Administrative Office of Courts. This allows authorized users in Nebraska to query any case in the State via the NCJIS, due to the use of standard datasets in each court.

Question Rank: Very Important

Respondents assigned: 1
Responses received: 1
Response rate: 100%

Question 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?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide an example analysis and describe the policy or enforcement actions taken as a result.

Assessor conclusions:
Some analyses are conducted at the local level, but the State has not focused its use of citation and adjudication data on traffic safety / crash reduction. In fact, analysis is limited to disposition data. Some simple analyses could determine if DUIs are handled differently by locality / geographic area or by court and if targeted enforcement of one type or another results in a reduction of crash incidence or severity.

Question Rank: Very Important

Respondents assigned: 1
Responses received: 1
Response rate: 100%
Question 209:
Do the appropriate components of the citation and adjudication systems adhere to the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) data guidelines?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative statement detailing the systems and their adherence to the NCIC guidelines. If not, specify if a comparable guideline is being used.

Assessor conclusions:
The State's citation and adjudication data is shared through CJIS and NLETS and, as such, are NCIC compliant and / or comply with alternate comparable guidelines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 210:
Do the appropriate portions of the citation and adjudication systems adhere to the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program guidelines?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative statement detailing the systems and their adherence to the UCR program guidelines. If not, specify if a comparable guideline is being used.

Assessor conclusions:
Data to be reported to UCR is compliant with guidelines, but may require conversion of statutory citations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 211:</td>
<td>Do the appropriate portions of the citation and adjudication systems adhere to the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) guidelines?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard of Evidence:</strong></td>
<td>Provide a narrative statement detailing the systems and their adherence to the NIBRS guidelines. If not, specify if a comparable guideline is being used.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessor conclusions:</strong></td>
<td>The State's response seems to indicate that only certain portions of the citation system adhere to the NIBRS guidelines, whereas no part of the adjudication system does. However, since NIBRS is not statutory citation specific, appropriate reporting is received by the NIBRS system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 212:</th>
<th>Do the appropriate portions of the citation and adjudication systems adhere to the National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (NLETS) guidelines?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard of Evidence:</strong></td>
<td>Provide a narrative statement detailing the systems and their adherence to the NLETS guidelines. If not, specify if a comparable guideline is being used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessor conclusions:</strong></td>
<td>NLETS is used in conjunction with NCIC for data transmission of driver and criminal history, and thus require adherence to the current guidelines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 213:</th>
<th>Do the appropriate portions of the citation and adjudication systems adhere to the National Law Enforcement Information Network (LEIN) guidelines?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard of Evidence:</strong></td>
<td>Provide a narrative statement detailing the systems and their adherence to the LEIN guidelines. If not, specify if a comparable guideline is being used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessor conclusions:</strong></td>
<td>LEIN is a Michigan-only guideline and the ratings for all States will reflect this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Respondents assigned | 2 | Responses received | 2 | Response rate | 100% |
### Question 214:
Do the appropriate portions of the citation and adjudication systems adhere to the Functional Requirement Standards for Traffic Court Case Management?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative statement detailing the systems and their adherence to the Functional Requirement Standards for Traffic Court Case Management. If not, specify if a comparable guideline is being used.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The Functional Requirement Standards for Traffic Court Case Management involve all court case management aspects from dockets to accounting. Based on the State’s response it appears that the systems in place, as described, are modeled after the functional requirement standards addressed in this assessment, though additional detail regarding their adherence would have been preferred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 215:
Do the appropriate portions of the citation and adjudication systems adhere to the NIEM Justice domain guidelines?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative statement detailing the systems and their adherence to the NIEM Justice domain guidelines. If not, specify if a comparable guideline is being used.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The citation system adheres to the NEIM guidelines for interfaces between law enforcement and prosecutors, but not for data transfer to the courts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 216: 
Does the State use the National Center for State Courts guidelines for court records? 

Standard of Evidence: 
Provide a narrative statement detailing the systems and their adherence to NCSC guidelines for court records. If not, specify if a comparable guideline is being used. 

Assessor conclusions: 
The State has worked with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) and the JUSTICE court management system includes processes and procedures that align with current NCSC guidelines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Question 217: 
Does the State use the Global Justice Reference Architecture (GRA)? 

Standard of Evidence: 
Provide a narrative statement detailing the systems and their adherence to GRA guidelines. If not, specify if a comparable guideline is being used. 

Assessor conclusions: 
The State uses a subset of Global Justice Reference Architecture guidelines. A Service Oriented Architecture has been implemented and the State has partially integrated the framework, profiles, and guidelines under the GRA.

| Respondents assigned | 1 | Responses received | 1 | Response rate | 100% |
Question 218: Does the State have an impaired driving data tracking system that meets the specifications of NHTSA's Model Impaired Driving Records Information System (MIDRIS)?

Standard of Evidence: Provide a narrative statement detailing the systems and their adherence to MIDRIS guidelines. If not, specify if a comparable guideline is being used.

Assessor conclusions: While it doesn't have a complete system patterned after MIDRIS, the State is commended for its efforts to study the feasibility of a MIDRIS-like DUI tracking system, and for having developed additional components that more fully resemble the model. The value of such a system transcends its use for statistical data, in that it should connect all those who interact with impaired driving offenders, in ways that can prevent the Driver Licensing authority from reinstating driver privileges prior to court sanctions being complied with or completed, and can track the evaluation, probation, education and therapy programs and curricula, in order to assess which programs are most effective with which types of offenders. It should also track fines, fees and costs of a DUI arrest and conviction. Information collected in a DUI tracking system should provide the basis for determining the optimal types and levels of sanction that allow and promote ability of the offender to regain compliance and licensure at some level, perhaps with an ignition interlock restriction. Failure to do so can result in hard-core drunk drivers, where violators abandon the system that has been set up to provide assistance with their issues and promote traffic safety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Rank: Somewhat Important
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 219:</th>
<th>Does the citation system have a data dictionary?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard of Evidence:</strong></td>
<td>Provide the data dictionary for the Statewide citation tracking system if one exists. If not, provide the data dictionary for the most widely used court case management system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessor conclusions:</strong></td>
<td>The JUSTICE system does not have a data dictionary; however, some courts use other case management systems that do have data dictionaries. At the State level, uniformity is accomplished by a statewide case management system and would be enhanced by a data dictionary that defines each data field and outlines the appropriate format. The benefits of data dictionaries to efforts involving integration of systems are obvious, though Nebraska has a great deal of integrated data at the current time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Respondents assigned | 2 | Responses received | 2 | Response rate | 100% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 220:</th>
<th>Do the citation data dictionaries clearly define all data fields?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard of Evidence:</strong></td>
<td>If a statewide citation tracking system exists, does its data dictionary clearly define all data fields. If there are two or more repositories of citation data, provide data dictionaries for the two largest. NOTE: This response does not require data dictionaries from individual law enforcement agencies that track their own citations—it refers to a statewide system or one used by multiple agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessor conclusions:</strong></td>
<td>There is no data dictionary for the JUSTICE system, although the Administrative Office of the Courts has outlined the definitions and formats of each data field. These should be compiled into a data dictionary that can be provided to and used by system and data users.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Respondents assigned | 2 | Responses received | 2 | Response rate | 100% |
Question 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?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative describing the process—including timelines and the summary of changes—used to ensure uniformity in the field data collection manuals, training materials, coding manuals, and corresponding reports.

Assessor conclusions:
It would serve the State well to develop a data dictionary for its JUSTICE system, which appears to have all appropriate documentation in other forms than in a consolidated data dictionary. If the State were to develop a statewide citation tracking system, it might be similar to the Courts' case management systems. A citation tracking system is meant to track citations from their inception--numbering and issuance--to their disposition and, if appropriate, posting on the driver history file. Such a system provides data on the State's traffic enforcement activities, and, in concert with the crash system, can provide information related to the effectiveness of enforcement countermeasures by location. Tracking systems also work to delineate what charges were filed versus those of which the violator was found or pled guilty, charges which the prosecutor opted not to file, the extent of plea-bargaining, deferrals and dismissals, and any variation of treatment of violations across state jurisdictions or courts. Besides being a means by which law enforcement can measure its return on investment of resources, it is also a way to gauge the effectiveness of traffic enforcement statewide.

Respondents assigned: 2
Responses received: 2
Response rate: 100%

Question 222:
Do the citation data dictionaries indicate the data fields that are populated through interface linkages with other traffic records system components?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a list of data fields populated through interface linkages with other traffic records system components.

Assessor conclusions:
The State does not currently have a citation data dictionary but should include the compilation of a data dictionary in the implementation of the e-citation system.

Respondents assigned: 2
Responses received: 2
Response rate: 100%
Question 223:
Do the courts’ case management system data dictionaries provide a definition for each data field?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a list of Case Management Systems used by both State and local level courts and note if a data dictionary is available for each one. Provide a data dictionary for one State, one county/district, and one local (municipal) court if they do not use the same case management systems.

Assessor conclusions:
The JUSTICE system, the courts’ case management system, has no data dictionary per se, but the data elements and formats for data entry in each field are defined by the Administrative Office of the Courts. Since the data exists, it should be consolidated into a data dictionary for users of the data and the system. An effective data dictionary, with definitions and formats for every data element helps data collectors to develop more uniformity in their data collection and provides information to data users about the data that they receive and analyze.

Respondents assigned 2  Responses received 2  Response rate 100%

Question 224:
Do the courts’ case management system data dictionaries clearly define all data fields?

Standard of Evidence:
Use the data dictionaries provided in response to Question 223.

Assessor conclusions:
There is no formal data dictionary for the JUSTICE system.

Respondents assigned 2  Responses received 2  Response rate 100%
### Question 225:
Do the courts’ case management system data dictionaries indicate the data fields populated through interface linkages with other traffic records system components?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a list of data fields populated through interface linkages with other traffic records system components.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The statewide trial court JUSTICE case and financial management system does not currently have a data dictionary. Additionally, the State response indicated no data fields are currently populated through interface linkages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 226:
Do the prosecutors’ information systems have data dictionaries?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a data dictionary for the State prosecutors’ office (State level courts that handle the most traffic violations). Indicate whether local prosecutors (cities, counties) have one or numerous types of data systems.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Prosecutors use one of several data systems throughout the State, which reportedly have data definitions, but no data dictionary for any of these systems was provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 227:
Can the State track citations from point of issuance to posting on the driver file?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a flow diagram documenting citation lifecycle process that identifies key stakeholders. Ensure that alternative flows are included (e.g., manual and electronic submission).

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State is not currently able to track all citations from issuance through disposition and posting on the driver file, but notes that this is a possibility to explore with the implementation of the e-citation system. The State has demonstrated that it understands the basis for a citation tracking system and its value to traffic safety overall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 228:
Does the State measure compliance with the process outlined in the citation lifecycle flow chart?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative describing how the State measures compliance with the citation lifecycle process specified in the flow chart. If there are official guidance documents, provide them.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Without a standardized citation lifecycle, the State is not currently able to measure compliance. The State notes it will review the potential for citation lifecycle development as it develops the e-citation system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 229:**
Is the State able to track DUI citations?

**Standard of Evidence:**

Provide a flow chart that documents the criminal and administrative DUI processes, identifies all key stakeholders, and includes disposition per the criminal and administrative charges.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Currently, the State is unable to track citations throughout their lifecycles, but has identified means by which to accomplish this. Tracking of citations provides assurance that citations, once written, do not disappear from the system. It will be possible to determine the number of citations that are not sent to court by law enforcement officers, those that prosecutors opt not to file, the number and types of plea bargains and the number of citations and charges that are deferred either by adjudication or sentencing. Additionally, tracking of citations provides valuable information about how citations are handled geographically throughout the State and by various courts and adjudicators. The data that results will give law enforcement officers information about the effect of their enforcement efforts. There is little return on investment if charges are routinely dismissed or not filed. When this is the case, it is important for law enforcement officers and agencies to determine whether additional training is needed. With the expense of time and effort in enforcing some traffic laws, particularly DUI arrests, it is vital for law enforcement agencies to be able to determine the return on their investments. A citation tracking system is a vital piece of this effort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 230:**
Does the DUI tracking system include BAC and any drug testing results?

**Standard of Evidence:**

If no statewide DUI tracking system is in place, indicate whether the driver history record contains the BAC test results.

**Assessor conclusions:**
While the managers of the Administrative License Revocation data could provide BAC levels and drug testing results, they are not available within a statewide DUI tracking system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 231:
Does the State have a system for tracking administrative driver penalties and sanctions?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative describing the protocol for reporting (posting) the penalty and/or sanction to the driver and/or vehicle file.

Assessor conclusions:
The driver system tracks all administrative penalties for driver licensing in the State.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 232:
Does the State have a system for tracking traffic citations for juvenile offenders?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a flow chart that documents the processing of juvenile offenders’ traffic citations, specifying any charges or circumstances that cause juveniles to be processed as adult offenders.

Assessor conclusions:
The JUSTICE system could be queried for all citations issued to juveniles. It is also possible that the data from the driver history file could be filtered by age to provide this information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 233:
Does the State distinguish between the administrative handling of court payments in lieu of court appearances (mail-ins) and court appearances?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a flow chart documenting the processing of administrative handling of court payments (mail-ins).

Assessor conclusions:
The JUSTICE and financial management system differentiates between administrative payments and mandatory court appearance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 234:**
Does the State track deferral and dismissal of citations?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a flow chart documenting the deferral and the dismissal of citations.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State cannot track deferrals and decisions by prosecutors to not file charges. As noted previously, this information is vital to determining if officers need additional training (Are citations not filed due to poor quality?) and whether a court or adjudicator treats some charges differently than others or if it treats cases differently than other courts within the State.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question 235:**
Are there State and/or local criteria for deferring or dismissing traffic citations and charges?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the criteria for deferring or dismissing traffic citations and charges.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Charging, deferrals and dismissal of charges is based on prosecutorial discretion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Question 236:
If the State purges its records, are the timing conditions and procedures documented?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative documenting whether or not the State purges records. If so, list the types of records the State purges and provide the criteria for doing so.

Assessor conclusions:
Nebraska has records retention guidelines, though no purging of traffic records occurs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses received</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 237:
Are the security protocols governing data access, modification, and release officially documented?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the official security protocols governing data access, modification, and release.

Assessor conclusions:
While it is recognized that various systems have a variety of security protocols, the State notes it is currently configuring the system to ensure data security through time-limited passwords, and other criteria. No specific documentation has been provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses received</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 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?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe how citation, adjudication and driver data are linked and by what means administrative actions are carried out or posted using these linkages.

Assessor conclusions:
Based on the State's response it appears data included in the driver system is collected and accessible in an electronic database and is linked directly to the citation system data in some cases. The ideal would include direct linkage of driver system administrative action to the citation system without accessing the information through a separate system.

Question 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?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the results of a sample query and describe how the linked information is used to collect certified driver records and administrative charges and to post dispositions to the driver file.

Assessor conclusions:
Linking of adjudication data with the driver systems serves to facilitate a two way transfer of administrative actions and dispositions. Linkage should include the ability for the court system to acquire driver history information to determine applicable charges for drivers as well as transmit adjudication dispositions back to driver history. The State response appears to indicate a link from conviction data to driver history but no link for prosecutors to add new appropriate charges based on current administrative actions on the driver history.

Respondents assigned 3 Responses received 2 Response rate 66.7%

Respondents assigned 3 Responses received 1 Response rate 33.3%
Question 240:
Is citation data linked with the vehicle file to collect vehicle information and carry out administrative actions (e.g., vehicle seizure, forfeiture, interlock)?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the results of a sample query and describe how the linked information is used to collect vehicle information and carry out administrative actions.

Assessor conclusions:
The citation file is not linked to the vehicle file.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 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)?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the results of a sample query and describe how the linked information is used to collect vehicle information and carry out administrative actions.

Assessor conclusions:
Adjudication data and vehicle data are not currently linked in Nebraska, although linkage is under consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 242:
Is citation data linked with the crash file to document violations and charges related to the crash?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the results of a sample query and describe how the linked information is used to document violations and charges related to the crash.

**Assessor conclusions:**
OLN matching (or name/DOB) on NCJIS would provide a link between the crash and driver history and/or court cases; however, although this capability exists, there is no link between the driver history file and the crash file at this time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 243:
Is adjudication data linked with the crash file to document violations and charges related to the crash?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the results of a sample query and describe how the linked information is used to document violations and charges related to the crash.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The adjudication file is not linked with the crash file, though a manual search through NCJIS by OLN or DOB could produce the same type of results. A comprehensive traffic records inventory for the State's data elements including formats and definitions, data dictionaries, database custodians and their contact information, data governance rules, and platforms and programming languages, helps to provide a basis for determining where integration and linkages are possible and is very useful if kept current and managed centrally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 244:
Is there a set of established performance measures for the timeliness of the citation systems?

Standard of Evidence:
If there is a statewide citation tracking system in the State, provide timeliness measures used. If there are two or more centralized citation tracking systems, provide timeliness measures for one of them.

Assessor conclusions:
The 48 hour goal for moving ecitation data to NCJIS is the basis for a performance measure. For example, a measure would be "percentage of citations that are transmitted to NCJIS from the ecitation system within 48 hours." If the answer is 100%, it would make sense to determine the actual time on average that it takes the citations to get to NCJIS, (3 days, 4 days, etc.) so new goals could be set. It would be even better to have the baseline time that it takes a paper citation to get to NCJIS. Performance measures provide an avenue to demonstrate the value of improvements that result from system updates, upgrades and system replacement. Such data can serve to justify the expense of information technology improvements. Besides, having a finger on the pulse of the system helps to ensure that any degradation of data timeliness is quickly discovered and interventions taken to return data timeliness to previous levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 245:
Is there a set of established performance measures for the accuracy of the citation systems?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide accuracy measures for the statewide citation tracking system. If there are several citation tracking systems, provide accuracy measures for one of them.

Assessor conclusions:
The State has developed edits to ensure accuracy of data entered; however, it does not measures accuracy. Even with system edits, errors often find their way into datasets. It is important to measure the accuracy of such data to ensure that edits are working or to add additional edits if necessary. Established performance measures for the citation system ensures accuracy of the citation data throughout the entire process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 246:
Is there a set of established performance measures for the completeness of the citation systems?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide completeness measures for the statewide citation tracking system. If there are several citation tracking systems, provide completeness measures for one of them.

Assessor conclusions:
The response from the State is an excellent reason for a State to develop performance measures for its data systems. For example, when electronic crash reporting was in its infancy, States tended to measure timeliness, accuracy and completeness of reports by submitting agency and reported that information back to the agencies individually, but also reported individual results to all agencies as a means to motivate them. Many states found that law enforcement officers were competitive enough to work tirelessly to improve their data speed, accuracy and completeness in order to outperform their sister agencies. This effort not only improved the datasets and the data system as a whole, but it served to promote awareness of data's importance and its use and usefulness by those who collected or initiated the data. Nebraska can at least test this theory with its e-citation implementation. A proof of concept related to performance measures is one way to establish their usefulness as a managerial tool and their effectiveness as a motivator to data collectors.

Respondents assigned 1 Responses received 1 Response rate 100%

Question 247:
Is there a set of established performance measures for the uniformity of the citation systems?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide uniformity measures for the statewide citation tracking system. If there are several citation tracking systems, provide uniformity measures for one of them.

Assessor conclusions:
While edit checks and validation rules serve to improve data uniformity, they do not ultimately ensure that each data element is always addressed from the same perspective. Measures of uniformity help to determine where additional training might be needed, or can help data managers notify data users of any anomalies in the data that might result from lack of uniformity. It is understood that there is a limited citation system in place and that any established performance measures are localized at best and not present for the system as a whole.

Respondents assigned 2 Responses received 1 Response rate 50%
Question 248:
Is there a set of established performance measures for the integration of the citation systems?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide integration measures for the statewide citation tracking system. If there are several citation tracking systems, provide integration measures for one of them.

Assessor conclusions:
Nebraska has integration of data from a variety of sources related to traffic safety, and a simple performance measure could ensure that is recognized. The easiest performance measures are: "Number of core data systems with which the citation system is integrated." or "Percentage of related traffic safety datasets that are integrated." Either of these measures would help to ensure that Nebraska's star power in this area is recognized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 249:
Is there a set of established performance measures for the accessibility of the citation systems?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide accessibility measures for the statewide citation tracking system. If there are several citation tracking systems, provide accessibility measures for one of them.

Assessor conclusions:
The goal noted by the State relates to timeliness primarily. Accessibility from this question's standpoint is related to the data that is made available to authorized users and researchers. It is often measured as "the number of (or percentage of) requests for citation data (generally in aggregate) that were able to be fulfilled during the year." So if this year 99 percent of requests were fulfilled but that percentage starts to drop over time, it might be an indication of the need for additional resources, but also it could be an indication that requests have increased because of the recognized quality of the data for analytical purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 250:**
Is there a set of established performance measures for the timeliness of the adjudication systems?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide timeliness measures for the statewide adjudication tracking system. If there are several adjudication tracking systems, provide timeliness measures for one of them.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The responses indicate performance (i.e., same day transmission of data), but no actual measures have been established to validate the timeliness of data and to provide for a standard against which any degradation of timeliness would be immediately noted and could be addressed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Somewhat Important

---

**Question 251:**
Is there a set of established performance measures for the accuracy of the adjudication systems?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide accuracy measures for the statewide adjudication tracking system. If there are several adjudication tracking systems, provide accuracy measures for one of them.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Accuracy measures for the JUSTICE system could be many and varied. They could address the number of convictions sent to the DMV that error-out and are returned. They could be related to incorrect data input into the case management system, such as incorrect dates of birth, driver license numbers, etc. Any data that is regularly the subject of error reports should be the focus of embedded edits and validation rules in the system software or training or notification to data collectors and those who enter the data into the system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Very Important
Question 252:
Is there a set of established performance measures for the completeness of the adjudication systems?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide completeness measures for the statewide adjudication tracking system. If there are several adjudication tracking systems, provide completeness measures for one of them.

Assessor conclusions:
Completeness measures fall into two categories. One relates to the completeness of individual records. Are there records where critical data elements are missing? These situations should be measured. Even if records are rejected from the system for incomplete data, this level of rejection should be measured to give some level of awareness of the data enterer's training or need for training. The second measure of completeness of the system relates to the overall number of records in the system. The lack of knowledge of number of violations that are not filed by the prosecutor is an indication of the inability to measure completeness of the data subset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 253:
Is there a set of established performance measures for the integration of the adjudication systems?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide integration measures for the statewide adjudication tracking system. If there are several adjudication tracking systems, provide integration measures for one of them.

Assessor conclusions:
This question relates to measuring the number of datasets that are integrated with the adjudication data--integration being linking data for analytical purposes. There are a great deal of data integration, linking and interfaces performed with traffic safety data in Nebraska. The number of datasets that have been linked with adjudication data is one way to measure integration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 254:
In States that have an agency responsible for issuing unique citation numbers, is information on intermediate dispositions (e.g., deferrals, dismissals) captured?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide documentation detailing the numbers of citations issued from the 10 largest law enforcement agencies and the number of dispositions for those citations that are in the driver file over a three month period.

Assessor conclusions:
It is not clear if Nebraska’s adjudication system sends data to the driver history file related to cases that are deferred. Noting deferrals on the driver history can prevent a driver from escaping enhanced penalties when additional violations occur. There is less opportunity for this to happen in Nebraska due to the interoperability of JUSTICE statewide, but there is value in reporting deferrals to the driver file, and the charge may be deleted when or if the case is eventually dismissed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 255:
Do the State's DUI tracking systems have additional quality control procedures to ensure the accuracy and timeliness of the data?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative description of the additional quality control measures for the DUI tracking systems and specify which systems use which measures.

Assessor conclusions:
Nebraska does not have a DUI tracking system per se, although DUI cases can be tracked in the JUSTICE system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EMS / Injury Surveillance

An ideal statewide Injury Surveillance System (ISS) is comprised of data from five core components: pre-hospital emergency medical services (EMS), trauma registry, emergency department, hospital discharge, and vital records. This data provides more detailed information on the nature and extent of injuries sustained in a motor vehicle crash than can be found in other components of the traffic records system. Consequently, this information is invaluable when determining the severity, cost, and clinical outcomes of the individuals involved.

Overall, Nebraska collects and maintains information on all five components; management of EMS, trauma registry, and vital records data is housed in the Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services Division of Public Health (DPH); and the emergency department and hospital discharge data is maintained by the Nebraska Hospital Association (NHA). Since this data is managed by a non-State agency, the DPH is encouraged to pursue more coordination and collaboration with the NHA.

The Nebraska EMS data system is built with ImageTrend software, is NEMSIS v.3 compliant, and all patient care reports have been submitted electronically since the beginning of 2015. Nebraska has adopted the NEMSIS data dictionary and utilizes all of the automated edit checks and validation rules built into that software. The State has also implemented a comprehensive quality control system for the EMS data that includes drafts of three of six recommended performance measures, regular evaluation and reporting of those measures, and utilizes common errors and user feedback to revise training programs. The State also provides quality control feedback to submitting agencies, conducts trend analyses for problem identification, and shares information with the State Traffic Records Coordinating Committee. Aggregate and raw data are also available upon request and approval from the DPH; such data has been used to map crashes and analyze other traffic safety interests.

However, there is still room for improvement, specifically with regards to the development of a formal data dictionary, to contain information beyond the current data layout, implementing the planned process for returning error records to the submitting agency for correction, expanding interfaces to other traffic records system components beyond the trauma registry, and creating formal performance measures (the three metrics currently in use have not been developed into full measures as defined in the Advisory).

The Nebraska Hospital Association collects and maintains hospital discharge and emergency department data from each of the State’s hospitals. Although this information is shared with the DPH, the NHA bears primary responsibility for the data quality. Both emergency department and hospital discharge data systems are managed in the same way and are compliant with the Uniform Billing 2004 standard (UB-04). Clearly documented data dictionaries and process flows are available from the NHA, which is very helpful for current and future partners to understand the data systems. Clinical data is available for research purposes upon approval from the DPH. The systems are well-designed and managed, but some characteristics of a quality control program are lacking and should be considered for implementation. Those include: expanding the automated edit checks and validation rules beyond the file structure to the element and attribute levels, developing a system for returning records to the submitting agency for correction, developing performance measures for all six data qualities, and incorporating high frequency errors and user feedback in the revision of training and documentation. The State is commended
for incorporating NHA data and quality information into the TRCC agendas, which is not common.

The State’s Trauma Registry includes data for all patients that are admitted for injuries that meet trauma criteria. The system is built with ImageTrend software, is compatible with the National Trauma Data Standard, and interfaces with the EMS system through a common software platform. A data dictionary and process flow explanation is readily available to help any user understand how the system functions. Similar to EMS, the State relies on automated edit checks in the ImageTrend software and does not correct any errors (records are returned to the submitting entity for correction). The software has also been adapted to provide quality review reports to the participating agencies as a continual evaluation of the system. The trauma registry has a comprehensive quality control program that utilizes common errors and user feedback to revise training, provides feedback to submitting agencies, conducts trend analyses for problem identification, and shares information with the State Traffic Records Coordinating Committee. The only aspect missing are performance measures, so the State is encouraged to develop measures and metrics against which the system may be evaluated at regular intervals.

The DPH also manages the State Vital Records including death data used in the traffic records system. That data is compliant with National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) standards and feedback from the NCHS is incorporated into quality control reviews and system updates. There is a documented process for returning records to the submitting agencies, primarily funeral homes, for correction before it is included in the State database. Most of the system’s quality control program utilizes NCHS processes, so the State is encouraged to provide oversight and institute quality control measures in addition to the federal ones. Vital records data has been used for traffic safety projects and is available upon approval by the DPH. The State has a data dictionary available for data users and interested parties.

A notable highlight of Nebraska’s injury surveillance system is their Crash Outcome Data Evaluation System (CODES) program. Although NHTSA funding has ceased, the State has supported and maintained the integration efforts which is commendable. The Nebraska CODES program has successfully integrated injury surveillance data with the crash file and other components of the traffic records system. Results of that integration may be found in problem identification and program evaluation reports published by the Highway Safety Office and other partners. The State should also be recognized for its successful relationship with the NHA. It appears that there is open communication and wide sharing of information and resources between DPH and NHA.

In addition to those achievements, there are several considerations that have been noted above. First, although most ISS components provide data quality reports to the TRCC, it was not clear if all have representation on the committee. It is important to have regular, reliable participation from all sections of the ISS. Second, to identify and understand the quality of each data system, performance measures should be developed and implemented. While there are guidelines related the timeliness, accuracy, and completeness of reports, and metrics have been identified for many parts of the ISS, performance measures include baselines and goal metrics so it’s possible to regularly evaluate and identify places for improvement in a system’s function, progress, and success. The ‘Model Performance Measures for State Traffic Records Systems’ publication provides example performance measures for each metric in each system. Third, the State should explore the feasibility of interfacing systems beyond the EMS-trauma registry connection. Interfaces help increase the accuracy of the data, by eliminating keystroke errors, and improves completeness by pulling all information from a primary source when it may not be
known at the time of the incident; for example, if hospitals have the ability to interface with EMS, all pre-hospital care may be incorporated into the hospital report even in cases where the EMS report is not available.

**Question 256:**
Does the injury surveillance system include EMS data?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide an injury surveillance report that illustrates the use of EMS data and data from other injury surveillance systems.

**Assessor conclusions:**
EMS data is included in the Injury Surveillance System and has been integrated with other traffic-related data systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 257:**
Does the injury surveillance system include emergency department (ED) data?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide an injury surveillance report that illustrates the use of emergency department (ED) data and data from other injury surveillance systems.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Emergency department data is included in the Injury Surveillance System.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 258:
Does the injury surveillance system include hospital discharge data?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide an injury surveillance report that illustrates the use of hospital discharge data and data from other injury surveillance systems.

Assessor conclusions:
Hospital discharge data is available in the Injury Surveillance System through the State Hospital Association.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 259:
Does the injury surveillance system include trauma registry data?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide an injury surveillance report that illustrates the use of trauma registry data and data from other injury surveillance systems.

Assessor conclusions:
Trauma registry data is included in the State Injury Surveillance System.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 260:
Does the injury surveillance system include rehabilitation data?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide an injury surveillance report that illustrates the use of rehabilitation data and data from other injury surveillance systems.

Assessor conclusions:
The State does not currently include rehabilitation data in the Injury Surveillance System, but has plans to do so.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 261:**
Does the injury surveillance system include vital records data?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide an injury surveillance report that illustrates the use of vital data and data from other injury surveillance systems.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Vital records data is a part of the State Injury Surveillance System. Two reports were submitted using injury data (2012 and 2009-2013). The 2012 CODES Report identified Crash, EMS, Hospital Discharge, and Vital Statistics (Death). The 2009-2013 Injury Report demonstrated the use of vital records data for motor vehicle crashes and other mechanisms of injury.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 262:**
Does the injury surveillance system include other data?

**Standard of Evidence:**
List any other databases or sources included in the injury surveillance system and provide a sample report using data from each of these sources. Additional data resources may include medical examiner reports, payer-related databases, traumatic brain injury registry, and spinal cord injury registry.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Although currently limited in its role and capabilities, the State has a TBI Registry that currently responds to data requests and provides resources for newly diagnosed TBI cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 263:
Does the EMS system track the frequency, severity, and nature of injuries sustained in motor vehicle crashes in the State?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the most recent motor vehicle-related incident counts for the EMS system, any injury severity categorizations applied, and the provider’s primary impression (if applicable).

Assessor conclusions:
The EMS system is able to track frequency and nature of injuries, while the severity of injuries is obtained through linkage with crash reports and the associated KABCO score. It was noted that EMS reports rarely include the cause of injury, so without identifying crashes in the EMS file it isn't possible to ensure the linkage is complete either.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 264:
Does the emergency department data track the frequency, severity, and nature of injuries sustained in motor vehicle crashes in the State?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the most recent motor vehicle-related incident counts for the emergency department data, any injury severity categorizations applied (e.g., Abbreviated Injury Score, Injury Severity Scale), and principal diagnosis.

Assessor conclusions:
Traffic-related injury frequency, nature, and severity may be tracked in the emergency department data through E-codes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 265:**
Does the hospital discharge data track the frequency, severity, and nature of injuries sustained in motor vehicle crashes in the State?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the most recent motor vehicle-related incident counts for the hospital discharge data, any injury severity categorizations applied (e.g., Abbreviated Injury Score, Injury Severity Scale), and principal diagnosis.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Traffic-related injury frequency, nature, and severity may be tracked in the hospital discharge data through E-codes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:**
Very Important

---

**Question 266:**
Does the trauma registry data track the frequency, severity, and nature of injuries sustained in motor vehicle crashes in the State?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the most recent motor vehicle-related incident counts for the trauma registry data, any injury severity categorizations applied (e.g., Abbreviated Injury Score, Injury Severity Scale), and principal diagnosis.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Traffic-related injury frequency, nature, and severity may be tracked in the trauma registry, including AIS and ISS values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:**
Very Important
Question 267:
Does the vital records data track the frequency, severity, and nature of injuries sustained in motor vehicle crashes in the State?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the most recent motor vehicle-related incident counts from the vital records data and the cause of death.

Assessor conclusions:
Traffic-related deaths, their frequency and nature, are tracked in the Vital Records system and reported in the Injury in Nebraska Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 268:
Is the EMS data available for analysis and used to identify problems, evaluate programs, and allocate resources?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a sample report or narrative description of a highway safety project that utilized EMS data to identify a problem, evaluate a program, or allocate resources.

Assessor conclusions:
EMS data is available for analysis and has been used to map crashes and study related factors and outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 269:**
Is the emergency department data available for analysis and used to identify problems, evaluate programs, and allocate resources?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a sample report or narrative description of a highway safety project that utilized emergency department data to identify a problem, evaluate a program, or allocate resources.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Emergency department data is available for analysis and has been used in the CODES program (i.e. head injury and seat belt use).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:**
Very Important

**Question 270:**
Is the hospital discharge data available for analysis and used to identify problems, evaluate programs, and allocate resources?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a sample report or narrative description of a highway safety project that utilized hospital discharge data to identify a problem, evaluate a program, or allocate resources.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Hospital discharge data is available for analysis and has been used extensively in the CODES program (i.e. head injury and seat belt use).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:**
Very Important
### Question 271:
Is the trauma registry data available for analysis and used to identify problems, evaluate programs, and allocate resources?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a sample report or narrative description of a highway safety project that utilized trauma registry data to identify a problem, evaluate a program, or allocate resources.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The trauma registry is available for problem identification and program evaluation, but with limited staff it is not being used for highway safety programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Very Important

---

### Question 272:
Is the vital records data available for analysis and used to identify problems, evaluate programs, and allocate resources?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a sample report or narrative description of a highway safety project that utilized vital records data to identify a problem, evaluate a program, or allocate resources (e.g., research in support of helmet or GDL legislation).

**Assessor conclusions:**
Vital Records data is available and has been used to evaluate crash deaths related to restraint use and impaired driving.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Very Important
### Question 273:
**Does the State have a NEMSIS-compliant statewide database?**

**Standard of Evidence:**
Demonstrate submission to the nationwide NEMSIS database and provide any relevant State statutes or regulations. If not compliant, provide narrative detailing the State’s efforts to achieve NEMSIS compliance.

**Question Rank:** Very Important

**Assessor conclusions:**
All EMS services are using NEMSIS-compliant software to submit records, per State Department of Health and Human Services regulation 172.12-004.09C3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 274:
**Does the State's emergency department and hospital discharge data conform to the most recent uniform billing standard?**

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the data dictionaries for both the emergency department and hospital discharge data as appropriate as well as any relevant State statutes or regulations.

**Question Rank:** Very Important

**Assessor conclusions:**
The hospital discharge data dictionary includes UB-04 data elements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 275:
**Does the State's trauma registry database adhere to the National Trauma Data Standards?**

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the trauma registry data dictionary and any relevant State statutes or regulations.

**Question Rank:** Very Important

**Assessor conclusions:**
Per State regulations, the trauma registry conforms to the National Trauma Data Standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 276:
Are Abbreviated Injury Scale (AIS) and Injury Severity Scores (ISS) derived from the State emergency department and hospital discharge data for motor vehicle crash patients?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a distribution of AIS and ISS scores for the most recent year available.

Assessor conclusions:
AIS and ISS information can be derived from the ED and inpatient databases using ICDMAP-90 software. This has been done for CODES analyses in the past.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 277:
Are Abbreviated Injury Scale (AIS) and Injury Severity Scores (ISS) derived from the State trauma registry for motor vehicle crash patients?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a distribution of AIS and ISS scores for the most recent year available.

Assessor conclusions:
Each trauma record contains AIS and calculated ISS scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 278:
Does the State EMS database collect the Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) data for motor vehicle crash patients?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a distribution of GCS scores for motor vehicle crash patients for the most recent year available.

Assessor conclusions:
GCS is captured in the EMS system, but the completeness of that element is low. Since it is captured to some degree it meets the ideal, but increased submission of this information (and compliance with the State regulations) should be encouraged.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 279:**
Does the State trauma registry collect the Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) data for motor vehicle crash patients?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a distribution of GCS scores for motor vehicle crash patients for the most recent year available.

**Assessor conclusions:**
GCS is collected in all trauma registry records.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 280:**
Are there State privacy and confidentiality laws that supersede HIPAA?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the applicable State laws and describe how they are interpreted—including the identification of situations that may impede data sharing within the State and among public health authorities.

**Assessor conclusions:**
State statutes protect ISS data except as stated by HIPAA. Therefore, the regulations supersede HIPAA by protecting information beyond those parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 281:**
Does the EMS system have a formal data dictionary?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the data dictionary including, at a minimum, the variable names and definitions.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The NEMSIS and Omaha data dictionaries were provided, but these documents are more of a data layout. Both contain element and attribute names, but not definitions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 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?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a user's manual or other form of documentation of the EMS data collection system. Such documentation should include a list of the dataset's variables and a description of how the data is collected, managed and maintained.

Assessor conclusions:
There is no formal documentation that provides a summary dataset beyond the data dictionary with information on elements, values, and exceptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 283:
Does the emergency department dataset have a formal data dictionary?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the data dictionary including, at a minimum, the variable names and definitions.

Assessor conclusions:
The State response includes an attached document consistent as a data dictionary for ED and hospital discharge data dictionary requirements (i.e., element names, field values, and definitions).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 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?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the documentation.

Assessor conclusions:
There is no documentation that provides information about the ED database beyond what is captured in the data dictionary. A data dictionary is unavailable but similar to the hospital discharge dictionary. That file includes characteristics and values, but no information about methods for collection and management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 285:
Does the hospital discharge dataset have a formal data dictionary?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the data dictionary including, at a minimum, the variable names and definitions.

Assessor conclusions:
The State has a data dictionary for the hospital discharge data set that contains elements, attributes, names, values, and definitions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 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?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the documentation.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The response indicated that there is no documentation that provides information about the inpatient database beyond what is captured in the data dictionary. The Hospital Association provides summary information for each submission, but that does not include all of the characteristics and details about data collection and management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 287:**
Does the trauma registry have a formal data dictionary?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the data dictionary including, at a minimum, the variable names and definitions.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State Trauma Data Quality Assurance committee developed a comprehensive data dictionary for the trauma registry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 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?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the documentation.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The trauma registry data dictionary is a comprehensive document with information about case inclusion, data elements and attributes, and limitations and exceptions. Information about how the data is collected and maintained at the State level is the responsibility of each trauma center and is not included in this central document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 289:**
Does the vital records system have a formal data dictionary?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the data dictionary including, at a minimum, the variable names and definitions.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There is a Vital Records System data layout that contains information in a data dictionary (elements, attributes, names, definitions).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 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?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the documentation.

Assessor conclusions:
There is documentation that provides information about the vital records database beyond what is captured in the data dictionary, but it is too cumbersome to provide here. The data layout provided is a good data dictionary but does not include information about data collection or management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 291:
Is there a single entity that collects and compiles data from the local EMS agencies?

Standard of Evidence:
Identify the State agency or third party to which the EMS data is initially submitted.

Assessor conclusions:
The State Department of Health and Human Services Division of Public Health is responsible for the EMS database and the data is stored by ImageTrend, Inc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 292:**
Is there a single entity that collects and compiles data on emergency department visits from individual hospitals?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Identify the State agency or third party to which the data on emergency department visits is initially submitted.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Emergency department visit information is collected and managed by the State Hospital Association.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 293:**
Is there a single entity that collects and compiles data on hospital discharges from individual hospitals?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Identify the State agency or third party to which the data on hospital discharges is initially submitted.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Hospital discharge information is collected and managed by the State Hospital Association.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 294:**
Is there a process flow diagram that outlines the EMS system’s key data process flows, including inputs from other systems?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the flow diagram. Alternatively, provide a narrative description of the EMS data process flows from dispatch to submission of the report to the State EMS repository.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The respondents provided a narrative description of the EMS data process flow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 295:
Is there a process flow diagram that outlines the emergency department data's key data process flows, including inputs from other systems?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the flow diagram. Alternatively, provide a narrative description of the emergency department data process flows from patient arrival to submission of the uniform billing data to the State repository.

Assessor conclusions:
The NHA Nebraska Hospital Information System (NHIS) is used for transmission of records from hospitals to the NHA; documentation is available. Data is captured by the Hospital Association through a medical billing software vendor or a medical billing clearinghouse. Most data is received daily, but no less than monthly.

Question Rank: Very Important

Respondents assigned | 4 | Responses received | 3 | Response rate | 75%

Question 296:
Is there a process flow diagram that outlines the hospital discharge data's key data process flows, including inputs from other systems?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the flow diagram. Alternatively, provide a narrative description of the hospital discharge data process flows from patient arrival to submission of the uniform billing data to the State repository.

Assessor conclusions:
Although the same documentation was not provided for this question, based on previous information: The NHA Nebraska Hospital Information System (NHIS) is used for transmission of records from hospitals to the NHA; documentation is available. Data is captured by the Hospital Association through a medical billing software vendor or a medical billing clearinghouse. Most data is received daily, but no longer than monthly.

Question Rank: Very Important

Respondents assigned | 4 | Responses received | 3 | Response rate | 75%
Question 297:
Is there a process flow diagram that outlines the trauma registry’s key data process flows, including inputs from other systems?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the flow diagram. Alternatively, provide a narrative description of the hospital discharge data process flows, from trauma activation to submission of the trauma data to the State registry.

Assessor conclusions:
The data dictionary contains the process flow diagram for identifying trauma cases for inclusion in the registry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 298:
Are there separate procedures for paper and electronic filing of EMS patient care reports?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a copy of the procedures for paper and electronic filing or a narrative describing the procedures.

Assessor conclusions:
Since the beginning of 2015 all EMS records are submitted electronically. During that transition, there were processes for paper and electronic submission, but at this time no paper reports are accepted into the State EMS database.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 299:
Are there procedures for collecting, editing, error-checking, and submitting emergency department and hospital discharge data to the statewide repository?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a copy of the procedures or a narrative describing the process of collecting, editing and submitting emergency department and hospital discharge data to the statewide repository.

Assessor conclusions:
The response provided information related to a quality review of E-codes and a feedback loop to the submitting hospital. A State analyst performs this review and provides quality reports to the submitting hospitals. No additional information was available about the breadth, depth, or frequency of these reports. This process was a partnership between the State and the NHA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 300:
Does the trauma registry have documented procedures for collecting, editing, error checking, and submitting data?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a copy of the procedures or a narrative describing the process for collecting, error-checking and submitting trauma registry data.

Assessor conclusions:
The State response describes procedures for quality data submission, timeliness (30 and 60 day submission checks), and a validation procedure with instructions for error corrections. While the procedures are from 2011, the State has a full-time RN serving in a trauma registrar position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 301:
Are there procedures for collecting, editing, error-checking, and submitting data to the statewide vital records repository?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a copy of the procedures or a narrative describing the process for collecting, error-checking and submitting data to the vital records repository.

**Question Rank:**
Very Important

**Assessor conclusions:**
State respondents are not aware of any procedures for collecting, editing, error-checking, and submitting data to the State's Vital Records system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 302:
Are there documented procedures for returning data to the reporting EMS agencies for quality assurance and improvement (e.g., correction and resubmission)?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a copy of the procedures or a narrative describing the process for returning data to the reporting EMS agencies for correction and resubmission.

**Question Rank:**
Very Important

**Assessor conclusions:**
Data quality feedback related to demographics, incident times, injury information, and transport information is provided to submitting agencies in 3 of the 7 EMS regions. There are plans, using the new software, to reject records with specified errors through validation checks but there is no process for returning an error record identified by the State to the submitting agency for correction (errors outside of the automated system checks).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 303:
Are there documented procedures for returning data to the reporting emergency departments for quality assurance and improvement (e.g., correction and resubmission)?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a copy of the procedures or a narrative that describes the process for returning data to the reporting emergency departments for correction and resubmission.

Assessor conclusions:
There are no procedures for returning data for correction outside of billing codes.

Question 304:
Are there documented procedures for returning hospital discharge data to the reporting hospitals for quality assurance and improvement (e.g., correction and resubmission)?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a copy of the procedures or a narrative describing the process for returning data to the reporting hospitals for correction and resubmission.

Assessor conclusions:
There are no documented procedures for returning reports to the submitting agency for correction, except in the case of billing errors.
Question 305:
Are there documented procedures for returning trauma data to the reporting trauma center for quality assurance and improvement (e.g., correction and resubmission)?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a copy of the procedures or a narrative describing the process for returning data to the reporting trauma center for correction and resubmission.

Assessor conclusions:
There are procedures for an RN specialist to identify critical errors during quality reviews, contact the reporting hospital, send the record back for correction, and receive the updated record for inclusion in the State file.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 306:
Are there documented procedures for returning data to the reporting vital records agency for quality assurance and improvement (e.g., correction and resubmission)?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a copy of the procedures or a narrative describing the process for returning data to the reporting vital records agency for correction and resubmission.

Assessor conclusions:
There are procedures for rejecting records to funeral homes to address 'questionable data'. However, it was unclear what constitutes 'questionable data' and the process for tracking correction and re-submission of such records.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 307:**
Is aggregate EMS data available to outside parties (e.g., universities, traffic safety professionals) for analytical purposes?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a copy of the data access policy, data use agreement, or link to appropriate data access website. Alternatively, provide a description of how outside parties may obtain access to the EMS data for analytical purposes.

**Question Rank:** Very Important

**Assessor conclusions:**
The response indicates that aggregate and de-identified raw data may be provided upon request and approval by the Division of Public Health. The raw data is limited to universities or a traffic safety group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 308:**
Is aggregate emergency department data available to outside parties (e.g., universities, traffic safety professionals) for analytical purposes?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a copy of the data access policy, data use agreement, or link to appropriate data access website. Alternatively, provide a description of how outside parties may obtain access to the emergency department data for analytical purposes.

**Question Rank:** Very Important

**Assessor conclusions:**
Aggregate ED data is available upon request and approval of the DHHS Division of Public Health.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 309:**
Is aggregate hospital discharge data available to outside parties (e.g., universities, traffic safety professionals) for analytical purposes?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a copy of the data access policy, data use agreement, or link to appropriate data access website. Alternatively, provide a description of how outside parties may obtain access to the hospital discharge data for analytical purposes.

**Assessor conclusions:**
A limited hospital discharge dataset is available upon request and approval of the DHHS Division of Public Health. That data is available to participating hospitals and organizations with IRB approval. A data use agreement will be agreed upon to receive data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 310:**
Is aggregate trauma registry data available to outside parties (e.g., universities, traffic safety professionals) for analytical purposes?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a copy of the data access policy, data use agreement, or link to appropriate data access website. Alternatively, provide a description of how outside parties may obtain access to the trauma registry data for analytical purposes.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Outside parties may submit a request to obtain aggregate trauma registry for analytical purposes. The request must be approved by the DHHS Division of Public Health.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 311:
Is aggregate vital records data available to outside parties (e.g., universities, traffic safety professionals) for analytical purposes?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a copy of the data access policy, data use agreement, or link to appropriate data access website. Alternatively, provide a description of how outside parties may obtain access to the vital records data for analytical purposes.

Assessor conclusions:
Outside parties may submit a request to obtain aggregate vital records data for analytical purposes. That request must be approved by the DHHS Division of Public Health.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 312:
Is there an interface among the EMS data and emergency department and hospital discharge data?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative description of the interface link between the EMS data and the emergency department and hospital discharge data. If available provide the applicable data exchange agreement.

Assessor conclusions:
There is no interface in place between EMS and hospital data, but those files are integrated on an annual basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 313:
Is there an interface between the EMS data and the trauma registry data?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative description of the interface link between the EMS data and the trauma registry data. If available provide the applicable data exchange agreement.

Assessor conclusions:
There is an interface between EMS and trauma registry through the ImageTrend software. Currently, data may be pulled from EMS into trauma and efforts are underway to pull trauma outcomes into EMS records.

Question 314:
Is there an interface between the vital statistics and hospital discharge data?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a narrative description of the interface link between the vital statistics and hospital discharge data. If available provide the applicable data exchange agreement.

Assessor conclusions:
There is no interface between vital records and hospital data.
Question 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?

Standard of Evidence: Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which automated edit checks and validation rules ensure entered data falls within the range of acceptable values and is logically consistent among fields.

Assessor conclusions: The State utilizes the edit checks and validation rules that exist in the Image Trend software, which are NEMSIS v.3-compliant. Additional checks have been developed by EMS program staff with some review done by the Office of Health Statistics and Injury Surveillance group. Services using collection software other than Image Trend are also NEMSIS v.3-compliant, so the data is subjected to the same edit checks. There are also manual quality reviews and reports provided to the submitting agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 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?

Standard of Evidence: Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which limited state-level correction authority is granted to quality control staff working with the statewide EMS database.

Assessor conclusions: The State does not make corrections to any data in the EMS database.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 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?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which rejected EMS patient care reports are returned to the collecting agency and tracked through resubmission to the statewide EMS database.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no documented processes for returning error reports to the submitting agency for correction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 318:**
Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of EMS system managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of timeliness performance measures for the EMS system and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are timeliness performance metrics for the EMS data system but no measures are identified. Performance measures include goals (1 year, 5 year, etc.) against which the interim metrics are evaluated for progress. It appears, although not formally evaluated, that the State aims ‘to increase the % of records received within 10 days of incident from 90% in 2015 to 100% in 2020.’ The monthly tracking document illustrates the need for continual evaluation of this metric because the goal has not been reached and maintained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 319:
Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of EMS system managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of accuracy performance measures for the EMS system and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

Assessor conclusions:
There are accuracy performance metrics for the EMS data system but no measures are identified. Performance measures include goals (1 year, 5 year, etc.) against which the interim metrics are evaluated for progress. Although the goals are not clearly stated on the monthly reports, it appears the State aims 'to maintain the % of records with accurate location coding at 99% in 2015.' Even when a goal is met, the system is fluid and measures should be regularly evaluated to ensure the metric doesn't regress and new accuracy measures should be developed.

| Respondents assigned | 3 | Responses received | 2 | Response rate | 66.7% |

Question 320:
Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of EMS system managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of completeness performance measures for the EMS system and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

Assessor conclusions:
There are completeness performance metrics for the EMS data system but no measures are identified. Performance measures include goals (1 year, 5 year, etc.) against which the interim metrics are evaluated for progress. Although not clearly stated as a performance measure, it appears the State aims 'to maintain the # of services submitting records to the State file monthly at 320 services from 2015 through 2020.' or 'to receive records from 100% of agencies; 320 in 2015' to ensure that as agencies develop that they are submitting to the State file. The monthly tracking document illustrates the need for continual evaluation of this metric because the goal has not been reached and maintained.

| Respondents assigned | 3 | Responses received | 2 | Response rate | 66.7% |
**Question 321:**
Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of EMS system managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of uniformity performance measures for the EMS system and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no uniformity performance measures for the EMS database. Although all data must be NEMSIS-compliant, that is a regulation not a performance measure. An example would be 'to maintain the % of all records that are NEMSIS-compliant at the point of submission to the State at 100% from 2015' to evaluate and identify any system-wide issues related to NEMSIS elements. Since records may be submitted with errors related to NEMSIS rules and rejected for correction, this is a viable measure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 322:**
Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of EMS system managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of integration performance measures for the EMS system and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no integration performance measures for the EMS database, the example provided relates to an interface, not integration (data file linkage for analysis). An example would be 'to increase the % of EMS records (with MVC as the call type) that link to crash report records from xx% in 2015 to xx% in 2020.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 323:**
Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of EMS system managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of accessibility performance measures for the EMS system and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no accessibility performance measures for the EMS database. Measuring the % of data requests filled and customer satisfaction may be a way to evaluate data accessibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 324:**
Has the State established numeric goals—performance metrics—for each EMS system performance measure?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide specific numeric goals and related performance measures for each attribute as determined by the State.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State has established some performance measures and metrics (although not provided for this question, they were available elsewhere). Some answers conflict (is the submission goal 72 hours or 10 days?) but metrics are available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 325:
Is there performance reporting for the EMS system that provides specific timeliness, accuracy, and completeness feedback to each submitting entity?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a sample report, list of receiving agencies, and specify frequency of issuance.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Reports are generated annually for each submitting agency that detail completeness and accuracy. Timeliness information is provided to the Nebraska Office of Highway Safety monthly, but not to each submitting agency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Very Important

### Question 326:
Are high frequency errors used to update EMS system training content, data collection manuals, and validation rules?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which high frequency errors are used to update EMS system training content, data collection manuals, and validation rules.

**Assessor conclusions:**
High frequency errors are reported to the State EMS program, but due to staff shortage it is unclear if those errors are incorporated into revision and update processes for EMS training and manuals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Very Important
**Question 327:**
Are quality control reviews conducted to ensure the completeness, accuracy, and uniformity of injury data in the EMS system?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a sample quality control review of injury records that details the system's data completeness.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Comprehensive EMS quality control reviews are conducted regularly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 328:**
Are periodic comparative and trend analyses used to identify unexplained differences in the EMS data across years and agencies?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Describe the analyses, provide a sample record or output, and specify their frequency.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Trend analyses are conducted to evaluate topics and variables of interest. They are also used to identify data discrepancies or issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 329:**
Is data quality feedback from key users regularly communicated to EMS data collectors and data managers?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Describe the process for transmitting and utilizing key users' data quality feedback to inform program changes.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Monthly meetings are held to discuss data collection and the DHHS EMS coordinator receives feedback from collectors, vendor representatives, and the State coordinator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 330:**
Are EMS data quality management reports produced regularly and made available to the State TRCC?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a sample quality management report and specify frequency of transmission to the State TRCC.

**Question Rank:** Somewhat Important

**Assessor conclusions:**
Monthly progress reports and quarterly presentations are produced and shared with the CODES Advisory Committee and the TRCC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 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?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which automated edit checks and validation rules ensure entered data falls within the range of acceptable values and is logically consistent among fields.

**Question Rank:** Very Important

**Assessor conclusions:**
There is a series of programs that ensure the submitted data file conforms to the required format and content, but this only relates to the file structure and layout and not the values entered within fields.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 332:
Is limited state-level correction authority granted to quality control staff working with the statewide emergency department and hospital discharge databases in order to amend obvious errors and omissions without returning the report to the originating entity?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which limited state-level correction authority is granted to quality control staff working with the statewide emergency department and hospital discharge databases.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There is no State-level correction authority because the hospital data is collected by the Nebraska Hospital Association.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 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?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which rejected emergency department and hospital discharge records are returned to the collecting agency and tracked through resubmission to the statewide emergency department and hospital discharge databases.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no processes for returning individual records to the submitting hospital for correction. Typically the only reasons for record re-submission is a change in the billing fields.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 334:
Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of emergency department and hospital discharge database managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of timeliness performance measures for the emergency department and hospital discharge databases and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no timeliness performance measures for the hospital data systems. An example would be 'to increase the % of records received from the NHA by October of the following year from xx in 2015 to xx in 2020.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 335:
Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of emergency department and hospital discharge database managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of accuracy performance measures for the emergency department and hospital discharge databases and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Although there is monthly tracking, there are no accuracy performance measures for the hospital data systems. Performance measures include goals (1 year, 5 year, etc.) against which the interim metrics are evaluated for progress. An example is 'to increase the % of records with accurate E-codes from 69/89% in 2015 to xx% in 2020.' The monthly tracking document should include the clearly stated performance measure/goal with the interim metrics for evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 336:**
Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of emergency department and hospital discharge database managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of completeness performance measures for the emergency department and hospital discharge databases and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no completeness performance measures for the hospital data systems. Performance measures include goals (1 year, 5 year, etc) against which the interim metrics are evaluated for progress. The monthly report tracks the timeliness of submissions and accuracy of N-codes and E-codes, there are no completeness measures. The Annual Report includes a completeness metric for drug poisoning cases (% of records with E-Codes but missing N-Codes). For all cases, an example is 'to increase the % of injury records with an E-Code and an N-Code from xx% in 2015 to xx% in 2020.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 337:**
Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of emergency department and hospital discharge database managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of uniformity performance measures for the emergency department and hospital discharge databases and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no uniformity performance measures for the hospital data systems. Performance measures include goals (1 year, 5 year, etc) against which the interim metrics are evaluated for progress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 338:
Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of emergency department and hospital discharge database managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of integration performance measures for the emergency department and hospital discharge databases and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no integration performance measures for the hospital data systems. Performance measures include goals (1 year, 5 year, etc.) against which the interim metrics are evaluated for progress. An example is 'to increase the % of records with motor vehicle crash-related E-codes that successfully link to police crash reports from xx% in 2015 to xx% in 2020.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 339:
Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of emergency department and hospital discharge database managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of accessibility performance measures for the emergency department and hospital discharge database and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no accessibility performance measures for the hospital data systems. Performance measures include goals (1 year, 5 year, etc.) against which the interim metrics are evaluated for progress. An example is 'to increase the % of data requests successfully filled from xx% in 2015 to xx% in 2020.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 340:
Has the State established numeric goals—performance metrics—for each emergency department and hospital discharge database performance measure?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide specific numeric goals and related performance measures for each attribute as determined by the State.

Assessor conclusions:
There are performance metrics for the hospital data systems but no measures/goals are identified. Performance measures include goals (1 year, 5 year, etc.) against which the interim metrics are evaluated for progress. Those metrics are provided in the quality review reports, but have not been used to develop measures/goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 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?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a sample report, list of receiving agencies, and specify frequency of issuance.

Assessor conclusions:
A member of the Injury Surveillance System staff conducts timeliness and completeness quality reviews monthly. That information is provided to the submitting hospitals quarterly and at TRCC and CODES meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 342:
Are high frequency errors used to update emergency department and hospital discharge database training content, data collection manuals, and validation rules?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which high frequency errors are used to update emergency department and hospital discharge database training content, data collection manuals, and validation rules.

Assessor conclusions:
It is unclear if there are processes for incorporating high frequency errors in manuals and training updates. Data quality reports are provided to the Hospital Association, who then provides training to hospitals, but there’s no evidence that the quality review information is incorporated into that training.

Question Rank: Very Important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 343:
Are quality control reviews conducted to ensure the completeness, accuracy, and uniformity of injury data in the emergency department and hospital discharge databases?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a sample quality control review of injury records that details the system's data completeness.

Assessor conclusions:
A data analyst in the Department of Health and Human Services conducts quality reviews for completeness and uniformity. That information is shared with the submitting hospitals quarterly and annually; the information is also shared with the State at TRCC and CODES meetings.

Question Rank: Somewhat Important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 344:**
Are periodic comparative and trend analyses used to identify unexplained differences in the emergency department and hospital discharge data across years and agencies?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Describe the analyses, provide a sample record or output, and specify their frequency.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State recognizes that periodic trend and comparative analyses are valuable tools. However, they are not currently conducted due to staff shortages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 345:**
Is data quality feedback from key users regularly communicated to emergency department and hospital discharge data collectors and data managers?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Describe the process for transmitting and utilizing key users’ data quality feedback to inform program changes.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The response indicates that feedback is communicated from data managers to users, but the question is asking the reverse. There is discussion at CODES meetings, but it is unclear if feedback from users is communicated to the data managers to inform program changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 346:
Are emergency department and hospital discharge data quality management reports produced regularly and made available to the State TRCC?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a sample quality management report and specify frequency of transmission to the State TRCC.

Assessor conclusions:
Data reports are provided to the CODES Advisory Committee annually and to the TRCC monthly or quarterly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 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?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which automated edit checks and validation rules ensure entered data falls within the range of acceptable values and is logically consistent among fields.

Assessor conclusions:
The trauma registry has edit checks and validation rules that alert the user to an error at the time of submission. One example is ensuring that the date of admission is not prior to the date of injury.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 348:
Is limited state-level correction authority granted to quality control staff working with the statewide trauma registry in order to amend obvious errors and omissions without returning the report to the originating entity?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which limited state-level correction authority is granted to quality control staff working with the statewide trauma registry.

Assessor conclusions:
The respondent states that the State trauma registrar does not have the authority to amend obvious errors or omissions at this time. The case is flagged and a note sent to the facility who entered the case to correct any errors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 349:
Are there formally documented processes for returning rejected data to the collecting entity and tracking resubmission to the statewide trauma registry?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which rejected data is returned to the collecting agency and tracked through resubmission to the statewide trauma registry.

Assessor conclusions:
If an error is identified in a record, its status is changed and the record is returned to the submitting hospital for correction. Its status will change again at the point of re-submission, allowing the State registry staff to track the record throughout the correction process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 350:**
Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of trauma registry managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of timeliness performance measures for the trauma registry and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no timeliness performance measures for the trauma registry; mandated timelines are not performance measures. Performance measures include goals (1 year, 5 year, etc.) against which the interim metrics are evaluated for progress. An example is "to increase the % of records received within 30 days of discharge from xx% in 2015 to xx% in 2020."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>33.3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question 351:**
Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of trauma registry managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of accuracy performance measures for the trauma registry and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There is an extensive quality control process in place that includes RN specialists, the State registrar, and a Trauma Data Quality Assurance group. However, no accuracy performance measures were provided.

| Respondents assigned | 3 | Responses received | 1 | Response rate | 33.3% |
Question 352:
Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of trauma registry managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of completeness performance measures for the trauma registry and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

Assessor conclusions:
While there are processes for returning incomplete reports, there are no completeness performance measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 353:
Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of trauma registry managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of uniformity performance measures for the trauma registry and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

Assessor conclusions:
While all data must be compliant with State and National standards, there are no uniformity performance measures. Performance measures include goals (1 year, 5 year, etc.) against which the interim metrics are evaluated for progress. An example is 'to maintain the % of records compliant with NTDB standards at 100% from 2015 to 2020.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 354:**
Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of trauma registry managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of integration performance measures for the trauma registry and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no integration performance measures for the trauma registry. Performance measures include goals (1 year, 5 year, etc.) against which the interim metrics are evaluated for progress. An example is 'to increase the % of trauma registry records with a motor vehicle crash related E-code that link to a police crash report from xx% in 2015 to xx% in 2020.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 355:**
Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of trauma registry managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of accessibility performance measures for the trauma registry and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Although the data is available internally and to outside agencies, there are no accessibility performance measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 356:**
Has the State established numeric goals—performance metrics—for each trauma registry performance measure?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide specific numeric goals and related performance measures for each attribute as determined by the State.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are no performance measures or associated metrics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 357:**
Is there performance reporting for the trauma registry that provides specific timeliness, accuracy, and completeness feedback to each submitting entity?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a sample report, list of receiving agencies, and specify frequency of issuance.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There is performance reporting for accuracy and completeness at the point of the monthly data submissions. Excel files are generated with errors and sent back to the trauma centers for correction. Centers using Image Trend software may receive feedback through verbal or written means, but each center is made aware of data errors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 358:
Are high frequency errors used to update trauma registry training content, data collection manuals, and validation rules?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which high frequency errors are used to update trauma registry training content, data collection manuals, and validation rules.

**Assessor conclusions:**
High frequency errors are identified through discussions with former regional registrars and the RN trauma specialists. The issues are then presented to the chairperson at Data Quality Assurance Committee meetings, added to the agenda, and proposed resolutions are voted on by the committee. If approved, those changes are incorporated into documentation and training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:**
Very Important

---

### Question 359:
Are quality control reviews conducted to ensure the completeness, accuracy, and uniformity of injury data in the trauma registry?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a sample quality control review of injury records that details the system's data completeness.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Quality control reviews are conducted to ensure completeness, accuracy and uniformity of trauma registry data. The data quality rules were attached as documentary evidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:**
Somewhat Important
**Question 360:**
Are periodic comparative and trend analyses used to identify unexplained differences in the trauma registry data across years and agencies?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Describe the analyses, provide a sample record or output, and specify their frequency.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Periodic trend analyses are conducted to identify differences across agencies or years, such as examining AIS scores within the trauma registry. It is unclear how often analyses are conducted and presented to the Data Quality Assurance Committee.

**Question Rank:**
Less Important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 361:**
Is data quality feedback from key users regularly communicated to trauma registry data collectors and data managers?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Describe the process for transmitting and utilizing key users’ data quality feedback to inform program changes.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Data quality feedback is regularly discussed and shared with collectors and managers at the Trauma data QA Committee meetings. Trauma data collectors and managers are also provide suggestions for ways to fix or improve data quality.

**Question Rank:**
Somewhat Important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 362:**
Are trauma registry data quality management reports produced regularly and made available to the State TRCC?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a sample quality management report and specify frequency of transmission to the State TRCC.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Data quality reports are produced regularly, but only provided to the TRCC upon request. It would be helpful for a TRCC coordinator to indicate the frequency they are requested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 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?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which automated edit checks and validation rules ensure entered data falls within the range of acceptable values and is logically consistent among fields.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Information was not available from the data custodian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 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?

**Standard of Evidence:**

Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which limited state-level correction authority is granted to quality control staff working with vital records.

**Assessor conclusions:**

It was reported that 'obvious errors can be corrected by vital records staff within one year of the date of death' but it is unclear what constitutes such an error or any other policies governing the use of the State correction authority.

**Question 365:**

Are there formally documented processes for returning rejected data to the collecting entity and tracking resubmission to vital records?

**Standard of Evidence:**

Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which rejected data is returned to the collecting agency and tracked through resubmission to vital records.

**Assessor conclusions:**

There is a formal process for rejecting data to the collectors, but no further information was available.
Question 366:
Are there timeliness performance measures tailored to the needs of vital records managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of timeliness performance measures for vital records and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

Question Rank: Very Important

Assessor conclusions:
The following performance measures were implemented after the last Traffic Records Assessment: 1. Number of days from death discharge until data is entered into database 2. Number of days from end of quarter/year until data is available for analysis on a state level. However, these are not complete measures because metrics are missing against which the system may be evaluated. Examples of full measures may be 'to provide 100% of death records within 30 days after the end of each quarter/year by 2020'.

Respondents assigned 4 Responses received 1 Response rate 25%

Question 367:
Are there accuracy performance measures tailored to the needs of vital records managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of accuracy performance measures for vital records and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

Question Rank: Very Important

Assessor conclusions:
The following performance measure was implemented after the last Traffic Records Assessment: 1. % missing found during data audits of critical data elements. However, this is not a complete measure because metrics are missing against which the system may be evaluated. Please provide full measures such as 'to reduce the % of missing values in critical data elements from xx% in 2015 to xx% in 2020'.

Respondents assigned 4 Responses received 1 Response rate 25%
**Question 368:**
Are there completeness performance measures tailored to the needs of vital records managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of completeness performance measures for vital records and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Information was not available from the data custodian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Very Important

---

**Question 369:**
Are there uniformity performance measures tailored to the needs of vital records managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of uniformity performance measures for vital records and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Information was not available from the data custodian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Very Important

---

**Question 370:**
Are there integration performance measures tailored to the needs of vital records managers and data users?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a complete list of integration performance measures for vital records and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Information was not available from the data custodian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Very Important
Question 371:
Are there accessibility performance measures tailored to the needs of vital records managers and data users?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a complete list of accessibility performance measures for vital records and explain how these measures are used to inform decision-making.

Assessor conclusions:
It was reported that accessibility is ‘near real-time’ but there are no performance measures for this quality. See page 103 of the Traffic Records Program Assessment Advisory, Sept. 2012 ed. for suggested injury surveillance performance measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 372:
Has the State established numeric goals—performance metrics—for each vital records performance measure?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide specific numeric goals and related performance measures for each attribute as determined by the State.

Assessor conclusions:
There are no performance measures or associated metrics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 373:
Is there performance reporting for vital records that provides specific timeliness, accuracy, and completeness feedback to each submitting entity?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a sample report, list of receiving agencies, and specify frequency of issuance.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The NE respondent states that the Injury Surveillance system does not conduct performance reporting for vital records.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 374:
Are high frequency errors used to update vital records training content, data collection manuals, and validation rules?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide the formal methodology or describe the process by which high frequency errors are used to update vital records training content, data collection manuals, and validation rules.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The response stated that high frequency errors are addressed with the submitting agency if limited to just a few agencies. It is unclear if there are broader processes for incorporating those errors in the revising/updating training materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 375:
Are quality control reviews conducted to ensure the completeness, accuracy, and uniformity of injury data in the vital records?

Standard of Evidence:
Provide a sample quality control review of injury records that details the system's data completeness.

Assessor conclusions:
Quality control reviews of cause of death fields are conducted for completeness and uniformity, but the information provided was a report of frequencies without information related to the data quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Rank: Somewhat Important

Question 376:
Are periodic comparative and trend analyses used to identify unexplained differences in the vital records data across years and agencies?

Standard of Evidence:
Describe the analyses, provide a sample record or output, and specify their frequency.

Assessor conclusions:
The State reported that trend analyses are conducted and a report with annual frequencies of specific elements was provided. However, it was unclear in the report if/how differences across years was identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Rank: Less Important
**Question 377:**
Is data quality feedback from key users regularly communicated to vital records data collectors and data managers?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Describe the process for transmitting and utilizing key users’ data quality feedback to inform program changes.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The NE respondent states that the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) "provides quality feedback within a couple days of sending them data." The respondent, however, did not sufficiently describe the process for transmitting and utilizing data quality feedback to inform program changes or indicate if/how other key users are incorporated into the quality control processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 378:**
Are vital records data quality management reports produced regularly and made available to the State TRCC?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a sample quality management report and specify frequency of transmission to the State TRCC.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Vital records reports have not been submitted to the TRCC since a special analysis several years ago. The Health Data Coordinator should be made aware of the TRCC and its functions. They should also be invited to join the TRCC to represent Vital Records.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Use and Integration

The Data Integration Module relied heavily upon the data collection, assessment and dissemination of Nebraska’s Crash Outcome Data Evaluation System (CODES). CODES is a cooperative product between Nebraska’s Department of Health and Human Services and the Nebraska Office of Highway Safety.

The State has received funding for the operation of CODES since 1998. Established by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), the purpose was to trace injured occupants from the time of their crash all the way through the health care system.

Data reports produced by the CODES group are vital in assisting key decision makers such as state legislators, governmental agencies, research institutions, as well as state and local highway safety and injury prevention programs in matters relative to highway traffic safety.

Responsible for the State’s highway safety initiatives, the Nebraska Office of Highway Safety (NOHS) is an invested partner and co-lead for administering CODES. NOHS is also the gatekeeper of federal highway safety funds for programs of need as identified through data analysis.

Vital in the execution of the State’s traffic safety initiatives and reliant upon the analysis and reporting of integrated data, the Traffic Records Coordinating Committee falls within the NOHS, but depends on CODES for accurate traffic safety information.

The State identifies its decision making as being directly dependent upon data availability. As Nebraska’s Traffic Safety Information System Strategic Plan specifies, the effectiveness of informed decision making requires sound research, programs and policies, and is directly dependent on data availability and quality. Accurate, comprehensive, and standardized data, provided in a timely manner, allows Nebraska to:
- Determine the causes of crashes and their outcomes
- Evaluate strategies for preventing crashes and improving crash outcomes
- Support traffic safety data operations
- Measure progress in reducing crash frequencies and severity
- Update traffic safety policies and laws

Observations:
- The State has a solid foundation with which to grow its data collection, integration and analysis capabilities.
- Currently there are more conversations about integrating data than actual implementation authorizations to do so.
- Responses in the assessment showed ranges of disparity between key decision makers to illustrate either a lack of knowledge, awareness, or cohesion among involved stakeholders of the State’s data capabilities.
- The TRCC plays a key role as designed in supporting the goals and vision of the State’s traffic safety strategic plan.
- The CODES group, although limited by lack of data integration capabilities, performs an outstanding job at working with and sometimes beyond the available resources.
### Question 379:
Do behavioral program managers have access to traffic records data and analytic resources for problem identification, priority setting, and program evaluation?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Identify the data source(s), (crash, roadway, driver, vehicle, citation adjudication, injury surveillance), discuss and provide examples of program specific analysis (e.g., reports, fact sheets, web pages, ad hoc analyses).

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State's behavioral program managers do have access to required traffic records for making informed decisions based on data. The behavioral program managers wisely rely upon the summary of crash data daily during their programs planning and analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 380:
Does the State have a data governance process?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a narrative detailing the State's data governance process, identifying the personnel involved and describing how it supports traffic safety data integration and formal data quality management.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State's data governance process is accomplished through the OCIO. This Office works with each component involved in the collection, analysis and dissemination of data. Quality control is practiced by the efforts of the OCIO to ensure an efficient and effective operation of expenses and services. It is through the efforts of the OCIO working with the TRCC and participating State agencies that data integration, quality management and traffic records equipment are meshed for a more seamless effort for responsible data management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 381:**
Does the State have a formal traffic records system inventory that identifies linkages useful to the State and data access policies?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Provide a copy of the 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.

**Assessor conclusions:**
There are several categories within this Advisory the State has identified as having begun the process of accomplishing. Their efforts appear to be responsibly directed, and therefore increase their potential for successfully implementing a formal practice in use relative to the linkage of useful traffic records system inventory processes. Currently, the process of planning does not meet the requirement of doing.

**Respondents assigned** 1  **Responses received** 1  **Response rate** 100%

**Question 382:**
Does the TRCC promote data integration by aiding in the development of data governance, access, and security policies for integrated data?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Identify, with appropriate citations, the TRCC strategic plan sections that demonstrate the promotion of data integration.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Although the State is actively working to update current systems to allow for the collection of electronic data, the TRCC does not have that capability. There are no processes of combined data systems available for integrated analytical functions. While the TRCC does support the eventual integration of data for governance, access and security policies, it isn't currently available.

**Respondents assigned** 1  **Responses received** 1  **Response rate** 100%
### Question 383:
Is driver data integrated with crash data for specific analytical purposes?

**Standard of Evidence:**

Document an integrative crash-driver link, the linkage variables, and example analysis, and the frequency of linkage. Example analyses could include an assessment of graduated drivers’ license (GDL) law effectiveness or of crash risk associated with motorcycle rider training, licensing, and behavior.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The TRCC recognizes the need to have the ability to have driver data integrated with crash data. The analysis of both data sets is critical but is not currently available. There were no details, plans or documentation made available to show creating the potential for this capability was in process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Very Important

### Question 384:
Is vehicle data integrated with crash data for specific analytical purposes?

**Standard of Evidence:**

Document an integrative crash-vehicle link, the linkage variables, and example analysis, and the frequency of linkage. Example analyses could include crash trends among vehicle types or vehicle weight restriction by road classification.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Currently there are no capabilities for the State to integrate vehicle data with crash data. While the TRCC is aware of the benefit, no active agenda for developing an integrative crash-vehicle linking system for the analysis of multivariate data is planned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Rank:** Very Important
Question 385:
Is roadway data integrated with crash data for specific analytical purposes?

Standard of Evidence:

Document an integrative crash-roadway link, the linkage variables, and example analysis, and the frequency of linkage. Example analyses could include the identification of high crash locations and locations with similar roadway attributes or an assessment of engineering countermeasures' effectiveness.

Assessor conclusions:
While the State's response was that no roadway data was integrated with crash data for specific purposes, the illustration by the CODES group's ability to link data from multiple sources for detailed reports included an example of analysis used in Omaha for enforcement objectives during large events. The "Omaha MVC Incidents" document demonstrates the data linkage capability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 386:
Is citation and adjudication data integrated with crash data for specific analytical purposes?

Standard of Evidence:

Document an integrative crash-citation or adjudication link, the linkage variables, and example analysis, and the frequency of linkage. Example analyses could include an assessment of the relationship between illegal actions and crashes for specific driver subpopulations (e.g., older drivers) or of crash-involved DUI offenders' adjudications.

Assessor conclusions:
Although the TRCC has discussed the need and benefit of linking the citation and adjudication data with crash data, there is no illustrative examples or documentation to show this application capability. The State would benefit from this and the other identified data linkage resources for the purposes of analysis and response and evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 387:**
Is injury surveillance data integrated with crash data for specific analytical purposes?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Document an integrative crash-injury surveillance link, the linkage variables, and example analysis, and the frequency of linkage. Example analyses could include injury outcomes by specific crash type or injuries associated with occupant protection.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The State has the ability to link injury surveillance data with crash data. It has provided evidence in the form of fact sheets which are available to decision makers relative to demonstrating effects for specific scenario analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 388:**
Are there examples of data integration among crash and two or more of the other component systems?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Document an integrative link among crash and multiple data systems, the linkage variables, and example analysis, and the frequency of linkage. Example analyses could include an assessment of the safety impact of differential speed limits for different vehicle types.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Nebraska’s CODES group provided documentation to demonstrate their ability to link / integrate crash data with two or more other component systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 389:**
Is data from traffic records component systems—excluding crash—integrated for specific analytical purposes?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Document an integrative link using at least two traffic record component systems excluding the crash system. Include the systems, their linkage variables, example analysis, and the frequency of linkage. Example analyses could include an assessment of recidivism among specific driver populations.

**Assessor conclusions:**
Data from Nebraska's traffic records component system are integrated with other component data systems to generate analytical reports critical for decision makers in assessing strategic plans for the State.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 390:**
Do decision-makers have access to resources—skilled personnel and user-friendly access tools—for the use and analysis of integrated datasets?

**Standard of Evidence:**
Identify the analytical resources available: personnel, software, or online resources. Specify the decision-makers who have access to these resources.

**Assessor conclusions:**
The range of responses has caused questions as to whether individuals identified as decision-makers do have access to resources for the use and analysis of integrated data, or that they are unaware of having access. By title, each respondent looks to hold positions of authority, so it's vital that there be a consensus on the state of access these and other decisions makers have to information. The TSS provided documentation for sources of information made available to key players in the decision making process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 391:
Does the public have access to resources—skilled personnel and user-friendly access tools—for the use and analysis of integrated datasets?

Standard of Evidence:
Identify the analytical resources available to the public: personnel, software, or online resources. Specify how the public has access to these resources.

Assessor conclusions:
It is noted that once again the disparity among respondents caused concern for reaching a definitive determination. The evidence provided does show that the public has access to the data for the use and analysis of integrated datasets. Although the State is clear that disparate databases are not automatically or seamlessly integrated, separate data sets do have the capability via the CODES group to enmesh the requested data for public consumption.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents assigned</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Rank: Somewhat Important
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**Appendix B**

**National Acronyms and Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AADT</td>
<td>Average Annual Daily Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAMVA</td>
<td>American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASHTO</td>
<td>American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>American College of Surgeons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIS</td>
<td>Abbreviated Injury Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANSI</td>
<td>American National Standards Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATSIP</td>
<td>Association of Transportation Safety Information Professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAC</td>
<td>Blood Alcohol Concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC</td>
<td>Center for Disease Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDIP</td>
<td>NHTSA’s Crash Data Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDLIS</td>
<td>Commercial Driver License Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CODES</td>
<td>Crash Outcome Data Evaluation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDACTS</td>
<td>Data Driven Approaches to Crime and Traffic Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>Department of Homeland Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMV</td>
<td>Department of Motor Vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPPA</td>
<td>Drivers Privacy Protection Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOH</td>
<td>Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOJ</td>
<td>Department of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOT-TRCC</td>
<td>The US DOT Traffic Records Coordinating Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Deputy Regional Administrator (NHTSA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI</td>
<td>Driving Under the Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUIID</td>
<td>Driving Under the Influence of Drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWI</td>
<td>Driving While Intoxicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Emergency Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>Emergency Medical Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARS</td>
<td>Fatality Analysis Reporting System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDEs</td>
<td>Fundamental Data Elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMCSA</td>
<td>Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCS</td>
<td>Glasgow Coma Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDL</td>
<td>Graduated Driver Licensing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GES</td>
<td>General Estimates System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHSA</td>
<td>Governors Highway Safety Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographic Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJXDM</td>
<td>Global Justice XML Data Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS</td>
<td>Global Positioning System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRA</td>
<td>Government Reference Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPAA</td>
<td>Health Information Privacy and Accountability Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPMS</td>
<td>Highway Performance Monitoring System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSP</td>
<td>Highway Safety Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICD-10</td>
<td>International Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB</td>
<td>Institutional Review Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISS</td>
<td>Injury Severity Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIEM</td>
<td>Justice Information Exchange Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEIN</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Information Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MADD</td>
<td>Mothers Against Drunk Driving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCMIS</td>
<td>Motor Carrier Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDRIS</td>
<td>Model Impaired Driving Records Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRE</td>
<td>Model Inventory of Roadway Elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMUCC</td>
<td>Model Minimum Uniform Crash Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPHSIS</td>
<td>National Association for Public Health Statistics and Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCHIP</td>
<td>National Criminal History Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCCHS</td>
<td>National Center for Health Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCIC</td>
<td>National Crime Information Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCSC</td>
<td>National Center for State Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDR</td>
<td>National Driver Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEMSIS</td>
<td>National Emergency Medical Service Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGA</td>
<td>National Governor's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHTSA</td>
<td>National Highway Traffic Safety Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIBRS</td>
<td>National Incident-Based Reporting System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIEM</td>
<td>National Information Exchange Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLETS</td>
<td>National Law Enforcement Telecommunication System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMVTIS</td>
<td>National Motor Vehicle Title Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTDS</td>
<td>National Trauma Data Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAR</td>
<td>Police Accident Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDPS</td>
<td>Problem Driver Pointer System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Property Damage Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PII</td>
<td>Personally Identifiable Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Regional Administrator (NHTSA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDIP</td>
<td>FHWA's Roadway Data Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPM</td>
<td>Regional Program Manager (NHTSA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTS</td>
<td>Revised Trauma Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMS</td>
<td>Records Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPC</td>
<td>Regional Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SaDIP</td>
<td>FMCSA’s Safety Data Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAVE</td>
<td>Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHSP</td>
<td>Strategic Highway Safety Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>Subject Matter Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSOLV</td>
<td>Social Security Online Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRAP</td>
<td>State Traffic Records Assessment Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWISS</td>
<td>Statewide Injury Surveillance System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCD</td>
<td>Traffic Control Devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRA</td>
<td>Traffic Records Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIPRS</td>
<td>Traffic Records Improvement Program Reporting System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCC</td>
<td>Traffic Records Coordinating Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRS</td>
<td>Traffic Records System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCR</td>
<td>Uniform Crime Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIN</td>
<td>Vehicle Identification Number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VMT  Vehicle Miles Traveled
XML  Extensible Markup Language
# State-Specific Acronyms and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AOC</td>
<td>Administrative Office of the Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CODES</td>
<td>Crash Outcome Data Evaluation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMV</td>
<td>Department of Motor Vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPH</td>
<td>Division of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAF</td>
<td>Electronic Accident Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDE</td>
<td>Fundamental Data Elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHI</td>
<td>Integrated Highway Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDOR</td>
<td>Nebraska Department of Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHA</td>
<td>Nebraska Hospital Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOHS</td>
<td>Nebraska Office of Highway Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAVE</td>
<td>Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMS</td>
<td>Traffic Monitoring System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIN</td>
<td>Vehicle Identification Number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>