Introduction

In 2013, the Traffic Injury Research Foundation (TIRF) developed the Driving While Impaired (DWI) Dashboard in conjunction with the DWI Working Group on System Improvements. The Dashboard is a monitoring tool to help states gauge the strengths and weaknesses of their own impaired driving system. It was created based on experiences and input from eight states and critically reviewed by the Working Group. This tool measures factors that are central to the effectiveness of the impaired driving system. It provides jurisdictions with insight and understanding of how and why progress is, or is not, being achieved in reducing impaired driving incidents. It can also inform decision-makers about strategies to address system gaps that impede progress. The DWI Dashboard consists of a two-tiered structure of questions. Tier I measures issues at a state level and aims to determine whether an issue is a potential gap that requires closer examination. Tier II measures issues at an agency level and acknowledges differences across agencies with respect to a particular topic. Collectively, the results of the Dashboard can identify potential gaps as well as where and why they may be occurring.

In 2014, the annual meeting of the DWI Working Group focused its attention on the development of a strategic guide to help states tackle priority issues that were identified by the DWI Dashboard. This guide was compiled by TIRF based upon the proceedings of the 11th Annual Meeting of the DWI Working Group. The purpose of this guide is to provide strategies, describe important caveats, and list helpful resources and templates to states that are seeking to address existing gaps in the impaired driving system. The guide is structured in nine sections according to the priority issues that are examined in the Dashboard tool. The guide is intended to provide options to states to improve their systems since each state will have issues that are unique to its own jurisdiction. This guide lists best practices, major caveats, and resources that practitioners may find useful to guide the implementation of solutions. Ultimately, it is important for practitioners to use their own intimate knowledge of the impaired driving system in their jurisdiction to determine which strategies can be enacted and which caveats may be encountered.

1. The abbreviation DWI (driving while intoxicated or impaired) is used throughout this report as a convenient descriptive label, even though some states use other terms such as OUI (operating under the influence) or DUI (driving under the influence), and in some states they refer to different levels of severity of the offense. We have used DWI not only to maintain consistency throughout the report but also because it is more descriptive of the offense usually associated with drunk drivers.
Goals and methods

The goal of this work was to enable jurisdictions to gain insight and understanding into how and why progress is, or is not, being achieved in reducing impaired driving in their individual jurisdictions, and to inform decision-making about strategies to address the problem. This was achieved with the development of a dashboard tool that jurisdictions can use biennially (every two years) or annually to monitor their own progress in preventing and reducing impaired driving.

The tool was created using a broad model that was based on existing research, expertise and practice relating to the wide array of factors that can, to varying extents, influence progress in reducing impaired driving. It included traditional measures of impaired driving, the presence, characteristics and quality of proven countermeasures, and a diversity of both environmental and contextual measures. This model was then applied in eight jurisdictions (Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, New York, Oklahoma, Utah, Washington, and West Virginia) that were selected because they had made either a lot or very little progress to reduce impaired driving in the past five years.

Each jurisdiction participated in the data collection process by sharing state data and reports, participating in phone interviews with key representatives of the DWI system, and a focus group involving a broad cross-section of stakeholders. These data were synthesized to create the DWI Dashboard. It contains a select number of the most relevant indicators of progress and is based upon input and feedback from experienced practitioners in the eight states and then reviewed by the DWI Working Group at their annual meeting in Phoenix, Arizona (November 2013) along with representatives of the Highway Safety Office in the eight states.

Using the Dashboard

The tool was initially developed in a paper-format and later loaded in an online software to automate it. This has greatly facilitated the ease of use and the ongoing application of the Dashboard by jurisdictions despite changing staff and enhancements to countermeasures. It also makes possible more precise comparisons of progress across jurisdictions in relation to individual facets of the DWI system and enables jurisdictions to better understand how and why some countermeasures are working better in other jurisdictions. Finally, such automation creates an easy point of reference for jurisdictions at any given time and enables them to review their progress over a period of years to examine trends.

Why should jurisdictions use the DWI Dashboard?

The use of the Dashboard underscores the importance of concerted and coordinated efforts on the part of political leaders, government officials across different systems, external stakeholders and grassroots organizations. Partnerships and coordination across people, organizations and systems play a fundamental role in achieving progress, and represent the next important step toward reducing impaired driving. One of the most important benefits that this tool can offer is the opportunity to build much-needed relationships with non-traditional partners whose activities can influence impaired driving, and whose input is essential to gain a complete picture of impaired driving in a given jurisdiction. The use of the Dashboard also makes it possible to identify critical but subtle gaps in DWI system processes. Moreover, the Dashboard can help to identify potential gaps before they fully emerge and help jurisdictions anticipate what strategies may be needed in the long-term to avoid such problems.

Who can use the DWI Dashboard?

The DWI Dashboard can be used by DWI task forces or committees, highway safety offices, criminal justice practitioners, treatment professionals, and licensing agencies. The outcomes of the tool can help all these practitioners develop priorities, strategies and activities across the DWI system and at an agency level. Ideally, the Chair of a state DWI Task Force or Committee, in cooperation with the Impaired Driving Coordinator of the State Highway Safety Office, is best positioned to lead and coordinate the use of the Dashboard. Such leaders can identify the individuals who are best able to complete applicable sections of the Dashboard. It is important to note that some components of the Dashboard can be most easily

2. The complete model developed as a foundation for the DWI Dashboard can be accessed in the full report at www.dwiwg.tirf.ca.
and efficiently applied by individual agencies within the DWI system. In relation to some sections (e.g., countermeasures, data collection, environmental conditions) it may be practical to have more than one individual complete questions. Ultimately, using this approach enables jurisdictions to maximize the accuracy and efficiency of data collection while minimizing the workload associated with doing so. There are also a range of other government staff who, while not directly implicated in impaired driving issues, may be able to provide guidance and insight into government practices and processes that are relevant to the application of the Dashboard.

**When should the DWI Dashboard be used?**

The DWI Dashboard was designed to be applied biennially, annually, or on a continuous basis in accordance with the individual needs of jurisdictions. For some jurisdictions, progress in reducing impaired driving has been nominal or non-existent for several years despite their best efforts. Among them, there may be a more pressing urgency to find tangible solutions to reverse this trend in the near-term. Jurisdictions are encouraged to consider at the outset the most appropriate timing to use the Dashboard. As familiarity with the tool increases, or as situations change, the Dashboard can be adapted to use on a more continuous basis to help monitor progress and inform decision-making.

**How is the DWI Dashboard structured?**

The DWI Dashboard is based upon a two-tiered structure of questions. The first tier represents more general state-level measures that are designed merely to gauge whether an issue requires closer examination. For example, it seeks to determine whether education/training and or resources have generally declined throughout the DWI system in the past few years, or whether there is limited data automation across the DWI system. It is not intended to capture distinctions across specific agencies in relation to a specific topic (e.g., training, data collection, resources). The second tier represents agency-level measures that acknowledge differences across agencies with respect to a particular topic. The objective of Tier 2 questions is to determine where in the DWI system and why a gap is occurring. This structure enables jurisdictions to first identify whether there are general gaps in the DWI system associated with fundamental issues related to the delivery of DWI countermeasures that require further investigation. Based on this general identification, jurisdictions can then better pinpoint where and why these issues are occurring, as well as evaluate which issues are more practical and feasible to tackle (e.g., training for law enforcement, lack of court automation, public attitudes towards impaired driving in rural areas).

There are different groups of stakeholders who may be able to provide useful information to complete the tool, including:

- highway safety offices;
- law enforcement agencies;
- prosecution;
- courts;
- correctional and community supervision services;
- assessment and treatment;
- grassroots/advocacy organizations; and,
- driver licensing agencies.

**What does the DWI Dashboard contain?**

The Dashboard measures factors pertaining to the current state of DWI countermeasures or practices along with barriers or gaps that exist. These measures are related to the following issues:

1. Traditional indicators of impaired driving such as fatalities, injuries, arrests and convictions in the past three years.
2. Leadership by governments, politicians and agencies.
3. Resources allocated to DWI initiatives including funding, staffing, training and equipment.
4. Data collected regarding DWI and its availability, accessibility and use to inform decision-making.
5. Communication and information-sharing within and across agencies and practitioners to share and exchange knowledge, information and experience.
6. Practitioner education, training, experience and staff turnover.
7. DWI countermeasures in terms of use, quality
8. Education and prevention efforts for the general public and for young persons aged 20 and younger combined with prevailing local attitudes in urban and rural areas.

9. Environmental and contextual issues pertaining to the presence and enforcement of alcohol ordinances, the role of rural jurisdictions in DWI initiatives, discussions and partnerships with tribal entities on DWI issues, and the availability of alternative transportation options across the jurisdiction.

10. Total costs to DWI offenders in terms of programmatic and licensing fees and costs, recent trends in relation to costs, and the extent to which offenders are able to complete the re-licensing process.

**Strategic guides for jurisdictions**

To complement the automated Dashboard, TIRF and the DWI Working Group also created two strategic guides to help jurisdictions tackle gaps in each of the areas identified by the Dashboard. The first guide is focused on strategies to improve the DWI system. It is organized according to nine of the ten sections in the Dashboard, and each section is associated with distinct options, tools and resources that jurisdictions may consider as part of a strategic plan to strengthen their state impaired driving system in the respective areas. The nine sections are structured according to the types of strategies that may be considered to strengthen a particular area, important caveats that may influence the strategies, and examples of practical resources that provide more operational guidance and information.

A second community supervision strategic guide was designed for criminal justice professionals to increase knowledge and understanding of common community services that may be available to DWI offenders, and ways that these services can be leveraged to help mitigate the risks of re-offending and criminogenic needs; those behaviors, attitudes and issues that contribute to aberrant behavior. The Community Supervision guide describes:

- supervision services;
- substance abuse and mental health services;
- vocational/educational programs;
- employment services;
- housing services; and,
- transportation services.

Each of these services can help support and assist DWI offenders to be compliant with sanctions and supervision, and promote the development of pro-social skills. Each service is described in terms of ways that the service can assist DWI offenders; challenges and caveats to forming partnerships with these service agencies; and, practical strategies to help criminal justice agencies work with local agencies to enhance services to support DWI offenders.

**Technical assistance for jurisdictions**

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) has a cooperative agreement with the Traffic Injury Research Foundation (TIRF; www.tirf.ca) to provide technical assistance to requesting states in order to enhance the implementation and delivery of impaired driving countermeasures.

From 2009 to 2017, TIRF delivered technical assistance and training for alcohol ignition interlock programs in more than 30 states. In 2017, the cooperative agreement was expanded to encompass technical assistance related to a continuum of impaired driving countermeasures such as public education, high-visibility enforcement, or post-conviction programs.

Technical assistance is guided by the DWI Dashboard, a tool designed by TIRF and the DWI Working Group with input from states. The Dashboard is used to identify system strengths, areas where improvements are needed and ways they can be achieved. The process adopted to deliver assistance in each jurisdiction is based on their priorities and capacity with much of the work being undertaken by TIRF staff. The opportunity to receive technical assistance is available to all states and regions upon request.

**Traffic Injury Research Foundation**

TIRF is a national, independent, charitable road safety research institute that studies road user behaviours. Visit www.tirf.ca or call (877) 238-5235
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