



## Data Checklist

# ORAL FLUID FIELD SCREENING (OFFS) PROGRAMS

A growing number of states have begun to implement oral fluid field screening (OFFS) programs to combat drug-impaired driving. In addition to aiding law enforcement in impaired driving investigations and creating general deterrence among the public, an important aspect of OFFS programs is the ability to collect and analyze data. Practitioners can use this data to gain a better understanding of the magnitude and characteristics of a jurisdiction's drug-impaired driving problem and make informed decisions about enforcement, policy, and resource allocation.

To assist agencies that are interested in implementing roadside oral fluid screening programs, the [National Alliance to Stop Impaired Driving](#) (NASID) Oral Fluid Working Group developed an implementation checklist that provides guidance on how to navigate this process. Part of this checklist focuses on developing a plan for data collection and program evaluation.

The following supplemental checklist provides stakeholders with a comprehensive list of data points that can be collected as part of that plan. Data collection and analysis should be done consistently to measure year-to-year progress and trends. To aid stakeholders in planning, the data points are categorized by type and the individual/agency most likely to be responsible for collecting and submitting the data is identified.

For states that have multi-agency programs, the following data can be examined at the agency level in addition to being compiled to produce statewide totals. The program authority (State OFFS Coordinator) can utilize the data to evaluate outcomes for the program as a whole while agencies can assess their respective OFFS practices.

# ORAL FLUID FIELD SCREENING (OFFS) PROGRAMS



## General OFFS Program Data

---

### Program Authority (OFFS Coordinator) and Law Enforcement Agencies

During the program planning phase, one agency/individual should be designated as the entity that is responsible for receiving OFFS data from participating law enforcement agencies, analyzing results, and disseminating findings. This State OFFS Coordinator should work with agencies to establish data reporting protocols.

- Date of OFFS program launch
- Number of participating law enforcement agencies
- Number of officers trained to administer OFFS
- Number of OFFS devices in the field  
(can also breakdown by agency for multi-agency programs)
- Number of OFFS trainings offered per year
- Number of new officers who receive OFFS training per year

## Driver Demographics and DUID Data

---

### Law Enforcement Agencies

Within law enforcement agencies, there should be an officer(s) who is designated as the agency OFFS coordinator. They will be responsible for submitting data related to the roadside drug testing program to the State OFFS Coordinator.

- Total number of annual DUID arrests
- Number of DUID arrests per month
- Total number of drivers who submit to OFFS  
If applicable, identify the percentage of drivers who refuse to submit to OFFS
- Number/percentage of drivers who test positive by gender
- Number/percentage of drivers who test positive by age categories
- Number/percentage of drivers who test positive by ethnicity
- Number/percentage of motor vehicle crashes where OFFS was administered to a driver

# ORAL FLUID FIELD SCREENING (OFFS) PROGRAMS



## Oral Fluid Test Data and OFFS Device Data \_\_\_\_\_

### Law Enforcement Agencies (Agency OFFS Coordinator)

For programs that utilize analyzer-based OFFS, this data can be retrieved from the analyzer by doing a data download. These devices have the capability to store thousands of test results.

To determine the extent of testing for each participating law enforcement agency, this data should be examined at the agency level in addition to being compiled for statewide totals.

- Total number of OFFS tests administered per year**  
Separate enforcement tests from training tests
- Number/percentage of tests that yield positive results**
- Number/percentage of tests that yield negative results**
- Number/percentage of tests that are positive for multiple drugs (i.e., polydrug results)**
- Number/percentage of tests that are positive for each drug screened**  
Identify the drug(s) that yield the most positive test results
- Number of OFFS administered by month**
- Number of OFFS administered by day of the week**
- Number of OFFS administered by time of day**  
Each of the above can be further analyzed by positive and negative test results to identify periods when drug-impaired driving occurs with greater frequency as this can inform future enforcement strategies
- Capture any invalid tests and error codes**

# ORAL FLUID FIELD SCREENING (OFFS) PROGRAMS



## Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) Data

---

### State DRE Coordinator and Law Enforcement Agencies

Many of these data points are submitted to state highway safety offices by the State DRE Coordinator; they are also submitted annually to the Drug Evaluation and Classification (DEC) Section of the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

(This data can be examined at both statewide and agency levels.)

- Number of certified DREs in the state
- Number of drug evaluations completed annually
- Number of DRE callouts made by arresting officers in cases where OFFS were administered
- Number of drug evaluations completed in cases where OFFS were administered
- Breakdown of DRE opinions by drug category/categories (i.e., number of opinions where the DRE identified each of the seven drug categories)
- Number/percentage of DRE opinions of poly-drug impairment
- Number/percentage of DRE opinions that align with OFFS results  
Note - the seven drug categories that DREs can identify are not the same as the drugs included in most OFFS panels, although there is significant overlap
- Number/percentage of cases where BAC tests yield positive results
- Average BAC level of drug-impaired drivers

# ORAL FLUID FIELD SCREENING (OFFS) PROGRAMS



## Toxicology Data

---

### State Forensic Laboratories

While laboratories will be the primary source of data, states should determine who will be responsible for reporting toxicology results to the State OFFS Coordinator. In some instances, it may be easier for law enforcement agencies to report this data alongside other OFFS program data as they receive results from the labs.

A possible option to facilitate comparison between OFFS and confirmation results is to add an OFFS section to the Toxicology Analysis Request (TAR) form.



**Total number of drug analysis submissions made to laboratories annually for confirmation testing in DUID cases (for the majority of states, the matrix used for confirmation testing is blood)**



**Number/percentage of confirmation tests that are positive for drugs**



**Breakdown of test results by substance (e.g., drug trend data) – identify number/percentage of positive results for each drug included in confirmation testing**



**Number/percentage of confirmation tests that are positive for alcohol and at least one drug**



**Number/percentage of confirmation tests that are positive for multiple drugs**



**Identify the most common combinations of impairing substances**



**Comparison of OFFS results to confirmation test results**

Number/percentage of DUID cases where screening and confirmation test results align

Number/percentage of cases where OFFS result was positive and laboratory confirmation test was negative

Number/percentage of cases where OFFS result was negative and laboratory confirmation test was positive (should note if the positive result was for a substance not included in OFFS panel and/or differences in cut-off levels)

Potential patterns in cases where screening and confirmation results do not align—an indication of the need for further confirmation testing using broader panels

# ORAL FLUID FIELD SCREENING (OFFS) PROGRAMS



## Crash and Fatality Data

---

### State Highway Safety Office



Annual impaired-driving fatality and serious injury data

Breakdown by category - alcohol-impaired driving, drug-impaired driving, and polysubstance-impaired driving



Monthly fatal and serious injury impaired driving data (by category)



Percentage of fatally-injured drivers that are tested for drugs (compare to alcohol)



Percentage of fatally-injured drivers that test positive for drugs



Percentage of surviving drivers that are tested for drugs (compare to alcohol)



Percentage of surviving drivers that test positive for drugs



Most commonly detected drugs in drivers involved in fatal and serious injury crashes

# ORAL FLUID FIELD SCREENING (OFFS) PROGRAMS



## Key Outcome Measures

---

Ideally, practitioners will be able to collect and analyze the data contained in this checklist to evaluate their state's roadside drug screening program. NASID recommends focusing on both process and outcome measures as part of an evaluation to assess program effectiveness, efficiency, and impact. This can identify ways to strengthen implementation as the program expands and matures. For agencies that need to prioritize program outcomes, the following measures can illustrate the value of implementing an oral fluid screening. Indiana relied on these data points to justify continued administration of their roadside drug screening program and to secure funding for program expansion.

- Number of annual drug-impaired driving fatal and serious injury crashes (decrease)
- Number of annual drug-impaired driving arrests (increase)
- Number of DRE drug evaluations completed annually (increase)
- Number of drug analysis submissions made to laboratories for confirmation testing (increase)
- Number of officers who participate in ARIDE training (increase)

## Supplemental Resources

---

In addition to this checklist, states are encouraged to utilize the [NASID Oral Fluid Resource Guide](#) which includes additional material to aid in the planning and implementation of roadside oral fluid screening programs. NASID is also available upon request to provide education and technical assistance to support agencies as they navigate the process of implementing this important drug-impaired driving countermeasure.

**Disclaimer: These materials are being provided for informational purposes only and do not represent legal guidance. NASID and its members do not accept any responsibility for reliance on these materials and encourage everyone to conduct their own research and diligence.**

# ORAL FLUID FIELD SCREENING (OFFS) PROGRAMS



## Acknowledgements

---

Responsibility.org would like to thank and acknowledge the efforts and support of the National Alliance to Stop Impaired Driving (NASID) Oral Fluid Working Group for compiling these useful resources states can utilize when developing and implementing a roadside oral fluid testing program in their state. The working group was co-chaired by Chuck DeWeese (Responsibility.org consultant) and Erin Holmes (formerly with Abbott Laboratories).

### Working group members included:

#### **Curt E. Harper, Ph.D., F-ABT**

Chief Toxicologist  
Alabama Department of Forensic Sciences

#### **Chris Kirby**

Law Enforcement Liaison  
Indiana Criminal Justice Institute  
Indianapolis, IN

#### **Bill Lindsey**

Deputy Director  
National Computer Forensics Institute (NCFI)  
Hoover, AL

#### **Amy Miles**

Program Project Manager  
National Resource Toxicologist  
Wisconsin State Laboratory of Hygiene  
UW School of Medicine and Public Health

#### **Jake Nelson, MPH, MPP**

Director, Traffic Safety Advocacy & Research  
AAA National // Government Relations & Traffic Safety

#### **Ryan C. Smith, Ph.D.**

Transportation Specialist, Safety Research  
National Transportation Safety Board  
Office of Research and Engineering  
Washington, D.C.

#### **Brian Swift**

Spokesperson  
National Alliance to Stop Impaired Driving (NASID)

### **About Responsibility.org**

Responsibility.org is a national not-for-profit that aims to eliminate drunk driving and work with others to end all impaired driving, eliminate underage drinking, and empower adults to make a lifetime of responsible alcohol choices. Responsibility.org is funded by the following distillers: Bacardi USA, Inc.; Brown-Forman; Campari Group; Constellation Brands; DIAGEO; Edrington, Hotaling & Co.; Mast-Jägermeister US, Inc.; Moët Hennessy USA; Ole Smoky, LLC; Pernod Ricard USA; Suntory Global Spirits; and William Grant & Sons. For more than 30 years, Responsibility.org has transformed countless lives through programs that bring individuals, families, and communities together to inspire a lifetime of responsible alcohol choices. To learn more, please visit [www.Responsibility.org](http://www.Responsibility.org).

### **About NASID**

The National Alliance to Stop Impaired Driving is a coalition established and led by Responsibility.org to eliminate all forms of impaired driving, especially multiple substance impaired driving, through effective and proven measures such as DUI system reform, DUI detection, and improved use of data and technology. To learn more visit [NASID.org](http://NASID.org).