

REPORT OF THE DIVISION OF RACIAL JUSTICE STATISTICS STATE OF VERMONT OFFICE OF RACIAL EQUITY

Tiffany North-Reid, Division Manager
Xusana R. Davis, Executive Director

January 2025

2024 Annual Report on Systemic Racial Disparities in the Justice System: Insights, Progress, and Strategic Recommendations of the Division of Racial Justice Statistics

Date: January 15, 2025 – Updated and resubmitted January 30, 2025
Authors: Tiffany North-Reid, MPH, Laura Carter, MLIS, Anthony Jackson-Miller, Xusana Davis, JD
Agency: Division of Racial Justice Statistics (DRJS), Office of Racial Equity (ORE), Agency of Administration (AOA)

Division Mandate

Act 142 of 2022 establishes the Division for Racial Justice Statistics (DRJS) and mandates our collection, analysis, and dissemination of data on racial disparities in Vermont’s justice system. [Title 3, Chapter 68](#) of the Vermont Statutes requires that the Division monitor and report on the impact of racial bias across law enforcement, the judicial system, and other sectors, with the aim of supporting policy reform and enhancing equity. Accordingly, this Annual Report provides: A) Findings on systemic racial bias and disparities in the justice system in Vermont, B) Progress update on addressing findings of disparities in the justice system, and C) Data-focused recommendations.

I. Findings on Systemic Racial Bias and Disparities in the Justice System

This year, we analyzed systemic racial bias and disparities in Vermont's justice system, drawing data from the Vermont Criminal Justice Council (VCJC), Department of Corrections (DOC), and the Agency of Education (AOE), as well as reviewing reports from other State and partner agencies. Our findings indicate that individuals identified as Black and/or Hispanic, continue to experience significant over-policing, disproportionate sentencing lengths, and more exclusionary school discipline practices when considering overall demographics of the state. **However, we recognize the challenges associated with analyzing publicly available data and we are planning reanalysis with de-identified data sets over the next year. In addition, we will make analyses available on our website over the next few months, including details on missing data and suppressed data.** We will also continue to identify any additional datasets that might indicate disparities in the justice system as well as factors that reflect broader systemic inequities that increase the likelihood of involvement in the justice system, including any upstream drivers or school-to-prison pipeline dynamics that could be at play. We also hope to conduct higher-level analyses beyond general descriptive statistics with access to more complete data. See also the [2025 report of the Racial Justice Statistics Advisory Council](#) (RJSAC), which provides guidance to the Division.

A. Traffic Stop Data for Municipal and Sheriffs Departments

- a. **Data Source:** [Vermont Criminal Justice Council \(VCJC\)](#)
- b. **Summary of Findings:** We analyzed 66,955 traffic stop outcomes from Vermont police departments for the year 2023, highlighting racial and gender disparities in ticketing, warnings, arrests, and warrants. The types of stops included moving violations (79%), vehicle equipment (17%), "Other" (3%), externally generated (1%), investigatory (1%), and suspicion of DUI (<1%).

- i. The Rutland County Sheriff's Department issued the most tickets (1,225) and warnings (1,521), followed by the Bennington Police Department with 1,219 tickets and 1,397 warnings.
 - ii. The Manchester Police Department had the highest number of arrests for violations (69), while the Barre City Police Department issued the most arrest warrants (51).
 - iii. The Addison County Sheriff's Office had the highest ticket-to-warning ratio (1.27), whereas the Barre City Police Department had the lowest (0.19).
 - iv. Moving violations accounted for 62% of tickets, while vehicle equipment violations were responsible for 51% of the warnings issued.
 - v. Overall, males as a group were ticketed 41% more often than females (51% vs. 36%).
 - vi. Black males were ticketed at a rate of 58%, compared to 39% for White males.
 - vii. White females received warnings instead of tickets 62% of the time, compared to 42% for Black females.
 - viii. Young adults (18-30 years old) were ticketed 27% more often than older individuals.
 - ix. For the 305 stops that involved contraband or evidence of a crime, 41% resulted in tickets, 29% in warnings, 27% in arrests for violations, 2% in arrests on warrants, and less than 1% resulted in no action taken. While acknowledging significant limitations of these data, the Division remains concerned that racial and gender disparities may persist.
- c. Further Investigation Needed:** To better understand the contributing factors, additional analysis is required to determine whether the higher frequency of stops in certain areas is related to crime rates, proximity to New York or Canada (areas with higher traffic bypasses), or population size. While the dataset includes location information, further data cleaning is necessary to extract geographic details for more precise analysis. One key area for exploration is the comparison of drug-related findings in Rutland, Bennington, and Manchester—towns that border New York State—versus other areas. We aim to assess the factors that contribute to these differences.

B. Vermont State Police (VSP) Traffic Stops

- a. Summary of Findings:** Our analysis of 2023 Vermont State Police traffic stop data, which includes 19,926 total stops, reveals potential disparities in ticket issuance and stop outcomes based on race and license plate type. The types of stops included moving violations (76%), vehicle equipment (22%), "Other" (1%), investigatory (1%), suspicion of DUI (152, <1%) and externally generated (<1%).
 - i. In-state license plate stops represented 74%, followed by Massachusetts (5%), New York (5%), and New Hampshire (4%) license plates.
 - ii. In-state plates were ticketed 30.7% of the time, while out-of-state plates were ticketed 16.4%.
 - iii. Black and Hispanic motorists with in-state plates faced the highest ticketing rates at 51% and 50.2%, respectively, compared to 37% for White motorists.
 - iv. Black motorists also appear to be subjected to searches more frequently than other racial groups, with a significantly higher "hit rate" for contraband found

during these searches. However, due to significant missing data, these numbers may not reflect the full picture.

- b. **Further Investigation Needed:** These disparities persist even for Out-of-State plates, where Black and Hispanic motorists are still ticketed at higher rates compared to White motorists. The findings suggest systemic biases, especially in the enforcement of traffic stops for In-State plates. Further analysis of the geographic locations of stops is necessary, as well as differences in the number of hours allocated to traffic enforcement in any given day. Future analyses will also focus on gathering information about the pretext for the stops—whether they were moving violations, investigatory stops, or based on the type of offense for which tickets were issued.

C. Corrections: Legal Status

- a. **Data Source: Department of Corrections**
- b. **Summary of Findings:** We analyzed 1,119,615 offender records from 2024, focusing on racial disparities in bond/bail amounts, sentence lengths, and legal statuses. Based on the data available and after considering missing data, we identified key findings, although their significance cannot be fully determined due to data limitations.
 - i. Black individuals face higher bond amounts than White individuals, with an average bond of \$15,000 compared to \$8,500 for White offenders.
 - ii. Additionally, 34% of Black defendants are sentenced to jail time, significantly higher than the 23% noted for White defendants.
 - iii. Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander individuals receive the longest average sentence lengths at 24.5 months, compared to 18.2 months for White individuals.
 - iv. Regression analysis indicates that race is a significant predictor of both bond amounts and sentence lengths, with a moderate predictive accuracy of 0.72.
- c. **Further Investigation Needed:** Given the limitations in the available data, further investigation is necessary to more accurately assess the underlying causes of racial disparities in the criminal justice system. Future research should aim to incorporate more comprehensive data, including factors such as socio-economic status, prior criminal history, and geographic location, to better understand the complexities of bond amounts, sentencing, and legal outcomes. Moreover, additional qualitative data could provide insights into systemic biases within the decision-making processes that may contribute to these disparities. Further analysis will be essential in confirming the extent of these disparities and developing strategies to address them.

D. Exclusionary Discipline (Student Exclusion Data)

- a. **Data Source: Agency of Education**
- b. **Summary of Findings:** We analyzed exclusionary discipline records from Vermont schools (2018-2021), focusing on racial, gender, and support services disparities in incidents like suspensions and expulsions. The data highlighted trends across various offense categories, including alcohol use, assault, fighting, and drug offenses, revealing potential disparities. However, given significant missing and suppressed data we cannot make any firm conclusions.¹

¹ The Agency of Education outlines on their website that data with asterisks (suppressed data) is to protect student privacy when there are less than 11 students represented. More information about AOE data collection and reporting can be found [here](#).

- i. By race/ethnicity, White students accounted for 83.4% of all incidents, with a particular concentration in School Conduct Violations, Fighting, and Drug offenses. Black students represented 5% of incidents and were notably overrepresented in Assault and Fighting incidents during 2018-2019. Hispanic students, making up 1.2% of incidents, were most commonly involved in Fighting. Other racial and ethnic groups, including Asian and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students, showed minimal representation in some categories.
 - ii. By gender², male students dominated high-incidence categories like Assault/Battery (88.4%), Bullying (78%), and Fighting. Female students accounted for a significant proportion of Danger to Self/Others incidents (33.33%) and Bullying (21.9%).
 - iii. Interestingly, students without support services represented 65% of Tobacco-related incidents and 49.7% of School Conduct Violations, while those with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) made up 39.6% of Threat/Intimidation incidents. Students with 504 Plans and Educational Support Teams accounted for less than 6% and 9%, respectively, with the highest proportion of the latter in Threat/Intimidation incidents (10.5%).
- c. Further Investigation Needed:** Differences in incidents by race were evident, with Black students overrepresented in Assault/Battery and Fighting, and White students in School Conduct Violations and Drug offenses. The decline in incidents from 2019 to 2021 likely reflects pandemic-related disruptions, but data from 2022-2024 could clarify whether this is a temporary trend or part of a broader, long-term shift. Further analysis is necessary to assess whether these disparities reflect overrepresentation relative to the overall student population. Additionally, the current practice of documenting each incident separately—even if involving the same student—could skew the data, as one student may account for multiple incidents. Further exploration is also needed to determine whether certain schools have a higher concentration of incidents that contribute to these disparities. Comprehensive student population data are crucial for evaluating whether these figures reflect overrepresentation in specific schools. There is also significant missing data due to the suppression of records from schools with very low incident numbers, and if this suppression affects many schools, it could indicate a larger, systemic issue that warrants attention.

E. Methodology

- a. **Data Sources:** The data for all four analyses—Traffic Stop Data for Local Police Departments, Vermont State Police Traffic Stops, Correctional-Legal Status, and Exclusionary Discipline—were provided in Excel spreadsheets and analyzed using Python in a Jupyter Notebook environment (Python Kernel 3).
- b. **Analytical Methods:** For the traffic stop and exclusionary discipline analyses, descriptive statistics (mean, percentage, and cross-tabulation) and correlation tests were used to assess disparities by race, gender, age, and incident type. Regression models and Chi-Square tests were applied in the correctional-legal status analysis to assess relationships between race and sentencing outcomes. Visualizations such as heatmaps, bar charts, and

² The Office of Racial Equity acknowledges that the data categories/labels provided do not accurately capture the difference between gender and sex.

regression models were also generated to enhance interpretation. However, given data limitations, our analytical methods were severely limited, and firm conclusions cannot be made at this time.

- c. **Limitations:** The data used in this analysis are public use files, so access to more granular, de-identified data (e.g., officer identity or individual school student body compositions) was not possible. Additionally, an individual may be represented multiple times in this data. Missing or incomplete data in certain areas could impact the accuracy of findings. Further investigation with more detailed data is necessary to draw definitive conclusions.

Recommendations and Next Steps

Our initial analyses of publicly available traffic stop data, corrections data, and school exclusionary discipline data reveal potential disproportionalities, particularly when considering Vermont’s overall demographics: 89.1% White, 1.3% Black, 1.8% Asian, 2.4% Hispanic, 0.7% Native American/Other, and 4.6% Multiracial. While these findings are based on the data at hand, we note that they may be influenced by factors such as data cleaning practices, the handling of missing data, and the use of de-identified datasets, which may limit our ability to fully capture individual-level patterns. Moving forward, we plan to conduct a more comprehensive re-analysis in collaboration with key data stakeholders to enhance the accuracy and depth of our findings. This collaboration will allow us to address potential gaps in the data, including identifying officer-specific patterns and examining recurring behaviors, such as repeat offenders or cyclical patterns within the justice system.

To address these issues and ensure an equitable and fair system, we propose the following actions:

1. Collaborative Analysis and Reporting:

To refine and expand upon these initial findings, we will work closely with data providers from local police departments, the Vermont State Police, the Department of Corrections, and the Agency of Education, and other stakeholder agencies. Collaborating with these stakeholders will allow us to access additional data, including officer-specific patterns and individual-level data that may not have been available in the de-identified dataset, as well as better understanding the context regarding any nuances in data collection practices. This will enable a more distinct understanding of disparities and help identify systemic issues that may be overlooked in aggregate data. By additionally integrating feedback from affected communities and equity organizations, we can further ensure that the findings accurately reflect the lived experiences of individuals impacted by these systems.

2. Enhance Data Collection:

A critical next step is refining our data collection processes to ensure completeness and consistency, particularly regarding race, gender, age, and incident type across traffic stops, corrections, and school discipline. Since the initial analysis was based on de-identified data, obtaining more detailed individual-level data will allow us to identify patterns such as repeat offenses, officer behaviors, and regional or systemic trends. This will improve our ability to assess disparities more comprehensively and accurately. For traffic stops, integrating real-time GPS data, along with consistent reporting on the reason for the stop and search outcomes, will enhance precision. In corrections, capturing data on prior encounters, recidivism, and sentence details disaggregated by race, ethnicity, and gender will improve tracking of systemic patterns. We might

also recommend making certain data fields, such as parental status, mandatory during intake to better understand broader social impacts. For school exclusionary discipline, it is essential to document the behavior leading to disciplinary actions, as well as contextual factors such as socio-economic status, special education needs, and race/ethnicity, to ensure a more complete and equitable analysis.

3. Prioritize Implicit Bias Training and Standardized Guidelines:

Implicit bias training should be prioritized for law enforcement, correctional staff, school administrators, and other decision-makers. Many of these professionals already are required to receive some form of implicit bias training but dismiss it as irrelevant to their work or as a burdensome chore not to be taken seriously. Given the disparities observed in ticketing, sentencing, and school discipline, this training is important to address how biases may influence decisions at various stages. As we gain access to more detailed data, we will analyze decision-making patterns, including practices regarding punitive measures that disproportionately affect certain demographics. This will help identify areas where bias may impact outcomes, enabling us to tailor training to address these specific issues. Additionally, establishing clear rubrics for specific offenses in traffic stops, corrections, and school discipline can help standardize responses, ensuring decisions are based on objective criteria rather than subjective perceptions, thereby reducing discriminatory actions.

4. Explore Restorative Practices and Restorative Justice:

Restorative Practice attempts to improve relationships and prevent conflict, while Restorative Justice focuses on repairing harm after it occurs. Restorative Justice is under the umbrella of Restorative Processes. An alternative to these approaches is a prevention model, which aims to avoid the harm entirely through individual and community supports, rather than restorative models that seek to address harm after it has occurred. To reduce exclusionary practices and address disparities, institutions can explore implementing restorative practices across traffic enforcement, corrections, and schools, and potentially other institutional settings. For traffic stops, community-based approaches to minor infractions could help prevent the criminalization of specific groups and reduce repeat offenses. In corrections, restorative practices could extend to the incarcerated population over current punitive methods, which disproportionately impact marginalized communities. In schools, shifting away from suspensions and expulsions – especially for underrepresented students and students of color—and adopting restorative practices that focus on reconciliation, support, and inclusion could help break cycles of exclusion and foster more positive outcomes. By focusing on repairing relationships and building a sense of belonging, schools can create environments where all students thrive. As an example, Chittenden County has access to programs such as Street Outreach and Community Outreach. Burlington Police Department runs CAIP (Crisis, Advocacy, and Intervention Programs) and within CAIP there are CSLs (Community Support Liaisons) and CARES (Crisis, Assessment, Responses, and Engagement) Clinicians. These programs are highly successful and should be early steps in the response to harm or mental health issues before law enforcement involvement commences. By implementing restorative approaches across various areas, institutions can create opportunities for inclusion, accountability and support, particularly for individuals from marginalized backgrounds.

5. Inform Institutional Practices and Policies by Applying an Equity Lens to Traffic Stops, Corrections, and School Discipline:

The Office of Racial Equity can collaborate with stakeholders to review and reform practices related to traffic stops, sentencing, bail, and school discipline to address racial disparities, applying an equity lens to ensure these systems do not disproportionately impact individuals based on race, gender, or socioeconomic status. In traffic stops, we can work with law enforcement agencies to evaluate and refine stop procedures, ensuring outcomes are not influenced by bias, reviewing how minor infractions are handled, and exploring community-based alternatives to prevent the criminalization of certain groups and reduce repeat offenses. In corrections, we will collaborate on reviewing sentencing and bail policies, particularly bond amounts and sentence lengths, with the goal of reducing disproportionate impacts on communities of color. We will also promote alternatives to incarceration, such as diversion programs, for non-violent offenders. While the courts set sentencing and bail decisions, Department of Corrections is responsible for enforcing them. The Department of Corrections (DOC) has adopted a version of the Office's impact assessment tool to review internal policies. Additionally, geriatric parole could be considered as part of this effort. In schools, we can support efforts to reduce exclusionary discipline practices, particularly for students of color, by exploring alternatives to suspensions and expulsions and shifting toward strategies that focus on reconciliation, inclusion, and support. By working with relevant institutions, we can help inform and support policies that promote fairness and equity, ultimately leading to more just outcomes across these systems.

6. Increase Transparency:

Increasing transparency in traffic stop practices, corrections policies, and school discipline procedures is crucial for addressing disparities. We will explore opportunities to collaborate with data sources to ensure that datasets, including officer role or shift data, correctional data, and school disciplinary records, are regularly updated and publicly available. Transparency is key to building public trust and identifying emerging disparities. Regular audits and public reporting can help detect misconduct, biases, and patterns, enabling prompt corrective actions. For traffic stops, this could include publishing aggregated stop-and-search data to reveal enforcement patterns. In addition, body-worn cameras (BWCs) may be useful tools. While almost all police departments in Vermont are equipped with BWCs, it is unclear whether all municipal police use them. Although many departments have BWCs, their use is not mandatory, and some agencies either lack the budget or have other reasons for not utilizing them. However, BWCs are not a panacea—they capture only one perspective, and what is seen on camera may differ from how individuals perceive or engage in a situation. Rather than focusing solely on BWCs, we would be more interested in comparing body camera footage with officer reports and evaluating how often the two align or misalign. In corrections, transparency may involve reporting outcomes by demographic group and tracking the use of solitary confinement or other punitive measures. DOC may also be in the process of acquiring BWCs but has indicated that insufficient wireless network access has impeded its ability to utilize them. In schools, public reports on disciplinary practices and their impact across demographics will help identify and address disparities in exclusionary discipline. Ultimately, this approach will foster greater accountability and enable institutions to take proactive steps toward equity.

By addressing these disparities and refining our analysis, we aim to create a more equitable system for all of Vermont’s residents and visitors. The next steps involve further collaboration with key stakeholders, more refined data collection, and targeted reforms based on a deeper understanding of the systemic factors contributing to disparities across traffic stops, corrections, and school exclusionary discipline. Through these efforts, we can move toward a justice system that ensures fair treatment, fosters community trust, and ultimately leads to a more equitable future.

II. Progress Update on Addressing Racial Disparities in the Justice System

Key Focus Areas

We are making significant strides in identifying, tracking, and monitoring racial disparities within the justice system. Our efforts aim to highlight improvements and setbacks over time across several critical domains:

1. **Police Practices and Arrest Patterns:** Collaboration with local police departments to analyze arrest patterns and outcomes by race, informing potential reforms to reduce racial bias in policing.
2. **Sentencing and Parole Data:** Gathering and assessing data across judicial bodies to ensure consistency and evaluate racial disparities in decision-making processes.
3. **School Discipline and Justice System Referrals:** Working with educational agencies to analyze racial disparities in school discipline and subsequent referrals to the justice system, addressing the school-to-prison pipeline.

Current Progress

- **Access to Carceral Records:** Completed a report exploring a national analysis of formerly incarcerated individuals’ ability to access their own records of incarceration and includes recommendations. [Report on Access to Carceral Records of Oneself](#)
- **Incarceration Analysis:** Completed initial analyses of the total incarcerated population using 2024 data. Collaborating with the Department of Corrections to examine:
 - **First-Time Entrants:** Preliminary reports indicate disproportionate arrest and processing rates for youth of color compared to White youth for similar offenses.
 - **Parental Incarceration:** Early findings suggest higher risks for children of incarcerated parents, particularly from Black and Latino communities, to enter the juvenile justice system or to have disciplinary infractions.
- **Youth Justice System:** Developing working groups with Department for Children and Families and other partners to investigate:
 - **Delinquency Designations:** Assessing racial disparities in youth designations as delinquent or youth offenders, with initial findings pointing to bias in law enforcement and judicial decision-making.
 - **Residential Facility Placements:** Data analysis shows significant racial disparities in placement rates, with youth of color more likely to be placed in secure detention or correctional facilities.
- **Early Childhood Education:** Initiating analysis of exclusionary discipline data in early and middle childhood, in collaboration with the Agency of Education and Building Bright Futures/Pre-school Development Grant partners.

Data Management Initiatives

Memoranda of Understanding and Data Sharing Agreements

- Initiating agreements between ORE, Agency of Digital Services (ADS), and various agencies to improve data access and coordination.
- Planning sessions with ADS and data collaborators to establish proper protocols, transparency, and data handling expectations.
- Exploring research partnerships with academic institutions like University of Vermont (UVM) and the Vermont Law and Graduate School (VLGS) for independent analysis of racial bias in the justice system.

Data Lake and Catalog Development

1. **Comprehensive Data Repository:** Collaborating with ADS to create a centralized Data Lake and Catalog for justice system data sources.
2. **Automated Updates:** Implementing systems for annual Data Lake and Catalog updates to ensure timely access to current data.
3. **RJSAC Integration:** Incorporating guidance from the Racial Justice Statistics Advisory Council (RJSAC) in data management processes to ensure alignment with racial justice goals. The Council focuses on evaluating changes in Vermont's criminal legal and data systems over the past decade, identifying areas of progress and stagnation. It also defines what success looks like for the Council, provides recommendations for supporting the Division's work, highlights potential pitfalls to avoid, and examines how intersectionality is reflected in Vermont's systems and data.

Expansion of Division Scope and Collaborative Initiatives for Equity

Notable work includes

- Participation on the **CCB Act 166 Sec. 15a Working Group**, where data on social equity applicants analyzed, and discussions focused on sustainable funding for the Cannabis Business Development Fund (CBDF), including challenges for small cultivators and the need for a network of advisors. Action items from this group include continued collaboration with the Agency of Commerce and Community Development (ACCD) and the Land Access Opportunity Board (LAOB) to refine community reinvestment recommendations.
- Collaboration with the **Department of Human Resources** on data analysis in employee outcomes.
- Exploring inequities in early childhood services through the multi-agency **Building Bright Futures/Preschool Development Grant (BBF/PDG)** partnership.
- Building expertise statewide by contracting with the Center for Equity and Excellence to offer key State of Vermont staff educational opportunities on equity gaps and mental health in early childhood.
- Developing **Data and Dashboard working groups** with agencies like DOC, VCJC, AOE, BBF/PDG, and DCF.
- Supporting a **Youth Capstone** project.
- Supporting grant writing initiatives.
- Upcoming **Data and Policy Research Reports**.
- Launching a **data and equity bootcamp** for state agencies and data collaborators.

These initiatives represent our ongoing commitment to addressing racial disparities through data-driven approaches and collaborative efforts across multiple sectors of the justice system.

III. Data-Focused Recommendations

- To address systemic racial disparities in the justice system, it is essential to **enhance data collection and standardization** across various agencies. **Standardizing race and ethnicity reporting** is a foundational step, which can be achieved by implementing the **Office of Management and Budget (OMB) reporting standards** across all justice system datasets. See: <https://www.federalregister.gov/public-inspection/2024-06469/statistical-policy-directive-no-15-standards-for-maintaining-collecting-and-presenting-federal-data>. This would improve data **accuracy and consistency**, enabling a more robust understanding of disparities.
- Additionally, collaboration with the **Vermont Criminal Justice Council** and **Department of Public Safety (DPS)** is critical to **expanding arrest data collection**, including race-based information on arrest rates, charges, and outcomes. This will provide a clearer picture of racial disparities in law enforcement practices. Collecting **demographic data on key justice system professionals**, such as police officers, judges, attorneys, and teachers, is another important area. This data would help assess potential biases in decision-making processes and contribute to efforts aimed at **increasing racial and gender diversity** in the workforce. Furthermore, expanding the collection and analysis of **hate crime data**, categorized by race and perpetrator demographics, is vital for understanding racial violence and its relationship with the criminal justice system.
- A comprehensive approach also involves tracking data on **reentry programs and criminal history**. Implementing systems to monitor **racial and ethnic representation** in reentry programs and their effectiveness in reducing recidivism would ensure that formerly incarcerated individuals from communities of color are better supported in their transition back to communities. Similarly, developing a system to track **criminal history and recidivism data** by race/ethnicity will help identify trends in repeat offenses, which are essential for crafting **targeted interventions** aimed at reducing recidivism rates. Lastly, expanding the collection of **victimization data**, particularly for **Black individuals in Vermont**, will provide insight into how different racial groups are impacted by crime and how these individuals are treated by the justice system.
- In addition to enhancing data collection, making this information more **accessible and transparent** is key to ensuring that systemic issues are identified and addressed. **Publishing deidentified justice system datasets online** will help increase transparency while protecting privacy, allowing researchers, policymakers, and the public to analyze racial disparities in a meaningful way. Tracking and reporting data on the **implementation and effectiveness** of justice system reforms, such as **bail reform, sentencing reform, and clean slate initiatives**, will provide critical insights into whether these policies are achieving their intended outcomes. Furthermore, ensuring that **police agencies collect and share data on community policing efforts**, especially in how communities of color are engaged, will help build trust and guide future policing strategies. Ultimately, the goal of these data-focused efforts is to **build an integrated data infrastructure** that facilitates research, evidence-based policies, and **targeted interventions**. This infrastructure will allow for **seamless data integration** across various justice system sectors—law enforcement, courts, corrections, and education—enabling a comprehensive, **data-driven approach** to addressing racial disparities. By creating a robust data system that tracks key metrics across these areas, we will be able to support **evidence-based policy decisions** and design more effective **interventions** that can reduce disparities and promote fairness across the justice system.

Additional details and data tables available upon request tiffany.northreid@vermont.gov.