IRis

Northeastern University

Institute on Race and Justice Publications

Institute on Race and Justice

May 04, 2004

Massachusetts racial and gender profiling final report: executive summary

Amy Farrell
Northeastern University

Jack McDevitt
Northeastern University

Lisa Bailey
Northeastern University

Carsten Andresen
Northeastern University

Erica Pierce
Northeastern University

Recommended Citation

Farrell, Amy; McDevitt, Jack; Bailey, Lisa; Andresen, Carsten; and Pierce, Erica, "Massachusetts racial and gender profiling final report: executive summary" (2004). *Institute on Race and Justice Publications.* Paper 12. http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d20004314

This work is available open access, hosted by Northeastern University.

Massachusetts Racial and Gender Profiling Final Report

Executive Summary

May 4, 2004

Background

The goal of this report is to answer the mandate of Chapter 228 of the Acts of 2000 to identify and provide to the Secretary of Public Safety a listing of state police units or municipalities that appear to have engaged in racial or gender profiling. Using data on traffic citations and written warnings collected by the Massachusetts Registry of Motor Vehicles, this study examines the existence of racial and gender disparities in approximately 1.6 million traffic citations issued between April 1, 2001 and June 30, 2003.[1] The citations analyzed in this report were received from the Massachusetts State Police, 340 municipal police departments and 25 other special police units.

The intent of the Massachusetts legislation was to identify communities with racial or gender disparities which may be suggestive of racial profiling and to require those communities to collect additional information on traffic enforcement to determine if the disparities identified could be explained by factors other than race or gender. This model for dealing with allegations of racial and gender profiling is unique nationally and was intended to minimize the data collection burden on those departments where no indication of racial or gender profiling exists.

It is important to note at the outset that research on racial profiling in traffic enforcement is a relatively new area of inquiry. Although numerous studies have begun to address questions of differential treatment in traffic stops, no absolute consensus exists about the best way to determine disparities. Racial disparities in citations can result from a number of factors that social scientists are just beginning to understand. Bias on the part of an individual officer is only one of several possible explanations for disparities in citations. Although the Massachusetts data does not allow for definitive findings of racial profiling on the part of individual officers or within a department, it does identify those jurisdictions with substantial racial or gender disparities in traffic citations.

Methodology

Although there are limits to the types of questions that traffic citation data can answer, this study addresses four different questions that commonly arise in public concern over racial profiling to determine if racial or gender disparities existed in any of the 366 jurisdictions who submitted data to the Registry of Motor Vehicles.

1. Are non-white drivers who are residents in a community cited more often than their representation in the residential population would predict?
2. Are non-white drivers overall cited more often their representation in the population of people driving on the roadways would predict?

[1] The original intent of the legislation was to conduct an analysis for one year. Northeastern University received data from the Registry of Motor Vehicles which covered a much larger time period (27 months). In consultation with the Executive Office of Public Safety and the Racial and Gender Profiling Working Group, Northeastern University conducted an analysis on all citations for the full time period that data was available in order to provide communities with the most information that was possible to assess any potential disparities in traffic citations. A breakdown of the racial demographics of citations by year is included in the technical report.

3. Once stopped, are non-white drivers more likely to be subject to a search than white drivers?
4. Once stopped, are non-white drivers more likely to receive a citation than white drivers?

In addition to examining the experiences of non-white drivers as a group, we have conducted additional analysis on each of the above four questions to determine if particular racial groups (Black or Hispanic drivers) or certain race and gender groups (non-white males) are disproportionately cited and/or searched. For example the measure of citations issued to community residents includes an examination of: 1) citations issued to non-white residents, 2) citations issued to Black residents, 3) citations issued to Hispanic residents, and 4) citations issued to non-white male residents. These subcategories are included to help departments focus their efforts toward the particular groups that are identified as having the greatest disparities.

In all research on racial disparities in traffic enforcement, one of the most challenging issues defining an appropriate benchmark, or baseline, against which to compare the demographics of traffic citations. If for example, 15% of the citations in a particular community are given to Black residents, is that too many or too few? To answer that question we would want to know the proportion of traffic stops compared to an appropriate benchmark or base rate of those driving in that community. In Massachusetts the present study utilized two measures to determine the degree of disparity that exists in traffic citations across the state. First we compare the racial demographics of town residents who are cited against the residential population of that community. Second we compare the racial demographics of all traffic citations made by an agency (both citations of residents and citations of non-residents) to an estimate of the demographics of the driving population for that community. This approach, while more complex, utilizes the most reliable available comparison for each disparity measure. No external benchmark is needed to answer the final two questions about racially disparate treatment searches and written warnings. Instead, a measure of statistical significance is used to determine if non-white drivers are more likely than white drivers to be subject to a search or issued a written warning.

Community and law enforcement feedback in analysis process

During the analysis of the data for this report the Northeastern University team has been extremely fortunate to have worked with a dedicated group of police officials, community representatives and representatives of advocacy groups, legislators and representatives from the Executive Office of Public Safety and the Office of the Attorney General. This working group met monthly during the analysis process and provided extremely helpful advice and comment, all of which has made this report stronger.

Also, with support from the Executive Office of Public Safety, Northeastern University implemented the most comprehensive comment process that has ever been conducted nationally in conjunction with a racial profiling report. Over the three month period between January and March of 2004, Northeastern led six regional community meetings and actively solicited feedback from community members and law enforcement about their reactions to the findings presented in a preliminary report which was released in January 2004. Many of the comments from law enforcement officials and community members have been integrated into the final

report, allowing us to address many of the problems or limitations of the study which may not have been identified without such an extensive comment period.

Major Findings

The process of drawing conclusions about racial and gender disparities in 366 different law enforcement agencies does not allow for the in-depth analysis that can and should occur in a particular community. This report is intended to highlight the main areas of concern, offer interpretations of different types of disparities and hopefully serve as a springboard for more detailed analysis that can best be done at the community level between local police and members of their community. A summary of the major findings is as follows:

- 249 law enforcement agencies in Massachusetts have substantial disparities[2] in at least one of the four categories of analysis used in this report (Table A). Breaking down these disparities into the four measurements that were used in the report we find:
    - 141 law enforcement agencies in Massachusetts have racial disparities above the statewide median in citations given to resident drivers who were non-white, Black, Hispanic or non-white males (Table B). Statewide the average disparity between non-white residents cited and non-white residents in the census population was .06% with non-white residents being cited slightly more frequently than their representation in the residential population. Statewide the largest racial difference between citations to residents and residential population was for Black drivers (average disparity of 1.3%) and non-white male drivers (average disparity 2.2%).
    - 201 law enforcement agencies in Massachusetts have racial disparities above the statewide median in citations given to non-white, Black, or Hispanic drivers (Table C). Statewide the average disparity between non-white drivers cited and non-whites in the driving population estimate was 2.6%. Very consistent disparities were found when Black citations (average disparity of 2.3%) and Hispanic citations (average disparity 2.2%) were compared to the driving population estimate.
    - Out of the 87 communities where a sufficient number of searches were conducted for analysis, 40 law enforcement agencies in Massachusetts are statistically significantly more likely to search non-white, Black, Hispanic or non-white male drivers compared to white drivers (Table D). Although searches following a

[2] Disparities between citations and resident or driving population were deemed substantial when they fell above the positive statewide median (mid-point) for all Massachusetts police agencies. For example, the median statewide disparity for non-white residential citations compared to the residential population is 2.1. When dealing with disparities in searches and warning we utilized a test of statistical significance. Here we simply indicate that if a department searches or issues citations to non-white drivers more frequently than white drivers, and if that differences rises to a level of statistical significance, these departments have a substantial disparity.

traffic citation are a relatively rare event in Massachusetts (only 1.3% of all traffic citations resulted in a non-inventory search of the motorist or their vehicle statewide), non-white drivers were more likely to be searched following a citation than white drivers (1.3% of white drivers searched compared to 1.8% of non-white drivers).

- Out of a sample of 142 communities where an analysis of written warnings could be conducted, 83 agencies are statistically significantly more likely to give a citation to a non-white, Black, Hispanic or non-white male driver compared to a white driver (Table E). Statewide 72% of non-white drivers receive citations compared to 65.9% of white drivers. This suggests that in some communities in Massachusetts officers may be more likely to use their discretion to give written warnings to white drivers rather than to non-white drivers.

- Overall males were more likely to be cited than their representation in either the residential or the driving population estimate. Males were uniformly more likely to be subject to a search and to be cited than women. These findings were consistent across virtually all communities in Massachusetts. This report finds no indication that female drivers, in the aggregate, are more likely to be stopped, cited or subject to a search than their male counterparts. In fact, quite the opposite appears to be the case.

Issues to Consider

Based on the findings of the Massachusetts study, national research on the issue, and recommendations from the Working Group and other stakeholders we offer the following set of issues to consider which provide guidance to those who must begin to formulate policies based on the findings in this report.

- Nationwide over 6,000 law enforcement agencies are collecting data on all traffic stops. Traffic stop data collection has been recommended by numerous national professional police organizations as a necessary component of professional policing. As a part of good police practices, all law enforcement agencies in Massachusetts should establish a system to collect and monitor data on all traffic stop activity.

- Following national models for traffic stop data collection, a uniform set of data elements to be collected on all stops should be identified. It is important that any new data collection system include information on officer identification and the location of the stop in the required data collection elements. Additionally a specific timetable for data collection, auditing and reporting should be established.

- All local police agencies should begin or continue a conversation with members of their community about the existence of disparities in traffic stops, the goals of traffic enforcement and strategies to monitor and reduce such disparities.

Table A: Any Disparity in the Four Summary Measures (N=249)

Abington	Chilmark	Holyoke	N. Attleboro	Shrewsbury+	Westborough
Acushnet	Clarksburg	Hopedale	Nahant	Shutesbury	Westfield
Adams	Clinton	Hopkinton	Nantucket	Somerset	Weston
Amesbury	Cohasset	Hudson	Natick	Somerville	Westwood
Amherst	Dartmouth	Hull	Needham	Southborough	Weymouth
Andover	Dedham+	Huntington	New Bedford	Southbridge	Whitman
Aquinnah	Dennis	Ipswich	New Marlborough	Southwick	Wilbraham
Arlington	Douglas	Kingston	New Salem	Spencer	Wilmington
Ashburnham	Dover	Lakeville	Newburyport	Springfield	Winchendon
Ashby	Dracut	Lancaster	Newton	State Police (All)	Windsor
Ashland	Dudley	Lanesborough	Northampton	Sterling	Winthrop
Athol	Dunstable	Lawrence	Northborough	Stockbridge	Woburn
Attleboro	E. Bridgewater	Lee	Northbridge	Stoneham	Worcester
Auburn	E. Brookfield	Leicester	Northfield	Stoughton	Wrentham
Avon	E. Longmeadow	Lenox	Norton	Stow	Yarmouth
Ayer	Easton	Leominster	Norwood	Sturbridge	
Barnstable	Edgartown	Lexington	Oak Bluffs	Sudbury	
Bedford	Erving	Lincoln	Oakham	Sunderland	
Belchertown	Everett	Littleton	Orange	Sutton	
Bellingham	Fairhaven	Longmeadow	Orleans	Swampscott+	
Belmont	Fall River	Lowell	Palmer	Taunton	
Berkley	Falmouth	Lunenburg	Paxton	Tewksbury	
Berlin	Fitchburg	Lynn	Peabody	Tisbury	
Bernardston	Foxborough	Lynnfield	Pelham	Topsfield	
Beverly	Framingham	Malden	Pepperell	Townsend	
Billerica	Franklin	Mansfield	Pittsfield	Truro	
Blackstone	Freetown	Marblehead	Plymouth	Tyngsborough	
Bolton	Georgetown	Marion+	Quincy	Upton	
Boston (All)	Gill	Marlborough	Randolph+	W. Bridgewater	
Bourne	Gloucester	Mashpee	Raynham	W. Brookfield	
Boxborough	Goshen	Mattapoisett	Rehoboth	W. Newbury	
Boylston	Granby	Maynard	Revere	W. Springfield	
Braintree	Granville	Medford	Rochester	W. Tisbury	
Bridgewater	Greenfield	Medway	Rockland	Wakefield	
Brockton	Groveland	Melrose	Rockport	Walpole	
Brookline	Hadley	Mendon	Rowley	Waltham	
Buckland	Hampden	Merrimac	Royalston	Ware	
Cambridge	Hanson	Methuen	S. Hadley	Wareham	
Canton	Harwich	Middleborough	Salem	Warwick	
Carver	Hatfield	Milford	Salisbury	Watertown+	
Charlton	Haverhill	Millbury	Sandwich	Wayland	
Chatham	Heath	Millis	Saugus	Webster	
Chelmsford	Hingham	Millville	Scituate	Wellesley	
Chelsea	Holbrook	Milton+	Seekonk	Wellfleet	
Cheshire	Holden	Montague	Sharon	Wendell	
Chester	Holland	N. Adams	Sherborn	Wenham	
Chicopee	Holliston	N. Andover	Shirley		

Table B: Resident Citation Disparities (N=141 Above Statewide Positive Median)

Abington	Harwich	Orleans
Adams	Hatfield	Paxton
Amherst	Haverhill	Peabody
Andover	Holbrook	Pelham
Arlington	Holyoke	Pittsfield
Ashland	Hudson	Quincy
Athol	Ipswich	Randolph
Avon	Kingston	Raynham
Barnstable	Lancaster	Revere
Belchertown	Lawrence	Rochester
Berkley	Lee	Rockland
Berlin	Leicester	Royalston
Beverly	Leominster	Salem
Boston (All)	Lexington	Scituate
Bourne	Littleton	Sharon
Boxborough	Longmeadow	Shrewsbury
Braintree	Lowell	Shutesbury
Brockton	Lynn	Somerville
Brookline	Malden	Southbridge
Buckland	Marion	Springfield
Cambridge	Marlborough	State Police (All)
Canton	Mashpee	Stockbridge
Chatham	Mattapoisett	Stoneham
Chelsea	Maynard	Stoughton
Cheshire	Medford	Sunderland
Chicopee	Medway	Sutton
Chilmark	Mendon	Taunton
Clarksburg	Methuen	Tisbury
Clinton	Middleborough	Townsend
Cohasset	Milford	W. Bridgewater
Dedham	Millbury	W. Springfield
Dennis	Millis	Waltham
Dudley	Milton	Ware
E. Brookfield	Montague	Wareham
Easton	N. Adams	Warwick
Edgartown	Nantucket	Watertown
Erving	Needham	Wayland
Everett	New Bedford	Webster
Fall River	Northampton	Wellfleet
Falmouth	Northborough	Wendell
Fitchburg	Northbridge	Westborough
Foxborough	Northfield	Weymouth
Framingham	Norton	Winchendon
Georgetown	Norwood	Winthrop
Gloucester	Oak Bluffs	Woburn
Greenfield	Oakham	Worcester
Hanson	Orange	Yarmouth

Table C: Driving Population Estimate Disparity (N=201 Above Statewide Positive Median)

Abington	E. Bridgewater	Malden	Sandwich	Windsor
Acushnet	E. Brookfield	Marblehead	Saugus	Winthrop
Adams	E. Longmeadow	Marion+	Seekonk	Worcester
Amherst	Easton	Marlborough	Sharon	Wrentham
Andover+	Edgartown	Mashpee	Sherborn	Yarmouth
Aquinnah	Everett	Mattapoisett	Shirley	
Arlington	Fairhaven	Maynard	Shrewsbury+	
Ashburnham	Falmouth	Medford	Shutesbury	
Ashby	Fitchburg	Medway	Somerville	
Ashland	Foxborough	Melrose	Southborough	
Athol	Framingham	Mendon	Southbridge	
Auburn	Freetown	Merrimac	Springfield	
Avon	Georgetown	Methuen	State Police (All)	
Ayer	Gill	Milford	Sterling	
Barnstable	Goshen	Millbury	Stoughton	
Belchertown	Granby	Millville	Stow	
Bellingham	Granville	Milton+	Sturbridge	
Belmont	Groveland	Montague	Sudbury	
Berlin	Hadley	N. Adams	Sutton	
Bernardston	Hampden	N. Andover	Swampscott+	
Billerica	Hanson	Nahant	Taunton	
Bolton	Harwich	Nantucket	Tewksbury	
Boston (All)	Hatfield	Natick	Tisbury	
Bourne	Haverhill	Needham	Topsfield	
Boxborough	Heath	New Bedford	Townsend	
Boylston	Hingham	New Marlborough	Truro	
Braintree	Holbrook	New Salem	Tyngsborough	
Bridgewater	Holden	Northborough	Upton	
Brockton	Holliston	Northbridge	W. Bridgewater	
Brookline	Holyoke	Norton	W. Brookfield	
Cambridge	Hopedale	Oak Bluffs	W. Newbury	
Canton	Hopkinton	Oakham	W. Springfield	
Carver	Hudson	Orange	W. Tisbury	
Charlton	Hull	Orleans	Walpole	
Chatham	Huntington	Paxton	Waltham	
Chelmsford	Kingston	Peabody	Ware	
Cheshire	Lakeville	Pepperell	Wareham	
Chester	Lancaster	Pittsfield	Warwick	
Chicopee	Lanesborough	Quincy	Watertown+	
Chilmark	Lawrence	Randolph+	Wayland	
Clinton	Leicester	Raynham	Webster	
Dartmouth	Lenox	Rehoboth	Wellesley	
Dedham+	Leominster	Revere	Wenham	
Dennis	Littleton	Rochester	Westborough	
Douglas	Longmeadow	Rockport	Weston	
Dover	Lowell	Rowley	Westwood	
Dracut	Lunenburg	S. Hadley	Whitman	
Dudley	Lynn	Salem	Wilbraham	
Dunstable	Lynnfield	Salisbury	Wilmington	

+ Denotes that the agency presented Northeastern University with road survey data that differed from the Northeastern University driving population estimate used in this report.

Table D: Search Disparities (N=40 Positive Statistically Significant Differences)

Amesbury	State Police (All)
Attleboro	Stoughton
Auburn	Taunton
Barnstable	Tewksbury
Bedford	Townsend
Boston (All)	W. Bridgewater
Bridgewater	Waltham
Brockton	Wareham
Brookline	Wilmington
Cambridge	Worcester
Dunstable	
Fairhaven	
Fall River	
Framingham	
Haverhill	
Leicester	
Lowell	
Lynn	
Malden	
Mansfield	
N. Adams	
New Bedford	
Newton	
Northampton	
Peabody	
Quincy	
Salisbury	
Southborough	
Spencer	
Springfield	

Table E: Warnings vs. Citations (N=83 Positive Statistically Significant Difference)

Abington	Methuen	Westfield
Amesbury	Milford	Weston
Andover	N. Andover	Weymouth
Arlington	N. Attleboro	Worcester
Auburn	Natick	Yarmouth
Barnstable	Needham	
Bellingham	New Bedford	
Belmont	Newburyport	
Berlin	Newton	
Billerica	Northampton	
Blackstone	Norwood	
Boston (All)	Palmer	
Braintree	Peabody	
Bridgewater	Pittsfield	
Brookline	Plymouth	
Cambridge	Quincy	
Canton	Randolph	
Chelsea	Revere	
Chicopee	Rockland	
Dedham	Shirley	
Dracut	Shrewsbury	
E. Bridgewater	Somerset	
Everett	Somerville	
Falmouth	Southborough	
Fitchburg	Southwick	
Framingham	Springfield	
Franklin	Stoughton	
Holland	Sturbridge	
Hudson	Sudbury	
Lawrence	Truro	
Leicester	Upton	
Leominster	W. Bridgewater	
Lexington	W. Tisbury	
Lincoln	Wakefield	
Longmeadow	Walpole	
Lynn	Waltham	
Marlborough	Watertown	
Mattapoisett	Wellesley	
Medway	Westborough	

Table F: Measures of Disparity for All Jurisdictions

Jurisdictions with Any Disparity (N=249)

1. Jurisdictions Above Threshold on All Four Measures (15)

Barnstable	Boston	Brookline
Cambridge	Framingham	Leicester
Lynn	New Bedford	Peabody
Quincy	Springfield	Stoughton
West Bridgewater	Waltham	Worcester

2. Jurisdictions Above Threshold on Three Measures (42)

Abington	Andover	Arlington
Auburn	Berlin	Braintree
Bridgewater	Brockton	Canton
Chicopee	Dedham	Everett
Falmouth	Fitchburg	Haverhill
Hudson	Lawrence	Leominster
Longmeadow	Lowell	Malden
Marlborough	Mattapoisett	Medway
Methuen	Milford	N. Adams
Needham	Northampton	Pittsfield
Randolph	Revere	Shrewsbury
Somerville	Southborough	State Police
Taunton	Townsend	Wareham
Watertown	Westborough	Yarmouth

3. Jurisdictions Above Threshold on Two Measures (87)

Adams	Amesbury	Amherst
Ashland	Athol	Avon
Belchertown	Bellingham	Belmont
Billerica	Bourne	Boxborough
Chatham	Chelsea	Cheshire
Chilmark	Clinton	Dennis
Dracut	Dudley	Dunstable
East Bridgewater	East Brookfield	Easton
Edgartown	Fairhaven	Fall River
Foxborough	Georgetown	Hanson
Harwich	Hatfield	Holbrook
Holyoke	Kingston	Lancaster
Lexington	Littleton	Marion
Mashpee	Maynard	Medford
Mendon	Millbury	Milton
Montague	N. Andover	Nantucket
Natick	Newton	Northbridge
Northborough	Norton	Norwood
Oak Bluffs	Oakham	Orange
Orleans	Paxton	Raynham
Rochester	Rockland	Salem
Salisbury	Sharon	Shirley
Shutesbury	Southbridge	Sturbridge
Sudbury	Sutton	Tewksbury
Tisbury	Truro	Upton
West Springfield	West Tisbury	Walpole
Ware	Warwick	Wayland
Webster	Wellesley	Weston
Weymouth	Wilmington	Winthrop

4. Jurisdictions Above Threshold on One Measure (105)

Acushnet	Aquinnah	Ashburnham
Ashby	Attleboro	Ayer
Bedford	Berkley	Bernardston
Beverly	Blackstone	Bolton
Boylston	Buckland	Carver
Charlton	Chelmsford	Chester
Clarksburg	Cohasset	Dartmouth
Douglas	Dover	E. Longmeadow
Erving	Franklin	Freetown
Gill	Gloucester	Goshen
Granby	Granville	Greenfield
Groveland	Hadley	Hampden
Heath	Hingham	Holden
Holland	Holliston	Hopedale
Hopkinton	Hull	Huntington
Ipswich	Lakeville	Lanesborough
Lee	Lenox	Lincoln
Lunenburg	Lynnfield	Mansfield
Marblehead	Melrose	Merrimac
Middleborough	Millis	Millville
N. Attleboro	Nahant	New Marlborough
New Salem	Newburyport	Northfield
Palmer	Pelham	Pepperell
Plymouth	Rehoboth	Rockport
Rowley	Royalston	S. Hadley
Sandwich	Saugus	Scituate
Seekonk	Sherborn	Somerset
Southwick	Spencer	Sterling
Stockbridge	Stoneham	Stow
Sunderland	Swampscott	Topsfield
Tyngsborough	W. Brookfield	W. Newbury
Wakefield	Wellfleet	Wendell
Wenham	Westfield	Westwood
Whitman	Wilbraham	Winchendon
Windsor	Woburn	Wrentham

Jurisdictions with No Disparity (92)

Acton	Agawam	Ashfield
Barre	Becket	Blandford
Boxford	Brewster	Brimfield
Brookfield	Burlington	Carlisle
Charlemont	Chesterfield	Colrain
Concord	Conway	Cummington
Dalton	Danvers	Deerfield
Dighton	Duxbury	Eastham
Easthampton	Egremont	Essex
Gardner	Grafton	Groton
Gt. Barrington	Halifax	Hamilton
Hanover	Hardwick	Harvard
Hinsdale	Hubbardston	Leverett
Leyden	Ludlow	Manchester
Marshfield	Medfield	Middleton
Monroe	Monson	Monterey
N. Brookfield	N. Reading	New Braintree
Newbury	Norwell	Norfolk

Otis	Oxford	Pembroke
Peru	Petersham	Phillipston
Plainfield	Plainville	Plympton
Princeton	Provincetown	Reading
Rowe	Rutland	Sandisfield
Savoy	Sheffield	Shelburne
Southampton	Swansea	Templeton
Tolland	Tyringham	Uxbridge
W. Boylston	W. Stockbridge	Wales
Warren	Washington	Westford
Westhampton	Westminster	Westport
Whately	Williamsburg	Williamstown
Winchester	Worthington	
Jurisdictions for Which Disparity Could Not Be Measured (N=25)		
AMTRAK	B&M Railroad	Bridgewater SC
Bunker Hill CC	CSX	Environmental PD
Fernald State School	MA Maritime Police	Massasoit CC
MBTA	Metro Police Lwr. Basin	Metro Police Marine
Mt Wachusett CC	Registry of MV	Somerville Housing Auth.
State Fire Marshal	Templeton Dev. Center	Tufts University
Univ Of Mass Amherst	Univ Of Mass Boston	Univ of Mass Datmouth
Univ of Mass Lowell	Univ of Mass Worcester	Westfield SC
Worcester Co. Sheriff		

Final Report Prepared by:

Dr. Amy Farrell
Associate Director, Institute on Race and Justice

Dean Jack McDevitt
Director, Institute on Race and Justice

Lisa Bailey
Assistant Director of Community Outreach, Institute on Race and Justice

Carsten Andresen
Research Associate, Center for Criminal Justice Policy Research

Erica Pierce
Research Associate, Center for Criminal Justice Policy Research

The Institute on Race and Justice at Northeastern University brings together academics from the College of Criminal Justice, School of Law, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, and African American Studies Program to examine questions on race and justice facing urban communities. Our primary goal is to conduct meaningful research in race and justice and provide leadership on issues of racial injustice. The mission of the Institute is founded on the premise that academic institutions can provide rigorous and objective analysis that can be used by members of the community and policy makers to make policy changes that advance the cause of social justice. This research model attempts to enhance scientific inquiries with the input and experiences of community stakeholders who struggle with issues of racial injustice. Combining traditional empirical questions with a community-based problem-solving model of research provides a national model for action-based research in the field of race and justice. For more information about the Institute or the findings in the Massachusetts Racial and Gender Profiling study please visit our website at *www.irj.neu.edu.*