Vermont

Elections Performance Index

This profile reports important trends for Vermont that emerged from the 2012 update to The Pew Charitable Trusts' Elections Performance Index, or EPI. The EPI analyzes 17 key indicators of election administration and scores each state's performance by indicator and overall. For more information and to view the full interactive index, visit www.pewstates.org/epi.

Overall EPI Average*		
o vorak Er minorago	National average	
2012		State's average decreased from
2008 > 68%		2008 to 2012
Key indicators	2008	2012
Key indicators Data completeness	2008 99.5%	2012 92.7%
Data completeness	99.5%	92.7%
Data completeness Disability- or illness-related voting problems	99.5%	92.7% 9.7%

*The overall EPI average is a simple average of all 17 indicators.

Beyond the numbers

Vermont had the second-largest drop in performance between 2008 and 2012 and was one of only 10 states whose overall EPI average declined between the two years. One significant factor in this drop was the state's decline in data completeness, which fell almost 7 percentage points from the 2008 level, the largest drop in the country.

This decline has cascading implications, because although it affects Vermont's data completeness score, it has an even greater impact on other indicators. The state had very low rates of registrations rejected and provisional ballots cast in 2008, but it did not provide enough data to calculate these indicators for 2012, eliminating them as variables from the state's overall EPI average.

Other factors influencing Vermont's overall decline were the lack of any online voting information lookup tools and the third-largest drop in turnout between 2008 and 2012.

On the other hand, Vermont had the lowest average wait time in 2012, just as it did in 2008.

Room for improvement

The state could improve its overall performance by adding online voter registration. Not only would this raise the state's score for the online registration indicator, but it could have a positive impact on other metrics as well, including the voter registration rate, wait time, nonvoting due to registration and absentee ballot problems, and provisional ballots cast.

Additionally, the state could work with local election officials to establish or improve procedures for collecting and reporting key performance data.

Adding online voter registration and improving data collection are both recommendations of the <u>Presidential</u> <u>Commission on Election Administration</u>.

The state could also add online voting information lookup tools. It was one of only two states to provide no lookup tools in 2012. By contrast, 10 states made all possible lookup tools available to voters that year. Providing these online resources would boost Vermont's overall performance, and it would improve the experience of state voters by providing them with the information they need about an election where they are most likely to look for it—online.

For further information, please visit:

pewstates.org/epi

Contact: Stephanie Bosh, officer, communications Email: sbosh@pewtrusts.org Project website: pewstates.org/elections

The Pew Charitable Trusts is driven by the power of knowledge to solve today's most challenging problems. Pew applies a rigorous, analytical approach to improve public policy, inform the public, and stimulate civic life.