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## ABOUT THIS REPORT

This summary report has been developed for the Community Prevention and Wellness Initiative (CPWI) to assist coalitions in their prevention strategic planning. We have included data from your county, presented by school district, for the assessment of problems associated with substance use. This report is intended to serve as a starting point for your planning and assessment work. Additional data that can only be collected locally will help with the interpretation of the data and in other ways enhance this assessment process.

The Community Prevention and Wellness Initiative is a project of the Health Care Authority's Division of Behavioral Health and Recovery (DBHR) in collaboration with the Office of the Superintendent of Schools (OSPI). The Department of Social and Health Services' Division of Research and Data Analysis is a key partner that leads the publication of this report and the associated data.

## ABOUT THE DATA

The CORE contains archival indicators (or social indicators) that are highly correlated with adolescent substance use, and the risk factors that predict substance use. There are currently 47 indicators, most of which originate from the Department of Health, Department of Social and Health Services, Uniform Crime Report/National Incident-Based Reporting System, and the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The data are published twice a year on a public website, and reported at the lowest feasible geography level: state, county, school district/community, and locale (a geography that incorporates more than one school district when the base population of the school district is too low for reliable reporting). See https://www.dshs.wa.gov/ffa/research-and-data-analysis/community-risk-profiles.

The Risk Rankings table(s) and maps have been developed using the data from CORE and Healthy Youth Survey (HYS). School district-level and more detailed HYS data are password protected and require a data sharing agreement with the Department of Health. State and county reports are available to the public at AskHYS.net.

## FOR MORE INFORMATION

Questions about this report or the Community Prevention and Wellness Initiative may be directed to the DBHR Training team at PxTraining@hca.wa.gov.

| CLARK COUNTY |  | RISK RANKING |  | RISK CATEGORY RANK |  | CONTEXTUAL INDICATORS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School District | Population: <br> Age 10-17* | Rank for Variable | Indicators with Data | ATMO Consumption | Consequence | Economic Deprivation | Troubled Family |
| Battle Ground | 9,781 | 45 | 22 | Average | Average | Low | Low |
| Camas | 4,375 | 1 | 22 | Very Low | Very Low | Very Low | Very Low |
| Evergreen (Clark) | 17,323 | 44 | 22 | Average | Average | Average | Average |
| Hockinson | 1,428 | 2 | 22 | Very Low | Very Low | Very Low | Very Low |
| La Center | 1,097 | 46 | 22 | Average | Average | Low | Low |
| Ridgefield | 2,046 | 17 | 21 | Average | Low | Low | Very Low |
| Washougal | 2,298 | 55 | 22 | Average | Average | Average | Average |

## NOTES:

This risk profile reflects the risk levels of this county as of February 2021. School districts with no high schools are not included in this summary. Please note risk levels and risk rankings may change over time.
 indicators. The overall risk ranking is not computed if either consumption or consequence score is missing.

A Risk Category Rank of "Very High" indicates the referenced School District Risk Score was in the top $10 \%$ of School Districts in the risk category.
A Risk Category Rank of "High" indicates the referenced School District Risk Score was in the top $25 \%$ of School Districts in the risk category.
A Risk Category Rank of "Average" indicates the referenced School District Risk Score was between $25 \%$ and $75 \%$ of School Districts in the risk category.
A Risk Category Rank of "Low" indicates the referenced School District Risk Score was in the bottom 25\% of School Districts in the risk category.
A Risk Category Rank of "Very Low" indicates the referenced School District Risk Score was in the bottom $10 \%$ of School Districts in the risk category.

## Review Considerations

1) To get an overall sense of risk severity for both consumption and consequence, examine the "Risk Percentile". It reflects what \% of School District had a Risk Score LOWER than the referenced School District.
2) To ensure that the risk score is meaningful, examine the "Indicators with data" column. Risk scores based on few indicators should be interpreted with caution. In total, 21 indicators were used.
 enrollment as it accounts for kids not in school as well as those in private schools.

* This is a 5-year average value.

| VANCOUVER PUBLIC SCHOOLS |  | RISK RANKING |  | RISK CATEGORY RANK |  | CONTEXTUAL INDICATORS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| High School | Population: <br> Age 10-17* | Rank for Variable | Indicators with Data | ATMO Consumption | Consequence | Economic Deprivation | Troubled Family |
| Columbia River HS | 1,881 | 69 | 21 | High | Average | Average | No Data |
| Fort Vancouver HS | 4,482 | 72 | 22 | Average | High | Very High | High |
| Hudson's Bay HS | 3,731 | 60 | 22 | Average | Average | High | High |
| Skyview HS | 4,759 | 28 | 22 | Average | Average | Average | Low |

## NOTES:

This risk profile reflects the risk levels of this county as of February 2021. Please note risk levels and risk rankings may change over time.
 indicators. The overall risk ranking is not computed if either consumption or consequence score is missing.

A Risk Category Rank of "Very High" indicates the referenced High School Risk Score was in the top 10\% of High Schools in the risk Category
A Risk Category Rank of "High" indicates the referenced High School Risk Score was in the top $25 \%$ of High Schools in the risk Category.
A Risk Category Rank of "Average" indicates the referenced High School Risk Score was between $25 \%$ and $75 \%$ of High Schools in the risk Category
A Risk Category Rank of "Low" indicates the referenced High School Risk Score was in the bottom 25\% of High Schools in the risk Category.
A Risk Category Rank of "Very Low" indicates the referenced High School Risk Score was in the bottom 10\% of High Schools in the risk Category.

## Review Considerations

1) To get an overall sense of risk severity for both consumption and consequence, examine the "Risk Percentile". It reflects what \% of High Schools had a Risk Score LOWER than the referenced High School.
2) To ensure that the risk score is meaningful, examine the "Indicators with data" column. Risk scores based on few indicators should be interpreted with caution. In total, 21 indicators were used.
 enrollment as it accounts for kids not in school as well as those in private schools.

* This is a 5 -year average value.


## Marijuana Composite Ranking

by School District, Clark County


Composite Risk Ranking $\qquad$
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DATA NOTES: The percentile of the composite risk scores. The composite risk scores were calculated using standardized indicators in marijuana consumption and consequence. Cartography: Irina Sharkova and Steve Leibenguth
SOURCE: DSHS Research and Data Analysis, Community Outcome and Risk Evaluation Geographic Information System (CORE GIS).
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## Marijuana Consumption Ranking

by School District, Clark County
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DATA NOTES: The percentile of the consumption risk scores. The composite risk scores were calculated using standardized indicators in marijuana consumption based on the 2018 HYS data. Cartography: Irina Sharkova and Steve Leibenguth
SOURCE: DSHS Research and Data Analysis, Community Outcome and Risk Evaluation Geographic Information System (CORE GIS).
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Alcohol, Tobacco, Marijuana and Prescription Opioids Composite Ranking
by School District, Clark County
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DATA NOTES: The percentile of the composite risk scores. The composite risk scores were calculated using standardized indicators in the alcohol, tobacco, marijuana and prescription opioids (ATMO) consumption and consequence. Cartography: Irina Sharkova and Steve Leibenguth.
SOURCE: DSHS Research and Data Analysis, Community Outcome and Risk Evaluation Geographic Information System (CORE GIS).
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## Alcohol, Tobacco, Marijuana and Prescription Opioids Consumption Ranking

by School District, Clark County


Consumption Risk Ranking

Washington State \& Health Services

DATA NOTES: The percentile of the consumption risk scores. The consumption risk scores were calculated using standardized indicators in the alcohol, tobacco, marijuana and prescription opioids (ATMO) consumption based on the 2018 HYS. Cartography: Irina Sharkova and Steve Leibenguth.
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## Consequence Risk Ranking

by School District, Clark County


Washington Stat Department of Socia \& Health Services

DATA NOTES: The percentile of the consequence risk scores. The consequence risk scores were calculated using standardized indicators in three sub-domains: school performance, youth delinquency, and mental health. Cartography: Irina Sharkova and Steve Leibenguth SOURCE: DSHS Research and Data Analysis, Community Outcome and Risk Evaluation Geographic Information System (CORE GIS)
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## Marijuana Composite Ranking

## by High School Attendance Area, Vancouver School District



Washington Stat Department of Socia \& Health Services

DATA NOTES: The percentile of the composite risk scores. The composite risk scores were calculated using standardized indicators in marijuana consumption and consequence. Cartography: Irina Sharkova and Steve Leibenguth.
SOURCE: DSHS Research and Data Analysis, Community Outcome and Risk Evaluation Geographic Information System (CORE GIS)
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## Marijuana Consumption Ranking

by High School Attendance Area, Vancouver School District


Washingtonstate Department of Socia \& Health Services

DATA NOTES: The percentile of the consumption risk scores. The composite risk scores were calculated using standardized indicators in marijuana consumption based on the 2018 HYS data. Cartography: Irina Sharkova and Steve Leibenguth.
SOURCE: DSHS Research and Data Analysis, Community Outcome and Risk Evaluation Geographic Information System (CORE GIS).
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Alcohol, Tobacco, Marijuana and Prescription Opioids Composite Ranking
by High School Attendance Area, Vancouver School District
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DATA NOTES: The percentile of the composite risk scores. The composite risk scores were calculated using standardized indicators in the alcohol, tobacco, marijuana and prescription opioids (ATMO) consumption and consequence. Cartography: Irina Sharkova and Steve Leibenguth.
SOURCE: DSHS Research and Data Analysis, Community Outcome and Risk Evaluation Geographic Information System (CORE GIS).
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## Alcohol, Tobacco, Marijuana and Prescription Opioids Consumption Ranking

by High School Attendance Area, Vancouver School District
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DATA NOTES: The percentile of the consumption risk scores. The consumption risk scores were calculated using standardized indicators in the alcohol, tobacco, marijuana and prescription opioids (ATMO) consumption based on the 2018 HYS. Cartography: Irina Sharkova and Steve Leibenguth
SOURCE: DSHS Research and Data Analysis, Community Outcome and Risk Evaluation Geographic Information System (CORE GIS).

## Consequence Risk Ranking

by High School Attendance Area, Vancouver School District
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DATA NOTES: The percentile of the consequence risk scores. The consequence risk scores were calculated using standardized indicators in three sub-domains: school performance, youth delinquency, and mental health. Cartography: Irina Sharkova and Steve Leibenguth. SOURCE: DSHS Research and Data Analysis, Community Outcome and Risk Evaluation Geographic Information System (CORE GIS).
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