

County Community Risk Profile (2018): Grant

School District	Population: 10-17	Risk Ranking		Risk Category Rank		Contextual Indicators	
		ATOD Risk Percentile	Indicators with Data	Consumption (ATOD)	Consequence	Economic Deprivation	Troubled Family
Grand Coulee Dam	352	98	21	Very High	Very High	Average	Average
Quincy	1,848	90	21	High	Very High	Average	Low
Warden	626	89	21	High	High	High	Average
Soap Lake	308	87	21	High	High	Very High	High
Wilson Creek	54	86	12	Very High	Average	No Data	Low
Moses Lake	5,354	85	21	Very High	Average	High	Average
Ephrata	1,558	59	21	Average	Average	Average	Average
Wahluke	1,206	52	21	Average	Average	Average	Very Low
Royal	986	28	21	Low	Average	Average	Very Low
Coulee-Hartline	115	.	3	No Data	No Data	Average	Average

NOTES:

This risk profile reflects the risk levels of this county as of February 2018. School districts with no high schools are not included in this summary. Please note risk levels and risk rankings may change over time.

The ATOD consumption risk score is calculated from prevalence of alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use. The consequence risk score is calculated from school performance, youth delinquency, and mental health 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, 26 indicators were used.
- 3) To consider other contextual information, examine the "Population: Age 0-17", "economic deprivation" indicator, and the "troubled family" indicator. Note the "Population 0-17 year olds" value will be greater than district enrollment as it accounts for kids not in school as well as those in private schools.

Marijuana Composite Ranking

by School District, Grant County, 2018



Composite Risk Ranking

- Average 25 - 74
- Very Low 1 - 9
- School Districts
- Highways and Major Roads
- Very High 90 - 99
- Low 10 - 24
- No data
- Counties
- Water Bodies
- High 75 - 89

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.

SOURCE: DSHS Research and Data Analysis, Community Outcome and Risk Evaluation Information System (CORE).




Transforming lives

March 20, 2018

Marijuana Consumption Ranking

by School District, Grant County, 2018



Consumption Risk Ranking

- Average 25 - 74
- Very Low 1 - 9
- School Districts
- Highways and Major Roads
- Very High 90 - 99
- Low 10 - 24
- No data
- Counties
- Water Bodies
- High 75 - 89

DATA NOTES: The percentile of the consumption risk scores. The consumption risk scores were calculated using standardized indicators in marijuana consumption. Cartography: Irina Sharkova.

SOURCE: DSHS Research and Data Analysis, Community Outcome and Risk Evaluation Information System (CORE).




Transforming lives

March 20, 2018

Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs Composite Ranking

by School District, Grant County, 2018



Composite Risk Ranking	Average 25 - 74	Very Low 1 - 9	School Districts	Highways and Major Roads
Very High 90 - 99	Low 10 - 24	No data	Counties	Water Bodies
High 75 - 89				

DATA NOTES: The percentile of the composite risk scores. The composite risk scores were calculated using standardized indicators in the alcohol, tobacco and other drugs (ATOD) consumption and consequence. Cartography: Irina Sharkova.
SOURCE: DSHS Research and Data Analysis, Community Outcome and Risk Evaluation Information System (CORE).




Transforming lives

March 20, 2018

Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs Consumption Ranking

by School District, Grant County, 2018



Consumption Risk Ranking

- Average 25 - 75
- Very Low 1 - 9
- Very High 90 - 99
- Low 10 - 24
- No data
- High 76 - 89

School Districts
 Counties
 Highways and Major Roads
 Water Bodies

DATA NOTES: The percentile of the consumption risk scores. The consumption risk scores were calculated using standardized indicators in the alcohol, tobacco and other drugs (ATOD) consumption. Cartography: Irina Sharkova.

SOURCE: DSHS Research and Data Analysis, Community Outcome and Risk Evaluation Information System (CORE).




Transforming lives

March 20, 2018

Consequence Risk Ranking

by School District, Grant County, 2018



Consequence Risk Ranking

- Average 25 - 74
- Very Low 1 - 9
- School Districts
- Highways and Major Roads
- Very High 90 - 99
- Low 10 - 24
- No data
- Counties
- Water Bodies
- High 75 - 89

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.
SOURCE: DSHS Research and Data Analysis, Community Outcome and Risk Evaluation Information System (CORE).



Transforming lives

March 20, 2018