Risk and Protection Profile for Substance Abuse Prevention in Grant County

Washington State Department of Social and Health Services
Management Services Administration
Research and Data Analysis Division

Risk and Protection Profile for Substance Abuse Prevention Planning in Grant County

Linda Becker, Ph.D.
Maija Sandberg
Vera Barga
Martin Hankins, Ph.D.

Washington State Department of Social and Health Services
Research and Data Analysis Division
in conjunction with the
Division of Alcohol and Substance Abuse
Olympia, Washington 98504-5204

May 2001

When ordering this Report, please refer to:
Report Number 4.40-13

Risk and Protective Factors Report Staff
Director: Linda Becker
Data Collection and Analysis: Maija Sandberg, Vera Barga, and Martin Hankins
Design & Production Assistance: Nora Ellsworth
Editorial Assistance: Pam Darby, Shelli Young

Washington State Survey of Adolescent Health Behaviors
Implementation: Eric Einspruch, Ph.D. RMC
Sponsors: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Health, Division of Alcohol and Substance Abuse and the Office of Community Development

Department of Social and Health Services
Dennis Braddock, Secretary

Management Services Administration
Kennith Harden, Assistant Secretary

Research and Data Analysis Division
Elizabeth Kohlenberg, Ph.D., Director

In conjunction with
Division of Alcohol and Substance Abuse
Kenneth D. Stark, Director
Antoinette Krupski, Ph.D., Research Administrator
Michael Langer, Prevention Services Supervisor

Acknowledgements

This report benefitted enormously from the contributions of the many individuals and their agencies who collect and maintain the data reported in this Risk and Protection Profile. Besieged by data requests as most state agencies are, these people indirectly but tirelessly support the planning and research that enhances state, county, and community efforts to prevent substance use and abuse among the youth of Washington.

In addition, the expanding participation of schools in the Washington State Survey of Adolescent Health Behaviors dramatically improves the local planning and monitoring of prevention activities. All of us working in prevention owe a debt of gratitude to the school personnel and students who contributed their time to this important survey effort.

Highlights of this County Profile

The Risk and Protective Factor Profile for each county contains the basic building blocks for the first phase of a county level needs assessment for substance abuse prevention. Besides reporting on the most recent collection of social indicator or archival data and student survey data, the sections called "Workbook" offer guidelines on how to use these data in a needs assessment that supports science-based prevention planning.

Workbook: Assess Archival Data Page 1

This section defines "archival indicators", also known as social indicators, offers suggestions about how to interpret the data, and explains how to read the archival data graphs and tables.

County Archival Data Page 15

Archival data is presented as summary measures and individual indicators, with comparison of county data to the state and to a set of similar counties called "Counties Like Us". The section is organized by domain---community, family, school and individual. There is also a section on other problem behaviors. The archival section includes data only on risk factors and prevalence indicators. There are no archival data sources for protective factors.

Workbook: Analyze Student Survey Data Page 49

This section contains information about interpreting student survey data, emphasizing the issues that arise in comparison between the Fall 2000 survey and the 1998 survey. The workbook includes guidelines on interpretation, taking into account level and geographic distribution of survey participation.

Student Survey Data Page 61

The results of the Fall 2000 Washington State Survey of Adolescent Health Behavior are presented by county (for those counties where participation was widespread) and by state. In addition, where data is available, these results are compared to results for the 1998 survey. Data are presented in charts and tables. The section includes a table that compares school district survey participation to Fall enrollment.

Appendices:

Technical Notes Page 89

Glossary of Archival Indicators Page 99

Police Agencies not reporting Arrests to UCR Page 107

The Washington State Survey of Adolescent Health Behaviors 2000: Risk and Protective Factors with Survey Items Page 111

Contents

Highlights of this County Profile v

PART ONE - Needs Assessment Workbook: Archival Data 1

Publication's WEB address 1
Assess Archival Data 3
Needs Assessment Worksheet 10
Reading the Charts and Graphs 11

PART TWO - Archival Data 15

County Profile 17

Community

Availability of Drugs 18
Alcohol Retail Licenses 18
Tobacco Sales Licenses 19
Extreme Economic and Social Deprivation 20
Children in Aid to Families Programs 20
Food Stamp Recipients 21
Free and Reduced Lunch Programs 21
Low Birthweight Babies Born 22
Unemployment 22
Low Neighborhood Attachment & Community Disorganization 23
Population Not Registered to Vote 23
Population Not Voting in Elections 24
Prisoners in State Correctional Systems, Age 18+ 24
Transitions and Mobility 25
Existing Home Sales 25
Net Migration 26
New Residence Construction 26

Family

Family Conflict 27
Divorce 28
Domestic Violence Arrests 28
Family History of Substance Abuse 29
Adults in Alcohol and Drug Treatment 29
Alcohol and Drug Related Deaths 30
Family Management Problems 31
Children in Foster Care 31
Victims in Accepted Child Abuse Referrals 32

Contents (continued)

School	Low Commitment to School	33
	High School Dropouts	33
	Low School Achievement	34
	Poor Academic Performance, Grade 4	34
	Poor Academic Performance, Grade 8	35
Individual/ Peer	Early Initiation of Problem Behavior	36
	Alcohol and Drug Related Arrests, Age 10-14	36
	Property Crime Arrests, Age 10-14	37
	Vandalism Arrests, Age 10-14	37
Additional Measures: Crime	Non-Violent Crime	38
	Adult Property Crime Arrests	38
	Vandalism and Conduct Type Arrests, Age 10-17	39
	Property Crime Arrests, Age 10-17	39
	Violence	40
	Adult Violent Crime Arrests	40
	Violent Crime Arrests, Age 10-17	41
Additional Measures: Substance Use	Substance Use	42
	Alcohol and Drug Treatment, Age 10-17	42
	Adult Alcohol Related Arrests	43
	Adult Drug Related Arrests	43
	Adult Drunken Driving Arrests	44
	Alcohol Related Traffic Fatalities	44
	Alcohol Violation Arrests, Age 10-17	45
	Drug Law Violation Arrests, Age 10-17	45
Additional Measures: Other	Adolescent Sexual Behavior	46
	Sexually Transmitted Diseases, Birth-19	46
	Births, Mother's Age 10-17	47
	Suicide	48
	Suicide and Suicide Attempts, Age 10-17	48

PART THREE - Needs Assessment Workbook: Student Survey Data 49

The Washington State Survey of Adolescent Health Behaviors 51
Analyze Student Survey Data Flow Chart 54
Changes Between the 1998 and 2000 Survey 59

Contents (continued)

PART FOUR - Student Survey Results 61

Student Survey Data – County Level 63

Student Survey Charts 65

Substance Use and Antisocial Behavior

6th Grade 66
8th Grade 67
10th Grade 68
12th Grade 69

Risk and Protective Factors

6th Grade 72
8th Grade 73
10th Grade 74
12th Grade 75

Student Survey Data Tables 77

Substance Use – 6th Grade 78
Substance Use and Antisocial Behavior 8th, 10th, and 12th Grades 79
Risk and Protective Factors – 6th, 8th, 10th, and 12th Grades 80

Student Survey Demographics 81

Participants by School District and Grade - 2000 82
Ethnicity Compared to Enrollment by School District - 2000 83
Participants by School District and Grade - 1998 84
Ethnicity Compared to Enrollment by School District - 1998 85

Appendices 87

Appendix One: Technical Notes 89
Appendix Two: Glossary of Archival Indicators 99
Appendix Three: Police Agencies not Reporting Arrests to UCR 107
Appendix Four: The Washington State Survey of Adolescent Health Behaviors 2000: Risk and Protective Factors with Survey Items 111

Part One
Needs Assessment Workbook:
Archival Data

Needs Assessment Phase One: Archival Data

INTRODUCTION

What is Archival Data?

Archival Data for substance abuse prevention planning are indirect indicators of risk factors and problem behaviors. There are no archival indicators for protective factors. These indicators are indirect, or "proxy measures" of risk factors, in that they do not directly measure risk, but rather show a statistical correlation with measures of substance use from the student survey. The presentation of these data begins on page 18. *(For and explanation of statistical correlation, see "Correlation" in Appendix One – Technical Notes.)*

The measures of problem behaviors, which we call prevalence indicators, are also not direct measures of substance use but rather show numbers of behaviors for which there have been interventions (arrests, treatment, etc.). These data begin on page 38.

For a complete description of the research on which these archival indicators are based, see the 1997 *Profile on Risk and Protection for Substance Abuse Prevention Planning in Washington State.* You can find that report on the RDA web site at: **www.app2.wa.gov/dshs/rda/reports**

What do the tables and graphs of archival data mean?

An explanation of how to read the county risk profile and the data behind it can be found on pages 11-13.

How are archival data used in a needs assessment?

The flow chart that appears on the nest eight pages outlines the basic steps for the first phase of the needs assessment. This phase begins with the assessment of arrival data based on the county level data presented in Part Two of this report. Each step of the assessment will be explained in the following pages.



Prevalence indicators are those that directly measure problem behaviors. In archival data they are the behaviors that result in some sort of intervention---arrests, drug treatment, etc.

Prevalence measures may serve as long-term outcome measures for monitoring purposes.

Pages 11-13 show how to read the County Profiles. You can also learn how the data were analyzed, with an explanation of summary measures. Behind each summary measure are two or more proxy indicators for which there are trend data in the following tables.

On pages 11-13 you will also see how to compare county data to the state and to "**Counties Like Us"** (CLU), a group of counties that are similar to your own in some key ways. (Also see the Technical Notes page 89.)

Now you are ready to compare your risk factor summary measures and the individual indicator rates to the state and to the CLU.

Review your trend data for the indicators.



How high is too high?
As a starting point, you could define "too high" as simply "higher than the state average", or "higher than the Counties-Like-Us average".
In some instances, you may decide that the state average itself is too high, in which case even if your county is lower than the state average, it is still too high.
In some cases your knowledge of the community and its values may suggest that even a lower-than-average level of a certain risk is too high.

Drop. However, as new information becomes available, and as you monitor your prevention plan, you may need to return to these data for another look.

Needs Assessment Worksheet
Keep track of your thinking! Needs Assessment should be an iterative process---that is, as you gain new information, new questions and ideas will arise, and you will go back to the original analysis with a different perspective. Develop a worksheet that meets your needs, your process. There is a sample on page 10. This one is designed to lead to a Needs Assessment that includes a prioritization step, and suggests the need for a resource assessment.



Not sure?
There are a number of reasons why you may not be able to put certain risk factors on either the "drop" list or the worksheet. For example:
--There are no data for the risk factor Community Laws and Norms but your workgroup may think it is important.
--You may be concerned about a trend. Summary measures are based on 5-year averages---there are no trends for summary measures. However, your County Profile includes trend data for the indicators behind your summary measures (see pages 12-13 on how to read trend data tables). Examine these trends for unfavorable direction.
--There may be a risk factor that is not especially high for the whole county but you believe there are populations or areas of the county for which the risk factor is very high.
--There may be a risk factor or protective factor for which there is high community concern, even though the county rate is not above the state. See "How High . . ." on page 5.

In each of these cases, you can collect additional data to develop your ideas.



Finding and analyzing additional data

--One way to find a link between a risk factor and a potential indicator is to ask the question: What makes you think this risk factor is a problem? (There is a column for problem identification on the Worksheet.) After identifying these issues, ask, "Is there a way you can measure or count these?"

--Key informants (or local experts) may have access to data not included in the County Profile. For instance, a local health official may help you gain access to and interpret emergency room data that are linked to an important prevalence indicator or risk factor.

--While the County Profiles report all risk factors and prevalence indicators at the county level, you can request reports from RDA that have data at their original source geography. For instance, if we collect a certain data element by zip code, we can give it to you by zip code.

--If you want to match local sources of data against the data in the County Profiles, make sure you use the same "data definition", and use the same population in the denominator when calculating rates. (See "Rates" in the Technical Notes, and the Glossary for definitions.)

--If you need to develop a new indicator, make sure that the new indicator is replicable (that is, the same data can be reliably collected in future years so that you can monitor the impacts of your prevention work), and verifiable---that is, two different people could collect the same data and come up with the same results. You also want data to be stable (that is, there are no wild fluctuations from one year to the next, which may occur with things that happen very rarely, or where the population is very small). Finally, you want data that is recent, easy to understand, and will have some legitimacy in your community.



Interpreting new data elements can be difficult. You may not have trend data, and you may not have anything with which to compare.

Use **experts** in your community to help---someone who has been looking at the same data for their work. On the WestCAPT and CSAP web sites there are guidelines for interpreting many kinds of local data. On the web, go to www.unr.edu/westcapt. From that page you can also go to CSAP's Decision Support System.

Something to consider as you analyze this new data: is the indicator appropriate for **monitoring** your prevention work?

Community-wide outcome measures are unlikely to change due to prevention efforts unless there is a long-term comprehensive plan. On the other hand, a very local rate (for instance, truancy at a specific elementary school) could change with a focussed prevention program.

Make sure you have a thorough definition of your data---exactly what is included?

Some existing **data systems can be modified** to produce data for local planning. This is an important way in which having a broad-based Needs Assessment committee (including the local health department) will prove valuable.



The ideal needs assessment...
The worksheet has columns for reporting resources, readiness, and priorities. Be sure to look at the WestCAPT web site's section on resource assessment.

In some prevention planning literature, problems are prioritized before resources are assessed. As WestCAPT points out, that allows the resource assessment to be focussed on the prioritized risk and protective factors. This makes sense---resource assessments are complex.

More commonly, however, resource assessments are considered part of needs assessment. This also makes sense---needs are partly defined as gaps in resources. This is a first step in communities focussing on resources as assets.

Focused attention on prioritized community-wide goals improves the chances of success for prevention. To follow the progress of a prevention strategy, every step, every goal, should be related to a measurable outcome.

** You have now completed the first phase of a needs assessment. The next phase—analyzing survey data—begins on page 51.*

Needs Assessment (Sample) Work Sheet

Risk Factor, Protective Factor or Prevalence Indicator	How does this show up in your community? How do you know it is a problem?	Data Analyzed/Source	Are there gaps in resources? Where are they?	Are there adequate resources to fill gaps?	Is the community ready to address this?	Priority

How to Read the Charts and Graphs



How Summary Measures are Displayed

Availability of Drugs

Summary Measure

These are the same summary measures that appear on the first page of the County Profile.

This line represents the state average for this risk factor. When a bar goes to the right of the line, the risk factor is higher than the state average. If it is to the left of the line, the risk factor is lower.



Indicators	5-year Rates County	5-year Rates State	5-year Rates CLU	Standardized Scores County	Standardized Scores CLU
Alcohol Retail Licenses	3.15	1.97	2.62	0.84	0.46
Tobacco Sales Licenses	2.34	1.65	2.07	0.75	0.45
*Average Indicator Standardized Score, Summary Measure**				*0.80*	*0.46*

*See Glossary: Standardized Scores and Summary Measures.

This summary measure has two indicators. Each has its own graph.

Annual rates for the most recent 5 years are averaged.

The five year averages for county and CLU are standardized to see how different they are from the state average. Approximately 95% of the state will fall between a -2.0 and +2.0 standard deviations from state average. (For more details see Glossary.)

Alcohol Retail Licenses

Read the rate as "2.12 licenses per 1,000 people".



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	***2.12***	2.06	2.03	2.01	2.01	2.01	2.00	1.98	1.96	1.91
Counties Like Us	2.85	2.78	2.73	2.70	2.67	2.66	2.62	2.62	2.57	2.65
Cascadia	3.54	3.52	3.46	3.48	3.33	3.19	3.20	3.16	3.14	3.09
Licenses	185	187	189	195	193	191	196	197	199	202
All Persons	52,250	53,200	54,602	56,000	57,998	59,962	61,301	62,439	63,476	65,270

Note: State liquor stores and retail alcohol outlets on reservations and on military bases are not included in these data.

Pay close attention to these scales. The **differences** between the state and county rates may appear more or less important depending on the scale used.

A definition of each indicator can be found in the glossary that begins on page 92.

Availability of Drugs

Tobacco Sales Licenses

Rate Per 1,000

This is the **factor.** Different rates use different factors- some per 100 (percent), 1,000 or 100,000.



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate				2.02	1.77	1.73	1.72	1.67	1.59	1.54
Counties Like Us				2.93	2.36	2.21	2.20	2.17	1.93	1.83
Cascadia				4.77	3.12	***2.69***	2.54	2.45	2.13	1.95
Licenses (numerator)				267	181	161	156	153	135	127
All Persons (denominator)				56,000	57,998	59,962	61,301	62,439	63,476	65,270

Note: Tobacco retailers on reservations and military bases are not included.

—Rate Formula--

Rate = (numerator/denominator) x Factor

Example: $\frac{161}{59{,}962} \times 1{,}000 = 2.69$

Read the rate as 2.69 licenses per 1,000 people.

Part Two
Archival Data

County Profile: Archival Data



Availability of Drugs

Summary of Standardized Scores



Indicators	Five-year Rates County	Five-year Rates State	Five-year Rates CLU	Standardized Scores County	Standardized Scores CLU
Alcohol Retail Licenses	2.79	1.97	2.95	0.58	0.70
Tobacco Sales Licenses	2.44	1.65	2.43	0.86	0.84
*Average Indicator Standardized Score, Summary Measure**				*0.72*	*0.77*

*See Appendix One - Technical Notes: Standardized Scores and Summary Measures.

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	2.12	2.06	2.03	2.01	2.01	2.01	2.00	1.98	1.96	1.91
Counties Like Us	3.27	3.12	3.11	3.08	2.98	3.00	2.96	2.88	2.77	3.17
Grant	3.16	2.98	2.88	2.85	2.77	2.90	2.85	2.79	2.59	2.83
Licenses	173	168	168	172	172	187	189	188	181	204
All Persons	54,758	56,443	58,241	60,299	62,199	64,419	66,400	67,448	69,813	72,157

Note: Retail alcohol facilities on military bases and reservations are not licensed by the State and therefore are not included in these data.

Tobacco Sales Licenses



	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	2.02	1.77	1.73	1.72	1.67	1.59	1.54
Counties Like Us	3.00	2.63	2.63	2.52	2.41	2.32	2.27
Grant	3.00	2.72	2.83	2.58	2.40	2.29	2.16
Licenses	181	169	182	171	162	160	156
All Persons	60,299	62,199	64,419	66,400	67,448	69,813	72,157

Note: Tobacco retailers on military bases and reservations are not licensed by the State and therefore are not included in these data.

Extreme Economic and Social Deprivation

Summary of Standardized Scores



Indicators	Five-year Rates			Standardized Scores	
	County	State	CLU	County	CLU
Children in Aid to Families Programs	134.30	103.72	147.44	0.71	1.01
Food Stamp Recipients	105.83	72.03	118.29	0.93	1.27
Free and Reduced Lunch Program	42.54	30.69	46.89	0.99	1.35
Low Birthweight Babies Born	55.02	56.00	55.71	-0.07	-0.02
Unemployment, Age 16+	9.43	5.40	10.13	1.16	1.37
*Average Indicator Standardized Score, Summary Measure**				*0.74*	*1.00*

*See Appendix One - Technical Notes: Standardized Scores and Summary Measures.



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	112.48	114.77	120.25	123.76	122.93	121.29	115.27	112.24	96.04	75.41
Counties Like Us	163.03	173.63	180.07	185.28	174.44	169.82	150.38	157.19	143.55	118.08
Grant	157.11	167.62	165.96	176.43	156.56	154.90	139.49	146.01	129.90	103.83
Children in …	2,714	2,984	3,050	3,357	3,061	3,121	2,896	3,086	2,805	2,302
Children, birth-17	17,274	17,802	18,378	19,027	19,552	20,148	20,762	21,136	21,594	22,170

Food Stamp Recipients



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	63.86	69.00	76.52	81.11	81.56	76.09	73.26	82.17	72.06	57.31
Counties Like Us	114.81	129.06	139.66	141.55	134.41	124.96	111.39	130.04	122.20	103.63
Grant	109.61	120.39	124.04	129.39	118.76	116.80	101.96	117.94	104.48	89.60
Recipients	6,002	6,795	7,224	7,802	7,387	7,524	6,770	7,955	7,294	6,465
All Persons	54,758	56,443	58,241	60,299	62,199	64,419	66,400	67,448	69,813	72,157

Free and Reduced Lunch Program



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	23.40	25.36	27.39	27.95	29.39	30.60	31.16	30.89	31.34	
Counties Like Us	40.94	42.83	46.26	43.93	44.04	45.04	47.88	47.01	50.35	
Grant	41.30	43.41	45.51	39.39	40.18	40.95	42.74	44.24	44.30	
Approved	4,472	4,927	5,261	5,440	5,794	6,114	6,566	6,968	7,056	
Students, K-12	10,829	11,349	11,561	13,809	14,421	14,931	15,361	15,749	15,927	

Extreme Economic and Social Deprivation

Low Birthweight Babies Born



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	52.79	51.06	52.88	51.99	52.81	55.94	56.33	56.90	57.89	59.38
Counties Like Us	59.21	56.17	46.01	47.92	59.62	57.29	53.99	52.05	55.80	62.59
Grant	52.10	57.17	48.80	56.41	56.03	61.78	49.46	54.07	53.97	64.01
Low-weight Babies	52	63	55	66	65	80	64	75	72	90
All Births	998	1,102	1,127	1,170	1,160	1,295	1,294	1,387	1,334	1,406

Note: Changes in data result from on-going updates to birth records. NR-No rate is given when the numerator is less than 5.

Unemployment, Age 16+

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	4.93	6.39	7.59	7.63	6.42	6.37	6.50	4.77	4.76	4.72
Counties Like Us	9.74	11.43	12.14	12.29	9.70	10.36	11.56	9.39	10.01	9.37
Grant	8.53	10.29	11.15	11.30	9.44	9.74	10.49	8.55	9.12	9.31
Unemployed, 16+	2,310	2,920	3,360	3,560	3,070	3,260	3,690	3,110	3,410	3,570
Labor Force,16+	27,070	28,380	30,130	31,500	32,520	33,480	35,190	36,360	37,400	38,340

Low Neighborhood Attachment

Summary of Standardized Scores



Indicators	Five-year Rates			Standardized Scores	
	County	State	CLU	County	CLU
Population Not Registered to Vote	38.04	26.17	33.89	1.17	0.76
Population Not Voting in Elections	38.12	39.73	38.33	-0.25	-0.22
Prisoners in State Correctional Systems, Age 18+	134.02	114.89	141.46	0.39	0.55
*Average Indicator Standardized Score, Summary Measure**				*0.44*	*0.36*

*See Appendix One - Technical Notes: Standardized Scores and Summary Measures.

Note: Residential Vacancies which came from the Census was dropped from this measure because data is only available once every ten years.



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	38.20	38.49	25.09	27.55	25.72	28.52	23.59	25.97	25.38	27.41
Counties Like Us	38.65	40.37	31.38	35.24	34.03	34.69	31.88	33.66	34.16	34.99
Grant	40.56	41.55	32.76	35.87	35.10	35.68	35.09	38.55	40.44	40.04
Not Registered	15,204	16,056	13,058	14,804	14,970	15,796	16,016	17,852	19,502	20,017
Persons, 18+	37,484	38,641	39,863	41,272	42,647	44,271	45,638	46,312	48,219	49,987

Low Neighborhood Attachment

Population Not Voting in Elections



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	38.76	32.10	17.40	44.51	40.15	50.71	25.48	43.35	37.83	42.23
Counties Like Us	33.35	35.41	19.33	42.41	32.76	50.44	26.34	38.99	35.90	40.70
Grant	31.93	32.69	17.21	37.72	33.65	50.68	25.16	38.29	36.85	40.07
Not Voting	7,114	7,383	4,613	9,985	9,313	14,431	7,454	10,897	10,583	12,008
Reg'd Voters	22,280	22,585	26,805	26,468	27,677	28,475	29,622	28,460	28,717	29,970

Prisoners in State Correctional Systems, Age 18+



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	87.29	91.42	98.63	98.22	100.27	109.29	112.44	116.06	119.38	116.91
Counties Like Us	145.45	149.37	137.55	151.96	145.02	144.30	146.60	147.40	135.54	134.12
Grant	63.92	70.87	82.42	112.77	136.66	131.95	138.55	152.71	130.35	117.80
Prisoners, 18+	35	40	48	68	85	85	92	103	91	85
All Persons	54,758	56,443	58,241	60,299	62,199	64,419	66,400	67,448	69,813	72,157

Note: NR-No rate is given when the numerator is less than 5.

Transitions and Mobility

Summary of Standardized Scores



Indicators	Five-year Rates			Standardized Scores	
	County	State	CLU	County	CLU
Existing Home Sales	13.64	18.39	16.02	-1.00	-0.50
Net Migration	13.09	8.36	7.24	0.71	-0.17
New Residence Construction	5.45	7.47	5.38	-0.49	-0.51
*Average Indicator Standardized Score, Summary Measure**				*-0.26*	*-0.39*

*See Appendix One - Technical Notes: Standardized Scores and Summary Measures.

Note: Households in Rental Properties which came from the Census was dropped from this measure because data is only available once every ten years.

Existing Home Sales



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	18.02	17.39	17.85	18.48	18.31	16.43	16.85	18.04	19.79	20.61
Counties Like Us	16.23	15.64	16.12	16.53	18.87	15.74	15.33	16.12	17.04	15.84
Grant	12.97	12.40	12.71	13.10	18.01	15.21	13.25	13.34	13.89	12.61
Sales	710	700	740	790	1,120	980	880	900	970	910
All Persons	54,758	56,443	58,241	60,299	62,199	64,419	66,400	67,448	69,813	72,157

Transitions and Mobility

Net Migration



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	18.01	16.60	13.85	12.55	10.24	10.05	8.88	7.79	5.04	
Counties Like Us	12.56	17.82	19.07	21.75	15.55	12.27	5.62	2.95	0.52	
Grant	22.79	20.71	21.05	23.37	21.42	20.16	12.59	8.81	3.77	
New Residents	1,248	1,169	1,226	1,409	1,332	1,299	836	594	263	
All Persons	54,758	56,443	58,241	60,299	62,199	64,419	66,400	67,448	69,813	

Note: Based on a three-year rolling average, previously reported as a five-year rolling average.

New Residence Construction



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	9.85	6.45	7.21	7.56	7.78	7.03	7.19	7.33	8.00	
Counties Like Us	3.01	3.52	4.09	4.68	5.65	5.28	5.21	5.17	5.60	
Grant	1.99	3.44	4.09	5.72	5.96	5.90	4.44	5.10	5.89	
New Residences	109	194	238	345	371	380	295	344	411	
All Persons	54,758	56,443	58,241	60,299	62,199	64,419	66,400	67,448	69,813	

Family Conflict

Summary of Standardized Scores



Indicators	Five-year Rates			Standardized Scores	
	County	State	CLU	County	CLU
Divorce	6.27	6.62	5.91	-0.32	-0.64
Domestic Violence Arrests	9.70	7.27	8.79	1.06	0.66
*Average Indicator Standardized Score, Summary Measure**				*0.37*	*0.01*

*See Appendix One - Technical Notes: Standardized Scores and Summary Measures.



	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	7.60	7.47	7.27	7.22	6.79	6.69	6.65	6.60	6.40
Counties Like Us	6.74	6.86	6.93	6.79	6.12	6.17	5.92	5.98	5.41
Grant	6.98	7.26	7.96	6.89	5.95	6.15	6.11	7.00	6.08
Divorces	288	309	351	314	282	301	303	361	325
Persons, 15+	41,262	42,559	44,069	45,557	47,357	48,938	49,589	51,588	53,411

Note: Divorces are reported by county of wife's residence or by husband's residence when her's is not available.

Family Conflict

Domestic Violence Arrests



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	4.58	4.62	5.65	6.02	6.66	7.43	7.30	7.62	7.29	
Counties Like Us	7.21	7.39	7.98	8.09	7.84	8.85	8.25	9.39	9.54	
Grant	5.92	6.26	7.45	7.92	7.60	8.76	9.07	10.90	11.86	
Arrests, 18+	222	242	297	327	324	388	414	505	572	
Persons, 18+	37,484	38,641	39,863	41,272	42,647	44,271	45,638	46,312	48,219	

Family History of Substance Abuse

Summary of Standardized Scores



Indicators	Five-year Rates			Standardized Scores	
	County	State	CLU	County	CLU
Adults in Alcohol and Drug Treatment	11.74	10.86	17.38	0.16	1.16
Alcohol- and Drug-Related Deaths	6.30	5.69	6.88	0.22	0.44
*Average Indicator Standardized Score, Summary Measure**				*0.19*	*0.80*

*See Appendix One - Technical Notes: Standardized Scores and Summary Measures.

Note: Alcohol- and Drug-Related Deaths were not included in the previous county report.



	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	9.83	9.52	10.12	10.52	10.49	10.64	10.69	11.11	11.31
Counties Like Us	14.74	13.99	15.83	16.92	16.30	16.86	17.16	18.35	18.14
Grant	12.63	10.59	12.14	14.54	12.81	12.80	11.31	11.20	10.76
Admits, 18+	488	422	501	620	567	584	524	540	538
Persons, 18+	38,641	39,863	41,272	42,647	44,271	45,638	46,312	48,219	49,987

Note: Rates vary from the last report because people enrolled more than one year in outpatient or methadone treatment are now included and refinements in our geographic assignment process caused slight changes. Persons in Department of Corrections treatment programs are not included.

Family Substance Abuse



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	5.36	5.13	5.33	5.29	5.61	5.84	5.67	5.79	5.55	
Counties Like Us	6.72	6.51	5.64	6.11	6.86	7.39	6.75	6.92	6.54	
Grant	5.97	7.28	4.42	5.51	6.68	5.60	5.67	6.52	7.10	
AOD-related	27	30	19	26	34	29	33	32	38	
Deaths	452	412	430	472	509	518	582	491	535	

Family Management Problems

Summary of Standardized Scores



Indicators	Five-year Rates County	State	CLU	Standardized Scores County	CLU
Children in Foster Care	4.51	4.16	5.21	0.18	0.54
Victims in Accepted Child Abuse Referrals	30.31	38.80	41.00	-0.45	0.12
*Average Indicator Standardized Score, Summary Measure**				*-0.14*	*0.33*

*See Appendix One - Technical Notes: Standardized Scores and Summary Measures.

Note: Children Living Away from Parents which came from the Census was dropped from this measure because data is only available once every ten years.



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	4.41	4.44	4.41	4.25	4.13	4.14	4.22	4.17	4.18	4.07
Counties Like Us	6.15	6.28	6.28	6.02	5.83	5.83	5.94	5.90	4.16	4.28
Grant	5.79	5.90	5.88	5.62	5.47	5.41	5.44	5.39	3.29	3.16
In Foster Care	100	105	108	107	107	109	113	114	71	70
Persons, birth-17	17,274	17,802	18,378	19,027	19,552	20,148	20,762	21,136	21,594	22,170

Family Management Problems

Victims in Accepted Child Abuse Referrals



	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	43.50	41.30	40.03	39.71	40.16	38.98	39.60	37.82	37.51
Counties Like Us	43.24	45.02	47.32	48.38	45.85	42.87	40.92	39.23	36.50
Grant	47.69	48.26	41.15	44.45	38.47	35.26	30.66	25.70	22.42
Accepted Victims	849	887	783	869	775	732	648	555	497
Persons, birth-17	17,802	18,378	19,027	19,552	20,148	20,762	21,136	21,594	22,170

Note: A "referral" is a report of suspected child abuse.

Low Commitment to School

Summary of Standardized Scores



Indicators	Five-year Rates County	State	CLU	Standardized Scores County	CLU
High School Dropouts	8.40	8.17	9.96	0.09	0.71
*Average Indicator Standardized Score, Summary Measure**				*0.09*	*0.71*

*See Appendix One - Technical Notes: Standardized Scores and Summary Measures.

High School Dropouts



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	6.36	6.68	0.00	8.47	9.45	7.62	7.94	7.61		
Counties Like Us	8.13	7.48	0.00	11.80	12.36	8.71	9.23	8.48		
Grant	6.71	6.66	NR	11.05	10.13	6.75	7.59	7.37		
Dropouts, 9th-12th	232	239	0	428	409	330	384	370		
Students, 9th-12th	3,456	3,589	3,350	3,874	4,038	4,886	5,062	5,018		

Note: No data are available for 1992.

Low School Achievement

Summary of Standardized Scores



Indicators	Five-year Rates			Standardized Scores	
	County	State	CLU	County	CLU
Poor Academic Performance, Grade 4	42.38	26.77	38.84	2.08	1.61
Poor Academic Performance, Grade 8	31.95	20.19	30.92	1.78	1.63
*Average Indicator Standardized Score, Summary Measure**				*1.93*	*1.62*

*See Appendix One - Technical Notes: Standardized Scores and Summary Measures.



	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997
State Rate	25.21	26.98	27.52	28.46	27.43	25.39	25.06
Counties Like Us	35.32	36.38	37.85	39.12	41.02	38.71	37.43
Grant	38.79	36.81	38.05	43.27	43.95	42.76	43.30
Low Scorers	384	353	347	450	465	425	472
Tested, 4th grade	990	959	912	1,040	1,058	994	1,090

Washington's testing system is in the process of changing content and grades tested. Methods for developing trend data are evolving, but more current data are not available at this time.

Poor Academic Performance, Grade 8



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate		20.05	20.98	21.32	21.60	21.61	18.76	17.43	21.66	
Counties Like Us		27.28	26.63	28.09	29.48	31.78	29.11	30.93	33.25	
Grant		29.46	27.13	26.92	30.71	33.72	29.89	29.81	35.04	
Low Scorers		246	245	224	304	346	281	319	411	
Tested, 8th grade		835	903	832	990	1,026	940	1,070	1,173	

Washington's testing system is in the process of changing content and grades tested. Methods for developing trend data are evolving, but more current data are not available at this time.

Early Initiation of Problem Behavior

Summary of Standardized Scores



Indicators	Five-year Rates			Standardized Scores	
	County	State	CLU	County	CLU
Alcohol- and Drug-Related Arrests, Age 10-14	5.60	3.77	6.93	0.48	0.84
Property Crime Arrests, Age 10-14	22.88	26.40	25.36	-0.35	-0.10
Vandalism Arrests, Age 10-14	3.06	3.71	6.68	-0.19	0.86
*Average Indicator Standardized Score, Summary Measure**				*-0.02*	*0.53*

*See Appendix One - Technical Notes: Standardized Scores and Summary Measures.

Alcohol- and Drug-Related Arrests, Age 10-14



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	2.32	1.93	1.95	2.24	3.49	3.59	4.19	4.18	3.45	3.56
Counties Like Us	3.67	3.15	4.80	4.29	5.43	6.39	8.02	7.62	7.13	6.56
Grant	6.10	2.21	12.15	3.31	5.46	3.39	5.76	6.75	6.53	7.53
Arrests, 10-14	10	10	22	16	27	18	32	37	36	43
Adjst'd Pop 10-14	1,639	4,517	1,811	4,831	4,944	5,305	5,553	5,479	5,516	5,714

Note: 1) Data may differ from our last report because of refinements to our population adjustment process. Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report arrests to UCR. In spite of this population adjustment, when the non-reporting police jurisdiction is where much of the crime occurs, the rate for the county will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted and the agencies not reporting, see Appendix Three. 2) The DUI portion of this measure is likely understated, because arrests made by the State Patrol (approximately 40% of DUI arrests) are not attributable to counties. State Patrol arrests are included in the state rates. 3) NR-No rate is given when the numerator is less than 5.

Property Crime Arrests, Age 10-14



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	29.62	30.47	31.39	27.65	32.38	28.36	26.89	24.23	21.12	17.26
Counties Like Us	26.43	25.13	30.70	29.25	33.38	26.94	24.11	21.28	21.44	19.50
Grant	33.56	17.49	53.56	16.56	27.91	27.14	17.65	20.44	21.94	21.70
Arrests, 10-14	55	79	97	80	138	144	98	112	121	124
Adjst'd Pop 10-14	1,639	4,517	1,811	4,831	4,944	5,305	5,553	5,479	5,516	5,714

Note: Data may differ from our last report because of refinements to our population adjustment process. Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report arrests to UCR. In spite of this population adjustment, when the non-reporting police jurisdiction is where much of the crime occurs, the rate for the county will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted and the agencies not reporting, see Appendix Three. NR-No rate is given when the numerator is less than 5.

Vandalism Arrests, Age 10-14



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	3.65	3.88	3.85	3.95	4.52	4.14	3.86	3.52	2.67	2.76
Counties Like Us	5.83	3.80	6.28	4.23	5.63	11.07	6.60	5.60	4.50	5.27
Grant	5.49	NR	7.73	1.86	2.83	5.66	1.80	2.92	2.18	4.55
Arrests, 10-14	9	2	14	9	14	30	10	16	12	26
Adjst'd Pop 10-14	1,639	4,517	1,811	4,831	4,944	5,305	5,553	5,479	5,516	5,714

Note: Data may differ from our last report because of refinements to our population adjustment process. Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report arrests to UCR. In spite of this population adjustment, when the non-reporting police jurisdiction is where much of the crime occurs, the rate for the county will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted and the agencies not reporting, see Appendix Three. NR-No rate is given when the numerator is less than 5.

Non-Violent Crime

Summary of Standardized Scores



Indicators	Five-year Rates			Standardized Scores	
	County	State	CLU	County	CLU
Adult Property Crime Arrests	11.37	8.55	8.09	0.83	-0.13
Vandalism and Conduct Type Arrests, Age 10-17	8.05	7.24	12.11	0.12	0.73
Property Crime Arrests, Age 10-17	35.17	38.47	34.93	-0.26	-0.28
*Average Indicator Standardized Score, Summary Measure**				*0.23*	*0.11*

*See Appendix One - Technical Notes: Standardized Scores and Summary Measures.

Adult Property Crime Arrests



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	10.46	9.90	9.81	8.98	9.41	9.14	8.81	8.12	7.35	6.80
Counties Like Us	10.06	9.69	9.92	9.80	9.26	8.83	7.98	7.03	7.48	6.78
Grant	6.98	8.48	11.38	9.43	10.98	12.46	11.52	9.88	11.96	9.56
Arrests, 18+	242	297	410	359	431	530	509	432	545	452
Adjst'd Pop 18+	34,662	35,026	36,031	38,086	39,241	42,530	44,172	43,740	45,580	47,301

Note: Data may differ from our last report because of refinements to our population adjustment process. Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report arrests to UCR. In spite of this population adjustment, when the non-reporting police jurisdiction is where much of the crime occurs, the rate for the county will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted and the agencies not reporting, see Appendix Three. NR-No rate is given when the numerator is less than 5.

Vandalism and Conduct Type Arrests, Age 10-17



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	6.55	6.73	7.01	7.78	8.36	7.88	7.49	7.02	5.75	5.86
Counties Like Us	7.83	6.40	8.37	7.66	10.46	17.24	12.40	11.55	8.91	9.31
Grant	7.74	1.74	9.36	4.06	5.65	9.42	6.52	10.29	8.19	9.52
Arrests, 10-17	20	12	26	30	43	78	57	88	71	85
Adjst'd Pop 10-17	2,583	6,892	2,778	7,396	7,609	8,280	8,737	8,556	8,672	8,924

Note: Data may differ from our last report because of refinements to our population adjustment process. Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report arrests to UCR. In spite of this population adjustment, when the non-reporting police jurisdiction is where much of the crime occurs, the rate for the county will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted and the agencies not reporting, see Appendix Three. NR-No rate is given when the numerator is less than 5.

Property Crime Arrests, Age 10-17



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	43.18	44.53	46.53	41.63	46.36	40.98	40.06	35.63	30.95	26.77
Counties Like Us	35.29	32.99	41.15	37.52	43.38	33.84	35.09	31.02	31.87	26.75
Grant	44.91	23.07	79.19	23.12	41.53	35.39	29.64	32.84	37.25	30.93
Arrests, 10-17	116	159	220	171	316	293	259	281	323	276
Adjst'd Pop 10-17	2,583	6,892	2,778	7,396	7,609	8,280	8,737	8,556	8,672	8,924

Note: Data may differ from our last report because of refinements to our population adjustment process. Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report arrests to UCR. In spite of this population adjustment, when the non-reporting police jurisdiction is where much of the crime occurs, the rate for the county will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted and the agencies not reporting, see Appendix Three. NR-No rate is given when the numerator is less than 5.

Violence

Summary of Standardized Scores



Indicators	Five-year Rates			Standardized Scores	
	County	State	CLU	County	CLU
Adult Violent Crime Arrests	3.77	1.90	3.13	2.30	1.52
Violent Crime Arrests, Age 10-17	4.83	4.07	4.95	0.48	0.56
*Average Indicator Standardized Score, Summary Measure**				*1.39*	*1.04*

*See Appendix One - Technical Notes: Standardized Scores and Summary Measures.

Adult Violent Crime Arrests



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	1.71	1.82	1.82	1.70	1.90	2.21	1.76	1.86	1.77	1.65
Counties Like Us	3.01	2.51	3.24	3.36	3.09	3.64	2.83	3.30	2.81	2.65
Grant	1.67	1.94	1.78	2.91	2.80	4.07	2.81	5.26	3.82	3.47
Arrests, 18+	58	68	64	111	110	173	124	230	174	164
Adjst'd Pop 18+	34,662	35,026	36,031	38,086	39,241	42,530	44,172	43,740	45,580	47,301

Note: Data may differ from our last report because of refinements to our population adjustment process. Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report arrests to UCR. In spite of this population adjustment, when the non-reporting police jurisdiction is where much of the crime occurs, the rate for the county will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted and the agencies not reporting, see Appendix Three. NR-No rate is given when the numerator is less than 5.

Violence

Violent Crime Arrests, Age 10-17



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	3.59	4.14	4.22	4.15	5.19	4.18	3.82	3.87	3.43	2.96
Counties Like Us	2.65	2.99	6.44	4.14	5.56	4.97	5.26	4.75	4.26	3.53
Grant	2.32	NR	2.88	2.16	4.73	3.74	5.15	5.73	4.73	4.48
Arrests, 10-17	6	4	8	16	36	31	45	49	41	40
Adjst'd Pop 10-17	2,583	6,892	2,778	7,396	7,609	8,280	8,737	8,556	8,672	8,924

Note: Data may differ from our last report because of refinements to our population adjustment process. Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report arrests to UCR. In spite of this population adjustment, when the non-reporting police jurisdiction is where much of the crime occurs, the rate for the county will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted and the agencies not reporting, see Appendix Three. NR-No rate is given when the numerator is less than 5.

Substance Use

Summary of Standardized Scores



Indicators	Five-year Rates			Standardized Scores	
	County	State	CLU	County	CLU
Alcohol and Drug Treatment, Age 10-17	4.88	12.72	8.14	-1.29	-0.76
Adult Alcohol-Related Arrests	11.58	12.00	15.74	-0.06	0.55
Adult Drug-Related Arrests	5.46	5.21	5.73	0.13	0.27
Adult Drunken Driving Arrests	6.68	9.27	10.87	-0.67	0.42
Alcohol-Related Traffic Fatalities	41.35	42.03	49.85	-0.05	0.62
Alcohol Violation Arrests, Age 10-17	14.24	8.86	15.75	0.48	0.61
Drug Law Violation Arrests, Age 10-17	5.40	4.99	6.24	0.20	0.60
*Average Indicator Standardized Score, Summary Measure**				*-0.18*	*0.33*

*See Appendix One - Technical Notes: Standardized Scores and Summary Measures.

Alcohol and Drug Treatment, Age 10-17



	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	6.96	6.80	8.40	10.41	11.93	12.23	13.55	13.09	12.76
Counties Like Us	4.38	4.41	4.83	6.29	6.82	6.61	9.64	9.10	8.53
Grant	3.17	3.21	3.21	6.35	4.74	3.99	4.73	3.80	7.07
Admits, 10-17	24	25	26	53	41	36	43	35	67
Persons, 10-17	7,581	7,795	8,090	8,347	8,647	9,030	9,099	9,214	9,483

Note: Data may differ from the last report because people enrolled more than one year in outpatient or methadone treatment are now included and refinements in our geographic assignment process caused slight changes. Persons in Department of Corrections treatment programs are not included.

Adult Alcohol-Related Arrests



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	16.80	16.53	16.95	16.32	13.58	10.85	11.71	12.84	11.26	10.91
Counties Like Us	17.78	19.10	20.04	17.90	16.93	15.03	14.65	14.56	17.53	16.80
Grant	11.66	11.93	12.74	10.35	10.88	9.71	7.27	11.73	17.97	17.42
Arrests, 18+	404	418	459	394	427	413	321	513	819	824
Adjst'd Pop 18+	34,662	35,026	36,031	38,086	39,241	42,530	44,172	43,740	45,580	47,301

Note: 1) Data may differ from our last report because of refinements to our population adjustment process. Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report arrests to UCR. In spite of this population adjustment, when the non-reporting police jurisdiction is where much of the crime occurs, the rate for the county will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted and the agencies not reporting, see Appendix Three. 2) The DUI portion of this measure is likely understated, because arrests made by the State Patrol (approximately 40% of DUI arrests) are not attributable to counties. State Patrol arrests are included in the state rates. 3) NR-No rate is given when the numerator is less than 5.

Adult Drug-Related Arrests



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	4.08	3.77	3.74	3.93	4.98	4.89	4.82	5.68	5.68	5.40
Counties Like Us	5.13	5.08	5.46	5.23	5.36	6.09	5.37	5.56	6.24	5.86
Grant	2.25	3.65	3.05	4.57	4.13	4.40	4.46	6.54	7.53	6.98
Arrests, 18+	78	128	110	174	162	187	197	286	343	330
Adjst'd Pop 18+	34,662	35,026	36,031	38,086	39,241	42,530	44,172	43,740	45,580	47,301

Note: Data may differ from our last report because of refinements to our population adjustment process. Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report arrests to UCR. In spite of this population adjustment, when the non-reporting police jurisdiction is where much of the crime occurs, the rate for the county will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted and the agencies not reporting, see Appendix Three. NR-No rate is given when the numerator is less than 5.

Substance Use

Adult Drunken Driving Arrests



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	11.16	11.36	12.01	11.49	10.86	8.57	8.90	9.72	8.50	8.09
Counties Like Us	12.00	13.17	12.75	13.07	11.80	10.77	10.27	10.26	11.29	10.99
Grant	8.08	8.22	8.33	7.09	6.86	5.97	4.30	7.18	9.04	9.77
Arrests, 18+	280	288	300	270	269	254	190	314	412	462
Adjst'd Pop 18+	34,662	35,026	36,031	38,086	39,241	42,530	44,172	43,740	45,580	47,301

Note: 1) Data may differ from our last report because of refinements to our population adjustment process. Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report arrests to UCR. In spite of this population adjustment, when the non-reporting police jurisdiction is where much of the crime occurs, the rate for the county will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted and the agencies not reporting, see Appendix Three. 2) The DUI portion of this measure is likely understated, because arrests made by the State Patrol (approximately 40% of DUI arrests) are not attributable to counties. State Patrol arrests are included in the state rates. 3) NR-No rate is given when the numerator is less than 5.

Alcohol-Related Traffic Fatalities



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	52.24	49.05	47.31	46.29	43.97	42.66	46.49	39.35	43.20	38.01
Counties Like Us	65.33	46.51	63.16	63.16	45.10	54.55	53.73	46.67	54.55	41.43
Grant	54.17	NR	53.33	44.44	58.82	63.64	46.67	46.67	37.50	28.95
Alcohol-related	13	3	8	8	10	7	14	14	9	11
Fatalities	24	12	15	18	17	11	30	30	24	38

Note: NR-No rate is given when the numerator is less than 5.

Alcohol Violation Arrests, Age 10-17



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	11.11	8.62	7.20	7.54	8.06	7.83	9.65	9.39	9.25	9.40
Counties Like Us	19.15	11.64	15.04	14.80	12.86	13.27	14.72	14.48	23.12	20.62
Grant	32.52	9.87	37.08	16.22	13.01	5.92	8.24	12.62	30.90	28.24
Arrests, 10-17	84	68	103	120	99	49	72	108	268	252
Adjst'd Pop 10-17	2,583	6,892	2,778	7,396	7,609	8,280	8,737	8,556	8,672	8,924

Note: 1) Data may differ from our last report because of refinements to our population adjustment process. Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report arrests to UCR. In spite of this population adjustment, when the non-reporting police jurisdiction is where much of the crime occurs, the rate for the county will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted and the agencies not reporting, see Appendix Three. 2) The DUI portion of this measure is likely understated, because arrests made by the State Patrol (approximately 40% of DUI arrests) are not attributable to counties. State Patrol arrests are included in the state rates. 3) NR-No rate is given when the numerator is less than 5.

Drug Law Violation Arrests, Age 10-17



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	2.46	2.19	2.57	3.07	4.39	4.70	5.50	5.52	4.83	4.76
Counties Like Us	1.81	1.22	2.37	3.31	3.71	5.57	7.26	7.79	6.64	6.44
Grant	2.32	0.73	3.24	2.70	1.84	3.86	5.49	7.60	7.73	8.74
Arrests, 10-17	6	5	9	20	14	32	48	65	67	78
Adjst'd Pop 10-17	2,583	6,892	2,778	7,396	7,609	8,280	8,737	8,556	8,672	8,924

Note: Data may differ from our last report because of refinements to our population adjustment process. Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report arrests to UCR. In spite of this population adjustment, when the non-reporting police jurisdiction is where much of the crime occurs, the rate for the county will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted and the agencies not reporting, see Appendix Three. NR-No rate is given when the numerator is less than 5.

Adolescent Sexual Behavior

Summary of Standardized Scores



Indicators	Five-year Rates			Standardized Scores	
	County	State	CLU	County	CLU
Sexually Transmitted Diseases, Birth-19	3.13	2.92	2.97	0.21	0.05
Births, Mother's Age 10-17	19.59	10.18	18.30	1.82	1.57
*Average Indicator Standardized Score, Summary Measure**				*1.02*	*0.81*

*See Appendix One - Technical Notes: Standardized Scores and Summary Measures.



	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	4.21	3.49	3.24	2.90	2.68	2.71	3.08	3.23
Counties Like Us	2.62	2.20	2.57	2.89	2.69	2.95	3.10	3.22
Grant	2.87	2.49	3.27	3.13	2.23	3.90	2.95	3.40
Cases, birth-19	57	51	69	68	50	89	69	82
Persons, birth-19	19,840	20,503	21,073	21,734	22,423	22,845	23,425	24,125

Adolescent Sexual Behavior



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	11.05	11.61	11.85	11.25	10.80	10.95	10.24	9.80	9.22	8.62
Counties Like Us	16.70	20.95	21.04	19.53	17.86	19.83	19.36	18.68	15.78	18.80
Grant	14.94	18.54	21.64	19.85	17.99	19.93	21.13	23.97	14.85	21.03
Birthed, 10-17	53	68	82	78	73	84	93	106	66	97
Females, 10-17	3,547	3,667	3,790	3,929	4,058	4,214	4,401	4,422	4,443	4,612

Adolescent Suicide Attempts

Summary of Standardized Scores



Indicators	Five-year Rates County	Five-year Rates State	Five-year Rates CLU	Standardized Scores County	Standardized Scores CLU
Suicide and Suicide Attempts, Age 10-17	33.83	59.34	42.23	-0.69	-0.46
*Average Indicator Standardized Score, Summary Measure**				*-0.69*	*-0.46*

*See Appendix One - Technical Notes: Standardized Scores and Summary Measures.



	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
State Rate	69.31	78.85	61.96	62.54	64.68	60.76	57.88	60.43	53.56	
Counties Like Us	89.34	69.35	97.44	105.60	39.31	26.67	44.29	59.76	40.68	
Grant	108.93	79.15	115.46	61.80	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	
Suicide & Attempt	8	6	9	5	4	3	2	2	4	
Persons, 10-17	7,344	7,581	7,795	8,090	8,347	8,647	9,030	9,099	9,214	

Part Three
Needs Assessment Workbook:
Student Survey Data

Needs Assessment Phase Two:
Analyze Student Survey Data

INTRODUCTION

What is Student Survey Data?

In Fall 2000, over 100,000 6th, 8th, 10th and 12th grade students in 629 schools successfully completed the Washington State Survey of Adolescent Health Behaviors (WSSAHB). The goal of this survey is to learn how Washington youth respond to questions about substance use and other problem behaviors, and to assess their levels of risk and protective factors that relate to substance use and other problem behaviors.

Who Receives Survey Data?

- Counties that had either survey participation by more than 50% of students in each grade (6th, 8th, 10th, and 12th), and more that half of the school buildings, or that successfully followed a random sampling plan, receive county-level results. [NOTE: Participation by all or part of a county in a survey administration that was particular to one of Washington's research grants (Diffusion or SIG) may affect county data. See the note on page 59.]
- Superintendents of school districts with more than 50% participation receive district-level reports.
- Superintendents receive school building results for all of the buildings in the district that participated in the survey.

How can a county without county-level data use WSSAHB data in their needs assessment?

- Every county profile includes results of the state-wide sample. Counties that do not have county-level data can use state results to support their needs assessment.
- Where there are no county survey results but some school district results are available, county prevention staff can work with their school partners to complete a needs assessment for a geographic area that corresponds to the school district. This workbook gives guidelines on how to interpret survey results based on the percentage and distribution of students who participated in the survey.

What is the relationship between survey data and archival data?

- Research on the relationship between archival and survey data is on-going. It is probably most useful to consider these as two ways of looking at the same thing. Other perspectives exist, for instance the perspective of local service providers and law enforcement personnel, many of whom have data to support their analyses.

- With the addition of survey data to your needs assessment process, you are in a position to weigh all the evidence you have gathered. Where all the evidence points in the same direction, your choice is clear. Where there are contradictions that you cannot resolve with the evidence on hand, you may need to look for additional information. Remember, your goal is to find and use measures for your needs assessment that
  - are reliable (or replicable), verifiable, and stable; and that
  - you can later use to monitor your prevention efforts.

♦♦Important!---READ THIS♦♦

How should prevention program planners analyze survey data?
The bars on the profiles in this report represent the percentage of students who are resilient (with protection), at risk, and who have engaged in the problem behaviors (substance use and antisocial behavior). The flow chart on pages 54-60 offer guidelines for your analysis.

In addition to changes in survey questions, the "percent at risk" and "percent with protection" is based on a new analysis of the cut-points that define risk and resiliency. An explanation of that cut-point analysis can be found in the Technical Notes. This change in analysis means that you should not compare the risk and protective factor results of the 2000 survey to **previously** published 1998 reports. The 1998 numbers reported here are adjusted to reflect the new analysis, and the school districts have received new district and building analyses.

Why was the survey changed?
Changes in the survey come from several different directions.

- Some items were dropped from this survey because of the length of the survey. However, **risk factors for which there are no data are still important for prevention programs and you are encouraged to use other data (including older survey data) for these risk factors.** Some of the missing items will be included in the 2002 survey.
- Many items that are required for monitoring and evaluating tobacco prevention efforts were added to the survey, making it longer than optimal. This length problem will be partly resolved with the 2002

survey when a joint administration of the WSSAHB and the Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS) will allow the new tobacco questions to be included in the YRBS.

- Research with our partners at the University of Washington led to the development of the cut-points, and some of the changes in risk and protective factors. This research is on-going, and we will benefit from advances in the field of prevention. In Washington State we have enough statewide and school district data that we will be able to deepen our research agenda, and this may lead to more changes in the survey items. The cut-points will stay the same, so that we can use risk and protective factor data in our monitoring and evaluation efforts.
- The change from Spring to Fall administration was based on an effort to find the optimal time in the schools' academic calendars, and to find a way to meet the needs of the planning efforts based on the WSSAHB and the YRBS.


Analyze Student Survey Data
Determine geographic and population distribution of data.
Consider the participation rate of students in each school.
Adjust scope of needs assessment to accommodate survey data availability.
Are risk factors too high or protective factors too low?
Yes
Add to Needs Assessment Worksheet


Analyze Student Survey Data
Compare school building participation in the survey to the number and geographic distribution of buildings in each school district in your county, and the school district participation to the districts in your county.
❖ If no school districts in your county participated in the survey, you can still use the statewide data for your Needs Assessment.
❖ If your school building participation is spotty, concentrated in only one part of the county, or in only one type of school (for instance, only large urban schools), you could use the data selectively, but not for countywide assessment.
❖ If only one of three elementary schools in a town or community participated, be cautious of applying these results to the whole community. The population of each school building may be very different.
Determine geographic and population distribution of data.
Consider the participation rate of students in each school
Adjust scope of needs assessment to accommodate survey data availability.
Are risk factors too high or protective factors too low?
Yes
Add to Needs Assessment Worksheet


Analyze Student Survey Data
Determine geographic and population distribution of data.
Consider the participation rate of students in each school
What percentage of students in each building, district or county participated in the survey? Any participation rate over 80% is good. However, if the rate is 80%, that still means that 20% of students did not participate. While those who did not participate may have been absent from school for a variety of reasons, in some cases there may be important differences between students who took the survey and students who did not.
Adjust scope of needs assessment to accommodate survey data availability.
Are risk factors too high or protective factors too low?
Yes
Add to Needs Assessment Worksheet

DASA Prevention and OCD Community Mobilization needs assessments can be successfully completed with county data if you have it, and state data if you do not. In addition, you can complete a needs assessment for any other geographic boundary for which you have adequate data.

No county data?

For instance, if you do not have countywide survey data, you can do a county needs assessment based on archival data and state student survey data. Say the members of your needs assessment team have *qualitative* data that supports the focus on a particular risk factor, but no survey data. Your needs assessment can site the state rate for the risk factor (your *quantitative* data) and support it with your other local evidence. (Before developing a prevention program to address this risk factor, you should develop an indicator for monitoring outcomes.)

If you have survey data for some of your county's school districts (say, two out of five of the county's school districts), you can complete a more precise needs assessment for the communities that most closely correspond to those school districts. In that case you may want to collect additional archival data that matches the school district or community boundaries.

NOTE

Counties with research projects (SIG and Diffusion)

Even though a significant part of your county has participated in student surveys administrated at other times, you may not have county results in this report, or you may not have county comparison data from 1998/99. This is because the surveys are not precisely comparable. Additional analytic work by the researchers will be required to adjust those data for new cut-points and differences in wording.



Consider the percent of students at risk in terms of comparisons with other geographies and times.

Tips on Analysis

There have been a number of changes between the 1998 survey and Fall 2000. (See the next page for a list and discussion of those changes.) It is essential that you consider these changes when comparing the new data to survey data in previous reports.

Compare local results to state results, and 1998 data to Fall 2000 data.

- The findings in this survey give a general picture of students' perceptions and behaviors. These are estimates, not exact measures.
- Differences in results can be considered from both a statistical and a practical point of view. **Statistical significance** is influenced primarily by the number of students who participated in the survey. In general, the more students who participate, the more precise are these estimates. In small counties and school districts, differences of less than 5% are probably not important.
- Differences in results are **practically significant** if the differences are programmatically meaningful.



Changes Between the 1998 and 2000 Survey

- If you have county-level survey data for 1998, you will notice that the figures presented here for **1998 "percent at risk" and "percent with protection" are different from those published in the 1999 County Profiles**. These changes are based on research that established a new set of "cut-points"---the point on a risk factor scale at which a student was determined to be at risk, or on a protective factor scale that indicated "with protection", or resilient. (See Technical Notes for more detail.) In the current report we have adjusted the 1998 data so that you can compare 1998 to 2000. The 1995 survey will be adjusted with new cut-points later this year.

  Keep this in mind when you look at previous needs assessments, grant applications, or any other reference to survey data. Also, inform your partners and other people with whom you have shared survey data.

- There were some **changes in the survey items** that affect the way survey results can be interpreted:
  - Two scales were dropped from the survey: **Transitions and Mobility**, and **Rebelliousness**. Transitions and Mobility is still an important risk factor. Evidence for this risk factor can be collected from schools (or perhaps more conveniently from the ESD) as school building "turnover" rate.
  - The scale for **Community Disorganization** is not complete---there is only a single item from the scale. More analysis will be needed to determine if that single item reflects the risk factor with any precision. That item is not reported here, but is available in the item details from the school district reports.
  - The question for **30-day use of alcohol** changed so much from 1998 to 2000 that they are not comparable. In 1998 the questions was phrased "how many times have you used alcohol (beer, wine, wine coolers, hard liquor)?" In 2000 the questions was "On how many days did you drink a glass, can or bottle of alcohol (beer, wine, wine coolers, hard liquor)?" Initial evidence suggests that the difference in wording has had a significant impact on student responses.
  - **Anti-Social Behavior** scale has been changed from a risk factor to a series of prevalence indicators.
  - Some buildings elected to include **Poor Family Management**, plus two **protective factors in the family domain**. Those are not reflected in the county report but may be available from individual school districts.

- The 1998 survey was administered in the Spring, the 2000 survey in the Fall. Most researchers expect that there are **seasonal effects** in student surveys, but there is no research that clarifies this effect. Bear this in mind if you see unexpected changes from Spring 1998 to Fall 2000.

Select the risk factors that are too high, protective factors that are too low, and prevalence indicators that are unacceptably high.

- Here are a number of reasons why you may choose to prioritize a particular risk factor, protective factor, or prevalence indicator:
  - One factor or one group of factors may stand out among all the other factors in your profile.
  - Certain risk factors may be higher than the state average, or protective factors much lower.
  - You may see a big change from 1998 to 2000, which you can corroborate from other evidence that represents a trend in the wrong direction.
  - Strongly held values in your community may lead to the selection of a risk factor or a protective factor despite a positive comparison with state data. In other words, being better off than the state does not necessarily mean being fine.
  - In the social development model, certain risk factors are especially important at different points in a child's development. For instance, if there is serious concern about poor academic performance among 8th and 10th graders, you may focus on commitment to school for younger kids, even if that risk factor is not the highest on your profile.



Part Four
Student Survey Results

Student Survey Data – County Level

Some of the profiles on the following pages represent a random sample of schools, and some contain results for each grade level that had at least 50% students participation in the survey. **50% should not be construed as valid county level data! Interpret these data with caution.**

Nineteen counties have county-level data
Where a sample was drawn and completed (King, Pierce, Snohomish, and 6th grade in Grays Harbor), ***sample*** data is reported in the county profile. For the fifteen other counties that achieved adequate participation, the responses of all participants are included in the results.

The Validity of County Data – Sample and Census
The extent of survey participation varied widely between counties in the Fall 2000 WSSAHB (Washington State Survey of Adolescent Health Behaviors). Nineteen counties are receiving at least 6th and 8th grade county-level survey results. However, some counties that had good participation will not find county data. For a meaningful county profile, participation must be widespread---from one end of the county to the other.

Because of the interest in county-level data, the research team agreed to a very low threshold for printing county results---50% participation, including more than one school district and more than one of each kind of school. This threshold is much lower than would be required for a *valid* county report---one that can be considered representative. In small counties, valid results require a **census** of students---that is, all schools participate. Base your interpretation on whether or not the student population that participated in the survey represents a cross-section of your county, considering size of building, whether urban or rural, and other important characteristics.

When a *random sample of schools has been successfully surveyed*, county profiles present only the data collected from the sample schools. Complete individual school district data will only be available from the school district offices. Within the county those school districts that have full participation can compare their results to county-level results.

In those counties that had *wide participation at all grades and filled a sample at 6th grade*, the county profile reports only sample data for 6th grade. Data for the other grades include all schools that participated. However, unless all 8th, 10th and 12th graders participated in the survey, these results have some bias. This issue is discussed in the flow chart on survey data.

To achieve county-level reporting in 2002, please note the following:

- The **largest counties** have enough schools at all grade levels to survey a random sample of school buildings. The sample is drawn at the same time as the state sample, but recruitment for the sample is a local or county/school district/ESD responsibility.

- Other **large counties** have the possibility of drawing a random sample for elementary schools. This is a bit more complicated where some 6th graders are in middle schools and others in elementary schools.

- **Smaller counties** must achieve full participation in order to get valid county-level results.

Student Survey Charts
Substance Use and Antisocial Behavior

Substance Use - 6th Grade



** Not comparable to 2000.*
*** No data available.*

Substance Use and Antisocial Behavior - 8th Grade



** Not comparable to 2000.*
*** No data available.*

Substance Use and Antisocial Behavior - 10th Grade



** Not comparable to 2000.*
*** No data available.*

Washington State Department of Social and Health Services
Research and Data Analysis, CORE-GIS Data System, May 2001

Substance Use and Antisocial Behavior - 12th Grade



** Not comparable to 2000.*
*** No data available.*

Washington State Department of Social and Health Services
Research and Data Analysis, CORE-GIS Data System, May 2001

Student Survey Charts
Risk and Protective Factors

Risk and Protective Factors - 6th Grade



** Not comparable to 2000.*
*** No data available.*

Washington State Department of Social and Health Services
Research and Data Analysis, CORE-GIS Data System, May 2001

Risk and Protective Factors - 8th Grade



** Not comparable to 2000.*
*** No data available.*

Washington State Department of Social and Health Services
Research and Data Analysis, CORE-GIS Data System, May 2001

Risk and Protective Factors - 10th Grade



** Not comparable to 2000.*
*** No data available.*

Washington State Department of Social and Health Services
Research and Data Analysis, CORE-GIS Data System, May 2001

Risk and Protective Factors - 12th Grade



** Not comparable to 2000.*
*** No data available.*

Student Survey Data Tables

Percent of Survey Participants Reporting Substance Use and Antisocial Behavior - 6th Grade

30-Day Use

Grant	Grade		Alcohol	Smoking Tobacco	Chewing Tobacco	Marijuana	Inhalants	Psychedelics	Party Drugs	Other Illegal Drugs	Binge Drinking
1998	6th	State	.	4.70	3.53	3.45	3.16	1.24	.	.	7.60
1998	6th	County	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
2000	6th	State	6.64	4.05	0.78	1.51	1.38	0.63	0.66	1.05	4.74
2000	6th	County	6.06	5.22	1.36	1.85	3.04	0.50	0.68	1.79	5.20

Percent of Survey Participants Reporting Substance Use and Antisocial Behavior - 8th-12th Grade

Grant	Grade		30-Day Use												Anti-Social Behavior In Last Year							
			Alcohol	Smoking Tobacco	Chewing Tobacco	Marijuana	Cocaine / Crack	Inhalants	Psychedelics	Party Drugs	Heroin	Amphetamines	Methamphetsmines	Binge Drinking	Suspended from School	Drunk or High at School	Sold Illegal Drugs	Stolen or Tried to Steal a Vehicle	Been Arrested	Attacked with Intention to Harm	Carried a Handgun	Taken a Handgun to School
1998	8th	State	.	15.22	6.66	16.46	2.48	6.63	3.84	.	1.31	3.85	2.27	18.34	17.84	16.87	8.58	5.41	8.31	17.18	8.57	2.10
1998	8th	County	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
1998	10th	State	.	21.83	9.62	26.61	3.17	3.84	5.79	.	1.36	5.59	3.77	27.71	12.96	26.27	13.72	5.23	8.26	15.59	7.80	2.57
1998	10th	County	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
1998	12th	State	.	28.61	12.42	28.72	2.62	2.33	6.04	.	0.76	3.59	2.89	32.73	8.53	26.90	15.02	3.36	7.91	13.02	7.56	2.48
1998	12th	County	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
2000	8th	State	22.31	12.50	2.06	12.04	1.50	4.87	3.06	3.40	0.80	2.75	1.25	14.93	13.59	10.77	4.69	2.75	5.82	12.42	4.97	1.18
2000	8th	County	25.58	14.38	4.45	14.77	2.25	5.64	3.17	3.43	1.55	3.13	2.13	18.82	12.50	12.44	5.19	2.95	8.61	12.39	7.95	0.88
2000	10th	State	37.58	19.79	4.60	21.88	2.65	3.63	5.82	6.23	0.99	4.47	2.61	23.22	9.72	20.58	9.81	3.52	6.28	10.79	5.35	1.66
2000	10th	County	40.15	23.24	8.91	23.01	2.16	3.54	3.86	3.54	0.47	3.86	2.16	28.22	11.46	22.08	8.97	3.19	7.50	11.18	4.94	1.12
2000	12th	State	46.78	27.65	8.77	24.44	2.80	2.43	6.45	6.78	0.82	3.96	2.93	31.83	8.31	23.53	11.78	2.18	6.26	9.12	4.47	1.29
2000	12th	County	44.49	27.91	12.26	20.55	2.97	1.48	4.87	1.49	0.21	3.18	2.55	30.87	7.58	20.65	8.52	1.08	5.66	8.24	5.21	0.87

Percent of Survey Participants with Risk or with Protection - 6th through 12th Grade

Grant	Grade		Risk Factors																*Protective Factors*					
			Community						Peer								School		Community		Peer		School	
			Community Disorganization	Laws & Norms Favorable to Drug Use	Low Neighborhood Attachment	Perceived Availability of Drugs	Perceived Availability Handguns	Transitions & Mobility	Favorable Attitudes Towards Antisocial Behavior	Favorable Attitudes Towards Drug Use	Early Initiation of Problem Behavior	Early Initiation of Drug Use	Intend to Use	Friends' Use of Drugs	Perceived Risk of Drug Use	Rewards for Antisocial Involvement	Academic Failure	Little Commitment to School	Community Opportunities for Positive Involvement	Community Rewards for Positive Involvement	Belief in a Moral Order	Social Skills	School Opportunities for Positive Involvement	School Rewards for Positive Involvement
1998	6th	State	37.80	52.40	53.10	40.30	14.20	46.60	36.30	34.40	23.40	42.80	.	41.40	.	38.80	40.20	36.70	.	62.20	45.30	64.90	54.40	51.60
1998	6th	County	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
1998	8th	State	33.20	46.70	40.10	47.70	22.30	43.80	43.40	45.00	36.60	47.00	.	52.20	.	52.50	42.50	33.80	.	48.50	54.10	55.70	54.30	47.80
1998	8th	County	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
1998	10th	State	40.80	55.50	44.70	58.70	30.90	50.10	40.90	51.90	39.70	51.30	.	53.10	.	39.90	41.80	31.70	.	54.00	66.40	49.60	53.60	59.80
1998	10th	County	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
1998	12th	State	41.00	49.60	48.20	60.90	37.70	46.40	34.50	52.10	35.50	44.90	.	46.60	.	48.70	38.00	33.10	.	52.20	54.50	62.40	55.90	47.30
1998	12th	County	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
2000	6th	State	.	37.50	48.58	26.81	22.75	.	32.34	23.45	17.95	27.11	5.76	22.93	13.77	25.37	39.87	35.20	42.39	67.38	56.82	.	59.15	60.13
2000	6th	County	.	35.80	45.30	25.00	24.00	.	27.10	20.70	17.70	32.20	8.40	26.00	14.20	24.50	42.60	29.60	48.70	70.50	55.30	.	67.00	66.10
2000	8th	State	.	33.31	35.00	34.87	35.72	.	36.62	34.39	28.93	44.59	17.13	37.54	21.77	42.68	41.37	39.38	56.54	52.63	64.38	66.07	60.50	52.78
2000	8th	County	.	32.60	38.30	32.10	39.00	.	31.20	33.90	30.30	48.60	18.60	40.30	21.10	38.30	48.80	35.20	59.70	56.50	67.70	63.00	65.80	52.80
2000	10th	State	.	44.14	43.76	48.78	25.32	.	43.37	45.36	31.78	45.49	22.84	42.18	20.87	38.07	38.14	42.50	48.94	55.65	69.23	55.36	57.41	59.33
2000	10th	County	.	45.60	46.00	45.10	29.40	.	43.30	43.10	32.90	47.90	25.50	41.80	21.00	35.90	45.00	39.20	54.90	57.40	73.00	54.90	61.40	62.20
2000	12th	State	.	42.26	48.18	55.89	32.57	.	41.92	47.15	33.40	48.73	25.95	43.36	26.39	43.63	41.29	47.30	47.07	51.53	57.36	64.19	57.74	45.00
2000	12th	County	.	38.70	47.40	48.60	37.40	.	35.20	36.80	33.20	45.30	25.80	40.10	20.80	41.80	39.30	39.30	54.90	59.40	64.10	67.60	67.40	48.70

Student Survey Demographics

Number of Survey Participants by School District and Grade - 2000

County / District Name	6th		8th		10th		12th	
	Survey Participants	Students Enrolled	Survey Participants	Students Enrolled	Survey Participants	Students Enrolled	Survey Participants	Students Enrolled
Grant	596	1,320	740	1,284	656	1,293	473	1,039
Coulee-Hartline	-	12	-	14	-	25	-	26
Ephrata	-	215	162	199	172	207	130	171
Grand Coulee	57	62	70	80	55	87	42	86
Moses Lake	440	513	416	518	366	489	247	355
Quincy	-	185	-	171	-	182	-	162
Royal	-	96	-	84	-	92	-	71
Soap Lake	40	47	36	33	22	47	10	35
Wahluke	-	110	-	111	-	100	-	66
Warden	59	71	56	60	41	55	44	55
Wilson Creek	-	9	-	14	-	9	-	12

Ethnicity: Percent Survey Participants Compared to Enrollment by School District - 2000

County / District Name	Asian		Black		Hispanic		Native American		White		Other	Unknown	County/ District Total	
	Survey Participants	Students Enrolled	Survey Participants	Students Enrolled	Survey Participants	Students Enrolled	Survey Participants	Students Enrolled	Survey Participants	Students Enrolled	Survey Participants	Survey Participants	# Survey Participants	# Students Enrolled
Grant	2.1%	1.3%	2.4%	1.2%	20.3%	31.6%	7.1%	3.9%	64.6%	62.1%		3.5%	2,465	4,936
Coulee-Hartline		1.3%		1.3%		1.3%				96.1%				77
Ephrata	1.7%	1.5%	0.9%	0.3%	10.6%	11.5%	2.8%	0.1%	82.3%	86.6%		1.7%	464	792
Grand Coulee	0.9%	1.0%	2.7%	0.6%	4.9%	2.9%	37.1%	48.6%	50.0%	47.0%		4.5%	224	315
Moses Lake	2.0%	1.5%	3.1%	2.7%	21.0%	23.5%	4.6%	1.1%	66.0%	71.1%		3.3%	1,469	1,875
Quincy		0.9%				54.1%		0.3%		44.7%				700
Royal		0.9%				51.3%				47.8%				343
Soap Lake	4.6%	0.6%		0.6%	15.7%	13.0%	5.6%	4.3%	67.6%	81.5%		6.5%	108	162
Wahluke		1.0%				72.4%		1.8%		24.8%				387
Warden	4.0%	1.7%	1.5%	0.4%	57.0%	67.6%	2.5%		28.0%	30.3%		7.0%	200	241
Wilson Creek						2.3%				97.7%				44

Number of Survey Participants by School District and Grade - 1998

County / District Name	6th		8th		10th		12th	
	Survey Participants	Students Enrolled	Survey Participants	Students Enrolled	Survey Participants	Students Enrolled	Survey Participants	Students Enrolled
Grant	0	1,282	285	1,308	0	1,288	0	984
Coulee-Hartline	-	18	-	9	-	25	-	15
Ephrata	-	204	-	217	-	201	-	166
Grand Coulee	-	73	-	71	-	101	-	84
Moses Lake	-	494	285	502	-	515	-	355
Quincy	-	183	-	180	-	168	-	140
Royal	-	85	-	102	-	86	-	84
Soap Lake	-	43	-	39	-	41	-	29
Wahluke	-	107	-	107	-	75	-	49
Warden	-	61	-	68	-	59	-	53
Wilson Creek	-	14	-	13	-	17	-	9

Ethnicity: Percent Survey Participants Compared to Enrollment by School District - 1998

County / District Name	Asian		Black		Hispanic		Native American		White		Other	Unknown	County/ District Total	
	Survey Participants	Students Enrolled	Survey Participants	Students Enrolled	Survey Participants	Students Enrolled	Survey Participants	Students Enrolled	Survey Participants	Students Enrolled	Survey Participants	Survey Participants	# Survey Participants	# Students Enrolled
Grant	3.9%	1.3%	0.7%	1.2%	16.5%	29.1%	4.2%	4.0%	63.9%	64.4%	9.5%	1.4%	285	4,862
Coulee-Hartline						1.5%				98.5%				67
Ephrata		1.6%		0.5%		11.5%		0.3%		86.0%				788
Grand Coulee		0.3%		0.3%		1.5%		47.1%		50.8%				329
Moses Lake	3.9%	1.7%	0.7%	2.8%	16.5%	22.5%	4.2%	1.3%	63.9%	71.8%	9.5%	1.4%	285	1,866
Quincy		1.0%				48.6%		0.1%		50.2%				671
Royal		0.6%				47.3%		0.6%		51.5%				357
Soap Lake		0.7%		0.7%		14.5%		1.3%		82.9%				152
Wahluke		0.9%				66.3%		2.7%		30.2%				338
Warden		2.1%				65.1%				32.8%				241
Wilson Creek						3.8%				96.2%				53

Appendices

Appendix One
Technical Notes

Archival Indicators
Collaborative
Community Readiness (see Readiness)
Comprehensive Prevention Plan
Correlation
Counties-Like-Us (CLU)
Cut Points
Data for Social Indicators (see Valid Data….)
Evaluation
Evidence-Based Prevention
Logic Model
Needs Assessment
Outcomes
Rates
Readiness
Research-Based/Science-Based Prevention Program
Resource Assessment
Risk and Protective Factors (see Validation Scales)
Significance
Social Indicators (see Valid Data for Social Indicators)
Standardized Scores and Summary Measures
Summary Measure
Valid Data for Social Indicators
Validation Scales for Student Survey Risk and Protective Factors

Archival Indicators
Archival indicators are those that already exist---they are collected by government agencies as part of routine data collection. Our database contains archival indicators that have been validated by research that has shown them to be good proxy measures for risk factors. For instance, the local health department does not have a statistic for "family management problems", so researchers found archival indicators that would seem to be conceptually related to family management, and then tested them to see if they correlated with adolescent substance use. (See "Correlation" below.) In this case, the proxy indicators are children in foster care, children living away from parents, and victims in accepted child abuse referrals.

Collaborative
Separate entities working together and sharing resources to accomplish a common purpose. Coalitions are sometimes also called partnerships or collaboratives.

Community Readiness
see "Readiness"

Comprehensive Prevention Plan
A long-term plan designed to prevent ATOD use and abuse. It must be based on a needs assessment, resource assessment, and a prioritization of unmet needs. Strategies are selected to target multiple domains, aimed at institutional policies (for instance, policies affecting youth access to alcohol) community norms, families, schools, peer groups and high-risk individuals. The strategies are described in the plan, and performance targets and outcome objectives are defined.

Correlation
Statistical correlation is a measure of the relationship or association between variables: if, when the value of one variable changes, another one changes in a predictable way, the two variables are correlated. The CORE-GIS uses archival risk factor indicators that are statistically correlated to corresponding risk factors and actual substance use as measured by the student survey.

The strength of correlation is usually described with correlation coefficients, represented with an *r*. We are not reporting on those correlation coefficients in this county profile. That research was done in conjunction with the Social Development Research Group and five other states. The results of the research that led to the current set of archival indicators is reported in Hawkins, David, Michael Arthur and Richard Catalano, 1997, "Six State Consortium for Prevention Needs Assessment Studies: Alcohol and Other Drugs – Final Report." National Institute on Drug Abuse.

For a friendly primer on correlation and other prevention statistics, go to Prevention On Line, research briefs, and look for "Prevention Statistics Made Easy: Understanding Correlation, Explained Variance, and Causation." The URL is www.health.org/pubs/corella2.htm.

Counties Like Us

Knowing that your county has a particular rate for one of the indicators----say, number of tobacco sales licenses---does not help you evaluate the importance of that indicator to your risk profile. You do not know if it is higher or lower than you could reasonably expect. County rates can be compared to the state rate, which is the average for the whole state, and to other counties. However, the most populated counties heavily influence the state rate. Therefore the comparison we present is for a group of counties that are similar in characteristics related to prevention planning: population of young people (aged 10-24), the percentage of deaths in the county that are alcohol and drug-related, and a simple geographic division into Eastern and Western Washington. For each indicator the Counties Like Us rate is the average rate across all of the counties in the cluster. The groupings for "Counties Like Us" are as follows:

*Urban A** – King County
*Urban B** – Pierce, Snohomish, and Spokane
Urban C – Benton, Clark, Kitsap, Thurston, Whatcom, and Yakima
Rural A – Ferry, Franklin, Grant, Klickitat, Okanogan, Pend Oreille, and Skamania
Rural B – Adams, Asotin, Chelan, Columbia, Douglas, Garfield, Kittitas, Lincoln, Stevens, Walla, and Whitman
Rural C – Clallam, Cowlitz, Grays Harbor, Island, Jefferson, Lewis, Mason, Pacific, San Juan, Skagit, Wahkiakum
* For comparison, King County is compared to Urban B, but average scores for the indicators in Urban B do not include King County.
[For a detailed explanation of how these Counties Like Us Groupings were made, see Appendix H in the 1996 County Profile.]

Cut-Points

Student survey data tables on pages 76-79 report the percent of students with elevated risk factors. These results are based on an analysis developed by researchers at the University of Washington that offers a standardized approach to calculating "percent at risk" and "percent with protection". The state survey steering committee elected to employ this analysis for the Fall 2000 survey, and to apply it retrospectively to the 1998 data.

On the survey questionnaire, a scale measures each risk and protective factor; a scale is made up of a number of questions that relate to each factor. The frequency of response to each individual question has of course not changed. What changed in the new analysis is the interpretation of all the items together---the interpretation of the scale. The analysis of each scale predicts whether an individual student is at risk, or is protected, for that particular factor.

The point on a scale at which a student's response predicts substance use is called the cut-point. The cut-point on a risk factor scale divides those students who are more at risk from those less at risk. The researchers based their analysis on data from over 200,000 surveys across seven states. Based on this analysis, it was possible to select two groups of youth, one that was more at risk for problem behaviors and another group that was less at risk or that had high levels of protection. A cut-point score

was determined for each protective and risk factor scale that best divided the youth from the two groups, the less-at-risk/more protected from the more-at-risk.

The criteria for selecting the more at-risk and the less at-risk groups included:

- academic grades (the less at-risk group received A's and B's, the more at-risk group D's and F's),
- alcohol, tobacco and other drug use (the more at-risk group had more regular use, the less at-risk had no drug use and use of alcohol or tobacco on only a few occasions), and
- antisocial behavior (the more at-risk group has two or more delinquent acts in the past year, the less at-risk group had no delinquent acts).

The "percent with protection" (or percent resilient) and the "percent at risk" can be used to monitor the results of a comprehensive prevention program.

Evaluation

Outcome Evaluation

Focused research questions that determine the effects of interventions on a program's intended outcomes or goals. The evaluation helps determine whether a program changed the knowledge, attitudes, or behavior of a specified set of program participants (target population). It answers the question: *"Did the anticipated change occur*?"

Process Evaluation

A set of research questions that deal with the implementation, structure and operation of program interventions. Process evaluation should be continuous and on-going. The target population, the content of program strategies, program inputs including staff, materials, timing, intensity, duration, service settings and other resources are all measured and described to determine if the program procedures were conducted according to a written plan. Process evaluation is geared toward program improvements, and may offer clues as to why certain outcomes were or were not achieved.

Evidence-based prevention in the context of substance abuse prevention includes strategies or programs that have shown through some level of evidence that they are effective. These programs have not been subjected to as rigorous an evaluation as are those that are classified as science-based.

Logic Model

Provides an overall view of a prevention program and the theory behind it. Some logic models require the selection of process and outcome measures, and measurement indicators. Depending on how much management information in included, a logic model can demonstrate the relative importance of a program's inputs, activities and outputs, which helps to guide resource allocation.

Needs Assessment

A process of gathering the basic information needed to identify problems, existing programs and resources, and gaps between the two. Specifically, it is a rational approach to carefully collect, analyze, and interpret risk and protective factor data to inform policy and program planning. Objective social indicator and survey data is used to quantify and describe the unique risk and protective factors operating in a community, rather than relying on opinion, prejudices, or historical practices.

Outcomes

Results of an implemented action or strategy. Outcomes are measurable changes observed on indicators related to specific program goals and objectives.

Rates: why is "raw data" converted to rates?

In order to make comparisons between counties and the state, and between counties that have different sizes, we use ***rates*** to describe an event in terms of a standard size population---either "per 100 people" (percent), "per 1,000 people" or "per 100,000 people". For instance, what does it mean if County A has 42 alcohol retail licenses, and County B has 399? Does it mean that based on this indicator, the risk factor (*Availability*) is much higher in County B than it is County A? No, not if County B is a much bigger county. If County B is bigger, then the "rate" of liquor licenses per population might be the same or even lower. The only way to compare them is to convert the raw numbers to rates, based on the same population factor. For instance:

County A: # of licenses – 42, # of persons (all ages) – 14, 297

County B: # of licenses – 399, # of persons (all ages) – 186,185

To calculate the ***rate per 1,000***:

42 / 14,297 = .002937	.002937 X 1,000 = 2.94
399 / 186,185 = .002143	.002143 X 1,000 = 2.14

So the rate of alcohol retail licenses is 2.94 per 1,000 people in County A, and 2.14 per 1,000 people in County B.

Readiness

- The degree of support for or resistance to identifying substance use and abuse as significant social problems in a community.
- The degree to which the community has the potential to actually realize success in planning, implementing and sustaining effective prevention and intervention strategies, practices and programs.

Research-Based/Science-Based Prevention Program

Science-based prevention programs have a strong theoretical design and extensive evaluation. In a peer-reviewed journal, a researcher has proven that the effects of the program can be clearly linked to the program itself and not to extraneous event. Conceptual or exact replications of a program and its evaluation add credibility to findings as being effective.

Resource Assessment
A systematic approach to examining the services, capacities and external assets available in a community that can help to reduce risk factors and increase protective factors. It answers the question: "*What is being done to prevent ATOD use and abuse in our community?*"

Significance
Statistical significance measures the likelihood that a particular relationship between variables is not due to chance alone. This is relevant when a measure is drawn from a sample rather than from the whole population.

The level of statistical significance does not explain the magnitude of importance---that is a different question, not a statistical one. In substance abuse prevention planning, the importance of a behavior or condition and its measure relates to the behavior's role in the development of substance use (as explained by the social development model), the susceptibility of the behavior or condition to change, and the availability of strategies or resources to effect change.

Social Indicators (see Valid Data for Social Indicators)

Standardized Scores and Summary Measures

Each individual risk factor is measured by more than one indicator. An individual indicator by itself is interesting because you can compare your county's rate for that indicator to all other counties, and to the state. But it is more difficult to compare all the indicators for one risk factor to each other---that's like comparing apples and oranges. For instance, you cannot compare the number of people voting in the last election to the number of residential vacancies---this would not be meaningful. And, since we cannot add those two indicators together---they do not have a common denominator---we cannot average the indicators together to determine the average level of risk for the risk factor *Low Neighborhood Attachment and Community Disorganization*.

You can compare and average rates by first finding out how much each individual indicator rate varies from some common point, and the point we use is the average rate for the state. In more technical terms, we transform the original absolute rates to a common scale of measure: the relative deviation from the state mean. This is called a **standardized score,** and is based on the mathematical calculation of the standard deviation. For a particular indicator, the county with the highest absolute rate (say, for alcohol retail licenses), will have the highest standardized measure. A standardized score of 1.2, for instance, means that the county's rate is 1.2 standard measures (or standard deviations) above the state rate, and a –1.2 would be 1.2 standard measures *below* the state rate. Approximately 95% of the state will fall between +2 and –2 standard measures.

Once we have standardized all of the rates for a particular risk factor, we can find the average of the standardized scores to come up with an average value for the risk factor. This is called a **summary measure**. To stay with the same example, we find the average of the standardized scores for tobacco retail sales licenses and liquor

sales licenses to come up with one summary measure for the risk factor *Availability of Drugs*. For instance, if the standardized score for alcohol retail licenses is -.31, and the standardized score for tobacco sales licenses is -.26, the standardized ***summary*** measure is -.31 plus -.26, divided by 2, or -.29. This means that the summary measure for the risk factor *Availability of Drugs* is .29 below the state average rate for that risk factor.

Valid Data for Needs Assessment

Data: Information collected according to a methodology using specific research methods and instruments.

> Reliability: The extent to which a measure produces the result time after time, no matter who collects or under what circumstances.
>
> Validity: In evaluation, the extent to which a measure of a particular idea or theory reflects a program's intent. More generally, does the measure for a construct truly reflect that construct?
>
> Qualitative Data: Contextual information gathered by observation, focus groups, open-ended interviews or textual analysis, and reported as text rather that as numbers. The strength of qualitative data are their ability to shed light on human affairs, processes and ideas.
>
> Quantitative Data: In prevention, measures that capture levels of prevalence, changes in levels of prevalence, and intervening variables. The strength of quantitative data is their use in measuring change.

Key questions to ask before choosing social indicators for needs assessment:

1. How closely do these data fit your informational needs? What type of inferences might you have to make?
2. How have these data been obtained and maintained? What is their quality? How reliable are they?
3. What kinds of safeguards should you observe to guarantee the confidentiality of records?
4. Can you adapt or change the data keeping procedures? Or, can you develop and implement a new data gathering system?

Validated Survey Scales for Risk and Protective Factors, Aligned with Archival Social Indicators

"Original" Risk Factor and Protective Factor Names	*Fall 2000 Student Survey Scales* ** These scales were optional, and are only available in local reports.* [ ] *Scales in brackets not available on WSSAHB.*	*Winter 2001 Archival (Social) Indicators* *Indicators from the 1990 Census were dropped from 2001 County Report. These will be reconsidered when new data are available.*
Community Domain Risk Factors		
Availability of Drugs Availability of Firearms	Perceived Availability of Drugs Perceived Availability of Handguns	Alcohol sales outlets Tobacco sales licenses
Community Laws and Norms Favorable Toward Drug Use	Laws and Norms Favorable to Drug Use	
Transitions and Mobility	[Transitions & Mobility] *NOTE: Previous versions of the survey had two scales---community and personal transitions and mobility..*	Net migration New home construction Households living in rental properties
Low Neighborhood Attachment and Community Disorganization	Low Neighborhood Attachment [Community Disorganization—*NOTE: Part of this scale appeared as item 16 on Fall 2000 WSSAHB.]*	Population not voting in elections Population not registered to vote Prisoners in state and local correctional systems
Extreme Economic Deprivation		Unemployment Free and reduced lunch program Children in aid to families programs Food stamp recipients Low birth weight babies born
Community Domain Protective Factors		
Opportunities for Positive (Prosocial) Involvement	Opportunities for Prosocial Involvement *This scale was significantly altered.*	
Rewards for Positive (Prosocial) Involvement	Rewards for Prosocial Involvement	
Family Domain Risk Factors		
Family Conflict	[Family Conflict]	Divorce Domestic violence arrests
Family History of Problem Behavior	[Family History of Antisocial Behavior *NOTE: Part of this scale appeared on Fall 2000 WSSAHB.*]	Adults in alcohol and other drug treatment programs Alcohol- and Drug-Related Deaths
Family Management Problems	*Poor Family Management	Children living in foster care Children living away from parents Victims in accepted child abuse referrals
Parental Attitudes and Involvement in Drug Use, Crime and Violence	[Parental Attitudes Favorable toward Drug Use] [Parental Attitudes Favorable Toward Antisocial Behavior]	

"Original" Risk Factor and Protective Factor Names	*Fall 2000 Student Survey Scales* ** These scales were optional, and are only available in local reports.* *[ ] Scales in brackets not available on WSSAHB.*	*Winter 2001 Archival (Social) Indicators* *Indicators from the 1990 Census were dropped from 2001 County Report. These will be reconsidered when new data are available.*
Family Domain Protective Factors		
Bonding: Attachment	[Family Attachment]	
Opportunities	*Opportunities for Prosocial Involvement	
Recognition	*Rewards for Prosocial Involvement	
School Domain Risk Factors		
Lack of Commitment to School	Low Commitment to School	High school dropouts
Academic Failure Beginning in Elementary School	Academic Failure	Poor academic performance, Grade 4 Poor academic performance, Grade 8
School Domain Protective Factors		
Opportunities	Opportunities for Prosocial Involvement	
Recognition	Rewards for Prosocial Involvement	
Individual/Peer Domain Risk Factors		
Alienation/Rebelliousness	[Rebelliousness]	
Early & Persistent Antisocial Behavior	*NOTE: Antisocial Behavior became a Prevalence/Outcome indicator.*	
Friends Who Engage in Problem Behavior	Friends' Use of Drugs [Interaction with Antisocial Peers]	
Favorable Attitudes toward Problem Behavior	Favorable Attitudes toward Drug Use Perceived Risks of Drug Use Favorable Attitudes toward Antisocial Behavior Rewards for Antisocial Involvement [Gang Involvement] Intention to Use	
Early Initiation of Problem Behavior	Early Initiation of Drug Use Early Initiation of Problem Behavior (*or Anti-Social Behavior*)	Alcohol- and drug-related arrests, age 10-14 Property crime arrests, age 10-14 Vandalism arrests, Age 10-14
Constitutional Factors	[Sensation Seeking]	
Peer/Individual Protective Factors		
Healthy Beliefs and Clear Standards	Belief in the Moral Order [Religiosity]	
Skills	Social Skills (*not on 6th grade form*)	

Appendix Two
Glossary of Archival Indicators

Adult Alcohol-Related Arrests

Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, Uniform Crime Report, Tables 40 and 50

The annual number of arrests of adults (age 18 and over) for alcohol violations, per 1,000 adults. Alcohol violations include all crimes involving driving under the influence, liquor law violations, and drunkenness. DUI arrests by the WSP (29% of all Adult Alcohol-related Arrests) are included in the state trend analysis. However, they are not included in the county rankings since WSP arrests are not assigned to counties. The smallest available geography is police jurisdiction.

Adult Drug-Related Arrests

Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, Uniform Crime Report, Tables 40 and 50

The annual number of arrests of adults (age 18 and over) for drug law violations, per 1,000 adults. Drug law violations include all crimes involving sale, manufacturing, and possession of drugs. The smallest available geography is police jurisdiction.

Adult Drunken Driving Arrests

Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, Uniform Crime Report, Tables 40 and 50

Adults (age 18 and over) arrested for driving under the influence (DUI) per 1,000 adults (age 18 and older). The smallest available geography is police jurisdiction.

Adult Property Crime Arrests

Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, Uniform Crime Report, Tables 40 and 50

The annual number of arrests of adults (age 18 and over) for property crimes, per 1,000 adults. Property crimes include all crimes involving burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson. The smallest available geography is police jurisdiction.

Adult Violent Crime Arrests

Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, Uniform Crime Report, Tables 40 and 50

The annual number of arrests of adults (age 18 and over) for violent crimes, per 1,000 adults. Violent crimes include all crimes involving criminal homicide, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault. Simple assault is not defined as a violent crime. The smallest available geography is police jurisdiction.

Adults in Alcohol and Drug Treatment

Department of Social and Health Services, Division of Alcohol and Substance Abuse, Treatment and Assessment Report Generation Tool (TARGET)

The annual number of adults (age 18 and over) admitted or assessed in state-funded alcohol or drug treatment programs, per 1,000 adults. Counts of adults are unduplicated so that those in treatment more than once during the year are only counted once for that year. The smallest available geography is zipcode.

Alcohol and Drug Treatment, Age 10-17

Department of Social and Health Services, Division of Alcohol and Substance Abuse, Treatment and Assessment Report Generation Tool (TARGET)

The annual number of adolescents (age 10-17) admitted or assessed in state-funded alcohol and other drug treatment programs, per 1,000 adolescents (age 10-17). Adolescents admitted to treatment more than once during the year were only counted once for that year. The smallest available geography is zipcode.

Alcohol- and Drug-Related Arrests, Age 10-14

Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, Uniform Crime Report, Tables 40 and 50

The annual number of arrests of adolescents (age 10-14) for alcohol and drug law violations, per 1,000 children (age 10-14). Alcohol violations include all crimes involving driving under the influence, liquor law violations, and drunkenness. For children, arrests for liquor law violations are usually arrests for minor in possession. Drug law violations include all crimes involving sale, manufacturing, and possession of drugs. The smallest available geography is police jurisdiction.

Alcohol- and Drug-Related Deaths

Department of Health, Center for Health Statistics, Death Certificate Data File

The annual number of deaths, with alcohol- or drug-related deaths, per 1,000 deaths. For a complete explanation of the codes and methods used please see Appendix B: Counting AOD Deaths in the 1997 Profile on Risk and Protection for Substance Abuse Prevention Planning in Washington State, available at http://www-app2.wa.gov/dshs/rda/. The smallest available geography is zipcode.

Alcohol Retail Licenses

Washington State Liquor Control Board, Annual Operations Report

The number of alcohol retail licenses active during the year, per 1,000 persons (all ages). Retail licenses include places such as restaurants, grocery stores, and wine shops that sell alcohol and do not include liquor stores and agencies. The smallest available geography is county.

Alcohol-Related Traffic Fatalities

Washington State Patrol, Records Section, Traffic Collisions in Washington State, Accident Records Database

The annual number of alcohol-related traffic fatalities, per 100 traffic fatalities. "Alcohol-related" means that the officer on the scene determined that at least one driver involved in the accident "had been drinking." Thus, "Alcohol-related" includes but is not limited to the legal definition of driving under the influence. The smallest available geography is county.

Alcohol Violation Arrests, Age 10-17

Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, Uniform Crime Report, Tables 40 and 50

The annual number of arrests of juveniles (age 10-17) for alcohol violations, per 1,000 juveniles (age 10-17). Alcohol violations include all crimes involving driving under the influence, liquor law violations, and drunkenness. For juveniles, arrests for liquor law violations are usually arrests for minor in possession. The smallest available geography is police jurisdiction.

Births, Mother's Age 10-17

Department of Health, Center for Health Statistics, Birth Certificate Data File

The annual number of live births to females (age 10-17) per 1,000 females (age 10-17). The smallest available geography is zipcode.

Children in Aid to Families Programs

Department of Social and Health Services, Research and Data Analysis, Automated Client Eligibility System and Warrant Roll

The annual number of children (age birth-17) participating in Aid to Families (AFDC/TANF) programs in the month of April, per 1,000 children (age birth-17). April was selected as the month with an average number of recipients. The smallest available geography is zipcode.

Children in Foster Care

Department of Social and Health Services, Research and Data Analysis, CORE-GIS, Foster Care Files

The annual average monthly number of children (age birth-17) in state-paid, family-based foster care or guardianship; regardless of parental rights termination or length of care; per 1,000 children (age birth-17), per year. The smallest available geography is zipcode.

Divorces

Department of Health, Center for Health Statistics, Dissolution and Annulment Data

The annual number of divorces per 1,000 adults (age 15 and over). Divorce includes dissolutions, annulments, and unknown decree types; it does not include legal separations. Divorce data is reported by the woman's residence, if in Washington at the time of decree. If the woman lived outside Washington, the man's residence was used. If both parties lived out of state, the county of decree was issued. The smallest available geography is self-reported city.

Domestic Violence Arrests

Washington State Patrol, Identification and Criminal History Section, Domestic Violence-Related Arrests File

The annual number of domestic violence-related arrests, per 1,000 adults. Domestic violence includes any violence of one family member against another family member. Family can include spouses, former spouses, parents who have children in common regardless of marital status, adults who live in the same household, as well as parents and their children. The smallest available geography is county.

Drug Law Violation Arrests, Age 10-17

Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, Uniform Crime Report, Tables 40 and 50

The annual number of arrests of juveniles (age 10-17) for drug law violations, per 1,000 juveniles (age 10-17). Drug law violations include all crimes involving sale, manufacturing, and possession of drugs. The smallest available geography is police jurisdiction.

Existing Home Sales

Washington Center for Real Estate Research, Washington State University, Washington State's Housing Market: A Supply/Demand Assessment

The annual number of previously-owned homes sold, per 1,000 persons (all ages). Previously-owned homes sold is rounded to the tens. Existing homes sold are estimated based on data from multiple listing services, firms that monitor deeds, and local Realtors associations. The smallest available geography is county.

Food Stamp Recipients

Department of Social and Health Services, Research and Data Analysis, Automated Client Eligibility System and Warrant Roll

The annual number of persons (all ages) receiving food stamps in the month of April, per 1,000 persons (all ages). April was selected as the month with an average number of recipients. The smallest available geography is zipcode.

Free and Reduced Lunch Program

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Child Nutrition, Free and Reduced Price Lunch

The annual number of students in public schools (K-12) whose applications have been approved for free and reduced price lunch programs, per 100 students enrolled in public schools (K-12). Children are eligible for free lunches if their family income is at or below 130% of the federal poverty level or for reduced price lunches if their family income is at or below 185% of the federal poverty level. The smallest available geography is school district.

High School Dropouts

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Information Services, School Dropout Files

The annual number of students (grades 9-12) who dropped out of school in a single year without completing high school, per 100 students (grades 9-12) enrolled in school in May. The smallest available geography is school district.

Low Birthweight Babies Born

Department of Health, Center for Health Statistics, Birth Certificate Data File

The annual number of babies born with low birthweight, per 1,000 live births. Low birthweight is less than 2,500 grams. The smallest available geography is zipcode.

Net Migration

Office of Financial Management, Net Migration Data

Net migration is the annual number of new residents that moved into an area minus the number of residents that moved out of an area. Net migration does not include numbers of births and deaths within an area. Calculating a 5-year moving average smoothes net migration. Annual net migration estimates are summed for 5-year ranges then averaged to calculate the numerator. The median year of the average is used for the population denominator and the year label for the 5-year moving average net migration value. A factor of 1,000 is used to calculate the 5 year moving average net migration per 1,000 population. The smallest available geography is county.

New Residence Construction

Washington Center for Real Estate Research, Washington State University, Washington State's Housing Market: A Supply/Demand Assessment

The annual number of new building permits issued for single and multi-family dwellings, per 1,000 persons (all ages). Each unit in a multi-family dwelling (for example, each apartment in a building) has a separate building permit. The smallest available geography is zipcode.

Poor Academic Performance, Grade 4

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Instructional Programs, Curriculum and Assessment, Grade 4 Low Quartile Test File

The annual number of fourth graders whose Battery test score was in the lowest 25% compared to the national norm group, per 100 fourth graders who took the Battery test. The Battery test score is the average of the scores on the reading, language, and math portions of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills. The smallest available geography is school district.

Poor Academic Performance, Grade 8

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Instructional Programs, Curriculum and Assessment, Grade 8 Low Quartile Test File

The annual number of eighth graders whose Battery test score was in the lowest 25% of the national norm group, per 100 eighth graders who took the Battery test. The Battery test score is the average of the scores on the reading, language, and math portions of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills. The smallest available geography is school district.

Population Not Registered to Vote

Office of the Secretary of State, Elections Division, Registered Voters

The annual number of persons not registered to vote in the November elections, per 100 adults (age 18 and over). The smallest available geography is county.

Population Not Voting in Elections

Office of the Secretary of State, Elections Division, Voting Records

The annual number of registered voters who do not vote in the November election, per 100 registered voters. The smallest available geography is county.

Prisoners in State Correctional Systems, Age 18+

Department of Corrections, Inmates File

The annual number of adult (age 18 and over) admissions to prison, per 100,000 persons (all ages). Admissions include new admissions, re-admissions, community custody inmate violations, and parole violations. Counts of admissions are duplicated so that individuals admitted to prison more than once in a year are counted each time they are admitted. The admissions are attributed to the county where the conviction occurred. The smallest available geography is county.

Property Crime Arrests, Age 10-14

Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, Uniform Crime Report, Tables 40 and 50

The annual number of arrests of children (age 10-14) for property crimes, per 1,000 children (age 10-14). Property crimes include all crimes involving burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson. The smallest available geography is police jurisdiction.

Property Crime Arrests, Age 10-17

Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, Uniform Crime Report, Tables 40 and 50

The annual number of arrests of juveniles (age 10-17) for property crimes, per 1,000 juveniles (age 10-17). Property crimes include all crimes involving burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson. The smallest available geography is police jurisdiction.

Sexually Transmitted Diseases, Birth-19

Department of Health, Sexually Transmitted Disease (STD) Services, Sexually Transmitted Disease Reported Cases

The annual number of reported cases of gonorrhea, syphilis, or chlamydia in adolescents (age birth-19) per 1,000 adolescents (age birth-19). The smallest available geography is self-reported city.

Suicide and Suicide Attempts, Age 10-17

Department of Health, Office of Hospital and Patient Data Systems, Comprehensive Hospital Abstract Reporting System (CHARS) and Department of Health, Center for Health Statistics Death Certificate Data

The annual number of adolescents (age 10-17) who committed suicide or were admitted to the hospital for suicide attempts, per 100,000 adolescents (age 10-17). Suicides are based on death certificate information. Suicide attempts are based on hospital admissions, but do not include admissions to federal hospitals. The smallest available geography is zipcode.

Tobacco Sales Licenses

Department of Health (from the Department of Licensing), Tobacco Prevention Program, Tobacco Statistics

The annual number of tobacco sales licenses current in the month of November, per 1,000 persons (all ages). Tobacco sales licenses include tobacco retailer licenses (stores that sell tobacco products) and tobacco vending machines. November counts are selected as representative of the average yearly number of retailers. The smallest available geography is county.

Unemployment

Employment Security Department, Labor Market and Economic Analysis, County Unemployment File

The annual number of unemployed persons (age 16 and over) per 100 persons in the civilian labor force. Unemployed persons are individuals (age 16 and over) who have actively looked for work, are currently available for work, and do not have a job. The civilian labor force includes persons (age 16 and over) who are working or looking for work. The smallest available geography is county.

Vandalism and Conduct Type Arrests, Age 10-17

Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, Uniform Crime Report, Tables 40 and 50

The annual number of arrests of juveniles (age 10-17) for curfew, loitering, vandalism, and disorderly conduct, per 1,000 juveniles (age 10-17). The smallest available geography is police

Vandalism Arrests, Age 10-14

Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, Uniform Crime Report, Tables 40 and 50

The annual number of arrests of adolescents (age 10-14) for vandalism (including residence, non-residence, vehicle venerated objects, police cars, or other) per 1,000 children (age 10-14). The smallest available geography is police jurisdiction.

Victims in Accepted Child Abuse Referrals

Department of Social and Health Services, Children's Administration, Administrative Services, Case Management Information System (CAMIS)

The annual number of children (age birth-17) identified as victims in reports to Child Protective Services that were accepted for further action, per 1,000 children (age birth-17). Children are counted more than once if they are reported as a victim more than once during the year. The smallest available geography is zipcode.

Violent Crime Arrests, Age 10-17

Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, Uniform Crime Report, Tables 40 and 50

The annual number of arrests of juveniles (age 10-17) for violent crimes, per 1,000 juveniles (age 10-17). Violent crimes include all crimes involving criminal homicide, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault. Simple assault is not defined as a violent crime. The smallest available geography is police jurisdiction.

Appendix Three
Police Agencies Not Reporting Arrests to UCR

Grant County

Populations Subtracted for Police Agencies not Reporting Arrests to UCR

Arrest data in this report comes from the Uniform Crime Report. Police agencies are not required to report arrests to UCR, they do so voluntarily. For a variety of reasons, a jurisdiction may report part or none of the arrests for a year. In these cases, the denominator is the population of the areas that did report. For example, if juvenile arrests for one agency are not reported, the juveniles for that jurisdiction are not included in the denominator either.

The tables below show the values that comprise the adjustment for your county for each age range we report. "% Subtracted" is the percent of the county's population subtracted for non-reporting. "Subtracted" is the amount subtracted. "Persons" is the county population. "Adjst'd Pop" is the denominator used to calculate indicator rates.

Nevertheless, rates can differ markedly from year to year particularly if a jurisdiction, where most of the crime in the county occurs, did not report. *Rates vary from our last report because of refinements to our population adjustment process.*

Adjustments for non-reporting (age 10-14)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
% Subtracted	65.19	8.93	64.48	8.73	9.07	4.60	3.09	5.89	5.63	5.69
Subtracted, 10-14	3,070	443	3,288	462	493	256	177	343	329	345
Persons, 10-14	4,709	4,960	5,099	5,293	5,437	5,561	5,730	5,822	5,845	6,059
Adjst'd Pop 10-14	1,639	4,517	1,811	4,831	4,944	5,305	5,553	5,479	5,516	5,714

Adjustments for non-reporting (age 10-17)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
% Subtracted	64.83	9.09	64.36	8.58	8.84	4.24	3.24	5.97	5.88	5.89
Subtracted, 10-17	4,761	689	5,017	694	738	367	293	543	542	559
Persons, 10-17	7,344	7,581	7,795	8,090	8,347	8,647	9,030	9,099	9,214	9,483
Adjst'd Pop 10-17	2,583	6,892	2,778	7,396	7,609	8,280	8,737	8,556	8,672	8,924

Adjustments for non-reporting (age 18+)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
% Subtracted	7.53	9.36	9.61	7.72	7.99	3.93	3.21	5.55	5.47	5.37
Subtracted, 18+	2,822	3,615	3,832	3,186	3,406	1,741	1,466	2,572	2,639	2,686
Persons, 18+	37,484	38,641	39,863	41,272	42,647	44,271	45,638	46,312	48,219	49,987
Adjst'd Pop 18+	34,662	35,026	36,031	38,086	39,241	42,530	44,172	43,740	45,580	47,301

Grant County

Police Agencies that did not Report Arrests to UCR

Police agencies in your county are listed below. The table shows reporting patterns for each year 1990-1999. Agencies that did not report arrests, or reported juvenile or adult arrests for only a part of the year, are indicated. If a jurisdiction extends into more than one county, arrests are apportioned to each county.

Jurisdictions	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
Adams County Sheriff's										
Coulee City Police Department	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Coulee Dam Police Department										
Douglas County Sheriff's Office										
Ephrata Police Department										
Grand Coulee Police Department										
Grant County Sheriff's Office	12J		12J	6A6J				1J		
Lincoln County Sheriff's Office										
Mattawa Police Department	X	X	X	X	X	6A6J	X	X	X	X
Moses Lake Police Department										
Quincy Police Department										
Roy Police Department	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Royal City Police Department	X	X	X	X	X					
Soap Lake Police Department	X	X	X							
Warden Police Department	X	X	X	X	X	X	6A6J			

Key: #A Number of months no arrests for adults were reported to UCR.
#J Number of months no arrests for juveniles were reported to UCR.
X Did not report arrests to UCR.

WASHINGTON STATE
DEPARTMENT OF
SOCIAL & HEALTH
SERVICES

Research and Data Analysis Division
Report Number 4.40-13