County Community Risk Profile (2015): Clark

		Risk Ranking		Risk Category Rank		Contextual Indicators	
School District	Population: Age 10-17	Risk Percentile	Risk Indicator with Data	Consumption (ATOD)	Consequence	Economic Deprivation	Troubled Family
Vancouver	14530	59	21	Average	Average	High	Average
Washougal	2,248	56	21	Average	Average	Average	Average
Evergreen (Clark)	17,135	49	21	Average	Average	Average	Low
Battle Ground	9,144	46	21	Average	Average	Low	Low
La Center	1,087	45	21	Average	Average	Low	Low
Ridgefield	1,890	16	21	Low	Low	Low	Very Low
Hockinson	1,320	13	21	Low	Low	Very Low	Very Low
Camas	4,211	3	21	Very Low	Very Low	Low	Very Low

County Community Risk Profile (2015): Clark

NOTE:

This risk profile reflects the risk levels of this county as of February 2015. School districts with no high schools are not included in this summary. Please note risk levels and risk rankings may change over time.

The ATOD consumption risk score is calculated from prevalence of alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use. The consequence risk score is calculated from school performance, youth delinquency, and mental health indicators. The overall risk ranking is not computed if either consumption or sonsequence score is missing.

A Risk Category Rank of "Very High" indicates the referenced School District Risk Score was in the top 10% of School Districts in the risk Category.

A Risk Category Rank of "High" indicates the referenced School District Risk Score was in the top 25% of School Districts in the risk Category.

A Risk Category Rank of "Average" indicates the referenced School District Risk Score was between 25% and 75% of School Districts in the risk Category.

A Risk Category Rank of "Low" indicates the referenced School District Risk Score was in the bottom 25% of School Districts in the risk Category.

A Risk Category Rank of "Very Low" indicates the referenced School District Risk Score was in the bottom 10% of School Districts in the risk Category.

Review Considerations

- 1) To get a overall sense of risk severity for both consumption and consequence, examine the 'Risk Percentile'. It reflects what % of School District had a Risk Score LOWER than the referenced School District.
- 2) To ensure that the risk score is meaningful, examine the 'Indicators with data' column. Risk scores based on few indicators should be interpreted with caution. In total, 26 indicators were used.
- 3) To consider other contextual information, examine the 'Population: Age 0-17', "economic deprivation" indicator, and the "troubled family" indicator. Note the "Population 0-17 year olds" value will be greater than district enrollment as it accounts for kids not in school as well as those in private schools.