May 2014

Risk and Protection Profile for Substance Abuse Prevention in Washington Communities: **Toledo**

Lewis County



4.53-21258 :2014

Research & Data Analysis Division
Vera Barga, B.S.
Irina V. Sharkova, Ph.D.
David Mancuso, Ph.D.

in conjunction with the
Division of Behavioral Health and Recovery
Chris Imhoff, Director

Washington State Department of Social & Health Services
RDA Research & Data Analysis Division

These tables provide a comprehensive update of data published in previous *Profiles* . They are among the timeliest data available to planners for understanding the risks of substance abuse among youth in their communities. Community, family, peer, and school-related factors are presented within the Hawkins and Catalano risk and protective factor framework that is used by many substance abuse prevention planners across the country.

These data are reported by the lowest geography available for each indicator, beginning with school districts, followed by the locale, county, and state levels of geography.
Locales are single school districts or groups of school districts. If school districts are grouped into a single locale, the following rules were used:

i. The total population within the grouping had to be at least 20,000 people.
ii. The school districts grouped were part of a single Educational Service District.
iii. The school districts grouped were similar in character (for example, they had similar proportions of students receiving school lunches).

For more information about the data, framework, definitions, and other topics, see the 1997 *Profile on Risk and Protection for Substance Abuse Prevention Planning in Washington State,* (Report4.15-40). That report and subsequent years' Profiles are available on the RDA website at: www1.dshs.wa.gov/rda/research/risk.shtm.

Toledo

Table of contents:

Cover page

Introduction

Interpreting Indicator Profiles:

Interpreting Annual Trend Charts:

Indicator Comparison Profiles: (A comparison of standardized five-year rates at county, locale, and school district levels by domain, factor, and indicator)

1. Indicator Profile 1
2. Indicator Profile 2
3. Indicator Profile 3
4. Indicator Profile 4

Community:

5. Availability of Drugs
6. Extreme Economic & Social Deprivation
7. Transitions & Mobility
8. Antisocial Behavior of Community Adults
9. Low Neighborhood Attachment and Community Disorganization

Family:

10. Family Problems

Schools:

11. Academic Achievement
12. School Climate

Individual/Peer:

13. Early Criminal Justice Involvement

Problem Outcomes:

14. Child and Family Health
15. Criminal Justice
16. Substance Use

Appendices

17. Technical Notes
18. Populations Subtracted for Police Agencies not Reporting Arrests to UCR
19. Police Agencies that did not Report Arrests to UCR

Each school district of interest is associated with information from the county in which it is located and the locale to which the district has been assigned.

School District: Toledo
County: Lewis County

Locale 95

County District #	School District	County	District Population (Census 2010)	Total Locale Population (Census 2010)
21143	Morton S.D.	Lewis County	2,742	20,508
21145	Mossyrock S.D.	Lewis County	3,980	
21175	Onalaska S.D.	Lewis County	5,296	
21258	Toledo S.D.	Lewis County	4,392	
21284	White Pass S.D.	Lewis County	4,098	

The Indicator Profile compares rates for County, Locale, and School District to the state. The Profile displays *standardized scores* to allow comparison between indicators. See Technical Notes for a definition of a standardized score.



Understanding the CORE Trend Charts and Tables

The presentation of risk factor data in the CORE reports is organized by domain (Community, Family, School, and Individual/Peer) and by risk factor within domains. Each risk factor may include one or more indicators

These data are reported by school district with comparisons to the county and locales for that district. Locales are single school districts or groups of school districts. If school districts are grouped into a single locale, the following rules were used:

i. The total population within the grouping had to be at least 20,000 people.
ii. The school districts grouped were part of a single Educational Service District.
iii. The school districts grouped were similar in character (for example, they had similar proportions of students receiving school lunches).

To see the school districts included into your locale, go to the tab "Community Definition." You may want to check out CORE reports prepared for these school districts and their counties.

Please note these IMPORTANT ISSUES:

The tabs are labeled with the name of the risk factor. Each risk factor may in turn include several indicators. Be sure to **scroll down the page** to review all of the available indicators for a given risk factor. The workbook is designed to print with one indicator on each page.

Understanding the chart scales:

Users should be careful to interpret the chart scales correctly. The chart scales are automatically adjusted to enhance differences between the indicators. Users should consider whether the differences they observe between geographic areas or across years are significant. The unit of measurement is displayed at the left of each chart scale. Often the unit of measurement is a rate expressed as the number of events or a count of individuals per 100 population (or, "percent"), or sometimes per 1,000 or 100,000 population.

Review the example:

On the following page (below, scroll down) is an example indicator for Alcohol Retail Licenses in "Your District" . The number of alcohol retail licenses is expressed as a rate per 1,000 population.

Each risk factor may include several indicators, so **remember** to page down. For example, the risk factor *Availability of Drugs* has two indicators: Alcohol Retail Licenses (shown below) and Tobacco Retail And Vending Machine Licenses.

Alcohol Retail Licenses

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

Rate Per 1,000

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



	1998	1999	2000	2001	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
State	1.55	1.67	1.89	1	2.07	1.91	1.89	1.78	1.66	1.59
Cascadia County	2.12	2.06	2.03		00	1.98	1.96	1.91	1.91	1.91
Locale 999	3.27	3.12	NR		96	2.88	2.77	3.17	3.17	3.17
My School District	5.08	5.23	NR		86	4.99	4.32	5.93	5.85	5.89
Licenses	32	34	35		35	35	31	43	43	43
All Persons	6,295	6,497	6,703	6,899	7,198	7,012	7,177	7,250	7,350	7,298

A suppression code is listed for suppressed rates. These codes are explained in Technical Notes. Be aware that these values can seem to indicate a zero value.

Note: The rates are the annual number of alcohol retail licenses active during the year, per 1,000 persons (all ages). Retail licenses include restaurants, grocery stores, and wine shops but do not include state liquor stores and agencies. Retail alcohol facilities on military bases and reservations are not licensed by the State and therefore are not included in these data. Policies on licensing distributors, taxing the proceeds, and determining who can sell alcohol varies substantially from state to state. Consequently, there is no consistent comparable source for national data. Data from 1999 to present is now geocoded from the facility address, rather than apportioned from zip code. This results in a more accurate, but different data total per county.

State Source: Washington State Liquor Control Board, Annual Operations Report
Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Each indicator graph is followed by data source and rate definitions as well as any special information for the data.

Updated 1/27/2010

When the newest data was added.

--Rate Formula--

Rate = (numerator / denominator) x factor

Example in 1998: (32 / 6,295) x 1,000 = 5.08

Read the rate as *5.08 licenses per 1,000 people*.

Domain/Factor	Indicators
Community Domain	
Availability of Drugs	Alcohol Retail Licenses
	Tobacco Retail and Vending Machine Licenses
Extreme Family Economic Deprivation	Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program (SNAP)
	Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), Child Recipients
	Unemployed Persons (Age 16+)
	Free or Reduced Price Lunch Eligibility
Transitions and Mobility	Net Migration, 3 Year Moving Average
	Existing Home Sales
	New Residence Construction
Antisocial Behavior of Community Adults	Alcohol- or Drug-Related Deaths
	Clients of State-Funded Alcohol or Drug Services (Age 18+)
	Arrests, Alcohol-Related (Age 18+)
	Arrests, Drug Law Violation (Age 18+)
	Arrests, Violent Crime (Age 18+)



Standardized Five-Year Indicator Profile

Domain/Factor	Indicators	Lewis County	Locale 95	Toledo
Community Domain (continued)				
Low Neighborhood Attachment and Community Disorganization	Prisoners in State Correctional Systems (Age 18+)	1.78		
	Population Not Registered to Vote	-0.15		
	Registered and Not Voting in the November Election	-0.47		
Family Domain				
Family Problems	Divorce	0.50		
	Victims of Child Abuse and Neglect in Accepted Referrals	0.62	0.52	0.45
School Domain				
Academic Achievement	Poor Academic Performance, Grade 10 (Age 15)	0.65	1.14	0.88
	Poor Academic Performance, Grade 7 (Age 12)	1.07	1.32	1.07
	Poor Academic Performance, Grade 4 (Age 9)	0.65	1.21	1.02
	High school Cohort (Cumulative) Dropouts	0.38	-0.59	-0.93
	Annual (Event) Dropouts	0.31	-0.55	-1.09
	On-time Graduation	-0.46	0.45	0.76
	Extended Graduation	-0.58	0.27	0.64

lower state rate higher

Domain/Factor	Indicators	Lewis County	Locale 95	Toledo
School Domain (Continued)				
School Climate	Weapons Incidents at School	-1.14	-1.35	-0.48
	Unexcused Absence	-0.55	-0.11	-0.80
Individual/Peer Domain				
Early Criminal Justice Involvement	Arrests, Alcohol- or Drug-Related (Age 10-14)	0.76		
	Arrests, Vandalism (Age 10-14)	0.32		
	Total Arrests (Age 10-14)	0.59		
Problem Outcomes				
Child and Family Health	Child Injury and Accident Hospitalizations	0.08	0.57	-0.01
	Infant Mortality (Under 1 Year)	-0.69	-2.33	-1.17
	Child Mortality (Ages 1-17)	0.68	1.89	0.17
	Births to School-Age (10-17) Mothers	0.31	0.06	0.57
	Sexually Transmitted Disease Cases (Birth-19)	-0.09		
	Suicide and Suicide Attempts (Age 10-17)	-0.58	-0.76	-0.85
	Low Birth Weight Babies	-0.47	-1.46	-0.03
	Women Injury and Accident Hospitalizations	0.28	0.18	0.03



Standardized Five-Year Indicator Profile

Domain/Factor	Indicators
Problem Outcomes	
Criminal Justice	Offenses, Domestic Violence
	Total Arrests, (Age 10-17)
	Arrests, Property Crime (Age 10-14)
	Arrests, Property Crime (Age 10-17)
	Arrests, Property Crime (Age 18+)
	Arrests, Violent Crime (Age 10-17)
Substance Use	Alcohol-Related Traffic Fatalities Per All Traffic Fatalities
	Arrests, Alcohol Violation (Age 10-17)
Note: Check other Domains for substance use of community adults and early teens.	Arrests, Drug Law Violation (Age 10-17)
	Clients of State-Funded Alcohol or Drug Services (Age 10-17)



Alcohol Retail Licenses



	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013*
State	1.9	1.9	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.2	2.0	2.2	2.2
Lewis County	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.6	2.8	2.8
Locale 95	2.6	2.6	2.5	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.7	3.0	2.6	2.8	2.8
Toledo	2.5	2.5	2.2	2.2	1.9	1.9	1.9	2.5	2.3	1.8	1.8	1.8
Licenses	10	10	9	9	8	8	8	11	10	8	8	8
All Persons	3,978	3,993	4,028	4,121	4,205	4,273	4,331	4,368	4,392	4,410	4,418	4,418

Note: The alcohol retail licenses active during the year, per 1,000 persons (all ages). Retail licenses include restaurants, grocery stores, and wine shops but do not include state liquor stores and agencies. Retail alcohol facilities on military bases and reservations are not licensed by the State and therefore are not included in these data. Policies on licensing distributors, taxing the proceeds, and determining who can sell alcohol vary substantially from state to state.

State Source: Washington State Liquor Control Board, Annual Operations Report
Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health, Vista Partnership

Updated
3/24/2014

Tobacco Retail and Vending Machine Licenses



	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013*
State	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.1	1.3	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.9
Lewis County	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.6	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5
Locale 95	2.2	2.1	2.4	2.0	2.0	2.1	1.9	1.4	1.9	1.8	3.5	1.7
Toledo	2.5	3.0	2.0	1.7	1.9	1.9	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6
Licenses	10	12	8	7	8	8	7	7	7	7	7	7
All Persons	3,978	3,993	4,028	4,121	4,205	4,273	4,331	4,368	4,392	4,410	4,418	4,418

Note: The tobacco retailer and vending machine licenses active during the year, per 1,000 persons (all ages). Tobacco retailers on military bases and reservations are not licensed by the State and therefore are not included in these data. Tobacco sales licenses include tobacco retailer licenses (stores that sell tobacco products) and tobacco vending machines.

State Source: Department of Health (from the Department of Licensing), Tobacco Prevention Program, Tobacco Statistics
Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
3/24/2014

Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program (SNAP)



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	8.7	9.5	10.4	11.3	11.9	12.1	12.1	12.6	15.1	18.0	20.4	21.4
Lewis County	13.4	13.9	15.0	16.3	18.2	18.6	18.8	21.1	22.8	26.3	29.3	30.2
Locale 95	12.0	13.2	13.9	15.2	17.0	17.1	16.4	16.3	19.2	23.0	25.0	26.1
Toledo	10.3	12.0	13.1	15.3	16.2	16.5	15.0	16.3	18.6	22.8	25.9	27.8
Recipients	406	479	523	617	667	692	639	706	813	1,000	1,144	1,228
All Persons	3,947	3,978	3,993	4,028	4,121	4,205	4,273	4,331	4,368	4,392	4,410	4,418

Note: Persons (all ages) receiving Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program1 (SNAP), formally called food stamps in the fiscal year, per 100 persons (all ages). Suppression code definitions for yearly rates and a comparison of economic indicators are explained in Technical Notes.

State Source: Department of Social and Health Services, Research and Data Analysis, Automated Client Eligibility System and Warrant Roll. Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
9/24/2013

Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), Child Recipients



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	10.8	10.6	10.3	10.4	10.2	9.7	9.0	8.8	9.7	10.3	11.0	9.6
Lewis County	15.4	14.8	15.5	15.5	16.0	15.2	13.0	12.2	14.4	15.6	16.4	14.6
Locale 95	13.7	13.5	14.1	13.3	15.6	13.5	10.4	9.6	11.5	13.3	13.5	12.8
Toledo	11.8	11.9	14.3	14.7	15.0	13.4	10.6	9.9	11.2	10.4	12.2	12.1
TANF Children	125	126	149	153	153	137	108	100	111	102	118	116
Children, birth-17	1,062	1,055	1,045	1,041	1,018	1,019	1,015	1,008	991	985	967	956

Note: The children (age birth-17) participating in Aid to Families (AFDC/TANF) programs in the fiscal year, per 100 children (age birth-17). Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes.

State Source: Department of Social and Health Services, Research and Data Analysis, Automated Client Eligibility System and Warrant Roll. Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
9/24/2013

Unemployed Persons (Age 16+)



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	6.2	7.3	7.4	6.3	5.5	5.0	4.5	5.3	8.9	9.6	9.2	8.2
Lewis County	8.6	9.2	9.3	8.2	7.7	7.0	6.9	8.2	12.6	13.5	13.4	12.4
Locale 95												
Toledo												
Unemployed, 16+												
Labor Force,16+												

Note: The unemployed persons (age 16 and over) per 100 persons in the civilian labor force. Unemployed persons are individuals who are currently available for work have actively looked for work, and do not have a job. The civilian labor force includes persons who are working or looking for work. The monthly numbers are a snapshot in time done approximately the 12th of each month. A yearly estimate is then produced by averaging the monthly numbers. Historical data has been updated. The last year of data should be considered preliminary. Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes.

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

Updated
6/3/2013

Students Eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	34.8	36.2	37.1	37.7	36.8	38.0	39.0	42.2	43.8	45.2	45.9	45.5
Lewis County	42.2	43.0	43.7	44.5	42.8	45.7	48.9	56.0	55.1	54.2	58.1	58.5
Locale 95	47.5	49.1	50.7	49.4	46.0	48.7	51.0	53.3	57.9	56.2	58.4	60.5
Toledo	45.3	46.3	49.9	49.0	41.6	45.8	51.0	52.5	52.5	52.1	57.5	56.9
Eligible Students	458	457	490	507	411	441	486	445	443	419	469	429
Enrolled Students	1,011	987	982	1,035	989	962	953	847	844	805	816	754

Note: The students eligible for free or reduced price lunch per 100 students enrolled. Eligibility requirements are discussed in Technical Notes.

State Source: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction

Updated
4/10/2014

Net Migration, 3 Year Moving Average



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	6.2	6.7	7.0	7.3	7.1	9.6	10.3	9.5	6.3	3.7	2.0	1.4
Lewis County	4.5	5.6	6.7	6.9	6.7	11.3	11.4	11.3	6.9	3.5	2.6	3.1
Locale 95												
Toledo												

Net Migration

All Persons

Note: 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. In Washington, the Office of Financial Management estimates annual net migration for twelve months ending on March 31st of a given year. For example, annual net migration in 2009 refers to the period from April 1, 2008 through March 31, 2009. Net migration can change a lot from year to year; calculating a 3-year moving average smoothes net migration. The net migration rate in Year 3 is equal to the average of net migration in Years 1, 2, and 3, divided by the total population in Year 3. The result is then multiplied by 1,000 to measure net migration rate per 1,000 persons.

State Source: Office of Financial Management, Net Migration Data

Updated
7/30/2013

Existing Home Sales



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	18.2	19.3	22.4	24.0	25.3	22.5	18.5	12.9	12.7	12.6	12.9	11.7
Lewis County	10.4	12.5	13.8	16.1	20.3	18.0	15.5	9.5	9.8	9.3	10.4	8.8
Locale 95												
Toledo												
Sales												
All Persons												

Note: The 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. Adjustments were made by the data provider to remove refinanced, rather than sold homes from the counts of sales.

State Source: Washington Center for Real Estate Research, Washington State University, Washington State's Housing Market: A Supply/Demand Assessment. Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
12/19/2013

New Residence Construction



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	6.4	6.7	7.1	8.2	8.5	7.8	7.3	4.4	2.6	3.1	1.9	2.4
Lewis County	2.5	3.2	5.3	5.6	7.4	7.9	6.9	3.7	2.8	2.7	1.1	1.3
Locale 95												
Toledo												
New Residences												
All Persons												

Note: The 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.

State Source: Washington Center for Real Estate Research, Washington State University, Washington State's Housing Market: A Supply/Demand Assessment. Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
12/19/2013

Alcohol- or Drug-Related Deaths



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	9.0	9.8	10.2	11.1	10.1	11.7	11.8	11.7	12.4	12.5	12.7	12.8
Lewis County	8.4	9.6	8.8	9.1	8.8	10.8	11.0	9.6	11.7	9.3	11.9	11.9
Locale 95	9.7	10.4	8.1	8.4	9.2	11.1	12.3	10.1	14.6	11.4	13.9	12.6
Toledo	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP
AOD-related	3	5	5	4	4	2	4	4	5	2	5	7
Deaths	34	38	46	38	44	33	40	40	52	36	41	42

Note: The deaths, with alcohol- or drug-related causes, per 100 deaths. Evaluation is based on all contributory causes of death for direct and indirect associations with alcohol and drug abuse. For a complete explanation of the codes and methods used please see Technical Notes: Counting Alcohol- or Drug-related Deaths. Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes. Rates are not reported when fewer than 100 deaths occurred in an area.

State Source: Department of Health, Center for Health Statistics, Death Certificate Data File

Updated
8/26/2013

Clients of State-Funded Alcohol or Drug Services (Age 18+)



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	11.5	11.8	12.0	12.7	13.4	13.5	13.8	14.4	14.3	13.4	12.9	12.0
Lewis County	13.9	13.3	14.3	13.4	15.2	15.8	15.9	16.5	18.1	16.7	14.8	14.1
Locale 95	10.6	9.6	12.2	9.2	11.7	12.9	12.6	11.5	11.9	11.7	10.8	10.1
Toledo	8.3	8.6	8.8	8.7	12.9	11.0	13.8	11.4	10.7	10.0	9.6	9.5
Admits, 18+	24	25	26	26	40	35	45	38	36	34	33	33
Persons, 18+	2,885	2,923	2,948	2,987	3,103	3,186	3,258	3,323	3,376	3,407	3,442	3,462

Note: The adults (age 18 and over) receiving state-funded alcohol or drug services, per 1,000 adults. Counts of adults are unduplicated so that those receiving services more than once during the year are only counted once for that year. State-funded services include treatment, assessment, and detox. Persons in Department of Corrections treatment programs are not included.

State Source: Department of Social and Health Services, Division of Behavioral Health and Recovery, Treatment and Assessment Report Generation Tool (TARGET). Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
12/6/2013

Arrests (Age 18+), Alcohol-Related



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	9.9	11.3	11.8	11.8	10.6	10.7	10.4	9.6	9.9	9.3	9.4	7.3
Lewis County	9.8	10.1	13.9	10.8	6.2	5.4	4.8	4.5	4.8	4.4	5.2	3.2
Locale 95	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Toledo	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Arrests, 18+	22	23	35	25	10	7	10	8	7	11	11	7
Adjusted Pop 18+	2,885	2,923	2,948	2,487	3,103	3,186	3,258	3,323	3,376	3,407	3,072	3,047

Note: The alcohol violations (age 18+), per 1,000 adults (age 18+). Alcohol violations include all crimes involving driving under the influence, liquor law violations, and drunkenness. DUI arrests by the Washington State Patrol are included in the state trend analysis. 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 will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted, suppression code definitions and the agencies not reporting, see the Technical Notes and the appendix on Non-Reporting Agencies and Population.

State Source: Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, Uniform Crime Report (UCR), Tables 40 and 50.
Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
10/22/2013

Arrests (Age 18+), Drug Law Violation



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	5.9	5.5	5.8	5.3	5.3	6.4	6.2	5.1	4.6	4.4	4.6	2.4
Lewis County	7.1	7.8	8.8	6.4	5.9	5.6	5.4	5.6	4.5	6.3	7.6	4.5
Locale 95	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Toledo	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Arrests, 18+	15	17	21	16	11	10	9	8	7	10	8	4
Adjusted Pop 18+	2,885	2,923	2,948	2,487	3,103	3,186	3,258	3,323	3,376	3,407	3,072	3,047

Note: The arrests of adults (age 18+) for drug law violations, per 1,000 adults (age 18+). Drug law violations include all crimes involving sale, manufacturing, and possession of drugs. 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 will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted, suppression code definitions and the agencies not reporting, see the Technical Notes and the appendix on Non-Reporting Agencies and Population.

State Source: Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, Uniform Crime Report (UCR), Tables 40 and 50.
Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
10/22/2013

Arrests (Age 18+), Violent Crime



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	1.7	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.5
Lewis County	3.1	3.1	2.5	3.5	2.6	2.0	2.3	2.6	1.8	2.2	1.7	1.3
Locale 95	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Toledo	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Arrests, 18+	5	8	5	7	5	3	5	5	3	5	3	2
Adjusted Pop 18+	2,885	2,923	2,948	2,487	3,103	3,186	3,258	3,323	3,376	3,407	3,072	3,047

Note: The arrests of adults (age 18+) for violent crime per 1,000 adults (age 18+). Violent crimes include all crimes involving criminal homicide, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault. Simple assault is not defined as a violent crime. 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 will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted, suppression code definitions and the agencies not reporting, see the Technical Notes and the appendix on Non-Reporting Agencies and Population.

State Source: Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, Uniform Crime Report (UCR), Tables 40 and 50.
Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
10/22/2013

Prisoners in State Correctional Systems (Age 18+)



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	125.9	143.1	198.1	291.9	346.6	366.6	411.3	403.0	400.1	400.4	367.9	401.6
Lewis County	284.9	349.0	416.2	486.6	601.7	657.8	703.8	751.5	714.0	783.3	810.9	979.7
Locale 95												
Toledo												

Prisoners, 18+
All Persons

Note: The 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 area where the conviction occurred. In 2003 prisoners being electronically monitored are included in the data. This may cause a jump in numbers for counties which use this incarceration option. Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes.

State Source: Department of Corrections, Inmates File. Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
5/14/2013

Population Not Registered to Vote



	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013*
State	29.0	29.8	24.5	29.1	32.9	33.6	27.8	29.7	30.0	29.6	25.5	25.4
Lewis County	20.1	34.5	28.0	27.6	29.3	28.6	26.9	28.0	27.6	27.2	25.2	25.2
Locale 95												
Toledo												

Not Registered
Persons, 18+

Note: The persons not registered to vote in the November elections, per 100 adults (age 18 and over). As part of the November Current Population Survey (the Voting and Registration Supplement), the Bureau of the Census collects data on voting and registration in years with presidential or congressional elections (i.e. every other year).

State Source: Office of the Secretary of State, Elections Division, Registered Voters. Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
12/18/2013

Registered and Not Voting in the November Election



	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
State	43.7	59.5	17.8	45.2	35.5	50.0	15.4	49.1	28.8	47.1	18.8	54.7
Lewis County	42.4	51.2	13.3	37.2	34.0	43.6	15.4	43.5	25.2	42.9	21.6	52.2
Locale 95												
Toledo												
Not Voting												
Reg'd Voters												

Note: The persons registered to vote in the November elections but not voting, per 100 adults (age 18 and over) registered to vote. As part of the November Current Population Survey (the Voting and Registration Supplement), the Bureau of the Census collects data on voting and registration in years with presidential or congressional elections (i.e. every other year).

State Source: Office of the Secretary of State, Elections Division, Registered Voters. Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
12/18/2013

Divorce



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	5.8	5.9	5.5	5.6	5.4	5.1	5.0	4.8	4.9	5.2	5.1	4.9
Lewis County	5.8	6.1	6.4	6.4	6.4	6.0	5.6	4.5	5.1	5.8	5.7	5.8
Locale 95												
Toledo												

Divorces
Persons, 15+

Note: The divorces per 1,000 persons (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 residence was unknown the event is not assigned to a county, but is included in the state rate. Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes.

State Source: Department of Health, Center for Health Statistics, Dissolution and Annulment Data. Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
10/22/2013

Victims of Child Abuse and Neglect in Accepted Referrals



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	39.4	37.6	40.9	38.1	35.0	34.1	34.0	31.6	32.0	31.8	33.9	34.3
Lewis County	67.4	52.1	60.3	42.8	52.5	39.9	36.5	30.6	36.8	41.4	47.2	49.1
Locale 95	58.6	45.1	54.1	44.2	50.4	38.8	38.0	26.7	39.8	41.4	55.3	36.3
Toledo	49.9	35.1	57.4	44.2	56.0	35.3	37.4	26.8	36.3	40.6	72.4	30.3
Accepted Victims	53	37	60	46	57	36	38	27	36	40	70	29
Persons, birth-17	1,062	1,055	1,045	1,041	1,018	1,019	1,015	1,008	991	985	967	956

Note: The 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. A "referral" is a report of suspected child abuse. Numbers may differ due to corrections or changes in location definition made in the database extraction process. Child location is derived from the residence at the time of referral. Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes.

State Source: Department of Social and Health Services, Children's Administration, FamLink Data Warehouse. Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
5/16/2013

Poor Academic Performance, Grade 10



	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
State	69.8	66.4	72.7	57.5	63.9	63.0	62.8	65.0	75.6	50.9	40.1	31.6
Lewis County	74.0	70.9	77.0	62.3	69.7	69.2	68.6	68.2	79.4	52.2	44.1	41.4
Locale 95	76.3	74.3	82.3	65.1	72.8	79.8	77.7	78.3	85.1	59.7	45.6	51.8
Toledo	75.0	72.0	87.9	53.1	69.0	81.8	80.7	SN	89.5	56.1	40.0	52.9
Low Scorers	60	54	80	43	40	54	25	6	102	37	22	36
Tested, 10th grade	80	75	91	81	58	66	31	7	114	66	55	68

Note: The students tested who failed one or more content areas as a percent of all students tested at the 10th grade level. Some districts have chosen to test students in both grades 9 and 10 for the 10th grade assessment. All students being tested at the 10th grade level are included in these data regardless of their grade placement. Tests are given in the spring of the year. For example, data for 2008 is for students in the 10th grade during the school year 2007/2008. By contractual agreement data is suppressed when less than ten students were tested to avoid individual student identification.

In 2009-10 the tenth grade WASL was replaced by the High School Proficiency Exam (HSPE). This test was built on the same framework as the WASL, but contain fewer questions. It is considered equivalent by OSPI.

State Source: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Instructional Programs, Curriculum and Assessment, Grade 10 Failing In One Or More Content Areas.

Updated
4/14/2014

Poor Academic Performance, Grade 7



	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
State	77.9	72.8	63.8	58.7	60.1	53.9	57.4	58.3	56.4	57.0	49.6	47.8
Lewis County	82.4	78.4	70.5	66.4	62.6	62.5	65.3	67.4	69.5	68.0	60.5	50.6
Locale 95	84.1	81.4	75.0	69.3	69.4	71.1	69.9	76.1	72.7	75.2	64.6	57.2
Toledo	81.1	81.4	65.2	64.9	65.4	74.1	70.8	73.8	70.6	74.6	59.0	67.7
Low Scorers	77	79	60	50	51	63	51	45	48	50	36	44
Tested, 7th grade	95	97	92	77	78	85	72	61	68	67	61	65

Note: The students tested who failed one or more content areas as a percent of all students tested at the 7th grade level. Tests are given in the spring of the year. Data for 2008 is for students in the 7th grade during the school year 2007/2008. By contractual agreement data is suppressed when less than ten students were tested to avoid individual student identification.

In 2009-10 the 7th grade WASL was replaced by Measurements of Student Progress (MSP). This test was built on the same framework as the WASL, but contain fewer questions. It is considered equivalent by OSPI.

State Source: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Instructional Programs, Curriculum and Assessment, Grade 7 Failing In One Or More Content Areas.

Updated
4/14/2014

Poor Academic Performance, Grade 4



	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
State	70.9	65.6	56.4	54.8	52.8	54.1	56.5	58.3	59.8	55.0	54.3	51.7
Lewis County	72.2	65.9	63.2	61.4	56.5	60.9	61.5	64.8	67.9	59.4	61.6	56.0
Locale 95	80.0	73.7	71.1	64.9	65.2	70.2	71.5	73.4	75.9	67.0	71.0	64.6
Toledo	79.5	72.6	71.4	60.3	63.5	67.7	68.3	68.5	78.3	64.3	75.6	68.6
Low Scorers	58	53	50	38	40	42	41	37	54	45	34	35
Tested, 4th grade	73	73	70	63	63	62	60	54	69	70	45	51

Note: The students tested who failed one or more content areas as a percent of all students tested at the 4th grade level. Tests are given in the spring of the year. Data for 2008 is for students in the 4th grade during the school year 2007/2008. By contractual agreement data is suppressed when less than ten students were tested to avoid individual student identification.

In 2009-10 the 4th grade WASL was replaced by Measurements of Student Progress (MSP). This test was built on the same framework as the WASL, but contain fewer questions. It is considered equivalent by OSPI.

State Source: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Instructional Programs, Curriculum and Assessment, Grade 4 Failing In One Or More Content Areas.

Updated
4/14/2014

High school Cohort (Cumulative) Dropouts



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State						21.4	21.0	21.4	19.4	17.6	16.8	15.9
Lewis County						21.8	27.7	24.3	22.9	22.1	19.5	22.1
Locale 95						17.5	17.0	16.8	13.6	14.2	13.1	13.2
Toledo						18.8	6.5	20.0	1.4	5.1	11.9	5.3

Note: A cumulative or cohort dropout rate is based on the percentage of students who began grade 9 in a given year but dropped out of school over a four-year period and did not receive a high school diploma. The Cohort (Cumulative) Dropout Rate formula is: 100-(100*(1-grade 9 dropout rate)*(1-grade 10 dropout rate)*(1-grade 11 dropout rate)*(1-grade 12 dropout rate)). Due to the complexity of this formula numerators and denominators have not been listed here, but are available at http://www.k12.wa.us/DataAdmin/pubdocs/GradDropout/.

State Source: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Graduation and Dropout Statistics for Washington.

Updated
5/23/2013

Annual (Event) Dropouts



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State						5.7	5.6	5.6	5.1	4.6	4.4	4.1
Lewis County						5.9	7.7	6.6	6.2	5.8	5.1	6.0
Locale 95						4.5	4.5	4.5	3.6	3.7	3.4	3.4
Toledo						4.6	1.8	4.9	0.3	1.0	3.1	1.3
Dropouts						17.00	6.00	17.00	1.00	3.00	9.00	4.00
Students						366	338	346	325	299	293	300

Note: The Annual Rate measures the proportion of students enrolled in grades 9-12 who drop out in a single year without completing high school. This indicator answers the question "How many high-school students left school without graduating this year?". This is the total number of students that drop out of school from grades 9 through 12, divided by the total number of students in grades 9 through 12, less the number of students that transferred out of the district/school. More information about graduation and dropout rates in Washington State can be found online at: http://www.k12.wa.us/dataadmin. Additional Information on using academic indicators is available in technical notes.

State Source: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Graduation and Dropout Statistics for Washington.

Updated
5/23/2013

On-time Graduation



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State						70.5	72.5	72.0	73.5	76.5	75.0	76.6
Lewis County						62.1	65.1	68.6	65.9	74.2	71.0	66.8
Locale 95						51.0	80.4	79.2	74.7	77.0	83.1	78.8
Toledo						69.8	90.8	76.5	91.4	83.1	83.0	82.0

Note: The percent of students who graduate in four years to complete their degree. The Washington State Board of Education establishes minimum credit requirements, the Culminating Project and the High School and Beyond Plan. The Washington State Legislature requires state testing. To earn a high school diploma, a student must:
- Earn high school credit
- Pass state tests or approved alternatives to those tests
- Complete a Culminating Project
- Complete a High School and Beyond Plan.

The On-Time Graduation Rate formula is: 100*(1-grade 9 dropout rate)*(1-grade 10 dropout rate)* (1-grade 11 dropout rate)*(1-grade 12 dropout rate-grade 12 continuing rate). Due to the complexity of this formula numerators and denominators have not been listed here, but are available at http://www.k12.wa.us/DataAdmin/pubdocs/GradDropout/. Additional Information on using academic indicators is available in technical notes.

State Source: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Graduation and Dropout Statistics for Washington.

Updated
5/23/2013

Extended Graduation



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State						75.1	77.5	77.1	79.2	82.6	81.0	82.6
Lewis County						65.5	68.6	72.7	69.6	79.9	75.2	71.4
Locale 95						52.5	83.4	81.5	79.9	83.4	85.0	83.0
Toledo						73.2	96.1	78.9	97.1	91.5	85.5	85.5

Note: The percent of students who graduate including those students who stay in school and take more than four years to complete their degree. The Extended Graduation formula is: (the number of on-time and late graduates)/(the number of on-time graduates divided by the on-time graduation rate). A large difference in the size of the on-time and extended graduation rates may indicate that a district or school is working hard to keep students in school or to have dropouts return to school and graduate. Additional Information on using academic indicators is available in technical notes.

State Source: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Graduation and Dropout Statistics for Washington.

Updated
5/23/2013

Weapons Incidents in School



	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
State	2.7	2.9	2.8	3.0	3.3	3.1	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.6	2.0
Lewis County	2.5	2.9	3.5	2.8	3.4	3.0	5.7	2.0	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.5
Locale 95	4.3	3.5	2.8	3.1	2.5	1.1	0.6	1.5	1.0	0.0	1.3	2.1
Toledo	2.0	5.0	5.1	0.0	1.0	3.0	2.1	2.1	1.2	0.0	1.2	3.7
Incidents	2	5	5	0	1	3	2	2	1	0	1	3
Enrollment	1,003	1,011	987	982	1,035	989	964	959	860	853	813	819

Note: The reported school incidents involving guns and other weapons at any grade level per 1000 students enrolled in October of all grades.

State Source: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Information Services, Safe and Drug-free Schools: Report to the Legislature on Weapons in Schools RCW 28A.320.130

Updated
4/10/2014

Unexcused Absences for Students in Grades 1 to 8



	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
State			4.5	4.2	4.3	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.8	4.3	5.1
Lewis County			2.5	2.2	2.3	2.8	2.9	2.5	2.7	3.2	3.1	3.3
Locale 95			2.9	3.0	2.8	3.8	5.2	2.9	2.4	3.7	5.0	5.4
Toledo			1.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	3.0	0.4	0.7	0.7	2.4	0.3
Unexcused Absences			127	10	23	17	285	37	62	57	190	19
Potential Days			102,705	98,865	97,240	93,072	95,880	89,779	85,345	80,025	78,030	75,881

Note: The unexcused absences for students in grades 1-8 per thousand potential school days.Potential school days are the number of days students were taught from the first day of school through May 31 in each school building multiplied by the net served students in grades 1-8 in that building. The definition of an unexcused absence is a local decision, so the definition differs among schools and districts. In general, a student who has an unexcused absence has not attended a majority of hours or periods in a school day, or has not complied with a more restrictive district policy, and has not met the conditions for an excused absence (see RCW 28A.225.020).

State Source: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Washington State Report Card, Unexcused Absence Files.

Updated
10/16/2013

Arrests (Age 10-14), Alcohol- or Drug-Related



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	3.5	3.1	3.1	3.0	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.4	2.4	2.8	2.8	2.0
Lewis County	5.6	6.0	3.9	2.2	2.3	4.2	3.3	2.9	2.7	4.8	6.2	2.5
Locale 95	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Toledo	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Arrests, 10-14	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Adjusted Pop 10-14	331	334	333	288	325	323	316	313	309	305	260	251

Note: The arrests of younger adolescents (age 10-14) for alcohol and drug law violations, per 1,000 adolescents (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.
1) Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report arrests to Uniform Crime Report (UCR). In spite of this population adjustment, when the non-reporting police jurisdiction is where much of the crime occurs, the rate will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted, suppression code definitions and the agencies not reporting, see the Technical Notes and the appendix on Non-Reporting Agencies and Population.
2) The DUI portion of this measure is likely understated, because arrests made by the State Patrol are not attributable to smaller areas. State Patrol arrests are included in the state rates.

State Source: Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, Uniform Crime Report (UCR), Tables 40 and 50. Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
10/22/2013

Arrests (Age 10-14), Vandalism



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	2.5	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.2	2.4	2.4	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.2
Lewis County	4.0	3.2	2.4	1.5	1.6	1.8	4.5	1.6	3.9	1.8	1.1	2.3
Locale 95	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Toledo	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Arrests, 10-14	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Adjusted Pop 10-14	331	334	333	288	325	323	316	313	309	305	260	251

Note: The arrests of younger adolescents (age 10-14) for vandalism (including residence, non-residence, vehicles, venerated objects, police cars, or other) per 1,000 adolescents (age 10-14). 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 will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted, suppression code definitions and the agencies not reporting, see the Technical Notes and the appendix on Non-Reporting Agencies and Population.

State Source: Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, Uniform Crime Report (UCR), Tables 40 and 50. Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
10/22/2013

Total Arrests of Adolescents (Age 10-14)



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	31.7	27.8	27.9	26.6	23.2	22.1	21.3	20.0	17.8	17.8	16.8	12.4
Lewis County	35.6	44.9	43.7	30.9	25.0	30.5	26.5	24.0	24.9	22.8	23.8	14.3
Locale 95	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Toledo	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Arrests, 10-14	5	10	14	6	4	5	6	2	3	5	4	2
Adjusted Pop 10-14	331	334	333	288	325	323	316	313	309	305	260	251

Note: The arrests of adolescents (age 10-14) for any crime, per 1,000 adolescents (age 10-14). 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 will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted, suppression code definitions and the agencies not reporting, see the Technical Notes and the appendix on Non-Reporting Agencies and Population.

State Source: Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, Uniform Crime Report (UCR), Tables 40 and 50. Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
10/22/2013

Injury or Accident Hospitalizations for Children



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	3.7	3.7	3.3	3.9	4.2	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.7
Lewis County	3.6	3.7	2.0	4.5	5.9	4.1	4.8	4.3	3.9	4.8	4.5	5.0
Locale 95	5.3	6.0	2.5	5.0	7.9	4.6	4.9	4.6	5.6	4.8	4.7	7.3
Toledo	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP
Injuries	2	3	3	3	5	4	2	4	2	2	2	3
Hospitalizations	55	70	47	60	57	69	81	67	68	53	58	63

Note: The child injury or accident hospitalizations as a percent of all hospitalizations for children (age birth-17). Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes. Due to contractual agreement data may not be displayed for areas with less than 100 hospitalizations.

State Source: Department of Health, Office of Hospital and Patient Data Systems, Comprehensive Hospital Abstract Reporting System (CHARS)

Updated
10/14/2013

Infant Mortality (Under 1 Year)



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	587.7	573.3	567.5	569.1	484.2	468.0	469.9	551.5	484.2	418.2	420.6	479.7
Lewis County	800.9	684.9	460.8	1156.1	684.9	227.3	223.2	109.2	215.8	432.4	431.0	328.6
Locale 95	1562.5	0.0	531.9	1063.8	546.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Toledo	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP
deaths, infants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Infants < 1 year	49	49	48	48	43	41	41	41	40	38	38	37

Note: The deaths, of infants under one year of age, per 100,000 population of infants under one year of age. Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes. Rates are not reported when fewer than 100 deaths occurred in an area.

State Source: Department of Health, Center for Health Statistics, Death Certificate Data File. Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
8/26/2013

Child Mortality (Ages 1-17)



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	22.0	23.4	22.3	20.5	19.2	17.6	16.7	18.1	16.1	16.2	15.2	16.3
Lewis County	17.3	28.8	23.3	23.5	41.8	29.7	17.8	41.6	18.0	36.3	6.1	24.8
Locale 95	21.2	64.0	21.6	0.0	70.1	23.5	23.8	24.2	24.8	101.4	0.0	26.0
Toledo	0.0	99.4	0.0	0.0	204.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	105.6	0.0	0.0
Child Deaths	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Children (age 1-17)	1,013	1,006	997	993	976	979	974	967	952	947	929	919

Note: The deaths, of children 1 to 17 years of age, per 100,000 population of children 1 to 17 years of age. Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes. Rates are not reported when fewer than 100 deaths occurred in an area.

State Source: Department of Health, Center for Health Statistics, Death Certificate Data File. Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
8/26/2013

Births to School-Age (10-17) Mothers



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	6.9	6.5	6.0	6.1	5.9	6.1	6.6	6.3	5.6	5.1	4.6	4.2
Lewis County	7.8	8.0	8.0	6.5	6.0	6.7	9.4	6.6	8.9	5.5	5.9	4.9
Locale 95	5.5	3.1	8.7	6.3	7.0	4.4	4.6	4.7	6.9	5.1	6.2	4.2
Toledo	7.7	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	11.8	4.0	12.2	8.3	4.2
Birthed, 10-17	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	3	2	1
Females, 10-17	260	260	259	257	256	260	256	254	249	246	240	237

Note: The live births to adolescents (age 10-17) per 1,000 females (age 10-17). Rate changes in data may result from on-going updates to birth records. Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes. Due to contractual agreement data may not be displayed for areas with less than 100 births.

State Source: Department of Health, Center for Health Statistics, Birth Certificate Data File. Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health, Vista Partnership

Updated
10/17/2013

Sexually Transmitted Disease Cases (Birth-19)



	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013*
State	3.5	4.1	3.9	4.0	3.7	3.8	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.1	4.1	3.8
Lewis County	2.9	2.7	4.4	3.7	3.7	3.0	4.1	3.9	2.9	3.7	4.3	4.7
Locale 95												
Toledo												
Cases, birth-19												
Persons, birth-19												

Note: The reported cases of gonorrhea, syphilis, or chlamydia in children (age birth-19) per 1,000 adolescents (age birth-19). Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes. Due to contractual agreement data may not be displayed for populations less than 100.

State Source: Department of Health, Sexually Transmitted Disease (STD) Services, Sexually Transmitted Disease Reported Cases. Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
3/17/2014

Suicide and Suicide Attempts (Age 10-17)



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	51.9	51.0	42.8	56.7	51.6	48.4	38.6	48.2	44.2	44.5	40.8	52.8
Lewis County	0.0	32.6	43.7	33.1	22.8	22.8	45.9	23.3	59.4	0.0	24.8	62.9
Locale 95	0.0	37.8	38.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	43.8	0.0	93.8	0.0	0.0	50.6
Toledo	0.0	183.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Suicide & Attempt	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Persons, 10-17	543	544	542	540	541	541	534	527	516	518	502	493

Note: The 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. Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes. Due to contractual agreement data may not be displayed for locations with adolescent populations less than 100.

State Source: 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. Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
10/14/2013

Low Birthweight Babies



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	57.6	57.3	60.4	62.0	61.0	65.2	63.3	63.4	62.5	63.2	61.5	61.2
Lewis County	58.3	48.6	54.6	52.6	77.1	57.6	56.8	53.7	53.7	62.3	60.8	56.9
Locale 95	67.0	48.7	58.8	93.3	66.4	59.1	59.9	34.8	50.7	39.0	71.8	54.6
Toledo	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP
Low-weight Babies	3	2	1	2	2	5	6	3	2	3	4	2
All Births	37	42	32	32	47	50	57	48	47	46	37	48

Note: The babies born with low birthweight, per 1,000 live births. Low birthweight is less than 2,500 grams. Rate changes in data result from on-going updates to birth records. No rate is given when the number of live births is less than 100 in the geographic area. Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes.

State Source: Department of Health, Center for Health Statistics, Birth Certificate Data File

Updated
10/17/2013

Injury or Accident Hospitalizations for Women



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	11.7	11.9	12.3	13.2	13.3	13.5	13.5	14.3	15.1	15.4	16.1	16.9
Lewis County	12.4	15.0	14.5	16.0	17.0	16.0	15.3	16.2	14.9	16.1	17.5	17.9
Locale 95	10.8	14.1	14.6	15.0	17.2	16.0	16.6	14.3	15.7	17.2	16.0	17.0
Toledo	13.9	11.8	13.5	16.9	16.7	17.5	16.9	14.8	12.7	18.0	15.0	17.8
Injuries	25	24	28	34	42	48	45	32	30	43	36	43
Hospitalizations	180	203	208	201	252	275	267	217	237	239	240	242

Note: The injury or accident hospitalizations for women as a percent of all hospitalizations for women (age 18+). Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes. Due to contractual agreement data may not be displayed for areas with less than 100 hospitalizations.

State Source: Department of Health, Office of Hospital and Patient Data Systems, Comprehensive Hospital Abstract Reporting System (CHARS) .

Updated
10/14/2013

Offenses, Domestic Violence



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	6.8	6.5	6.5	6.5	6.4	6.0	5.8	5.3	5.7	5.7	5.6	5.9
Lewis County	8.8	7.8	7.7	7.5	7.3	7.5	6.9	6.7	6.7	6.8	6.3	7.7
Locale 95	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Toledo	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Offenses	29	22	20	19	27	20	25	18	18	25	20	22
Persons	3,947	3,978	3,993	3,363	4,121	4,205	4,273	4,331	4,368	4,392	4,410	3,843

Note: The domestic violence-related offenses, per 1,000 persons. 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.

Offenses differ from arrests. While funding and grants are associated with participation, reporting is not mandatory. Offenses are incidence reporting. When more than one victim is involved an offence is filed for each victim. Multiple property violations performed at the same incident are counted as one offence. However when both types of events happen, only the victim incidents are reported as offenses. Offenses focus on the nature of the crime, while arrests focus on the apprehended accused perpetrator. Many offenses occur without arresting perpetrators.

Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report offenses. In spite of this population adjustment, when the non-reporting police jurisdiction is where much of the crime occurs, the rate will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted and the agencies not reporting, see the appendix on Non-Reporting Agencies and Population. Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes.

State Source: Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, UCR Division. Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
1/22/2014

Total Arrests of Adolescents (Age 10-17)



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	60.3	54.7	54.3	51.8	48.1	48.4	49.0	45.5	41.4	39.4	37.2	26.8
Lewis County	71.2	76.9	82.7	66.1	59.8	51.5	50.9	46.6	46.6	44.3	41.0	27.7
Locale 95	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Toledo	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Arrests, 10-17	21	30	39	21	19	17	18	12	13	11	12	8
Adjusted Pop 10-17	543	544	542	470	541	541	534	527	516	510	427	411

Note: The arrests of adolescents (age 10-17) for any crime, per 1,000 adolescents (age 10-17). 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 will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted, suppression code definitions and the agencies not reporting, see the Technical Notes and the appendix on Non-Reporting Agencies and Population.

State Source: Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, Uniform Crime Report (UCR), Tables 40 and 50.
Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
10/22/2013

Arrests (Age 10-14), Property Crime



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	13.1	12.0	11.8	11.0	9.4	8.6	8.6	7.5	6.7	5.9	5.8	4.0
Lewis County	8.6	11.5	13.3	7.8	7.4	6.4	3.3	7.7	6.5	5.6	6.8	3.3
Locale 95	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Toledo	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Arrests, 10-14	1	3	3	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	1
Adjusted Pop 10-14	331	334	333	288	325	323	316	313	309	305	260	251

Note: The arrests of younger adolescents (age 10-14) for property crimes, per 1,000 adolescents (age 10-14). Property crimes include all crimes involving burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson. 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 area will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted, suppression code definitions and the agencies not reporting, see the Technical Notes and the appendix on Non-Reporting Agencies and Population.

State Source: Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, Uniform Crime Report (UCR), Tables 40 and 50.
Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
10/22/2013

Arrests (Age 10-17), Property Crime



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	21.0	19.7	19.1	18.1	16.6	15.7	16.3	15.4	13.8	12.4	12.3	8.9
Lewis County	15.8	18.3	16.9	18.8	16.9	9.6	9.7	14.1	11.6	13.5	11.7	6.8
Locale 95	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Toledo	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Arrests, 10-17	3	6	7	3	4	2	5	3	3	1	1	1
Adjusted Pop 10-17	543	544	542	470	541	541	534	527	516	510	427	411

Note: The arrests of adolescents (age 10-17) for property crimes, per 1,000 adolescents (age 10-17). Property crimes include all crimes involving burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson. 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 will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted, suppression code definitions and the agencies not reporting, see the Technical Notes and the appendix on Non-Reporting Agencies and Population.

State Source: Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, Uniform Crime Report (UCR), Tables 40 and 50. Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
10/22/2013

Arrests (Age 18+), Property Crime



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	6.3	6.2	6.5	6.8	6.7	6.1	6.1	5.6	6.2	6.2	6.7	6.1
Lewis County	8.2	10.2	9.0	10.7	8.9	7.5	6.2	9.1	6.7	9.5	7.0	4.8
Locale 95	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Toledo	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Arrests, 18+	14	15	15	17	14	14	11	14	11	10	7	7
Adjusted Pop 18+	2,885	2,923	2,948	2,487	3,103	3,186	3,258	3,323	3,376	3,407	3,072	3,047

Note: The arrests of adults (age 18+) for property crimes, per 1,000 adults (age 18+). Property crimes include all crimes involving burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson. 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 will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted, suppression code definitions and the agencies not reporting, see the Technical Notes and the appendix on Non-Reporting Agencies and Population.

State Source: Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, Uniform Crime Report (UCR), Tables 40 and 50. Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
10/22/2013

Arrests (Age 10-17), Violent Crime



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	2.7	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.5	2.3	2.3	2.1	1.8	1.5
Lewis County	3.5	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.6	1.7	3.3	1.6	1.6	2.0	2.4	0.6
Locale 95	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Toledo	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Arrests, 10-17	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Adjusted Pop 10-17	543	544	542	470	541	541	534	527	516	510	427	411

Note: The arrests of adolescents (age 10-17) for violent crime per 1,000 adolescents (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. 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 will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted, suppression code definitions and the agencies not reporting, see the Technical Notes and the appendix on Non-Reporting Agencies and Population.

State Source: Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, Uniform Crime Report (UCR), Tables 40 and 50.
Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
10/22/2013

Alcohol-Related Traffic Fatalities Per All Traffic Fatalities



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	37.4	39.8	36.8	37.7	41.8	39.7	40.8	43.6	49.0	41.1	39.7	36.1
Lewis County	35.7	35.5	47.6	31.6	28.6	27.3	42.9	9.1	44.4	28.6	25.0	11.1
Locale 95												
Toledo												

Alcohol-related Fatalities

Note: The 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. Care should be taken since small numbers of events can cause unreliable rates in some counties.

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

Updated
2/14/2014

Arrests (Age 10-17), Alcohol Violation



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	8.1	7.8	7.8	7.4	6.5	7.4	7.7	6.7	5.8	4.8	3.9	2.7
Lewis County	8.4	11.3	15.1	7.3	6.2	4.2	6.1	7.2	5.2	6.9	5.0	5.0
Locale 95	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Toledo	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Arrests, 10-17	1	2	4	3	3	2	2	3	2	1	2	2
Adjusted Pop 10-17	543	544	542	470	541	541	534	527	516	510	427	411

Note: The arrests of adolescents (age 10-17) for alcohol violations, per 1,000 adolescents (age 10-17). 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.

1) 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 will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted, suppression code definitions and the agencies not reporting, see the Technical Notes and the appendix on Non-Reporting Agencies and Population.

2) The DUI portion of this measure is likely understated, because arrests made by the State Patrol are not attributable to smaller areas. State Patrol arrests are included in the state rates.

State Source: Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, Uniform Crime Report (UCR), Tables 40 and 50.
Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
10/22/2013

Arrests (Age 10-17), Drug Law Violation



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	5.2	4.9	4.9	4.2	4.3	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.3	4.8	5.2	3.3
Lewis County	3.8	3.2	4.6	4.0	3.6	4.0	3.1	2.7	4.1	5.0	6.8	3.6
Locale 95	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Toledo	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Arrests, 10-17	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	0
Adjusted Pop 10-17	543	544	542	470	541	541	534	527	516	510	427	411

Note: The arrests of adolescents (age 10-17) for drug law violations, per 1,000 adolescents (age 10-17). Drug law violations include all crimes involving sale, manufacturing, and possession of drugs.

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 will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted, suppression code definitions and the agencies not reporting, see the Technical Notes and the appendix on Non-Reporting Agencies and Population.

State Source: Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, Uniform Crime Report (UCR), Tables 40 and 50.
Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
10/22/2013

Clients of State-Funded Alcohol or Drug Services (Age 10-17)



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State	11.6	11.4	11.2	11.1	10.6	10.2	10.6	11.3	11.0	11.1	11.5	11.4
Lewis County	19.7	18.9	14.3	13.0	18.8	20.0	24.2	23.6	18.4	17.2	19.4	16.6
Locale 95	16.3	19.7	16.7	10.3	16.9	21.4	25.9	18.5	8.9	10.1	16.4	14.7
Toledo	11.1	18.4	14.8	16.7	33.3	33.3	24.3	15.2	3.9	0.0	12.0	10.1
Admits, 10-17	6	10	8	9	18	18	13	8	2	0	6	5
Persons, 10-17	543	544	542	540	541	541	534	527	516	518	502	493

Note: The adolescents (age 10-17) receiving state-funded alcohol or drug services, per 1,000 adolescents 10-17. Counts of clients are unduplicated so that those receiving services more than once during the year are only counted once for that year. State-funded services include treatment, assessment, and detox. Persons in Department of Corrections treatment programs are not included.

State Source: Department of Social and Health Services, Division of Behavioral Health and Recovery, Treatment and Assessment Report Generation Tool (TARGET). Population Estimates: Washington State Department of Health

Updated
12/6/2013

Topics:

Population Denominators Used in This Report
Counting Alcohol- or Drug-related Deaths
Uniform Crime Report - Non-Reporting Police Jurisdictions
CORE-GIS Conversion Process and Weighted Reliability Index
Duplicated and Unduplicated Counts
Suppression Codes
Rates – Why is Raw Data Converted to Rates?
Standardization of CORE Indicators
Where are the roadblocks to learning in our communities?

Population Denominators Used in This Report

Population is updated as the data becomes available. If events for the numerator are available, but the population is not yet available the population for the year previous is used for calculating rates. Those data years are marked with an asterisk, like this: 2011*. The asterisk is removed when the population, and the rate are updated.

Counting Alcohol- or Drug-related Deaths

AOD deaths are identified by matching all the contributory causes of death from death certificate records to a list of causes that are considered AOD-related. The deaths identified as AOD-related then may be summed to provide area totals. Dividing the total AOD-related deaths by all deaths in an area gives the percent of all deaths that are alcohol and drug related. Lists of underlying causes of death that are AOD-related have been developed in several studies. Citations for these studies are listed prior to the AOD attribution tables. AOD-related deaths used in this report are determined using a comprehensive assembly of disease, accident, and injury codes identified in those studies. The codes are based upon the International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision (ICD-9) from 1990 to 1998 or International Classification of Diseases, Tenth Revision (ICD-10) after 1998.

The identified AOD-related causes of death may be either fully attributable or sometimes attributable to alcohol or drugs. Some contributory causes of death are explicit in their mention of alcohol or drugs. Examples include alcoholic cirrhosis of the liver (ICD-9 code 571.2), alcohol and drug dependence syndromes (ICD-9 codes 303 and 304, respectively), and drug poisonings (ICD-9 codes E850 through E859). All deaths of this sort are fully, or 100%, attributable to alcohol or drug abuse and are considered direct AOD-related deaths.

Other contributory causes of death are related only sometimes to alcohol or drugs. For example, epidemiological studies have shown that, among persons over 35 years of age, 60% of deaths due to chronic pancreatitis (ICD-9 code 577.1) and 75% of malignant neoplasms of the esophagus (ICD-9 code 150) are alcohol-related. For persons of all ages, 42% of motor vehicle traffic and nontraffic deaths (ICD-9 codes E810 through E825) are alcohol-related. The appropriate percentage of such indirectly attributable deaths are also counted toward totals for AOD-related deaths.

The tables on the following pages characterize the different diseases, injuries, and accidents by: name, ICD-9 or ICD-10 code, percent attributable to alcohol or drugs, age of inclusion. Information sources are listed below.

1. Schultz J, Rice D, & Parker D. 1990. Alcohol-related mortality and years of potential life lost - United States, 1987. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, 39, 173-178.

2. Rice D, et al. 1990. The Economic Costs of Alcohol and Drug Abuse and Mental Illness: 1985. Report submitted to the Office of Financing and Coverage Policy of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and mental health Administration, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. San Francisco, CA: Institute for Health and Aging, University of California.

3. Fox K, Merrill J, Chang H, & Califano J. 1995. Estimating the Costs of Substance Abuse to the Medicaid Hospital Care Program. American Journal of Public Health, 85(1), 48-54.

4. Seattle-King County HIV/AIDS Epidemiology Unit and Washington State Office of HIV/AIDS Epidemiology and Evaluation. 1994. Washington State/Seattle-King County HIV/AIDS Epidemiology Report (2nd Quarter, 1994), p. 4.

Disease Category	ICD-10 Code	ICD-9 Code	Attrib	Age
Diseases Directly Attributable to Alcohol				
Alcoholic psychoses	F10, F10.3-F10.9	291	100%	>=15
Alcohol dependence syndrome	F10.2	303	100%	>=15
Alcoholic polyneuropathy	G62.1	357.5	100%	>=15
Alcoholic cardiomyopathy	I42.6	425.5	100%	>=15
Alcoholic gastritis	K29.2	535.3	100%	>=15
Alcoholic fatty liver	K70.0	571.0	100%	>=15
Acute alcoholic hepatitis	K70.1, K70.4	571.1	100%	>=15
Alcoholic cirrhosis of the liver	K70.3	571.2	100%	>=15
Alcoholic liver damage, other	K70.2, K70.9, K70	571.3	100%	>=15
Excessive blood level of alcohol, toxic effect of alcohol	R78.0, T51	790.3. 980	100%	>=0
Accidental poisoning by alcohol	X45, Y15	E860	100%	>=0
Nondependent abuse of Alcohol	F10.1	305.0	100%	>=0
Alcohol-induced pseudo-Cushing's	E24.4	Not Available in ICD-9	100%	>=15
Degeneration of nervous system due	G31.2	Not Available in ICD-9	100%	>=15
Alcoholic myopathy	G72.1	Not Available in ICD-9	100%	>=15
Maternal care for (suspected) damag	O35.4	Not Available in ICD-9	100%	>=15
Newborn affected by maternal use o	P04.3	Not Available in ICD-9	100%	>=0
Fetal alcohol syndrome (dysmorphic	Q86.0	Not Available in ICD-9	100%	>=0
Suicide attributable to alcohol	X65	Not Available in ICD-9	100%	>=0
Alcoholic Pellagra	E52	265.2	100%	>=0
Diseases Indirectly Attributable to Alcohol				
Neoplasms				
Breast	C50, D05	174.0-174.9, 233.0	13% F	>=35
Esophagus	C15, D00.1	150.1-150.9, 230.1	75%	>=35
Larynx	C32 , D02.0	161.0-.161.9, 231.0	50% M, 40% F	>=35
Lip, oral cavity, pharynx	C00-C14, D00.0	140.1-141.9, 143.0-149.9, 230.0	50% M, 40% F	>=35
Liver	C22, D01.5	155.0-155.2, 230.8	29%	>=35
Cardiovascular				
Cardiomyopathy	I42.0 - I42.2, I42.5, I42.7- I42.9	425.1, 425.4, 425.9	40%M	>=35
Hypertension	I10-113, O10-O14, O16	401.0-404.9, 642.0, 642.2, 642.9	11%	>=35
Digestive System				
Cirrhosis	K71.7, K74.5-K74.6	571.5	74%	>=35
Duodenal Ulcers	K26	532.0-532.9	10%	>=35
Pancreatitis, acute	K85	577.0	47%	>=35
Pancreatitis, chronic	K86.1- K86.3, K86.9	577.1, 577.2, 577.9	72%	>=35
Other Diseases or Conditions				
Epilepsy	G40.3,G40.4,G40.6,G40.9	345.1, 345.3, 345.9	30%	>=15
Seizures	R56	780.3	41%	>=15
Tuberculosis		011-013, 017, 018	25%	>=15
Accident or Injury Causes: Motor vehicle traffic and non-traffic accidents	V02–V04, V09.0, V09.2, V12–V14, V19.0–V19.2, V19.4–V19.6, V20–V79, V80.3– V80.5, V81.0–V81.1, V82.0–V82.1, V83–V86, V87.0–V87.8, V88.0–V88.8, V89.0, V89.2	E810-E825	42%	>=0

Disease Category	ICD-10 Code	ICD-9 Code	Attrib	Age
Pedal cycle and other road vehicle accidents	V01, V05–V06, V09.1, V09.3–V09.9, V10–V11, V15–V18, V19.3, V19.8–V19.9, V80.0–V80.2, V80.6–V80.9, V82.2–V82.9, V87.9, V88.9, V89.1, V89.3, V89.9	E826-E829	20%	>=0
Water transport accidents	V90-V94	E830-E838	20%	>=0
Air & space transport accidents	V95-V97	E840-E845	16%	>=0
Accidental falls	W00-W19	E880-E888	35%	>=15
Accidents caused by fire	X00-X09	E890-E899	45%	>=0
Accidental drowning and submersion	W65-W74	E910	38%	>=0
Suicides due to alcohol or drugs are now considered direct AOD-related deaths, other suicides are not apportioned. This brings our definitions into compliance with NCHS definitions.				
Homicide & other purposely inflicted injury	X86–Y09, Y87.1	E960-E962, E962.1-E969	46%	>=15
Other	X31, W79, W50-W52, W20- W34, Y15-Y19	E901, E911, E917-E920, E922	25%	>=15
Other category includes: Excessive cold, Choking on food in airway; Striking against or struck accidentally by objects or persons; Caught accidentally in or between objects; Accidents caused by machinery; Accidents caused by cutting and piercing instruments.				
Diseases Directly Attributable to Drugs				
Drug psychoses	F11-F16, F18-F19	292	100%	>=0
Drug dependence syndrome	F11-F16, F18-F19	304	100%	>=0
Polyneuropathy due to drugs	G62.0	357.6	100%	>=15
Drug dependence during pregnancy	F11-F16, F18-F19	648.3	100%	>=0
Suspected damage to fetus from drugs	O35.5,	655.5	100%	>=0
Noxious influences affecting fetus	P04.4	760.7	100%	>=0
Drug reactions, intox., withdrawal specific to newborn	P96.1	779.4, 779.5	100%	>=0
Selected drug poisonings	R78,R78.1-R78.6, T38 ; excludes Y40-59.9 (therapeutic use)	962, 965, 967-971, 977 excludes E930-949	100%	>=0
Selected accidental drug poisonings	X40-X44	E850-E858	100%	>=0
Accidental Poisonings (magic mushrooms, huffing and other drug use)	X46-X49	E861-E869	100%	>=0
Nondependent abuse of drugs	F11-F16, F18-F19	305.2-305.9	100%	>=0
Assault by poisoning using drugs and medicaments	x85	E962.0	100%	>=0
Drug induced myopathy	G72.0	Not Available in ICD-9	100%	
Poisoning by drugs, accidentally or purposely inflicted	Y10-Y14	E980.0-E980.5	100%	>=0
Suicides attributable to drugs	x60-64	E950.0-E950.5	100%	>=0
Diseases Indirectly Attributable to Drugs				
AIDS (from IV drug use exposure)	B20-B24	042.0-044.9	5%	>=15
Cardiovascular				
Endocarditis	I33.0, I33.9	421.0, 421.9	75%	>=15
Other				
Hepatitis A	B15.9	70.1	12%	>=15
Hepatitis B	B16-B16.9	70.2, 70.3	36%	>=15
Hepatitis C	B17-B19.9	70.5, 70.9	10%	>=15

Uniform Crime Report - Non-Reporting Police Jurisdictions

Most law enforcement agencies report arrest and offense data to the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC), which in turn provides data to the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting Program. This is the source of our data. Some jurisdictions do not report all arrests and offenses, some report partial years, and some withhold certain categories of arrests or offenses. Reporting is voluntary for arrests and offenses. offenses are more likely to be reported since some funding is associated with reporting. offenses are incidence reporting. When more than one victim is involved an offense is filed for each victim. Multiple property violations performed at the same incident are counted as one offense.

However when both types of events happen, only the victim incidents are reported as offenses. offenses focus on the nature of the crime, while arrests focus on the apprehended accused perpetrator. Many offenses occur without arresting perpetrators. Sometimes charges are dropped and sometimes no perpetrator is ever found. No perpetrator age can be assigned to offense data so the entire age range of population is used as the denominator. Some data is reported to UCR in a new system which is not yet compatible with UCR output reports and UCR cannot extract that data for this report but does include it in their reports to the FBI. We list those jurisdictions as non-reporting although UCR considers them to have reported. Only part one offenses are reported in the Uniform Crime Report, some agencies have no part one crimes to report. Those agencies are listed with zero events, not as non-reporting.

Information on the Non-reporting Population and Non-reporting Agencies are available only in the individual county and locale level reports. Each area report shows how and when that area's police jurisdictions reported data to the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs. If your area is one with jurisdictions having a significant amount of incomplete data, be very careful that you adjust your risk assessment to reflect this. In other words, the reported arrest rates may not adequately reflect the entire area. This will be true especially in those cases where the non-reporting police jurisdictions have either very high or very low arrest rates, compared to the rest of the area.

In order to compensate for missing police reports, we have adjusted the denominator in the rate calculation so that it reflects only the proportion of the area for which we do have data. For instance, say area A, with a population of 40,000, has eight police districts. Now, if one of the police districts in the area did not report their arrests, the number of arrests would not be representative of the whole area. Therefore, we would not want to use the population of the whole area in the denominator because that would make the rate lower than it should be. The solution used in this report is to subtract the population of that missing police district from the area population. We follow the same procedure for police districts that report partial years: if they report only six months, we use only half of the population to calculate the rate.

Due to the uneven geographic distribution of crime, missing police data can cause spikes or dips in the trend data comparison of multiple consecutive years. We do not run into this problem in the state report because the county rates there (as opposed to the individual county reports) only report 5-year averages. However for individual county reports and reports for smaller areas like locales or districts the trend data can become unstable due to non-reporting. Alternately, the conversion of data from certain police jurisdictions to other areas like locales may not apportion directly causing too much of the data to be apportioned based on population rather than clearly assigned to one area. We use a weighted reliability index (WRI) to determine when the conversion is no longer reliable. An explanation of that process follows. We have tried to compensate for these and other issues by suppressing data which is likely to be affected.

CORE-GIS Conversion Process and Weighted Reliability Index

CORE-GIS obtains data from many government agency sources. The data are represented as events (e.g. # of teen births, # of crimes, # of clients) occurring within a given geographic unit. This geographic unit is generally the smallest that can be obtained from the agency source. For example, data may be available by school district, by zip code, by census tract or by police jurisdictions. CORE-GIS calls these geographic units the "source geography."

CORE-GIS data is usually reported at the geographic level of county or community – called in the rest of this report the "destination geography." Therefore, data usually needs to be converted from the "source geographies" to the "destination geography."

The conversion is based on an overlay process, in which the events occurring in small source geographies that are totally contained within the destination are combined with synthetic estimates of events occurring in source geographies that are partly within and partly outside the destination geography. The synthetic estimation is weighted by the population distribution between the source and destination areas. Therefore, it requires a small-scale count of the population underlying both source and destination geographies. This process is explained below through examples.

Data being converted from a smaller geography (source geography) like school district to a larger geography (like a county) is usually fairly reliable because most of the smaller pieces fit neatly and wholly into the new geography. (See example 1).

The rectangles represent two possible data source geographies (one densely populated school district – Urban School District -- and one thinly populated school district – Suburban School District -- surrounding it). The large oval represents a report's destination geography such as county, locale or network.

Example 1



The following statements refer to the first example:

All of the events occurring in the urban school district can be attributed entirely to the destination geography.

The events occurring in the split source geography (suburban school district, in this example) are distributed to the destination geography in the same proportion as the underlying population is distributed. If 40% of the suburban school district population lies within the destination geography, then 40% of its events are attributed to the destination geography.

These events are split by age, race and gender subgroups whenever possible, as are the populations. So the synthetic estimation is broken down that way also. If 40% of the young White population of the suburban school district lives in the destination geography, then 40% of the events occurring to young White people are attributed there. If, on the other hand, only 10% of the young American Indian population of the suburban school district lives in the destination geography, then only 10% of the events occurring to young American Indian people are attributed there.

While we can develop an algorithm to distribute all source geography populations to all destination geography populations, that distribution will not always be reliable.

For example, see the situation depicted in Example 2 below. Here we are trying to estimate the number of events contained in two very small destination geographies (the ovals). Could this synthetic estimate be reliable? Perhaps, if the small area within the ovals really is representative of the whole area -- but more likely not.

Example 2



A statistic is needed to assist researchers in determining when a destination geography's events cannot be reliably estimated using these processes. For CORE-GIS, that statistic is the Weighted Reliability Index (WRI).

The amount of overlap between source and destination populations can vary from less than 1% to 99% -- only a little of a source population can live in a destination, or almost all of the source population can live in a destination.

The key underlying assumption behind the CORE-GIS Weighted Reliability Index is as follows:

When most of the population for the source geography is also in the destination geography, we can be more certain of the reliability of the estimation process.

Therefore, the weighting process lets us calculate, for each source-geography/destination-geography combination, the reliability of each destination geography's estimate.

In the figure for Example 3, for zip code 2 the source area population is mostly in the destination oval (encased in the dashed line), but the majority population from the other contributing source area is not.

Example 3



The oval represents the destination geography boundary -- the edge of a destination city. The rectangles represent the source geography boundaries for two zip codes. The numbers are population of people living in each place: 10 people live both in Destination City and in the first source (Zip code 1), and 900 people live both in Destination City and in the second source (Zipcode2).

The formula for **Weighted Reliability Index** for a single destination is the total weighted destination population as a percent of total population. To understand this formula, see the calculations below.

	Percent of source population attributed to destination	Multiplied by the population attributed to the destination	Amount of destination
zip code 1	10/80 = 12.5%	* 10	1.25
zip code 2	900/1000 = 90%	* 900	810.00
	Total for Destination	**910**	**811.25**

In the above example, the **Weighted Reliability Index** for Destination City is **811.25 / 910 = 89%. Basically, 89% of the event locations were directly attributed to the area they occurred.** Along with the WRI a cut point for reliable reporting is needed. When half or more of the events have been imputed to the destination geography, rather than directly attributed from the source geography, the data is considered unreliable and rates are suppressed.

WRI for Areas with Non-Reporting of Data

There is a second way that data may become unreliable. Some police jurisdictions do not report data to the state sources, use a reporting method which cannot be included in our files, fail to report for either adults or juveniles, or report for only part of a year. This is particularly true for court data – arrests or offenses. In order to accurately evaluate the reliability of data conversions for destination geographies containing those jurisdictions, non-reporting jurisdiction populations were excluded from the calculations for WRI and the non-reporting jurisdiction issue is evaluated separately.

Partial Reporting, part of a year or part of a population, is also taken into consideration when computing the percentage of non-reporting in a destination geography. Adult and juvenile rates are evaluated separately. Some areas may pass for one, but not for the other due to their reporting habits. For partial year reporting the percentage of the year with data reported is used to evaluate each category.

Example 4



The second test of reliability is to determine whether the population for the rate is adequately represented. In this example, allow the numbers inside the oval to represent a population of 100 allocated to the destination geography. Two source jurisdictions are entirely located in the destination geography represented by the oval. Their events when reported would be directly attributed. The non-reporting jurisdiction would have its population of 50 excluded from the calculation for WRI, while the reporting jurisdiction would have its population included in the calculation. In this case the completely contained reporting jurisdiction would represent 30 of the remaining 50 population (60%) in the destination oval. The imputed portion is 40% allowing the destination geography to pass the first test for WRI.

CORE-GIS also requires that the excluded non-reporting jurisdiction population (50 of 100) are less than 50% of the total population for the destination geography. With an exclusion rate of 50%, this destination geography would fail the reliability criteria.

The reliability of arrest rates is calculated each year based on non-reporting. For five year rates, three out of five data years must be considered reliable by both tests and the average of the yearly WRI for all five years must reach the WRI cut point value.

Duplicated and Unduplicated Counts

In an unduplicated person count, each person is counted only once in a year for the specified activity or service type, even if they receive that service multiple times during the year. Examples include Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) Child Recipients, Food Stamp Recipients, and alcohol or drug treatment. Duplicated counts are made of events such as prison admissions, arrests, births, or admission to a hospital for attempted suicide. For instance, each time a person is admitted to a prison, that "event" is counted. Therefore, a person admitted more than once is included more than once in the total count.

Suppression Codes for Yearly Trend Data

UN=**Unreliable conversion** of events to report geography, failure of **weighted reliability index** (WRI). The WRI evaluation process is further explained in the section labeled 'CORE-GIS Conversion Process and Weighted Reliability Index'.

SP=Suppressed by agreement with data provider when denominator is below agreed level and may compromise a person's rights to confidentiality.

SN=Small Number Sample. Geography has less than 30 events in the denominator. More reliable at 5 year level or for larger area.

NR=Not reliable due to non-reporting of police jurisdictions data. Fifty percent or more of the population is not represented by the data due to non-reporting jurisdictions.

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 (percent), per 1,000 or per 100,000. 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.

Standardization of CORE Indicators

An individual indicator by itself is interesting because you can compare your county (school district, locale) to all other counties (school districts, locales), and to the state. You can also look at how the indicator changes over time. But it is more difficult to compare several indicators to each other, for example, if you want to see which indicator of risk is extremely high and which is just average. For instance, you cannot directly compare the number (or rate) of alcohol retail licenses to the number (or rate) of Food Stamp recipients---this would be like comparing apples and oranges and would not be meaningful.

The preferred way to compare different indicators is to find out how much each individual indicator varies from some common point; in CORE reports the point we use is the indicator's value for the state. In more technical terms, we transform the original absolute rates to a common scale: the relative deviation from the state rate. This is called a **standardized score,** and is based on the mathematical calculation of the standard deviation. For a particular indicator, the county (school district, locale) with the highest absolute rate will have the highest standardized score. A standardized score of 1.2, for instance, means that the county's rate is 1.2 standard deviations above the state rate, and a –1.2 would be 1.2 standard measures *below* the state rate. Approximately 95% of all counties (school districts, locales) in the state will fall between +2 and –2 standard deviations from the state rate.

Here is an example. Let's say an indicator for extreme family economic deprivation (Food Stamp recipients per 100 people) has a standardized score of 2.5 and an indicator for availability of drugs (alcohol retail licenses per 1,000 people) has a score of 1.2. We can say that, other things being equal, the county (school district, locale) in question has a higher risk for extreme family economic deprivation than for availability of drugs.

CORE indicators are standardized using a formula similar to the calculation of a z-score. A typical z-score for an observation (a county, a locale, a school district) is calculated as a difference between an observation and the mean (average) of all observations, divided by the standard deviation for all observations. A CORE standardized score for a county (school district, locale) is instead calculated using the state rate in place of the mean for all counties (school districts, locales). A standardized CORE indicator avoids the problem of using an unweighted mean of all counties (school districts, locales) that would give counties of very different size equal weight, and therefore provides a more meaningful comparison.

CORE standardized indicators for counties are calculated using the following formula. The same formula is used for locales and for districts, by substituting locale or district rates for county rates in the formula.

$$stdiz_score = \frac{county_{rate} - state_{rate}}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (county_{rate,i} - state_{rate})^2}{N}}}$$

Where are the roadblocks to learning in our communities?

Academic Achievement:

The CORE-GIS measures academic achievement using three groups of indicators:

1. student assessment on statewide tests;
2. students who graduate from high school;
3. students who drop out of high school, failing to complete their education.

Student Assessment

The academic assessment indicators answer the question : **"What kind of progress have students been making in learning basic skill content areas needed for academic success?".** The indicators, *Poor Academic Performance in the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL)*, are available for grades 4, 7 and 10. The indicators are calculated as a percentage of students tested in each grade assessment. Earlier years of information are from the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL). In 2009-10 the WASL was replaced by the Measurements of Student Progress (MSP) for grades 3 through 8 and the High School Proficiency Exam (HSPE) for grade 10. Some districts have chosen to test students in both grades 9 and 10 for the 10th grade assessment, giving freshmen a second chance to pass the test. Passing the HSPE is essential for high-school graduation. Ninth graders who were tested are included with the tenth graders in the calculation of the Academic Achievement indicator for grade 10.

Graduating from High School

The Washington State Board of Education establishes minimum credit requirements and requirements for the Culminating Project and the High School and Beyond Plan. The Washington State Legislature requires state testing. To earn a high school diploma, a student must:

- earn sufficient number of high school credits;
- pass state tests or approved alternatives to those tests;
- complete a Culminating Project;
- complete a High School and Beyond Plan.

Two types of high school graduation rates are listed in the CORE-GIS reports, *On-time Graduation* and *Extended Graduation* .

To graduate on-time, a student must graduate within four years by completion of the above listed graduation requirements. This indicator answers the question **"What percent of freshmen stayed in school and graduated in four years?".** The *On-Time Graduation rate* formula uses dropout rates discussed below; the formula is: 100*(1-grade 9 dropout rate)*(1-grade 10 dropout rate)*(1-grade 11 dropout rate)*(1-grade 12 dropout rate-grade 12 continuing rate). The on-time graduation rate is the inverse of the cumulative dropout rate with the senior class adjusted to remove those students who stay in school for more than four years from the calculation.

Extended Graduation is going the extra mile, and requires more resources and dedication from district staff. It includes those students who stay in school after their senior year and complete the graduation requirements. This indicator answers the question **"Do we go the extra distance to help students at risk graduate?".** Districts which have high extended graduation rates may also have poor dropout rates since the students attempting extended graduation are also at highest risk of again dropping out. A large difference in the size of the on-time and extended graduation rates may indicate that a district or school is working hard to keep students in school or to have dropouts return to school and attempt to graduate. The *Extended Graduation rate* formula is: (the number of on-time and late graduates)/(the number of on-time graduates divided by the on-time graduation rate).

Dropping Out of High School

Two types of high school dropout rates are listed in the CORE-GIS reports, *Annual (Event) Dropouts* and *High School Cohort (Cumulative) Dropouts* .

The *Annual Dropout rate* measures the proportion of students enrolled in grades 9-12 who drop out in a single year without completing high school as a percentage of all students in grades 9 through 12. This indicator answers the question **"How many high-school students left school without graduating this year?".** When districts try new policies or projects to keep students in school the impact of those actions will be more immediately visible in this rate.

The *High School Cohort Dropout rate* (may also be referred to as the longitudinal, cumulative, or freshmen cohort dropout rate) measures what happens to a single group (or cohort) of students over a period of time. This indicator answers the question **"How many of the freshmen give up in the four years before their expected year of graduation?".** This rate is most useful for seeing the long-term impact on the community. The Cohort (Cumulative) Dropout rate formula is: 100-(100*(1-grade 9 dropout rate)*(1-grade 10 dropout rate)*(1-grade 11 dropout rate)*(1-grade 12 dropout rate)). The cohort rate is significantly higher than the annual rate for the same area as it measures the cumulative effect of the multiyear loss of students from their freshmen cohort.

Due to the complexity of the graduation and cohort dropout formulas numerators and denominators are not listed in the CORE-GIS reports. Formulas, definitions and requirements information has been taken primarily from the following report: Ireland, L. (2009), "Graduation and Dropout Statistics for Washington in 2007-08", Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. Olympia, WA. This report and the formula components are available at the State of Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction website, in the Research and Reports section, Data and Reports subsection, Graduation and Dropout Statistics for Washington's Counties, Districts, and Schools at:
http://www.k12.wa.us/DataAdmin/default.aspx#dropoutgrad.

Discussion of the difference between types of graduation and dropout rates was taken from: Camilla A. Lehr, David R. Johnson, Christine D. Bremer, Anna Cosio, Megan Thompson (May 2004). Increasing Rates of School Completion Moving From Policy and Research to Practice, A Manual for Policymakers, Administrators, and Educators. National Center on Secondary Education and Transition (NCSET):
http://www.ncset.org/publications/essentialtools/dropout/default.asp .

Although the focus of the NCSET website is students with disabilities, it has many broad-ranging articles with many useful ideas for educators and prevention workers.

School Climate:

"Do students feel safe in school?" "Are they expected and encouraged to attend school?" Indicators listed under School Climate give an idea of how safe students may feel in their school or how committed they and their fellow students are to learning. These indicators are *Weapons Incidents in School* (rate per 1,000 students) and *Unexcused Absences for Students in Grades 1 to 8* (as a percentage of total student days possible in the school year, which equals the number of students times teaching days). When weapons incidents are common or it is acceptable for young students to frequently miss school without explanation the school climate is not conducive to learning.

Extreme Family Economic Deprivation:

"Are students too hungry to learn?" Hungry students find it difficult to focus their attention long enough to learn. Those with inadequate housing or clothing may find it difficult to interact with their peers. There are three indicators which evaluate levels of poverty.

Child Recipients of TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families) gives the rate of children from birth to 17 who receive income assistance. The child must be a citizen or legal alien and their caregiver must not have exceeded the 60 month maximum. There is a requirement for the adults to seek work and an income evaluation. Teen parents must attend school.

Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Recipients , formerly called Food Stamps shows a more generalized level of need. While the persons must be citizens or legal aliens who seek work and meet the income guidelines there is no cutoff time limit for benefits.

Students Eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch gives a much broader look at poverty in your area. Children of people who are "working poor", who have exceeded 60 months in benefits, are not legal aliens, or are not seeking work can still receive meals and free milk. The free guidelines are at or below 130 percent of the Federal poverty guidelines and the reduced price guidelines are between 130 and at or below 185 percent of the Federal poverty guidelines.

However, there are other ways to qualify. Many persons earning a gross income up to 200% of the Federal Poverty Level apply for income assistance because their children are automatically eligible for free school lunch if they meet the adjusted income guidelines. These are sometimes called $0 grants. Households receiving assistance under SNAP, TANF for their children, Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (FDPIR) or, with children who are homeless, fostered, runaway, migrant, or in Head Start Programs are eligible for free benefits. If <u>any</u> child or household member receives benefits under Assistance Programs <u>all</u> children who are members of the household are eligible for free school meals.

Toledo

Populations subtracted for police agencies not reporting

Police agencies are not required to report arrests or offences to UCR, they do so voluntarily. For a variety of reasons, a jurisdiction may report part or none of the arrests or offences 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 population 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 locale's population. "Adjusted 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. When 50% or more of the population is not reported the yearly rate is suppressed. Jurisdictions crossing county boundary lines are apportioned to each area by age, and sex of the population. When more than 40% of the reported events have been apportioned, "synthetically estimated", the yearly rate is suppressed.

All **Arrests** for 10-14 year olds have 5 year rates which represent **93.70** % of the population.

Adjustments for Non-reporting Arrests (age 10-14)

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
% Subtracted	0.00	0.00	12.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.61	14.19	15.72
Subtracted, 10-14	0	0	43	0	0	0	0	0	5	43	47
Persons, 10-14	334	333	331	325	323	316	313	309	310	303	299
Adjusted Pop 10-14	334	333	288	325	323	316	313	309	305	260	252

All Arrests for 10-17 year olds have 5 year rates which represent **93.34** % of the population.

Adjustments for Non-reporting Arrests (age 10-17)

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
% Subtracted	0.00	0.00	12.96	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.74	14.94	16.63
Subtracted, 10-17	0	0	70	0	0	0	0	0	9	75	82
Persons, 10-17	544	542	540	541	541	534	527	516	518	502	493
Adjusted Pop 10-17	544	542	470	541	541	534	527	516	509	427	411

All Arrests for adults have 5 year rates which represent **95.45** % of the population.

Adjustments for Non-reporting Arrests (age 18+)

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
% Subtracted	0.00	0.00	16.71	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.78	11.96
Subtracted, 18+	0	0	499	0	0	0	0	0	0	371	414
Persons, 18+	2,923	2,948	2,987	3,103	3,186	3,258	3,323	3,376	3,407	3,442	3,462
Adjusted Pop 18+	2,923	2,948	2,488	3,103	3,186	3,258	3,323	3,376	3,407	3,071	3,048

All Offenses for persons have 5 year rates which represent **97.40** % of the population.

Adjustments for Non-reporting Offenses

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
% Subtracted	0.00	0.00	16.51	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.99
Subtracted, 18+	0	0	665	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	574
Persons, 18+	3,978	3,993	4,028	4,121	4,205	4,273	4,331	4,368	4,392	4,410	4,418
Adjusted Pop 18+	3,978	3,993	3,363	4,121	4,205	4,273	4,331	4,368	4,392	4,410	3,844

Toledo
Percent of Adult Arrests Not Reported to UCR by Year

Police agency jurisdictions which are located at least partially in your district are listed below. The table shows the percentage of non-reporting by jurisdiction for each year.

Jurisdictions	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Lewis CO											
Toledo PD			100.0							75.0	83.0

Toledo

Percent of Juvenile (Age 10-17) Arrests Not Reported to UCR by Year

Police agency jurisdictions which are located at least partially in your district are listed below. The table shows the percentage of non-reporting for juvenile arrests each year.

Jurisdictions	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Lewis CO											
Toledo PD			100.0						8.0	75.0	83.0

Toledo

Percent of Offenses Not Reported to UCR by Year

Police agency jurisdictions which are located at least partially in your district are listed below. The table shows the percentage of non-reporting for offenses each year.

Jurisdictions	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Lewis CO											
Toledo PD			100.0								83.0