

# 2021 Davis County SHARP *Risk* Factor Heatmap

Youth with...  
  
of risk compared to their peers in other race/ethnicity groups.

		Student Race/Ethnicity (sample size)						
		African American / Black (125)	American Indian / Alaska Native (118)	Asian (133)	Hispanic or Latino (1,033)	Multiracial (440)	Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander (85)	White (9,510)
<i>Community</i>	Low neighborhood attachment	48.0	44.2	52.9	46.0	39.9	39.6	25.0
	Laws and norms favorable to drug use	26.3	29.6	28.4	30.0	16.7	15.6	16.7
	Perceived availability of drugs	27.7	31.9	31.5	31.2	23.2	17.7	16.1
	Perceived availability of handguns	30.8	27.5	22.9	25.4	21.9	20.5	26.8
<i>Family</i>	Poor family management	34.0	35.7	26.4	29.6	16.4	33.0	14.4
	High family conflict	36.3	38.8	41.6	37.3	35.6	24.7	24.8
	Family history of antisocial behavior	18.8	30.4	16.0	32.4	22.6	25.7	15.3
	Parental attitudes favorable to antisocial behavior	34.0	41.5	37.6	42.3	38.0	3.0	31.0
	Parental attitudes favorable to drug use	15.4	8.0	17.6	17.4	12.3	6.0	8.9
<i>School</i>	Academic failure	34.0	39.3	24.3	43.0	27.9	43.2	22.3
	Low commitment to school	58.6	46.8	51.8	51.3	53.3	50.3	43.5
<i>Peer-Individual</i>	Rebelliousness	30.7	21.4	38.2	24.2	24.1	33.0	18.3
	Early initiation of problem behavior	30.4	25.7	15.0	24.9	20.3	23.3	15.9
	Early initiation of drug use	12.1	12.6	11.0	20.1	13.1	16.4	5.7
	Attitudes favorable to antisocial behavior	41.0	39.0	43.7	44.8	47.5	52.8	34.1
	Attitudes favorable to drug use	24.4	12.4	24.0	29.8	24.3	19.4	17.8
	Perceived risk of drug use	43.0	47.2	41.4	46.3	39.8	37.8	31.1
	Interaction with antisocial peers	24.7	25.9	13.3	18.3	13.9	26.7	10.1
	Friend's use of drugs	24.6	12.9	10.9	17.0	11.0	19.5	7.0
	Rewards for antisocial behavior	30.5	24.6	17.7	33.3	26.8	37.3	24.0
	Depressive symptoms	53.5	37.4	50.7	56.2	48.6	53.8	36.4
	Gang involvement	5.6	0.8	0	3.1	1.4	3.7	0.8

(Turn page over for details)

# 2021 Davis County SHARP *Risk* Factor Heatmap

**Background:** The Student Health and Risk Prevention (SHARP) Statewide Survey is given every two years to students in grades 6, 8, 10, and 12. It measures life experiences that **predict a youth's risk of engaging in unhealthy behaviors** like drug use, violence, or delinquency. Survey results are used to create risk and protective profiles for the county.

## **Methods:**


- In 2021, Davis County had 11,614 participants and respondents self-identified their preferred race/ethnicity group
- Scores are percentages ranging from 0 to 100; the **closer a score is to 100, the greater the risk** and an area of potential concern
- Average scores for race/ethnicity groups were color formatted per row from **low (green) to high (red) to compare peers on each risk factor to identify disparities**; note, this color scale is opposite of the protective profile scale
- This was a peer comparison within the county; race/ethnicity groups were compared to each other for the same year, thus a score may be red but better than the state value and/or a prior year's score
- **To find trends**, look down columns or across domains (row groups) for color patterns; also compare how close or far apart scores are per row
- When interpreting trends, **consider the impact COVID-19 and policy changes** may have had on student experiences and risk

## **Conclusions:**

- Overall, students identifying as White had lower risk (green) and students identifying as Hispanic/Latino had higher risk (no green) than their peers in Davis County suggesting a disparity; however, **race/ethnicity is not the cause of scores**; these trends are likely influenced by structural factors beyond an individual's control, like access to opportunities
- Three race/ethnicity groups had lower risk (green) in the Community domain
- Of all the factors, gang involvement had the lowest risk score for all groups
- Among four race/ethnicity groups, over half of students reported depressive symptoms
- Among five race/ethnicity groups, over half of students reported low commitment to school
- Disparities and high risk scores emphasize the **continued need for community prevention efforts and partnership**

**Acknowledgments:** Bach Harrison LLC, Davis Behavioral Health, Davis School District

# 2021 Davis County SHARP *Protective* Factor Heatmap

Youth with...  
 Low %  High %  
 of protection compared to their peers in other race/ethnicity groups.

		Student Race/Ethnicity (sample size)						
Domain	Protective Factor	African American / Black (125)	American Indian / Alaska Native (118)	Asian (133)	Hispanic or Latino (1,033)	Multiracial (440)	Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander (85)	White (9,510)
Community	Rewards for prosocial involvement	46.8	49.0	45.6	37.4	52.9	66.9	69.2
Family	Family attachment	49.7	71.2	47.9	57.1	65.4	72.5	78.2
	Opportunities for prosocial involvement	59.1	66.9	57.9	61.1	71.6	62.4	79.0
	Rewards for prosocial involvement	53.6	58.0	46.8	47.4	57.2	67.1	71.0
School	Opportunities for prosocial involvement	74.1	73.0	86.2	80.2	76.9	84.8	80.4
	Rewards for prosocial involvement	49.0	62.9	67.5	57.7	62.2	64.5	65.5
Peer-Individual	Belief in the moral order	51.2	57.3	48.3	56.7	66.0	53.7	73.2
	Interaction with prosocial peers	30.7	41.0	52.0	32.6	52.5	49.0	65.7
	Prosocial involvement	49.8	42.1	43.7	38.4	53.1	36.8	56.0
	Rewards for prosocial involvement	41.9	57.0	60.6	55.6	61.7	77.5	66.6

(Turn page over for details)

# 2021 Davis County SHARP *Protective* Factor Heatmap

## *Background:*

- The Student Health and Risk Prevention (SHARP) Statewide Survey is given every two years to 6<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup>, and 12<sup>th</sup> graders
- The SHARP survey measures life experiences that **predict a youth's risk of engaging in unhealthy behaviors** like drug use, violence, or delinquency
- Survey results are used to create risk and protective profiles for the county. All domains (settings) of the protective profile heavily feature **prosocial involvement, meaning participation in activities that are cooperative and helpful to others**

## *Methods:*

- In 2021, Davis County had 11,614 participants and respondents self-identified their preferred race/ethnicity group
- Scores are percentages ranging from 0 to 100; the **closer a score is to 100, the greater the protection**
- Average scores for race/ethnicity groups were color formatted per row from **low (red) to high (green) to compare peers on each protective factor to identify disparities**; note, this color scale is opposite of the risk profile scale
- This was a peer comparison within the county; race/ethnicity groups were compared to each other for the same year, thus a score may be red but better than the state value and/or a prior year's score
- **To find trends**, look down columns or across domains (row groups) for color patterns; also compare how close or far apart scores are per row
- When interpreting trends, **consider the impact COVID-19 and policy changes** may have had on student experiences

## *Conclusions:*

- Overall, students identifying as White had greater protection (green) while those identifying as Hispanic/Latino or Black/African-American had the least protection (less green) compared to their peers in Davis County suggesting a disparity
- Students identifying as Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander had lower protection from peer-individual factors than from other domains
- Students identifying as Asian had greater protection from school factors than from other domains
- **Race/ethnicity is *not* the cause of scores**; these trends are likely influenced by structural factors beyond an individual's control, like access to opportunities
- Disparities and low protective scores emphasize the **continued need for community prevention efforts and partnership**

*Acknowledgments:* Bach Harrison LLC, Davis Behavioral Health, Davis School District