

MAY 2008

Report Card on Secondary Schools in British Columbia and Yukon 2008 Edition

Peter Cowley and Stephen Easton

Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	3
<i>Key academic indicators of school performance</i>	6
<i>Other indicators of school performance</i>	11
<i>Detailed school reports</i>	13
<i>Ranking the schools</i>	38
<i>Appendix 1: Calculating the Overall rating out of 10</i>	42
<i>About the authors</i>	44
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	45

Studies in Education Policy are published periodically throughout the year by The Fraser Institute.

Our vision is a free and prosperous world where individuals benefit from greater choice, competitive markets, and personal responsibility. Our mission is to measure, study, and communicate the impact of competitive markets and government interventions on the welfare of individuals.

Founded in 1974, we are an independent research and educational organization with offices throughout North America and international partners in over 70 countries. Our work is financed by tax-deductible contributions from thousands of individuals, organizations, and foundations. In order to protect its independence, the Institute does not accept grants from government or contracts for research.

To order additional copies of Studies in Education Policy, any of our other publications, or a catalogue of the Institute's publications, please contact the publications coordinator via our toll-free order line: 1.800.665.3558, ext. 580; via telephone: 604.688.0221, ext. 580; via fax: 604.688.8539; via e-mail: sales@fraserinstitute.ca.

For media enquiries, please contact our Communications department via telephone: 604.714.4582; via e-mail: communications@fraserinstitute.ca. To learn more about the Institute, please visit our web site at <http://www.fraserinstitute.org>.

Copyright© 2008 The Fraser Institute. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission except in the case of brief quotations in critical articles and reviews.

The author of this study has worked independently and opinions expressed by him are, therefore, his own, and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the supporters, trustees, or staff of The Fraser Institute.

Editing: Kristin McCahon and Lindsey Thomas Martin; typesetting: Nick Murphy.

Printed and bound in Canada

ISSN 1492-1863 Studies in Education Policy (English print edition)

ISSN 1707-2395 Studies in Education Policy (English online edition)

Date of issue: May 2008

For information about how to support the Institute, please contact:

- ◇ Development Department, The Fraser Institute, Fourth Floor, 1770 Burrard Street
Vancouver, BC, V6J 3G7 Canada
- ◇ telephone, toll-free: 1.800.665.3558 ext. 586
- ◇ e-mail: development@fraserinstitute.ca

Calgary

- ◇ telephone: 403.216.7175 ext. 227
- ◇ fax: 403.234.9010

Montréal

- ◇ telephone: 514.281.9550 ext. 303
- ◇ fax: 514.281.9464
- ◇ e-mail: montreal@fraserinstitute.ca.

Tampa, USA

- ◇ telephone: 1.800.665.3558 ext. 586
- ◇ e-mail: development@fraserinstitute.org.

Toronto

- ◇ telephone: 416.363.6575 ext. 232
- ◇ fax: 416.934.1639.

Vancouver

- ◇ telephone: 604.688.0221 ext. 586
- ◇ fax: 604.688.8539



Introduction

The *Report Card on Secondary Schools in British Columbia and Yukon* collects a variety of relevant, objective indicators of school performance into one easily accessible, public document so that all interested parties—parents, school administrators, teachers, students, and taxpayers—can analyze and compare the performance of individual schools. Parents use the *Report Card*'s indicator values, ratings, and rankings to compare schools when they choose an education provider for their children. Parents and school administrators use the results to identify areas of academic performance in which improvement can be made.

The Report Card helps parents choose

Where parents can choose among several schools for their children, the *Report Card* provides a valuable tool for making a decision. Because it makes comparisons easy, the *Report Card* alerts parents to those nearby schools that appear to have more effective academic programs. Parents can also determine whether schools of interest are improving over time. By first studying the *Report Card*, parents will be better prepared to ask relevant questions when they interview the principal and teachers at the schools under consideration.

Of course, the choice of a school should not be made solely on the basis of any one source of information. Families choosing a school for their students should seek to confirm the *Report Card*'s findings by visiting the school and interviewing teachers and school administrators. Parents who already have a child enrolled at the school can provide another point of view. Useful information may also be found on the web sites of the ministry of education, local school

boards, and individual schools. In addition, a sound academic program should be complemented by effective programs in areas of school activity not measured by the *Report Card*. Nevertheless, the *Report Card* provides a detailed picture of each school that is not easily available elsewhere.

The Report Card facilitates school improvement

Certainly, the act of publicly rating and ranking schools attracts attention; attention can provide motivation. Schools that perform well or show consistent improvement are applauded. Poorly performing schools generate concern, as do those whose performance is deteriorating. This inevitable attention provides an incentive for all those connected with a school to focus on student results.

However, the *Report Card* offers more than motivation; it also offers opportunity. The *Report Card* includes a variety of indicators, each of which reports results for an aspect of school performance that might be improved. School administrators who are dedicated to improvement accept the *Report Card* as another source of opportunities for improvement.

Some schools do better than others

To improve a school, one must believe that improvement is achievable. This *Report Card* provides evidence about what can be accomplished. It demonstrates clearly that, even when we take into account factors such as the students' family backgrounds, which some believe dictate the degree of academic success that students will have in school, some schools do better than others. This finding confirms the results of research carried out in

other countries.¹ Indeed, it will come as no great surprise to experienced parents and educators that the data consistently suggest that what goes on in the schools makes a difference to academic results and that some schools make more of a difference than others.

Comparisons are at the heart of the improvement process

Comparative and historical data enable parents and school administrators to gauge their school's effectiveness more accurately. By comparing a school's latest results with those of earlier years, they can see if the school is improving. By comparing a school's results with those of neighbouring schools and of schools with similar school and student characteristics, they can identify more successful schools and learn from them. Reference to overall provincial results places an individual school's level of achievement in a broader context.

There is great benefit in identifying schools that are particularly effective. By studying the techniques used in schools where students are successful, less effective schools may find ways to improve. This advantage is not lost on the United Kingdom's Department of Education and Skills. Its "Leading Edge" program² helps educators connect with others who have expertise in particular areas of instruction and school administration.

Comparisons are at the heart of improvement: making comparisons among schools is made simpler and more meaningful by the *Report Card's* indicators, ratings, and rankings.

What is new in this edition?

The design of the report card has been changed in several significant ways in response to changes in ministry of education testing policy introduced in the 2006/2007 school year. Specifically, as of that school year, only a small number of grade-12 courses now include a mandatory provincial examination. In most of the provincially examinable grade-12 courses, students may choose whether or not to write the provincial final examination.

New exams used to calculate indicators

Beginning with the 2006-2007 school year, a new set of provincial exams will be used in the calculation of the Average exam mark, Percentage of exams failed, and School vs exam mark difference indicators. Only exam results in those grade-10, grade-11, and grade-12 courses in which the provincial exam is mandatory will now be used in the calculation of these indicators. The complete list of these exams used can be found in Note 2 on page 10.

The inclusion of exam results from three grade levels provides a more complete picture of school performance in academics.

Gender gap indicators use grade 10 results

Beginning with this edition the gender gap indicators are calculated using the English 10 and Mathematics 10 results. This change was made because the provincial examination in Principals of Mathematics 12—the results from which were previously used in the calculation of the mathematics gender gap—is no longer mandatory.

Participation rate indicator eliminated

As a result of changes to the ministry's testing policy and possible further changes to the admissions policies of the province's universities, participation rates in provincial examinable courses may become unstable. For this reason, the participation rate indicator has been removed from the report card. The status of this indicator will be reviewed prior to the publication of the 2009 edition of this report card.

Calculation of Overall rating changed

As a result of the changes made to the report cards indicators described above, the relative weighting of the indicators for the purposes of the calculation of the Overall rating out of 10 have changed. Indicator weightings are detailed in the Appendix.

Trend indicator is removed

Because the report card's indicator results for the 2006/2007 school year are in most cases, not comparable to those of early years, useful trend information

is impossible to calculate. The trend indicator will be re-introduced in the 2012 edition of the report card.

You can contribute to the Report Card's development

The *Report Card* program benefits from the input of interested parties. We welcome your suggestions, comments, and criticisms. Please call Peter Cowley, Director of School Performance Studies at 604.714.4556.

Notes

- 1 See, for instance, Michael Rutter et al., *Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979); Peter Mortimore et al. and *School Matters: The Junior Years* (Wells, Somerset: Open Books, 1988).
- 2 See the website of *Leading Edge*, <<http://www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/leadingedge/>>.



Key academic indicators of school performance

The foundation of the *Report Card* is an overall rating of each school's academic performance. Building on data about student results provided by the Ministry of Education,¹ we rate each school on a scale from zero to 10. We base our overall rating of each school's academic performance on eight indicators:

- (1) the average exam mark in the grade-10, grade-11, and grade-12 courses that include a mandatory provincial exam;
- (2) percentage of grade-10, grade-11, and grade-12 mandatory provincial examinations failed;
- (3) average difference between the school mark and examination mark in the courses considered in (1) and (2) above;
- (4) difference between male and female students in the value of indicator (3) for English 10 only;
- (5) difference between male and female students in the value of indicator (3) for Mathematics 10 only;
- (6) graduation rate;
- (7) delayed advancement rate.

We have selected this set of indicators because they provide systematic insight into a school's performance. Because they are based on annually generated data, we can assess not only each school's performance in a year but also its improvement or deterioration over time.

Three indicators of effective teaching

1 *Average mandatory examination marks*

This indicator (in the tables *Average exam mark*) is the average percentage achieved by a school's students on the grade-10, grade-11, and grade-12 final examinations in all of the courses that include a mandatory provincial exam.² For each school, the indicator is the average of the mean scores achieved by the school's students in each of these mandatory examinations at all sittings during the year, weighted by the relative number of students who wrote the examination.

Examinations are designed to achieve a distribution of results reflecting the differences in students' mastery of the course work. Differences among students in interests, abilities, motivation, and work-habits will inevitably have some impact upon the final results. There are, however, recognizable differences from school to school within a district in the average results on the provincial examinations. There is also variation within schools in the results obtained in different subject areas. Such differences in outcomes cannot be wholly explained by the individual and family characteristics of the school's students. It seems reasonable, therefore, to include the average examination mark for each school as one indicator of effective teaching.

2 *Percentage of provincial examinations failed*

For each school, this indicator (in the tables *Percentage of exams failed*) provides the rate of failure (as a percentage) in the grade-10, grade 11, and grade-12 mandatory provincial examinations. It was derived by dividing the sum, for each school, of all the man-

datory provincial examinations written where a failing grade was awarded by the total number of such examinations written by the students of that school.

In part, effective teaching can be measured by the ability of the students to pass any uniform examination that is a requirement for successful completion of a course. Schools have the responsibility of preparing their students to pass these final examinations.

3 *Difference between school mark and examination mark*

For each school, this indicator (in the tables *School vs exam mark difference*) gives the average of the absolute value of the difference between the average mark obtained on the provincial exams and the average “school” mark—the assessment of each student’s learning that is made by the school—for all the grade-10, grade-11, and grade-12 courses that include a mandatory provincial exam.³

Effective teaching includes regular testing so that students may be aware of their progress. For such assessment to be useful, it must accurately reflect the student’s understanding of the course. As a systematic policy, inflation of school-awarded grades will be counterproductive. Students who believe they are already successful when they are not will be less likely to invest the extra effort needed to master the course material. In the end, they will be poorer for not having achieved the level of understanding that they could have gained through additional study. On the other hand, the systematic deflation of grades can work to the detriment of students in those situations where post-secondary admissions and scholarship awards are, in part, based on school assessments. Students may also lose interest in a subject when their actual understanding of the material is disparaged by inadequate recognition.

The effectiveness of school-based assessments can be determined by a comparison to external assessments of the students. In each course that includes a mandatory provincial examination, the Ministry of Education, the same authority that designed the course, administers a uniform examination. This examination will test the students’ knowledge of

the material contained in the course. If the marks assigned by the school are a reasonably accurate reflection of students’ understanding, they should be roughly the same as the mark gained on the provincial examination. Thus, if a school has accurately assessed a student as consistently working at a C+ level, the student’s examination result will be at a similar level. If, however, a school is consistently granting marks substantially higher or lower than those achieved by its students on the final examinations, then the school is not providing an accurate indicator of the extent to which knowledge of the course material is being acquired.

An indicator of consistency in teaching and assessment

The Gender gap indicators

Research⁴ has shown systematic sex-based differences in academic results in British Columbia’s secondary schools. These differences are particularly apparent where the local school rather than the Ministry of Education makes assessments. However, the same research found that “there appears to be no compelling evidence that girls and boys should, given effective teaching and counselling, experience differential rates of success.”⁵ Further, “[t]he differences described by each indicator vary from school to school over a considerable range of values.”⁶

The *Gender gap* indicators measure the difference, if any, in the average Mathematics 10 and English 10 school marks for boys and girls when their respective average examination marks in the same courses are taken into account. For each course, the indicator value is determined according to the formula:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\text{Female school mark} - \text{Female exam mark}) \\ & - (\text{Male school mark} - \text{Male exam mark}) \end{aligned}$$

The indicator reports the size of the difference and the more successful sex.

The *Gender gap* indicators are affected by at least two factors. If the components of the curriculum tested at the school level are different from those tested on the

provincial examination, a large gender gap indicates that the favoured sex is, on average, more successful in acquiring the skills and knowledge embodied in those aspects of the curriculum tested at the school level. If the components of the curriculum tested at the school level are the same as those tested on the provincial examination, then a large gender gap indicates that the school-based assessment may be biased in favour of one sex or may include factors in the assessment other than an understanding of the curriculum. In either case, schools experiencing large gender gaps should investigate classroom practice to determine why one sex receives better grades than the other.

Two indicators of practical, well-informed counselling

While they are attending secondary school, students must make a number of decisions of considerable significance about their education. Once they have reached the age of 16, for instance, they are at liberty to continue or end their educational program.⁷ Before grade 10, they are required to choose between different streams in Mathematics. They will annually decide whether to begin or continue the study of a second language.

Will these young people make good decisions? It is unrealistic to presume that they can do so without advice. What practical, well-informed counselling can they call upon? While parents, in the main, are willing to help, many lack the information they need to be able to provide good advice. It falls, therefore, to the schools to shoulder some responsibility for advising students and their parents about educational choices.

The final two indicators used in the calculation of the *Overall rating out of 10* assess the counsel given by the schools by measuring the quality of the decisions taken by the students about their education. Of course, wise students will seek guidance not only from the counsellors designated by the schools but also from teachers and administrators, parents, and other relatives. Where students have strong support from family and community, the school's responsibility for coun-

selling may be lighter; where students do not have such strong support, the school's role may be more challenging. These indicators measure the school's success in using the tools at its disposal to help students make good decisions about their education.

There are two very important decisions that senior students must make. First, they must decide whether or not to remain in school, do the work, and graduate with their class. Second, they must decide whether or not to take a number of academically challenging provincially examinable courses. Effective counselling will encourage students to make appropriate choices.

1 *Delayed advancement rate*

This indicator measures the extent to which schools keep their students in school and progressing in a timely manner toward completion of their diploma program. It uses data that report the educational status of students one year after they have enrolled in a given grade at a school in British Columbia. For example, we can determine from these data how many of a school's grade-10 students re-enroll in the following year in grade 11; are enrolled in grade 10 for a second time; or fail to re-enroll. With these raw data, following a technique that we introduced to Canada in the *Report Card on Quebec's Secondary Schools, 2001 Edition*,⁸ we calculate a statistic that will answer the question, "Based on this single year's school results, what is the likelihood that a student entering grade 10 at the school will graduate in the normal three-year period?"

The indicator is calculated as follows. For each school, for each of grades 10, 11, and 12, a rate of successful transition is determined by first summing the number of students who either receive a diploma in the current school year or re-enroll in a higher grade in the following year and then dividing that sum by the number of students enrolled in the grade in the current year. Then, for each grade, a dropout rate is determined by subtracting the rate of successful transition from 1. Each of the three dropout rates is then reduced by the average grade-8 dropout rate at the school during the last three years in order to produce a net dropout rate for each grade. We have

adopted the grade-8 drop-out rate as an estimate of the “involuntary” drop-out rate caused by events such as emigration or death that lead to the disappearance of students from the school system.

The *Delayed advancement rate* indicator can now be calculated. The complement of the net dropout rates (1 – net drop-out rate) for grades 10 through 12 is determined and their product is calculated. This three-year composite successful transition rate is then subtracted from 1 to produce the *Delayed advancement rate* indicator that appears in the detailed tables.

Where a school does not enroll grade-8 students, the net dropout rate is calculated using the three-year average grade-8 dropout rate for the school district in which the school is located. Where a school does not enroll grade-10 or grade-11 students, no *Delayed advancement rate* can be calculated. The relative weighting in the calculation of the *Overall rating out of 10* that is given to this and the other indicators is explained in the Appendix.

2 Graduation rate

This indicator, related to the *Delayed advancement rate*, compares the number of students eligible to graduate enrolled in the school on September 30 with the number of students who actually graduate by the end of the same school year. Only those enrollees who are capable of graduating with their class within the current school year are included in the count of eligible graduates.

Graduation from secondary school retains considerable value since it increases options for post-secondary education. Further, graduates from secondary school who decide to enter the work force immediately will, on average, find more job opportunities than those who have not graduated. By completing the 11 years of schooling in preparation for the final secondary school year, students have already demonstrated a reasonable ability to handle the basic courses offered by the school. Moreover, for the majority of students, the minimum requirements for graduation are not onerous. The chance that students will not graduate solely because they are unable to meet the intellectual demands of the curriculum is, therefore, relatively small.

Nevertheless, the graduation rate varies quite widely from school to school throughout the province. While there are factors not related to education—emigration from the province, sickness, death, and the like—that can affect the data, there is no reason to expect these factors to influence particular schools systematically. Accordingly, we take variations in the graduation rate to be an indicator of the extent to which students are being well coached in their educational choices.

In general, how is the school doing academically? The Overall rating out of 10

While each of the indicators is important, it is almost always the case that a school does better on some indicators than on others. So, just as a teacher must make a decision about a student’s overall performance, we need an overall indicator of school performance (in the tables *Overall rating out of 10*). Just as teachers combine test scores, homework, and class participation to rate a student, we have combined all the indicators to produce an overall school rating. The overall rating of school performance answers the question, “In general, how is the school doing, academically compared to others in the province?”

To derive this rating, the results for each of the indicators for each school year were first standardized. Standardization is a statistical procedure whereby sets of raw data with different characteristics are converted into sets of values with “standard” statistical properties. Standardized values can readily be combined and compared.

The standardized data were then combined as required to produce nine standardized scores— one for each indicator—for each school, for each year. The standardized scores were weighted and combined to produce an overall standardized score. Finally, this score was converted into an overall rating out of 10. It is from this *Overall rating out of 10* that the school’s provincial rank is determined. For schools teaching only one sex, there are, of course, no results for the

Gender gap indicators. In these cases, the *Overall rating* is derived using the remaining seven indicators. (See the Appendix for an explanation of the calculation of the *Overall rating out of 10*.)

Notes

- 1 The data from which these indicators are derived is provided by British Columbia's Ministry of Education.
- 2 In 2006/2007 school year, mandatory provincial examinations were administered in the following grade-10, grade-11, and grade-12 subjects:
Applications of Mathematics 10; BC First Nations Studies 12; Civic Studies 11; Communications 12; English 10; English 12; Essentials of Mathematics 10; Français Langue Premiere 10; Français Langue Premiere 12; Principles of Mathematics 10; Science 10; Social Studies 11; and Technical Professional Communications 12.
- 3 A student's final mark for all courses that include a mandatory provincial examination is derived from both the mark received on the course's provincial examination and a mark provided by the school.
- 4 Peter Cowley and Stephen Easton, *Boys, Girls, and Grades: Academic Gender Balance in British Columbia's Secondary Schools*, Public Policy Sources 22 (Vancouver, BC: The Fraser Institute, 1999).
- 5 Cowley and Easton, *Boys, Girls, and Grades*, page 7.
- 6 Cowley and Easton, *Boys, Girls, and Grades*, page 17.
- 7 See *School Act*, BC, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section 1b.
- 8 Richard Marceau and Peter Cowley, *Report Card on Quebec's Secondary Schools: 2001 Edition*, Studies in Education Policy (Vancouver, BC: The Fraser Institute, 2001), pages 8–9.



Other indicators of school performance

Since the inception of the *Report Card*, we have added other indicators that, while they are not used to derive the *Overall rating out of 10*, add more information about a school's effectiveness.

The Socioeconomic indicator

When they design their lesson plans and deliver the curriculum, educators can and should take into account the abilities, interests, and backgrounds of their students. By doing so, educators can overcome disadvantages that their students may have. The socioeconomic indicator enables us to identify schools that are successful despite adverse conditions faced by their students at home. Similarly, it identifies schools where students with a relatively positive home situation appear not to be reaching their presumed potential.

The socioeconomic indicator was derived as follows. First, using enrolment data from the Ministry of Education sorted by Dissemination Area (a census geography) and 2001 census data provided by Statistics Canada, we established a profile of the student body's home characteristics for each of the schools in the *Report Card*. We then used multiple regression analysis to determine which of the home characteristics were associated with variations in school performance as measured by the *Overall rating out of 10*. Taking into account all of the socioeconomic variables simultaneously, we identified one characteristic that was significantly associated with the *Overall rating*: the average number of years of education of the most educated parent in a two-parent family (or of the lone parent in a single-parent family). When a school had more highly educated

parents, the *Overall rating* at the school was likely to be higher.¹

As a measure of the success with which each school took into account the socioeconomic characteristics of the student body, we used the formula derived from the regression analysis to predict the *Overall rating* for each school. We then reported the difference (in the tables *Actual rating vs predicted rating based on parents' avg. ed.*) between the actual *Overall rating* and this predicted value in each school's results table.

For example, during the 2006/2007 school year, Rick Hansen Secondary, a public school in Abbotsford, achieved an *Overall rating* of 6.3 and yet, when the family characteristics of the student body are taken into account, the school was expected to achieve a rating of only about 5.1. The difference of 1.2 is reported in the tables. On the other hand, the actual *Overall rating* of Grand Forks Secondary in Grand Forks was 5.1, although its predicted rating was 6.8. The reported difference for Grand Forks is -1.7. This measurement suggests that Rick Hansen is more successful than Grand Forks in enabling all of its students to reach their potential.

This measure of the effect of the socioeconomic background of a school's student body is presented with two important notes of caution. First, only about 30% of the variation among BC schools in the overall rating is associated with family characteristics like the level of parents' education. Clearly, many other factors—including good teaching, counselling, and school administration—contribute to the effectiveness of schools. Second, the statistical measures used describe past relationships between a socioeconomic characteristic and a measure of school effectiveness. These relationships may not remain static. The more effectively the school enables all of its students to

succeed, the weaker will be the relationship between the home characteristics of its students and their academic success. Thus, this socioeconomic indicator should not be used as an excuse or rationale for poor school performance. The effective school will produce good results, regardless of the family background of its students.

The *Student characteristics* indicators

For each public school, the *Report Card* notes the percentage of its students who are enrolled in ESL

programs, in French Immersion programs, or who have identified special needs. As was noted in the introduction, it is sometimes useful to compare a school's results to those of similar schools. These three indicators can be used to identify schools with similar student-body characteristics.

Notes

- 1 Peter Cowley and Stephen Easton, *Third Annual Report Card on British Columbia's Secondary Schools*, Studies in Education Policy (Vancouver, BC: The Fraser Institute, 2000), pages 12, 119.



Detailed school reports

How to read the tables

Use the sample table and the explanation of each line below to help you interpret the detailed results for individual schools. Families choosing a school for their students should seek to confirm the *Report Card's* findings by visiting the school and interviewing teachers, school administrators, and other parents. And, of course, a sound academic program should be complemented by effective programs in areas of school activity not measured by the *Report Card*.

More information regarding schools may be found

on the Ministry of Education's web site at <<http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/reporting/select/>> and on the web sites of local school districts and individual schools.

IMPORTANT: In order to get the most from the *Report Card*, readers should consult the complete table of results for each school of interest. By considering several years of results—rather than just a school's rank in the most recent year—readers can get a better idea of how the school is likely to perform in the future.

DISTRICT NAME						
School name [Affiliation]	Gr 12 Enrollment: 23 – A					
B – ESL (%): n/a	Special needs (%): n/a	French Imm (%): n/a				
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 14.1 yrs: 1.9		Rank:	2006-07	Last 5 Years		
			43/298	111/264		
Academic Performance		2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
D – Average exam mark		66.6	67.7	66.6	67.4	71.4
E – Percentage of exams failed		6.3	0.0	14.9	11.0	7.1
F – School vs exam mark difference		4.8	5.8	7.2	7.9	6.5
G – English gender gap	F 10.7	F 6.4	F 2.3	F 3.3	F 5.6	
H – Math gender gap	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	M 0.8	
I – Graduation rate		100.0	100.0	95.0	100.0	100.0
J – Delayed advancement rate		8.1	12.5	0.0	0.0	3.5
K – Overall rating out of 10		6.0	6.6	5.5	7.0	7.8

A—Gr 12 Enrollment

The grade-12 enrollment on September 30, 2006. Indicator results for small schools tend to be more variable than do those for larger schools and caution should be used in interpreting the results for smaller schools.

B—ESL (%); Special needs (%); French Imm (%)

These statistics report the percentage of students for whom English is a second-language; the percentage of students with special needs; and the percentage of stu-

dents registered in French Immersion programs at the school. When you want to compare academic results, these statistics can be used to find other schools where the student body has similar characteristics.

C (left)—Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' average education

This statistic compares the school's actual *Overall rating out of 10* with the rating that is predicted by the average number of years of education of the most educated parent in each student's family. A positive

difference suggests that the school is effective in enabling its students to succeed regardless of their family's characteristics.

C (right)—Academic ranking

The school's overall academic rank in the province for 2006/2007 and for the most recent five years. These rankings show how the school has done academically compared to the other schools in the province. A high ranking over five years indicates consistently strong results at the school.

D—Average exam mark

The average provincial mark (%) achieved by the school's students in all the grade-10, grade-11, and grade-12 courses in which the provincial exam is mandatory.

E—Percentage of exams failed

The percentage of all the mandatory grade-10, grade-11, and grade-12 provincial examinations written by students at the school that received a failing grade.

F—School vs exam mark difference

The average difference (in percentage points) between the mark received at the school and the provincial examination mark in all the courses in which the provincial exam is mandatory. A large difference usually indicates that the school has been "inflating" grades.

G—English 10 gender gap

H—Math 10 gender gap

The difference (in percentage points) between boys and girls in the extent to which their school marks in English 10 and Math 10 are different from their examination marks. Where the difference favours girls, the value is preceded by an **F**; where the difference favours boys, the value is preceded by an **M**. An **E** means that there is no difference between the girls and the boys on this measure. Small differences indicate that the school is doing a good job for all its students.

I—Graduation rate

The percentage of eligible graduates enrolled on September 30 who actually graduate in the same school

year. Higher rates of graduation indicate that the school is doing a good job of keeping students on track and focused on their work during their final year.

J—Delayed advancement rate

The estimated percentage of the schools grade-10 students who will not complete grade 12 within three years. Low *Delayed advancement rates* indicate that the school's students are likely to complete the last three grades of secondary school in the normal time.

K—Overall rating out of 10

The *Overall rating out of 10* takes into account the school's performance on all of these indicators and answers the question, "In general, how is the school doing in academics?"

Other notes

Note 1

Due to the substantial changes to the report card's design that are introduced in this edition, meaningful comparisons between a school's 2007 results and those of previous years are, for most indicators, not possible. For further information on these changes, please consult the full report card that is available free of charge on-line at <fraserinstitute.org>.

Note 2

The tables showing the detailed school results are organized by four geographic regions of the province as follows: (1) Lower Mainland, (2) Vancouver Island and the Coast, (3) Fraser Valley and Southern British Columbia, and (4) Interior, Northern British Columbia, and Yukon. Within each geographic region, school districts are grouped alphabetically. Finally, within each school district, both public and independent (private) schools are listed alphabetically.

Note 3

Not all the province's secondary schools are included in the tables or the ranking. Of all the schools for which any mandatory provincial examination results

were reported, this *Report Card* rated 298. Excluded are schools at which fewer than 15 students were enrolled in grade 12 and schools that did not generate a sufficiently large set of student data to enable the calculation of an *Overall rating out of 10*. Also excluded from the ratings and rankings are: centres for adult education and continuing education; schools that cater largely to non-resident foreign students; schools not located in British Columbia or Yukon; most on-line and distributed learning schools; and certain alternative schools that do not offer a full program of courses.

The exclusion of a school from the *Report Card* should in no way be construed as a judgement of the school's effectiveness.

Note 4

Where there were insufficient data available with which to calculate an indicator or where a school was not in operation during a specific year, "n/a" appears in the tables.

Note 5

The complete *Report Card on Secondary Schools in British Columbia and Yukon* may be downloaded from the Fraser Institute's web site at <http://www.fraserinstitute.org/reportcards/schoolperformance/>.

Note 6

Due to continuing improvements in methodology, some historical values for indicators and overall ratings are different from those previously reported.

Note 7

You can compare a school's results with the all-schools results shown below.

Note 8

If you have questions about the *Report Card*, contact Peter Cowley at the Fraser Institute at 604.714.4556.

Average values for all schools 2006/2007		Gr 12 Enrollment: 161				
ESL (%): 5.1	Special Needs (%): 10.1	French Immersion (%): 3.3				
Parents' avg. education: 14.5						
Academic Performance	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	
Average exam mark	69.7	69.6	70.1	67.9	66.9	
Percentage of exams failed	10.1	9.8	9.2	11.9	11.8	
School vs exam mark difference	6.2	6.4	6.0	6.2	5.8	
English gender gap	2.9	2.6	2.5	2.6	3.8	
Math gender gap	2.7	2.4	2.2	2.4	3.0	
Graduation rate	95.0	95.1	95.2	94.7	93.6	
Delayed advancement rate	21.5	22.1	22.3	22.0	20.8	
Overall rating out of 10	6.2	6.2	6.2	6.2	6.3	

* These results reflect the average size of the gender gaps. In 2006-2007, the English gender gap favoured females at 88.2% of schools, males at 8.8% of schools, and was even at 3.0% of schools. The Math gender gap favoured females at 76.4% of schools, males at 20.2% of schools, and was even at 3.4% schools."

List of cities and school districts

City	School district	City	School district
100 Mile House	Cariboo-Chilcotin	Lillooet	Gold Trail
Abbotsford	Abbotsford	Logan Lake	Kamloops/Thompson
Agassiz	Fraser-Cascade	Lumby	Vernon
Aldergrove	Langley	Lytton	Gold Trail
Armstrong	North Okanagan-Shuswap	Mackenzie	Prince George
Ashcroft	Gold Trail	Madeira Park	Sunshine Coast
Barriere	Kamloops/Thompson	Maple Ridge	Maple Ridge-Pitt Meadows
Burnaby	Burnaby	Masset	Haida Gwaii/Queen Charlotte
Burns Lake	Nechako Lakes	McBride	Prince George
Campbell River	Campbell River	Merritt	Nicola-Similkameen
Castlegar	Kootenay-Columbia	Midway	Boundary
Chase	Kamloops/Thompson	Mill Bay	Cowichan Valley
Chemainus	Cowichan Valley	Mission	Mission
Chetwynd	Peace River South	Nakusp	Arrow Lakes
Chilliwack	Chilliwack	Nanaimo	Nanaimo-Ladysmith
Clearwater	Kamloops/Thompson	Nelson	Kootenay Lake
Clinton	Gold Trail	New Aiyansh	Nisga'a
Comox	Comox Valley	New Westminster	New Westminster
Coquitlam	Coquitlam	North Vancouver	North Vancouver
Courtenay	Comox Valley	Oliver	Okanagan Similkameen
Cranbrook	Southeast Kootenay	Osoyoos	Okanagan Similkameen
Creston	Kootenay Lake	Parksville	Qualicum
Dawson City	Yukon	Pemberton	Howe Sound
Dawson Creek	Peace River South	Penticton	Okanagan Skaha
Delta	Delta	Pitt Meadows	Maple Ridge-Pitt Meadows
Duncan	Cowichan Valley	Port Alberni	Alberni
Elkford	Southeast Kootenay	Port Coquitlam	Coquitlam
Enderby	North Okanagan-Shuswap	Port Hardy	Vancouver Island North
Fernie	Southeast Kootenay	Port McNeill	Vancouver Island North
Fort Langley	Langley	Port Moody	Coquitlam
Fort Nelson	Fort Nelson	Powell River	Powell River
Fort St James	Nechako Lakes	Prince George	Prince George
Fort St John	Peace River North	Prince Rupert	Prince Rupert
Fraser Lake	Nechako Lakes	Princeton	Nicola-Similkameen
Gibsons	Sunshine Coast	Qualicum Beach	Qualicum
Gold River	Vancouver Island West	Queen Charlotte	Haida Gwaii/Queen Charlotte
Golden	Rocky Mountain	Quesnel	Quesnel
Grand Forks	Boundary	Revelstoke	Revelstoke
Hazelton	Coast Mountains	Richmond	Richmond
Hope	Fraser-Cascade	Rossland	Kootenay-Columbia
Houston	Bulkley Valley	Saanichton	Saanich
Hudson's Hope	Peace River North	Salmo	Kootenay Lake
Invermere	Rocky Mountain	Salmon Arm	North Okanagan-Shuswap
Kamloops	Kamloops/Thompson	Salt Spring Island	Gulf Islands
Kaslo	Kootenay Lake	Sechelt	Sunshine Coast
Kelowna	Central Okanagan	Shawnigan Lake	Cowichan Valley
Keremeos	Okanagan Similkameen	Sicamous	North Okanagan-Shuswap
Kimberley	Rocky Mountain	Sidney	Saanich
Kitimat	Coast Mountains	Smithers	Bulkley Valley
Ladysmith	Nanaimo-Ladysmith	Sooke	Sooke
Lake Cowichan	Cowichan Valley	South Slocan	Kootenay Lake
Langley	Langley	Sparwood	Southeast Kootenay

List of cities and school districts

City	School district	City	School district
Squamish	Howe Sound	Vernon	Vernon
Summerland	Okanagan Skaha	Victoria	Greater Victoria
Surrey	Surrey	Victoria	Saanich
Terrace	Coast Mountains	Victoria	Sooke
Trail	Kootenay-Columbia	Waglisla	Central Coast
Tumbler Ridge	Peace River South	West Vancouver	West Vancouver
Ucluelet	Alberni	Whistler	Howe Sound
Valemount	Prince George	Whitehorse	Yukon
Vancouver	Vancouver	Williams Lake	Cariboo-Chilcotin
Vanderhoof	Nechako Lakes	Winfield	Central Okanagan

Index of school districts

School district	Page
Abbotsford	30
Alberni	26
Arrow Lakes	30
Boundary	30
Bulkley Valley	34
Burnaby	19
Campbell River	26
Cariboo-Chilcotin	34
Central Coast	26
Central Okanagan	30
Chilliwack	31
Coast Mountains	26
Comox Valley	26
Coquitlam	19
Cowichan Valley	26
Delta	20
Fort Nelson	34
Fraser-Cascade	31
Gold Trail	34
Greater Victoria	27
Gulf Islands	27
Haida Gwaii/Queen Charlotte	28
Howe Sound	28
Kamloops/Thompson	34
Kootenay-Columbia	32
Kootenay Lake	31
Langley	32
Maple Ridge-Pitt Meadows	20
Mission	32
Nanaimo-Ladysmith	28

School district	Page
Nechako Lakes	35
New Westminster	21
Nicola-Similkameen	33
Nisga'a	28
North Okanagan-Shuswap	35
North Vancouver	21
Okanagan Similkameen	33
Okanagan Skaha	33
Peace River North	35
Peace River South	36
Powell River	28
Prince George	36
Prince Rupert	28
Qualicum	28
Quesnel	36
Revelstoke	36
Richmond	21
Rocky Mountain	36
Saanich	29
Sooke	29
Southeast Kootenay	33
Sunshine Coast	29
Surrey	22
Vancouver	23
Vancouver Island North	29
Vancouver Island West	29
Vernon	33
West Vancouver	25
Yukon	37

Windermere [Public]		Gr 12 Enrollment: 193				
ESL (%): 10.6	Special needs (%): 11.5	French Imm (%): 0.0		2006-07		Last 5 Years
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 13.0 yrs: 1.3		Rank:		146/298	196/264	
Academic Performance		2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Average exam mark		67.7	67.8	67.0	67.1	64.9
Percentage of exams failed		13.9	13.6	13.5	10.7	12.5
School vs exam mark difference		5.9	6.5	7.0	3.8	3.2
English gender gap		F 3.3	F 4.9	M 1.0	M 4.8	F 2.5
Math gender gap		F 6.6	F 0.4	F 3.2	F 3.1	F 3.2
Graduation rate		87.6	87.6	90.0	88.0	93.2
Delayed advancement rate		25.5	31.3	31.4	29.6	23.8
Overall rating out of 10		4.8	4.9	5.0	5.8	6.3

Mulgrave [Independent]		Gr 12 Enrollment: 53				
ESL (%): n/a	Special needs (%): n/a	French Imm (%): n/a		2006-07		Last 5 Years
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 16.8 yrs: 0.9		Rank:		12/298	n/a	
Academic Performance		2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Average exam mark		n/a	72.4	71.2	76.3	76.6
Percentage of exams failed		n/a	10.3	10.3	1.3	0.4
School vs exam mark difference		n/a	11.1	6.6	3.1	2.7
English gender gap		n/a	n/a	M 1.5	M 4.0	F 1.1
Math gender gap		n/a	n/a	M 2.1	n/a	F 4.6
Graduation rate		n/a	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Delayed advancement rate		n/a	2.5	0.0	0.0	1.3
Overall rating out of 10		n/a	7.1	8.0	9.9	9.2

West Vancouver [Public]		Gr 12 Enrollment: 308				
ESL (%): 7.3	Special needs (%): 8.3	French Imm (%): 0.0		2006-07		Last 5 Years
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 17.1 yrs: -0.8		Rank:		43/298	19/264	
Academic Performance		2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Average exam mark		76.0	76.0	75.7	74.7	70.9
Percentage of exams failed		3.4	4.8	4.2	4.0	6.3
School vs exam mark difference		2.4	2.4	3.3	3.8	4.5
English gender gap		M 3.0	E	M 1.4	F 0.3	M 0.1
Math gender gap		F 2.0	F 2.9	M 0.5	F 2.1	F 0.4
Graduation rate		96.2	95.8	98.6	95.6	95.2
Delayed advancement rate		13.0	15.9	12.9	15.1	11.9
Overall rating out of 10		8.4	8.4	8.8	8.4	7.8

York House [Independent]		Gr 12 Enrollment: 58				
ESL (%): n/a	Special needs (%): n/a	French Imm (%): n/a		2006-07		Last 5 Years
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 16.7 yrs: 1.7		Rank:		1/298	1/264	
Academic Performance		2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Average exam mark		80.7	82.0	84.5	84.3	82.8
Percentage of exams failed		0.3	1.7	0.0	0.4	0.3
School vs exam mark difference		3.7	3.4	3.0	1.8	2.8
English gender gap		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Math gender gap		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Graduation rate		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Delayed advancement rate		3.5	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Overall rating out of 10		10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0

Rockridge [Public]		Gr 12 Enrollment: 154				
ESL (%): 2.0	Special needs (%): 9.6	French Imm (%): 0.0		2006-07		Last 5 Years
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 17.6 yrs: -0.8		Rank:		29/298	n/a	
Academic Performance		2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Average exam mark		n/a	75.8	76.2	73.9	71.7
Percentage of exams failed		n/a	5.8	4.9	4.2	3.9
School vs exam mark difference		n/a	5.9	4.1	4.4	4.4
English gender gap		n/a	M 2.2	M 1.2	F 2.4	F 1.4
Math gender gap		n/a	M 4.4	M 2.6	M 3.1	F 2.2
Graduation rate		n/a	97.2	99.4	97.5	99.3
Delayed advancement rate		n/a	6.5	6.7	7.5	3.2
Overall rating out of 10		n/a	8.5	8.6	8.4	8.2

WEST VANCOUVER

Collingwood [Independent]		Gr 12 Enrollment: 90				
ESL (%): n/a	Special needs (%): n/a	French Imm (%): n/a		2006-07		Last 5 Years
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 16.9 yrs: 0.7		Rank:		13/298	13/264	
Academic Performance		2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Average exam mark		76.6	74.7	76.7	76.6	77.1
Percentage of exams failed		5.5	6.1	4.6	3.4	1.4
School vs exam mark difference		5.4	7.4	6.1	4.3	4.3
English gender gap		F 0.8	M 0.7	F 2.0	M 3.1	F 1.2
Math gender gap		F 1.5	M 3.1	F 4.0	F 2.6	F 2.5
Graduation rate		98.9	100.0	98.1	100.0	100.0
Delayed advancement rate		0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0
Overall rating out of 10		9.3	8.8	8.9	9.2	9.1

Sentinel [Public]		Gr 12 Enrollment: 161				
ESL (%): 6.5	Special needs (%): 5.1	French Imm (%): 24.5		2006-07		Last 5 Years
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 17.2 yrs: -0.5		Rank:		29/298	19/264	
Academic Performance		2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Average exam mark		75.0	73.9	74.5	74.7	73.2
Percentage of exams failed		6.9	8.4	4.9	4.9	5.6
School vs exam mark difference		4.3	4.5	4.6	3.3	2.9
English gender gap		M 1.6	M 3.3	M 4.3	M 2.5	F 5.6
Math gender gap		M 2.7	E	M 1.5	F 0.8	F 0.2
Graduation rate		96.7	96.7	99.3	99.2	98.7
Delayed advancement rate		20.4	6.4	8.4	5.8	9.2
Overall rating out of 10		8.0	8.1	8.6	9.0	8.2

YUKON

F.H. Collins [Public]		Gr 12 Enrollment: 104				
ESL (%): n/a	Special needs (%): n/a	French Imm (%): n/a				
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of n/a yrs: n/a		2006-07	Last 5 Years			
		Rank:	200/298	n/a		
Academic Performance						
Average exam mark	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	
Percentage of exams failed	n/a	n/a	64.3	66.5	64.0	
School vs exam mark difference	n/a	n/a	17.0	15.6	17.7	
English gender gap	n/a	n/a	8.6	4.8	5.3	
Math gender gap	n/a	n/a	F 3.0	F 2.9	F 9.4	
Graduation rate	n/a	n/a	F 2.8	F 5.4	F 2.3	
Delayed advancement rate	n/a	n/a	96.8	95.8	96.3	
Overall rating out of 10	n/a	n/a	5.2	5.9	5.7	

Porter Creek [Public]		Gr 12 Enrollment: 148				
ESL (%): n/a	Special needs (%): n/a	French Imm (%): n/a				
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of n/a yrs: n/a		2006-07	Last 5 Years			
		Rank:	272/298	n/a		
Academic Performance						
Average exam mark	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	
Percentage of exams failed	n/a	n/a	65.3	62.2	60.8	
School vs exam mark difference	n/a	n/a	18.4	18.8	25.4	
English gender gap	n/a	n/a	9.9	7.5	5.9	
Math gender gap	n/a	n/a	F 3.6	F 7.3	F 5.3	
Graduation rate	n/a	n/a	F 1.8	F 2.6	M 5.1	
Delayed advancement rate	n/a	n/a	98.3	95.1	91.9	
Overall rating out of 10	n/a	n/a	5.0	4.5	4.0	

Robert Service [Public]		Gr 12 Enrollment: 18				
ESL (%): n/a	Special needs (%): n/a	French Imm (%): n/a				
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of n/a yrs: n/a		2006-07	Last 5 Years			
		Rank:	126/298	n/a		
Academic Performance						
Average exam mark	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	
Percentage of exams failed	n/a	n/a	n/a	68.3	65.9	
School vs exam mark difference	n/a	n/a	n/a	7.8	4.7	
English gender gap	n/a	n/a	n/a	7.1	3.7	
Math gender gap	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	F 25.9	
Graduation rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	94.7	88.9	
Delayed advancement rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Overall rating out of 10	n/a	n/a	n/a	5.9	6.6	

Vanier Catholic [Public]		Gr 12 Enrollment: 84				
ESL (%): n/a	Special needs (%): n/a	French Imm (%): n/a				
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of n/a yrs: n/a		2006-07	Last 5 Years			
		Rank:	110/298	n/a		
Academic Performance						
Average exam mark	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	
Percentage of exams failed	n/a	n/a	66.5	70.4	67.4	
School vs exam mark difference	n/a	n/a	17.9	9.6	9.5	
English gender gap	n/a	n/a	8.0	7.3	5.4	
Math gender gap	n/a	n/a	F 0.5	F 4.8	F 1.2	
Graduation rate	n/a	n/a	F 0.6	F 0.2	M 0.7	
Delayed advancement rate	n/a	n/a	95.2	98.6	94.3	
Overall rating out of 10	n/a	n/a	5.9	7.0	6.9	



Ranking the schools

Important notes to the rankings

In this table, schools are ranked (on the left hand side of the page) in descending order (from 1 to 296) according to their academic performance as measured by the *Overall rating out of 10* (shown on the right hand side of the table) for the school year 2006/2007. Each school's five-year average ranking and *Overall rating out of 10* are also listed. The higher the overall rating (out of 10), the higher the rank awarded to the school. Where schools tied in the overall rating, they were awarded the same rank. Where less than five years of data was available, "n/a" appears in the table.

Not all the province's secondary schools are included in the tables or the ranking. Excluded are schools at which fewer than 15 regular day students were enrolled in grade 12 and schools that did not generate a sufficiently large set of student data to

enable the calculation of an *Overall rating out of 10*. Also excluded from the ratings and rankings are centres for adult education and continuing education; schools that cater largely to non-resident foreign students; schools not located in British Columbia or Yukon; most on-line and distributed learning schools; and certain alternative schools that do not offer a full program of courses.

The exclusion of a school from the *Report Card* should in no way be construed as a judgement of the school's effectiveness.

IMPORTANT: In order to get the most from the *Report Card*, readers should consult the complete table of results for each school of interest. By considering several years of results—rather than just a school's rank in the most recent year—readers can get a better idea of how the school is likely to perform in the future.

Rank		School name	City	Overall rating	
2006/2007	Last 5 years			2006/2007	Last 5 years
1	1	Little Flower	Vancouver	10.0	10.0
1	1	St George's	Vancouver	10.0	10.0
1	1	York House	Vancouver	10.0	10.0
1	4	Southridge	Surrey	10.0	9.9
1	7	Vancouver College	Vancouver	10.0	9.7
6	4	Crofton House	Vancouver	9.6	9.9
6	7	St Michaels	Victoria	9.6	9.7
6	n/a	Meadowridge	Maple Ridge	9.6	n/a
9	6	West Point Grey	Vancouver	9.5	9.8
10	9	Brentwood College	Mill Bay	9.3	9.5
10	11	Shawnigan Lake	Shawnigan Lake	9.3	9.3
12	n/a	Mulgrave	West Vancouver	9.2	n/a
13	13	Collingwood	West Vancouver	9.1	9.1
14	10	University Hill	Vancouver	9.0	9.4
15	41	Immaculata	Kelowna	8.8	7.6
16	11	Glenlyon Norfolk	Victoria	8.7	9.3
16	19	St Thomas Aquinas	North Vancouver	8.7	8.4

Rank		School name	City	Overall rating	
2006/2007	Last 5 years			2006/2007	Last 5 years
16	27	St Thomas More	Burnaby	8.7	7.9
16	46	White Rock Christian	Surrey	8.7	7.5
20	15	Kelowna Christian	Kelowna	8.6	8.7
21	14	St Margaret's	Victoria	8.5	8.9
21	15	Pacific Academy	Surrey	8.5	8.7
23	15	Lord Byng	Vancouver	8.4	8.7
23	18	Prince Of Wales	Vancouver	8.4	8.6
23	24	Mennonite Educational Institute	Abbotsford	8.4	8.0
23	91	Bulkley Valley Christian	Smithers	8.4	6.8
27	32	Langley Fine Arts	Fort Langley	8.3	7.8
27	46	St John's	Vancouver	8.3	7.5
29	19	Sentinel	West Vancouver	8.2	8.4
29	32	Haney-Pitt Meadows Christian	Maple Ridge	8.2	7.8
29	41	Highroad	Chilliwack	8.2	7.6
29	n/a	Rockridge	West Vancouver	8.2	n/a
33	24	Handsworth	North Vancouver	8.1	8.0
33	41	Okanagan Mission	Kelowna	8.1	7.6

Rank		School name	City	Overall rating		Rank		School name	City	Overall rating	
2006/2007	Last 5 years			2006/2007	Last 5 years	2006/2007	Last 5 years			2006/2007	Last 5 years
33	n/a	Southpointe	Delta	8.1	n/a	90	62	South Kamloops	Kamloops	7.1	7.2
36	46	Rossland	Rossland	8.0	7.5	90	80	Princess Margaret	Surrey	7.1	7.0
36	73	Holy Cross	Surrey	8.0	7.1	90	91	Credo Christian	Langley	7.1	6.8
36	85	St Ann's	Kamloops	8.0	6.9	90	91	Fraser Valley Christian	Surrey	7.1	6.8
39	37	Kalamalka	Vernon	7.9	7.7	90	139	Chemainus	Chemainus	7.1	6.2
39	46	Steveston	Richmond	7.9	7.5	90	168	Osoyoos	Osoyoos	7.1	5.8
39	55	L V Rogers	Nelson	7.9	7.3	99	24	Mount Douglas	Victoria	7.0	8.0
39	n/a	King David	Vancouver	7.9	n/a	99	46	New Westminster	New Westminster	7.0	7.5
43	19	West Vancouver	West Vancouver	7.8	8.4	99	55	Elkford	Elkford	7.0	7.3
43	22	Point Grey	Vancouver	7.8	8.2	99	62	Argyle	North Vancouver	7.0	7.2
43	37	Richmond Christian	Richmond	7.8	7.7	99	62	Robert Bateman	Abbotsford	7.0	7.2
43	41	Pacific Christian	Victoria	7.8	7.6	99	73	Sa-Hali	Kamloops	7.0	7.1
43	62	Abbotsford Christian	Abbotsford	7.8	7.2	99	80	Fleetwood Park	Surrey	7.0	7.0
43	111	Kamloops Christian	Kamloops	7.8	6.6	99	111	Windsor	North Vancouver	7.0	6.6
49	23	Archbishop Carney	Port Coquitlam	7.7	8.1	99	118	South Delta	Delta	7.0	6.5
49	62	Campbell River Christian	Campbell River	7.7	7.2	99	128	Boundary Central	Midway	7.0	6.4
49	101	George Elliot	Winfield	7.7	6.7	99	146	Templeton	Vancouver	7.0	6.1
49	n/a	Heritage Woods	Port Moody	7.7	n/a	110	80	Dr. Charles Best	Coquitlam	6.9	7.0
53	27	St Andrew's	Victoria	7.6	7.9	110	85	Moscrop	Burnaby	6.9	6.9
53	46	Seycove	North Vancouver	7.6	7.5	110	n/a	Carver Christian	Burnaby	6.9	n/a
53	53	Whistler	Whistler	7.6	7.4	110	n/a	Cedars Christian	Prince George	6.9	n/a
53	101	R. E. Mountain	Langley	7.6	6.7	110	n/a	Vanier Catholic	Whitehorse	6.9	n/a
53	n/a	Mount Cheam Christian	Chilliwack	7.6	n/a	115	73	Earl Marriott	Surrey	6.8	7.1
58	27	Claremont	Victoria	7.5	7.9	115	91	Delta	Delta	6.8	6.8
58	32	Semiahmoo	Surrey	7.5	7.8	115	118	Walnut Grove	Langley	6.8	6.5
58	46	Fraser Heights	Surrey	7.5	7.5	115	128	Valleyview	Kamloops	6.8	6.4
58	62	Gleneagle	Coquitlam	7.5	7.2	115	132	Charles E London	Richmond	6.8	6.3
58	80	J Lloyd Crowe	Trail	7.5	7.0	120	62	Notre Dame	Vancouver	6.7	7.2
58	85	Stanley Humphries	Castlegar	7.5	6.9	120	73	Burnaby North	Burnaby	6.7	7.1
58	101	Robert Alexander McMath	Richmond	7.5	6.7	120	73	Penticton	Penticton	6.7	7.1
58	n/a	Regent Christian	Surrey	7.5	n/a	120	80	Johnston Heights	Surrey	6.7	7.0
66	32	Sir Winston Churchill	Vancouver	7.4	7.8	120	91	Clayton Heights	Surrey	6.7	6.8
66	62	Dover Bay	Nanaimo	7.4	7.2	120	n/a	Surrey Traditional	Surrey	6.7	n/a
66	73	J N Burnett	Richmond	7.4	7.1	126	118	Riverside	Port Coquitlam	6.6	6.5
66	101	Richmond	Richmond	7.4	6.7	126	132	Ballenas	Parksville	6.6	6.3
66	146	Similkameen	Keremeos	7.4	6.1	126	132	Chilliwack Christian	Chilliwack	6.6	6.3
71	27	Elgin Park	Surrey	7.3	7.9	126	132	St John Brebeuf	Abbotsford	6.6	6.3
71	32	Magee	Vancouver	7.3	7.8	126	132	Tamanawis	Surrey	6.6	6.3
71	37	Kitsilano	Vancouver	7.3	7.7	126	152	Hugh Boyd	Richmond	6.6	6.0
71	37	Pinetree	Coquitlam	7.3	7.7	126	158	Fernie	Fernie	6.6	5.9
71	55	Timothy Christian	Chilliwack	7.3	7.3	126	n/a	Robert Service	Dawson City	6.6	n/a
71	62	Port Moody	Port Moody	7.3	7.2	134	101	Sullivan Heights	Surrey	6.5	6.7
71	73	Kelowna	Kelowna	7.3	7.1	134	118	Burnaby Mountain	Burnaby	6.5	6.5
71	111	DW Poppy	Langley	7.3	6.6	134	128	Mission	Mission	6.5	6.4
71	111	Kwalikum	Qualicum Beach	7.3	6.6	134	132	David Thompson	Vancouver	6.5	6.3
71	118	Lambrick Park	Victoria	7.3	6.5	134	139	J V Humphries	Kaslo	6.5	6.2
71	n/a	Duncan Christian	Duncan	7.3	n/a	134	176	Reynolds	Victoria	6.5	5.7
82	41	St Patrick's	Vancouver	7.2	7.6	134	196	Frank Hurt	Surrey	6.5	5.4
82	53	Yale	Abbotsford	7.2	7.4	134	n/a	Princess Margaret	Penticton	6.5	n/a
82	55	Parkland	Sidney	7.2	7.3	142	55	Sparwood	Sparwood	6.4	7.3
82	55	Seaquam	Delta	7.2	7.3	142	101	Mount Boucherie	Kelowna	6.4	6.7
82	62	Langley Christian	Langley	7.2	7.2	142	111	Sardis	Chilliwack	6.4	6.6
82	85	Eric Hamber	Vancouver	7.2	6.9	142	139	Matthew McNair	Richmond	6.4	6.2
82	118	North Surrey	Surrey	7.2	6.5	146	101	Mount Sentinel	South Slovan	6.3	6.7
82	n/a	Maxwell International	Shawnigan Lake	7.2	n/a	146	101	Prince Charles	Creston	6.3	6.7
90	27	Hugh McRoberts	Richmond	7.1	7.9	146	118	Burnaby Central	Burnaby	6.3	6.5
90	55	W J Mouat	Abbotsford	7.1	7.3	146	118	Cambie	Richmond	6.3	6.5
90	62	Oak Bay	Victoria	7.1	7.2	146	146	Rick Hansen	Abbotsford	6.3	6.1

Rank		School name	City	Overall rating		Rank		School name	City	Overall rating	
2006/2007	Last 5 years			2006/2007	Last 5 years	2006/2007	Last 5 years			2006/2007	Last 5 years
146	196	Windermere	Vancouver	6.3	5.4	204	211	Norkam	Kamloops	5.6	5.2
146	202	Charles Bloom	Lumby	6.3	5.3	204	217	Rutland	Kelowna	5.6	5.1
146	202	MacKenzie	Mackenzie	6.3	5.3	204	239	Pemberton	Pemberton	5.6	4.5
146	n/a	Nanaimo Christian	Nanaimo	6.3	n/a	211	139	Revelstoke	Revelstoke	5.5	6.2
155	85	Frances Kelsey	Mill Bay	6.2	6.9	211	146	Wellington	Nanaimo	5.5	6.1
155	91	Highland	Comox	6.2	6.8	211	158	D P Todd	Prince George	5.5	5.9
155	91	Stelly's	Saanichton	6.2	6.8	211	186	Garibaldi	Maple Ridge	5.5	5.5
155	111	Lord Tweedsmuir	Surrey	6.2	6.6	211	186	Gladstone	Vancouver	5.5	5.5
155	118	Killarney	Vancouver	6.2	6.5	211	222	Lakes District	Burns Lake	5.5	4.9
155	139	Westview	Maple Ridge	6.2	6.2	217	182	Vernon	Vernon	5.4	5.6
155	152	R C Palmer	Richmond	6.2	6.0	217	196	Alpha	Burnaby	5.4	5.4
155	158	Maple Ridge	Maple Ridge	6.2	5.9	217	196	Langley	Langley	5.4	5.4
155	158	Salmon Arm	Salmon Arm	6.2	5.9	217	211	Chetwynd	Chetwynd	5.4	5.2
155	176	Thomas Haney	Maple Ridge	6.2	5.7	221	168	Vancouver Technical	Vancouver	5.3	5.8
155	186	Valemount	Valemount	6.2	5.5	221	186	Caledonia	Terrace	5.3	5.5
155	202	Westsyde	Kamloops	6.2	5.3	221	196	Agassiz	Agassiz	5.3	5.4
155	n/a	Delview	Delta	6.2	n/a	221	227	Nanaimo District	Nanaimo	5.3	4.8
155	n/a	Hudson's Hope	Hudson's Hope	6.2	n/a	225	118	Kwantlen Park	Surrey	5.2	6.5
155	n/a	Okanagan Adventist	Kelowna	6.2	n/a	225	132	Chatelech	Sechelt	5.2	6.3
155	n/a	Sands	Delta	6.2	n/a	225	146	David Thompson	Invermere	5.2	6.1
171	91	Centennial	Coquitlam	6.1	6.8	225	168	Howe Sound	Squamish	5.2	5.8
171	91	Summerland	Summerland	6.1	6.8	225	186	W L Seaton	Vernon	5.2	5.5
171	101	Houston	Houston	6.1	6.7	225	232	A L Fortune	Enderby	5.2	4.6
171	158	Clarence Fulton	Vernon	6.1	5.9	225	232	Fraser Lake	Fraser Lake	5.2	4.6
171	158	Elphinstone	Gibsons	6.1	5.9	232	158	Grand Forks	Grand Forks	5.1	5.9
171	168	Hope	Hope	6.1	5.8	232	186	Brooks	Powell River	5.1	5.5
171	186	Brocklehurst	Kamloops	6.1	5.5	232	211	Correlieu	Quesnel	5.1	5.2
171	n/a	Mark R. Isfeld	Courtenay	6.1	n/a	235	158	North Peace	Fort St John	5.0	5.9
179	85	Gulf Islands	Salt Spring Island	6.0	6.9	235	176	Selkirk	Kimberley	5.0	5.7
179	111	Enver Creek	Surrey	6.0	6.6	235	182	L A Matheson	Surrey	5.0	5.6
179	128	Terry Fox	Port Coquitlam	6.0	6.4	235	186	North Delta	Delta	5.0	5.5
179	158	Timberline	Campbell River	6.0	5.9	235	222	Victoria High	Victoria	5.0	4.9
179	168	Mount Baker	Cranbrook	6.0	5.8	235	249	Clearwater	Clearwater	5.0	4.0
179	168	Pleasant Valley	Armstrong	6.0	5.8	241	217	Prince George	Prince George	4.9	5.1
179	176	Golden	Golden	6.0	5.7	241	232	Eagle River	Sicamous	4.9	4.6
179	202	Chilliwack	Chilliwack	6.0	5.3	241	n/a	Samuel Robertson	Maple Ridge	4.9	n/a
179	n/a	Burnsview	Delta	6.0	n/a	244	152	Pender Harbour	Madeira Park	4.8	6.0
179	n/a	Heritage Christian	Kelowna	6.0	n/a	244	176	Nakusp	Nakusp	4.8	5.7
179	n/a	Queen Charlotte	Queen Charlotte	6.0	n/a	244	176	Peter Skene Ogden	100 Mile House	4.8	5.7
190	101	Sutherland	North Vancouver	5.9	6.7	244	202	Kelly Road	Prince George	4.8	5.3
190	146	Burnaby South	Burnaby	5.9	6.1	244	202	Merritt	Merritt	4.8	5.3
190	182	Belmont	Victoria	5.9	5.6	244	221	King George	Vancouver	4.8	5.0
190	202	South Peace	Dawson Creek	5.9	5.3	244	232	Columneetza	Williams Lake	4.8	4.6
190	239	Ucluelet	Ucluelet	5.9	4.5	244	245	Williams Lake	Williams Lake	4.8	4.1
190	n/a	Abbotsford Traditional	Abbotsford	5.9	n/a	252	186	Cariboo Hill	Burnaby	4.7	5.5
196	91	Brookwood	Langley	5.8	6.8	252	186	Carson Graham	North Vancouver	4.7	5.5
196	139	Cowichan	Duncan	5.8	6.2	252	202	Alberni District	Port Alberni	4.7	5.3
196	152	Duchess Park	Prince George	5.8	6.0	252	211	Chase	Chase	4.7	5.2
196	168	Georges P Vanier	Courtenay	5.8	5.8	252	232	Sir Charles Tupper	Vancouver	4.7	4.6
200	139	Pitt Meadows	Pitt Meadows	5.7	6.2	257	202	Hatzic	Mission	4.6	5.3
200	152	Smithers	Smithers	5.7	6.0	257	255	John Oliver	Vancouver	4.6	3.7
200	211	Logan Lake	Logan Lake	5.7	5.2	259	222	Woodlands	Nanaimo	4.4	4.9
200	n/a	F.H. Collins	Whitehorse	5.7	n/a	259	227	Quesnel	Quesnel	4.4	4.8
204	152	Carihi	Campbell River	5.6	6.0	259	227	Spectrum	Victoria	4.4	4.8
204	158	Southern Okanagan	Oliver	5.6	5.9	259	245	Nechako Valley	Vanderhoof	4.4	4.1
204	168	Esquimalt	Victoria	5.6	5.8	263	227	Abbotsford	Abbotsford	4.3	4.8
204	182	Guildford Park	Surrey	5.6	5.6	263	239	Mount Elizabeth	Kitimat	4.3	4.5

Rank		School name	City	Overall rating		Rank		School name	City	Overall rating	
2006/ 2007	Last 5 years			2006/ 2007	Last 5 years	2006/ 2007	Last 5 years			2006/ 2007	Last 5 years
263	250	John Barsby	Nanaimo	4.3	3.9	281	257	Lake Cowichan	Lake Cowichan	3.6	3.6
263	n/a	David Stoddart	Clinton	4.3	n/a	283	232	Britannia	Vancouver	3.5	4.6
267	211	Aldergrove Community	Aldergrove	4.2	5.2	283	232	North Island	Port McNeill	3.5	4.6
267	n/a	Byrne Creek	Burnaby	4.2	n/a	285	245	Charles Hays	Prince Rupert	3.3	4.1
269	222	College Heights	Prince George	4.1	4.9	285	245	Port Hardy	Port Hardy	3.3	4.1
269	222	Prince Rupert	Prince Rupert	4.1	4.9	285	260	Fort St James	Fort St James	3.3	3.2
269	250	McBride	McBride	4.1	3.9	288	261	Barriere	Barriere	3.0	2.8
272	196	Ladysmith	Ladysmith	4.0	5.4	289	250	Fort Nelson	Fort Nelson	2.8	3.9
272	217	H D Stafford	Langley	4.0	5.1	290	255	Lillooet	Lillooet	2.4	3.7
272	n/a	Porter Creek	Whitehorse	4.0	n/a	291	254	Hazelton	Hazelton	2.3	3.8
272	n/a	Salmo	Salmo	4.0	n/a	291	259	Princeton	Princeton	2.3	3.3
276	243	Edward Milne	Sooke	3.9	4.4	293	250	Tumbler Ridge	Tumbler Ridge	1.9	3.9
277	217	Heritage Park	Mission	3.8	5.1	294	262	Gold River	Gold River	1.6	2.6
278	227	Fraser Valley Adventist	Aldergrove	3.7	4.8	295	n/a	Bella Bella	Waglisla	1.2	n/a
278	239	Cedar	Nanaimo	3.7	4.5	296	263	Nisga'a	New Aiyansh	0.0	0.6
278	258	Ashcroft	Ashcroft	3.7	3.4	296	264	George M Dawson	Masset	0.0	0.0
281	243	Queen Elizabeth	Surrey	3.6	4.4	296	n/a	Kumsheen	Lytton	0.0	n/a



Appendix 1: Calculating the Overall rating out of 10

The *Overall rating out of 10* is intended to answer the question, “In general, how is the school doing, academically compared to other schools in the province?” The following is a simplified description of the procedure used to convert the raw indicator data into the *Overall rating out of 10*.

1 The *School vs exam mark difference* for each course and the English 10 and Mathematics 10 *Gender gap* indicators were calculated using the raw data.

2 Course by course, all the results were then converted into standardized or “Z” scores by solving the equation

$$Z = (X - \mu) / \sigma$$

where X is the individual school’s result, μ is the mean of the all-schools distribution of results, and σ is the standard deviation of the same all-schools distribution.

3 With the exception of the *Gender gap* indicators (these use the results from a single course), the course-by-course standardized data were then aggregated to produce weighted average indicator values. The weighting used was the number of examinations written in each course at the school relative to the total number of examinations written at the school.

4 These weighted average results were then re-standardized.

5 The seven standardized indicator results were then combined to produce a weighted average summary standardized score for the school. The weightings used in this calculation were *Average exam mark*—25%, *Percentage of exams failed*—25%, *School vs exam mark difference*—13%, *English 10 gender gap*—6%, *Math 10 gender gap*—6%, *Graduation rate*—12.5%, and *Delayed advancement rate*—12.5%. For schools for which there were no gender-gap results because only boys or girls were enrolled, the *School vs exam mark difference* was weighted at 25%. Where no *Composite dropout rate* could be calculated, the *Graduation rate* was weighted at 25%.

6 This summary standardized score was then standardized.

This standardized score was converted into an overall rating between 0 and 10 as follows:

7 The maximum and minimum standardized scores were set at 2.2 and -3.29 respectively. Scores equal to, or greater than 2.2 receive the highest overall rating of 10. This cut-off was chosen because it allows more than one school in a given year to be awarded 10 out of 10. Scores of equal to, or less than, -3.29 receive the lowest overall rating of 0. Schools with scores below -3.29 are likely to be outliers—a statistical term used to

denote members of a population that appear to have characteristics substantially different from the rest of the population. We chose, therefore, to set the minimum score so as to disregard such extreme differences.

- 8 The resulting standardized scores were converted into *Overall ratings* according to the formula:

$$OR = \mu + (\sigma * \text{StanScore}),$$

where OR is the resulting *Overall rating*, μ is the average calculated according to the formula:

$$\mu = (OR_{\min} - 10 (Z_{\min} / Z_{\max})) / (1 - (Z_{\min} / Z_{\max}))$$

where σ is the standard deviation calculated according to the formula:

$$\sigma = (10 - \mu) / Z_{\max}$$

and StanScore is the standardized score calculated in (6) above and adjusted as required for minimum and maximum values as noted in (7) above. As noted in (7) above, OR_{\min} equals zero, Z_{\min} equals -3.29 ; and Z_{\max} equals 2.2 .

- 9 Finally, the derived *Overall rating* is rounded to one decimal place to reflect the significant number of places of the decimal in the original raw data.

Note that the *Overall rating out of 10*, based as it is on standardized scores, is a relative rating. That is, in order for a school to show improvement in its overall rating, it must improve more than the average. If it improves, but at a rate less than the average, it will show a decline in its rating.



About the authors

Peter Cowley

Peter Cowley is the Director of School Performance Studies at The Fraser Institute. He graduated from the University of British Columbia with a B.Comm. in 1974. Shortly thereafter, he began a long career in marketing and general management in several sectors. During his assignments in general management, process improvement was a special focus and interest. In 1994, Mr Cowley independently wrote and published *The Parent's Guide*, a popular handbook for parents of British Columbia's secondary-school students. *The Parent's Guide* web site replaced the handbook in 1995. In 1998, Mr Cowley was co-author of The Fraser Institute's *A Secondary Schools Report Card* for British Columbia, the first of the Institute's continuing series of annual reports on school performance. This was followed by *The 1999 Report Card on British Columbia's Secondary Schools, Boys, Girls, and Grades: Academic Gender Balance in British Columbia's Secondary Schools*, and *The 1999 Report Card on Alberta's High Schools*. Since then, Mr Cowley has co-authored all of the Institute's annual *Report Cards*. Annual editions now include *Report Cards* on secondary schools in British Columbia & Yukon, Alberta, Ontario, and Quebec; and *Report Cards* on elementary schools in British Columbia, Alberta, and Ontario. The *Report Card on Aboriginal Education in British Columbia* is published every second year. He continues his research on education and related issues for The Fraser Institute.

Stephen T. Easton

Stephen T. Easton in addition to being a Senior Scholar at the Fraser Institute, is a professor of Economics, a member of the School for International Studies, and an Associate member of the School of Criminology at Simon Fraser University. He received his A.B. from Oberlin College and his Ph.D. from the University of Chicago. Recent works published by The Fraser Institute include *Marijuana Growth in British Columbia* (2004), *Privatizing Prisons* (editor, 1998), *The Costs of Crime: Who Pays and How Much? 1998 Update* (with Paul Brantingham, 1998), and *Rating Global Economic Freedom* (editor, 1992). A co-author of *A Secondary Schools Report Card for British Columbia* (1998), *Boys, Girls, and Grades: Academic Gender Balance in British Columbia's Secondary Schools* (1999) and the *Report Card on Aboriginal Education in British Columbia* (2004), he has continued to co-author the *Report Cards* for British Columbia, Alberta, New Brunswick and, most recently, Ontario. Other publications about education include "Do We Have a Problem Yet? Women and Men in Higher Education," in David Laidler (ed.), *Renovating the Ivory Tower: Canadian Universities and the Knowledge Economy* (C.D. Howe Institute, 2002), pp. 60–79; "Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose" in Stephen B. Lawton, Rodney Reed, and Fons van Wieringen, *Restructuring Public Schooling* (Springer-Verlag, 1997) and *Education in Canada: An Analysis of Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Schooling* (The Fraser Institute, 1988). His editorials have been carried by the *Vancouver Sun*, the *Globe and Mail*, the *National Post*, the *Ottawa Citizen*, the Stirling chain and many other newspapers around the country.



Acknowledgments

The Fraser Institute wishes to acknowledge the generous support for this project from the Lotte and John Hecht Memorial Foundation.