

Studies in Education Policy



June 2009

Report Card on Secondary Schools in British Columbia and Yukon 2009

by Peter Cowley and Stephen Easton



JUNE 2009

Report Card on Secondary Schools in British Columbia and Yukon 2009

By Peter Cowley and Stephen Easton

Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	3
<i>Key academic indicators of school performance</i>	5
<i>Other indicators of school performance</i>	10
<i>Detailed school reports</i>	12
<i>Ranking the schools</i>	39
<i>Appendix 1: Calculating the Overall rating out of 10</i>	43
<i>About the authors</i>	45
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	46

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?

Gender gap indicators have been re-designed

Beginning with this edition the gender gaps in English 10 and Mathematics 10 are determined by calculating the difference between the boys and the

girls in the mark they receive on the mandatory provincial exam in each of the courses. This new gender gap design will be common to all the Institute's report cards by the end of 2009.

School vs exam mark indicator has been redesigned.

Beginning with this edition the *School vs exam mark* indicator is calculated as follows: For each course with a mandatory provincial exam, the average exam mark at the school is subtracted from the average school mark. If the result is negative, that is, where the exam mark is greater than the school mark, the result is adjusted to zero. The differences for all of the courses are then weight averaged.

Thus, the redesigned *School vs exam mark* indicator is now a more accurate measure of school-level grade inflation. By the end of 2009, this new design will be common to all the Institute's report cards in which this indicator is included.

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 seven 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 by which the school mark exceeds the examination mark in the courses considered in (1) and (2) above;
- (4) difference between male and female students in their exam mark in English 10 only;
- (5) difference between male and female students in their exam mark in 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 amount (for all grade-10, grade-11, and grade-12 courses with a mandatory provincial exam) by which the “school” mark--the assessment of each student’s learning that is made by the school--exceeds the exam mark in that course.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.

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 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. 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 exam marks in Mathematics 10 and English 10 for boys and girls. The indicator reports the size of the difference and the more successful sex.

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 counselling 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.

Of the decisions that senior students must make, perhaps the most important is the decision to remain in school, do the work, and graduate with their class. 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 graduation 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 graduate 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 grade-8 dropout rate at the school 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 ($1 - \text{net drop-out rate}$) 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 weighted average grade-8 dropout rate for all the schools in the relevant school district. 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 *Report Card*?"

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" sta-

tistical properties. Standardized values can readily be combined and compared.

The standardized data were then combined as required to produce seven 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*.)

Finally, 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.

Notes

- 1 The data from which these indicators are derived is provided by British Columbia's Ministry of Education.
- 2 In 2007/2008 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 Première 10; Français Langue Première 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 2006 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 parental income from wages, salaries, and unemployment. When a school had higher income 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. inc.*) between the actual *Overall rating* and this predicted value in each school's results table.

For example, during the 2007/2008 school year, Pinetree Secondary, a public school in Coquitlam, achieved an *Overall rating* of 7.6 and yet, when the average parental income of the student body is taken into account, the school was expected to achieve a rating of only about 5.9. The difference of 1.7 is reported in the tables. On the other hand, the actual *Overall rating* of H. D. Stafford Secondary in Langley was 4.6, although its predicted rating was 6.2. The reported difference for H. D. Stafford is -1.6. This measurement suggests that Pinetree is more successful than H. D. Stafford 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 average parental income. 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.

SCHOOL DISTRICT						
School [Affiliation] City	Gr 12 Enrollment: 187					— A
B—	ESL (%): 0.1	Special needs (%): 14.7	French Imm (%): 0.0			
	Actual rating vs predicted based		2007-08	Last 5 Years		
C—	on parents' avg. inc. of \$70,200: -0.9		Rank: 228/316	196/267		
	Academic Performance	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
D—	Average exam mark	69.2	68.9	64.1	64.2	64.5
E—	Percentage of exams failed	8.0	6.8	15.2	13.7	10.9
F—	School vs exam mark difference	3.0	4.9	6.4	5.6	4.8
G—	English gender gap	F 3.2	F 3.6	M 2.9	F 1.9	F 1.7
H—	Math gender gap	F 6.0	F 3.7	F 0.9	F 4.5	F 1.2
I—	Graduation rate	93.0	98.0	89.7	90.1	88.5
J—	Delayed advancement rate	30.2	29.1	39.9	24.1	25.1
K—	Overall rating out of 10	5.5	5.8	4.9	5.5	5.4

A—Gr 12 Enrollment

The grade-12 enrollment on September 30, 2007. 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 students 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 average parental employment income

This statistic compares the school's actual *Overall rating out of 10* with the rating that is predicted by the average parental employment income in each stu-

dent'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 2007/2008 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' average exam marks in English 10 and Math 10. 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 compared to other schools in the *Report Card*?"

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 at a greater rate than the average. If it improves, but at a rate less than the average, it will show a decline in its rating.

Other notes

Note 1

Due to the substantial changes to the report card's design that are introduced in this and the previous edition, care should be taken when making comparisons between a school's 2007 and 2008 results and those of previous years.

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 316. 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; and certain alternative schools that do not offer a full program of courses.

The exclusion of a school from the *Report Card* should not 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 2007/2008		Gr 12 Enrollment: 161				
ESL (%): 3.7	Special Needs (%): 9.9	French Immersion (%): 12.6				
Average Parents' Income: \$68,600						
Academic Performance	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	
Average exam mark	69.6	70.1	67.9	66.9	68.7	
Percentage of exams failed	9.8	9.2	11.9	11.8	9.1	
School vs exam mark difference	6.4	6.0	6.2	5.8	4.1	
English gender gap	2.6	2.5	2.6	3.8	6.0	
Math gender gap	2.4	2.2	2.4	3.0	3.3	
Graduation rate	95.1	95.2	94.7	93.6	94.9	
Delayed advancement rate	22.1	22.3	22.0	20.8	23.1	
Overall rating out of 10	6.2	6.2	6.2	6.3	6.2	

* These results reflect the average size of the gender gaps. In 2007-2008, the English gender gap favoured females at 97.2% of schools and males at 2.8% of schools. The Math gender gap favoured females at 62.1% of schools, males at 37.6% of schools, and was even at 0.3% schools.

List of cities and school districts

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

List of cities and school districts

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

Index of school districts

School district	Page
Abbotsford	29
Alberni	25
Arrow Lakes	29
Boundary	29
Bulkley Valley	34
Burnaby	18
Campbell River	25
Cariboo-Chilcotin	34
Central Coast	25
Central Okanagan	29
Chilliwack	30
Coast Mountains	25
Comox Valley	25
Coquitlam	18
Cowichan Valley	25
Delta	19
Fort Nelson	34
Fraser-Cascade	30
Gold Trail	34
Greater Victoria	26
Gulf Islands	27
Haida Gwaii/Queen Charlotte	27
Howe Sound	27
Kamloops/Thompson	34
Kootenay-Columbia	31
Kootenay Lake	30
Langley	31
Maple Ridge-Pitt Meadows	19
Mission	32
Nanaimo-Ladysmith	27

School district	Page
Nechako Lakes	35
New Westminster	20
Nicola-Similkameen	32
Nisga'a	28
North Okanagan-Shuswap	35
North Vancouver	20
Okanagan Similkameen	32
Okanagan Skaha	32
Peace River North	36
Peace River South	36
Powell River	28
Prince George	36
Prince Rupert	28
Qualicum	28
Quesnel	36
Revelstoke	36
Richmond	20
Rocky Mountain	37
Saanich	28
Sooke	28
Southeast Kootenay	32
Sunshine Coast	28
Surrey	21
Vancouver	22
Vancouver Island North	28
Vancouver Island West	28
Vernon	32
West Vancouver	24
Yukon	38

Pinetree [Public] Coquitlam **Gr 12 Enrollment: 355**

ESL (%): 14.2 Special needs (%): 6.3 French Imm (%): 0.0
 Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
 "on parents' avg. inc. of \$59,300: 1.7" Rank: 61/316 45/267

Academic Performance **2004 2005 2006 2007 2008**

Average exam mark 74.3 76.0 73.9 71.2 74.2
 Percentage of exams failed 5.6 5.2 6.2 7.1 4.8
 School vs exam mark difference 3.3 3.1 3.1 3.2 1.1
 English gender gap F 0.8 F 1.1 M 0.5 F 4.5 F 5.2
 Math gender gap M 0.8 F 0.5 M 0.3 F 1.2 F 1.0
 Graduation rate 95.3 98.2 98.0 92.0 93.8
 Delayed advancement rate 15.3 15.6 16.0 18.3 24.6
Overall rating out of 10 7.7 8.1 7.8 7.3 7.6

Port Moody [Public] Port Moody **Gr 12 Enrollment: 359**

ESL (%): 6.4 Special needs (%): 5.7 French Imm (%): 0.0
 Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
 "on parents' avg. inc. of \$64,800: 0.7" Rank: 117/316 78/267

Academic Performance **2004 2005 2006 2007 2008**

Average exam mark 73.3 74.0 71.9 70.0 70.6
 Percentage of exams failed 8.9 8.0 8.9 9.6 8.9
 School vs exam mark difference 6.0 5.0 4.9 3.2 2.0
 English gender gap F 1.6 F 1.1 M 0.5 F 2.5 F 2.7
 Math gender gap M 0.3 F 0.8 F 1.4 F 2.2 F 3.4
 Graduation rate 92.8 94.3 93.8 92.6 94.8
 Delayed advancement rate 24.6 21.8 20.9 15.4 24.0
Overall rating out of 10 6.9 7.2 7.2 7.3 6.8

Riverside [Public] Port Coquitlam **Gr 12 Enrollment: 334**

ESL (%): 4.0 Special needs (%): 9.5 French Imm (%): 14.5
 Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
 "on parents' avg. inc. of \$75,200: 0.1" Rank: 130/316 110/267

Academic Performance **2004 2005 2006 2007 2008**

Average exam mark 70.8 72.7 69.0 66.4 68.2
 Percentage of exams failed 9.4 7.9 9.5 10.7 8.5
 School vs exam mark difference 5.5 4.0 5.8 5.2 2.0
 English gender gap F 1.4 F 1.2 M 1.7 F 1.0 F 5.3
 Math gender gap M 1.7 M 0.1 M 1.7 F 2.2 F 3.8
 Graduation rate 97.5 96.7 94.1 94.9 94.6
 Delayed advancement rate 24.6 21.4 16.5 8.9 13.5
Overall rating out of 10 6.4 6.8 6.4 6.6 6.6

Terry Fox [Public] Port Coquitlam **Gr 12 Enrollment: 443**

ESL (%): 2.4 Special needs (%): 10.6 French Imm (%): 0.0
 Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
 "on parents' avg. inc. of \$68,000: 0.2" Rank: 149/316 136/267

Academic Performance **2004 2005 2006 2007 2008**

Average exam mark 69.6 70.1 66.0 63.5 66.5
 Percentage of exams failed 9.4 8.9 13.2 15.4 9.9
 School vs exam mark difference 4.1 4.1 5.4 5.8 3.4
 English gender gap F 1.6 F 1.9 M 1.8 F 2.4 F 5.8
 Math gender gap F 0.1 M 1.7 M 1.2 F 1.0 F 1.5
 Graduation rate 95.8 93.9 96.7 95.3 97.8
 Delayed advancement rate 22.4 23.6 12.6 8.0 12.9
Overall rating out of 10 6.5 6.4 6.4 6.0 6.4

DELTA

Burnsview [Public] Delta **Gr 12 Enrollment: 104**

ESL (%): 3.8 Special needs (%): 10.7 French Imm (%): 48.9
 Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
 "on parents' avg. inc. of \$69,100: 0.3" Rank: 130/316 n/a

Academic Performance **2004 2005 2006 2007 2008**

Average exam mark n/a n/a n/a 65.4 68.2
 Percentage of exams failed n/a n/a n/a 9.4 6.5
 School vs exam mark difference n/a n/a n/a 7.4 3.4
 English gender gap n/a n/a n/a F 6.0 F 8.5
 Math gender gap n/a n/a n/a F 0.6 F 1.1
 Graduation rate n/a n/a n/a 93.0 93.7
 Delayed advancement rate n/a n/a n/a 18.4 13.5
Overall rating out of 10 n/a n/a n/a 6.0 6.6

Delta [Public] Delta **Gr 12 Enrollment: 308**

ESL (%): 0.8 Special needs (%): 15.3 French Imm (%): 0.0
 Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
 "on parents' avg. inc. of \$81,700: 0.8" Rank: 61/316 86/267

Academic Performance **2004 2005 2006 2007 2008**

Average exam mark 73.5 72.9 68.8 66.7 68.9
 Percentage of exams failed 6.9 3.4 8.6 9.7 5.7
 School vs exam mark difference 4.0 4.7 5.8 5.4 1.2
 English gender gap F 1.3 M 0.5 F 0.2 F 3.5 F 4.0
 Math gender gap F 2.3 M 2.5 F 7.0 F 3.8 F 1.0
 Graduation rate 94.1 95.8 96.8 97.4 98.9
 Delayed advancement rate 25.4 21.0 23.8 12.0 14.0
Overall rating out of 10 7.0 7.2 6.4 6.8 7.6

Delta Access [Public] Delta **Gr 12 Enrollment: 24**

ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 0.0 French Imm (%): 0.0
 Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
 "on parents' avg. inc. of \$78,800: -6.6" Rank: 313/316 n/a

Academic Performance **2004 2005 2006 2007 2008**

Average exam mark n/a n/a n/a n/a 68.6
 Percentage of exams failed n/a n/a n/a n/a 7.1
 School vs exam mark difference n/a n/a n/a n/a 7.9
 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 n/a n/a n/a n/a 43.8
 Delayed advancement rate n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a
Overall rating out of 10 n/a n/a n/a n/a 0.0

Delview [Public] Delta **Gr 12 Enrollment: 74**

ESL (%): 3.1 Special needs (%): 16.4 French Imm (%): 0.0
 Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
 "on parents' avg. inc. of \$64,200: 0.5" Rank: 130/316 n/a

Academic Performance **2004 2005 2006 2007 2008**

Average exam mark n/a n/a n/a 65.8 69.3
 Percentage of exams failed n/a n/a n/a 10.6 7.9
 School vs exam mark difference n/a n/a n/a 4.3 2.3
 English gender gap n/a n/a n/a F 7.0 F 5.8
 Math gender gap n/a n/a n/a M 2.7 F 0.2
 Graduation rate n/a n/a n/a 92.1 92.3
 Delayed advancement rate n/a n/a n/a 27.9 35.5
Overall rating out of 10 n/a n/a n/a 6.2 6.6

North Delta [Public] Delta **Gr 12 Enrollment: 285**

ESL (%): 5.6 Special needs (%): 11.7 French Imm (%): 0.0
 Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
 "on parents' avg. inc. of \$59,200: -0.7" Rank: 238/316 190/267

Academic Performance **2004 2005 2006 2007 2008**

Average exam mark 67.9 68.1 68.5 64.3 66.1
 Percentage of exams failed 10.9 10.0 10.1 15.2 11.5
 School vs exam mark difference 6.7 6.1 4.9 6.3 4.4
 English gender gap M 0.2 F 3.4 F 2.3 F 10.6 F 7.0
 Math gender gap E F 1.9 F 0.7 M 1.9 F 2.5
 Graduation rate 92.1 93.3 95.1 89.4 89.0
 Delayed advancement rate 24.3 21.7 18.6 27.6 36.6
Overall rating out of 10 5.8 5.4 6.3 5.0 5.2

Sands [Public] Delta **Gr 12 Enrollment: 155**

ESL (%): 1.1 Special needs (%): 12.8 French Imm (%): 0.0
 Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
 "on parents' avg. inc. of \$72,600: -0.3" Rank: 172/316 n/a

Academic Performance **2004 2005 2006 2007 2008**

Average exam mark n/a n/a 66.2 64.5 65.9
 Percentage of exams failed n/a n/a 15.5 13.3 12.2
 School vs exam mark difference n/a n/a 5.4 4.2 2.4
 English gender gap n/a n/a F 3.6 F 5.6 F 7.8
 Math gender gap n/a n/a F 4.1 M 1.5 F 2.3
 Graduation rate n/a n/a 95.6 93.2 94.2
 Delayed advancement rate n/a n/a 20.7 17.5 16.1
Overall rating out of 10 n/a n/a 5.9 6.2 6.1

Seaquam [Public] Delta **Gr 12 Enrollment: 228**

ESL (%): 5.6 Special needs (%): 9.1 French Imm (%): 0.1
 Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
 "on parents' avg. inc. of \$74,800: 0.5" Rank: 104/316 64/267

Academic Performance **2004 2005 2006 2007 2008**

Average exam mark 72.6 73.2 70.0 68.5 69.7
 Percentage of exams failed 9.5 7.8 9.2 10.7 8.2
 School vs exam mark difference 7.1 5.8 4.7 4.0 2.4
 English gender gap M 1.1 M 2.3 F 0.3 F 0.3 F 7.1
 Math gender gap F 3.3 F 0.7 M 0.2 F 2.3 F 0.3
 Graduation rate 93.8 95.1 96.7 95.6 94.8
 Delayed advancement rate 14.5 13.9 16.0 11.7 10.3
Overall rating out of 10 7.1 7.3 7.4 7.2 7.0

South Delta [Public] Delta **Gr 12 Enrollment: 254**

ESL (%): 0.2 Special needs (%): 14.3 French Imm (%): 10.2
 Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
 "on parents' avg. inc. of \$104,500: -0.4" Rank: 79/316 102/267

Academic Performance **2004 2005 2006 2007 2008**

Average exam mark 68.0 69.5 70.0 67.8 70.9
 Percentage of exams failed 12.7 8.9 7.9 9.0 4.8
 School vs exam mark difference 7.0 7.5 5.5 5.5 2.5
 English gender gap F 3.3 M 0.1 F 1.4 F 2.9 F 7.9
 Math gender gap F 2.7 F 4.0 M 2.1 F 2.1 F 5.0
 Graduation rate 94.7 96.6 99.2 95.0 97.0
 Delayed advancement rate 20.2 13.6 6.1 9.9 14.3
Overall rating out of 10 5.6 6.2 7.4 7.0 7.3

Southpointe [Independent] Delta **Gr 12 Enrollment: 29**

ESL (%): 0.7 Special needs (%): n/a French Imm (%): n/a
 Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
 "on parents' avg. inc. of \$90,600: 1.5" Rank: 22/316 n/a

Academic Performance **2004 2005 2006 2007 2008**

Average exam mark n/a n/a n/a n/a 74.5 78.8
 Percentage of exams failed n/a n/a n/a n/a 3.0 1.1
 School vs exam mark difference n/a n/a n/a n/a 6.3 2.0
 English gender gap n/a n/a n/a n/a F 4.0 M 3.6
 Math gender gap n/a n/a n/a n/a F 2.7 M 13.9
 Graduation rate n/a n/a n/a n/a 100.0 100.0
 Delayed advancement rate n/a n/a n/a n/a 8.9 5.3
Overall rating out of 10 n/a n/a n/a n/a 8.1 8.6

MAPLE RIDGE-PITT MEADOWS

Garibaldi [Public] Maple Ridge **Gr 12 Enrollment: 187**

ESL (%): 0.1 Special needs (%): 14.7 French Imm (%): 0.0
 Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
 "on parents' avg. inc. of \$70,200: -0.9" Rank: 228/316 196/267

Academic Performance **2004 2005 2006 2007 2008**

Average exam mark 69.2 68.9 64.1 64.2 64.5
 Percentage of exams failed 8.0 6.8 15.2 13.7 10.9
 School vs exam mark difference 3.0 4.9 6.4 5.6 4.8
 English gender gap F 3.2 F 3.6 M 2.9 F 1.9 F 1.7
 Math gender gap F 6.0 F 3.7 F 0.9 F 4.5 F 1.2
 Graduation rate 93.0 98.0 89.7 90.1 88.5
 Delayed advancement rate 30.2 29.1 39.9 24.1 25.1
Overall rating out of 10 5.5 5.8 4.9 5.5 5.4

Maple Ridge [Public] Maple Ridge **Gr 12 Enrollment: 286**

ESL (%): 0.3 Special needs (%): 8.0 French Imm (%): 23.7
 Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
 "on parents' avg. inc. of \$71,100: 0.8" Rank: 98/316 155/267

Academic Performance **2004 2005 2006 2007 2008**

Average exam mark 68.1 67.9 67.3 65.1 68.2
 Percentage of exams failed 10.2 11.7 10.2 12.4 8.5
 School vs exam mark difference 6.1 5.7 5.1 4.4 1.4
 English gender gap M 0.6 F 3.5 F 2.8 F 2.4 F 5.3
 Math gender gap M 2.9 F 0.9 F 5.4 F 3.5 M 3.1
 Graduation rate 94.2 95.0 93.2 92.5 97.0
 Delayed advancement rate 37.9 30.8 30.2 19.3 6.1
Overall rating out of 10 5.4 5.4 5.8 6.2 7.1

Maple Ridge Christian [Ind.] Maple Ridge **Gr 12 Enrollment: 25**

ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): n/a French Imm (%): n/a
 Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
 "on parents' avg. inc. of \$80,600: 1.3" Rank: 41/316 31/267

Academic Performance **2004 2005 2006 2007 2008**

Average exam mark 74.4 77.7 69.6 74.1 73.3
 Percentage of exams failed 5.3 3.6 6.4 4.2 2.6
 School vs exam mark difference 5.6 3.3 7.7 3.4 3.5
 English gender gap F 3.1 F 3.8 M 0.1 F 5.4 F 5.7
 Math gender gap n/a n/a n/a M 10.0 M 2.7
 Graduation rate 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0
 Delayed advancement rate 13.1 12.8 3.5 0.0 0.0
Overall rating out of 10 7.5 8.7 7.0 8.2 8.0

Meadowridge [Independent] Maple Ridge **Gr 12 Enrollment: 35**

ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): n/a French Imm (%): n/a
 Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
 "on parents' avg. inc. of \$86,500: 2.5" Rank: 9/316 11/267

Academic Performance **2004 2005 2006 2007 2008**

Average exam mark 79.3 73.0 77.4 82.0 81.9
 Percentage of exams failed 1.1 7.4 4.7 1.2 0.6
 School vs exam mark difference 5.5 7.4 3.5 3.2 1.9
 English gender gap M 5.2 M 1.8 F 1.9 F 3.5 F 9.7
 Math gender gap n/a F 6.5 M 0.6 F 4.3 M 0.1
 Graduation rate 95.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0
 Delayed advancement rate 0.5 0.0 0.4 0.0 0.0
Overall rating out of 10 9.5 8.2 9.7 9.6 9.5

Pitt Meadows [Public] Pitt Meadows **Gr 12 Enrollment: 163**

ESL (%): 0.9 Special needs (%): 8.7 French Imm (%): 10.4
 Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
 "on parents' avg. inc. of \$71,000: -0.1" Rank: 166/316 140/267

Academic Performance **2004 2005 2006 2007 2008**

Average exam mark 69.3 72.6 66.3 65.0 67.5
 Percentage of exams failed 7.4 3.8 13.2 14.1 9.9
 School vs exam mark difference 5.4 4.6 7.9 8.2 5.2
 English gender gap F 3.6 M 0.6 F 0.4 F 4.0 F 3.5
 Math gender gap M 1.7 M 2.0 M 0.9 F 0.5 F 3.7
 Graduation rate 97.5 95.0 97.3 97.2 96.6
 Delayed advancement rate 19.7 25.4 23.4 26.5 24.2
Overall rating out of 10 6.4 7.0 5.8 5.7 6.2

Spectrum [Public] Victoria Gr 12 Enrollment: 314
ESL (%): 1.5 Special needs (%): 9.6 French Imm (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
'on parents' avg. inc. of \$66,200: -1.1" Rank: 251/316 234/267
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Average exam mark 67.3 66.4 64.6 62.8 63.8

HAIDA GWAIL/QUEEN CHARLOTTE
George M Dawson [Public] Masset Gr 12 Enrollment: 26
ESL (%): 18.5 Special needs (%): 13.1 French Imm (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
'on parents' avg. inc. of \$21,400: -4.4" Rank: 313/316 267/267
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Average exam mark 51.4 52.8 52.2 54.2 50.0

Dover Bay [Public] Nanaimo Gr 12 Enrollment: 285
ESL (%): 1.0 Special needs (%): 6.7 French Imm (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
'on parents' avg. inc. of \$68,400: 1.4" Rank: 61/316 59/267
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Average exam mark 71.5 72.9 70.7 69.4 70.6

St Andrew's [Independent] Victoria Gr 12 Enrollment: 83
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): n/a French Imm (%): n/a
Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
'on parents' avg. inc. of \$72,600: 0.8" Rank: 93/316 37/267
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Average exam mark 74.9 72.0 71.0 69.1 70.0

Queen Charlotte [Public] Queen Charlotte Gr 12 Enrollment: 27
ESL (%): 11.0 Special needs (%): 16.2 French Imm (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
'on parents' avg. inc. of \$44,400: 1.2" Rank: 139/316 n/a
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Average exam mark 59.7 67.2 n/a 66.5 68.4

John Barsby [Public] Nanaimo Gr 12 Enrollment: 117
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 15.0 French Imm (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
'on parents' avg. inc. of \$40,900: -0.6" Rank: 277/316 256/267
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Average exam mark 62.8 62.3 59.7 60.6 62.5

St Margaret's [Independent] Victoria Gr 12 Enrollment: 23
ESL (%): 3.0 Special needs (%): n/a French Imm (%): n/a
Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
'on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 8/316 15/267
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Average exam mark 76.6 78.1 77.9 76.6 81.5

HOWE SOUND
Howe Sound [Public] Squamish Gr 12 Enrollment: 200
ESL (%): 0.8 Special needs (%): 15.0 French Imm (%): 3.8
Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
'on parents' avg. inc. of \$50,600: -0.6" Rank: 258/316 185/267
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Average exam mark 68.3 72.0 67.4 63.3 63.9

Ladysmith [Public] Ladysmith Gr 12 Enrollment: 160
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 5.7 French Imm (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
'on parents' avg. inc. of \$57,200: -0.3" Rank: 219/316 190/267
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Average exam mark 68.8 68.9 65.1 62.5 65.3

St Michaels [Independent] Victoria Gr 12 Enrollment: 104
ESL (%): 1.0 Special needs (%): n/a French Imm (%): n/a
Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
'on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 10/316 8/267
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Average exam mark 79.2 79.5 80.3 80.7 82.9

Pemberton [Public] Pemberton Gr 12 Enrollment: 49
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 18.7 French Imm (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
'on parents' avg. inc. of \$33,500: 0.4" Rank: 238/316 234/267
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Average exam mark 63.0 62.7 64.5 65.4 66.5

Learn @ Home 8-12 [Public] Nanaimo Gr 12 Enrollment: 31
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 0.0 French Imm (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
'on parents' avg. inc. of \$53,000: -2.3" Rank: 301/316 n/a
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Average exam mark n/a n/a n/a n/a 66.6

Victoria High [Public] Victoria Gr 12 Enrollment: 180
ESL (%): 3.8 Special needs (%): 16.7 French Imm (%): 2.0
Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
'on parents' avg. inc. of \$53,100: -0.8" Rank: 261/316 224/267
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Average exam mark 69.6 67.9 65.4 65.0 65.7

Whistler [Public] Whistler Gr 12 Enrollment: 77
ESL (%): 1.1 Special needs (%): 7.7 French Imm (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
'on parents' avg. inc. of \$87,000: 1.0" Rank: 41/316 55/267
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Average exam mark 74.8 75.7 74.0 72.7 73.9

Nanaimo Christian [Independent] Nanaimo Gr 12 Enrollment: 23
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): n/a French Imm (%): n/a
Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
'on parents' avg. inc. of \$57,900: 1.8" Rank: 61/316 n/a
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Average exam mark n/a n/a 67.8 67.6 70.7

GULF ISLANDS
Gulf Islands [Public] Salt Spring Island Gr 12 Enrollment: 121
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 11.2 French Imm (%): 13.9
Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
'on parents' avg. inc. of \$57,700: 1.0" Rank: 117/316 102/267
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Average exam mark 71.2 75.1 71.0 67.1 69.7

NANAIMO-LADYSMITH
Cedar [Public] Nanaimo Gr 12 Enrollment: 71
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 11.2 French Imm (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
'on parents' avg. inc. of \$53,800: -3.6" Rank: 310/316 249/267
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Average exam mark 67.0 67.1 58.5 58.7 57.4

Nanaimo District [Public] Nanaimo Gr 12 Enrollment: 205
ESL (%): 0.4 Special needs (%): 10.0 French Imm (%): 19.9
Actual rating vs predicted based 2007-08 Last 5 Years
'on parents' avg. inc. of \$53,100: -0.7" Rank: 258/316 224/267
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Average exam mark 67.7 68.5 65.6 64.6 66.8

MISSION

Table for Mission school: Hatzić [Public] Mission, Gr 12 Enrollment: 124. Includes ESL, Special needs, French Imm, Academic Performance (2004-2008), and Overall rating.

Table for Heritage Park [Public] Mission, Gr 12 Enrollment: 123. Includes ESL, Special needs, French Imm, Academic Performance (2004-2008), and Overall rating.

Table for Mission [Public] Mission, Gr 12 Enrollment: 172. Includes ESL, Special needs, French Imm, Academic Performance (2004-2008), and Overall rating.

NICOLA-SIMILKAMEEN

Table for Distance Ed - S. Central Interior [Public] Merritt, Gr 12 Enrollment: 91. Includes ESL, Special needs, French Imm, Academic Performance (2004-2008), and Overall rating.

Table for Merritt [Public] Merritt, Gr 12 Enrollment: 144. Includes ESL, Special needs, French Imm, Academic Performance (2004-2008), and Overall rating.

Table for Princeton [Public] Princeton, Gr 12 Enrollment: 51. Includes ESL, Special needs, French Imm, Academic Performance (2004-2008), and Overall rating.

OKANAGAN SIMILKAMEEN

Table for Osyoos [Public] Osyoos, Gr 12 Enrollment: 58. Includes ESL, Special needs, French Imm, Academic Performance (2004-2008), and Overall rating.

Table for Similkameen [Public] Keremeos, Gr 12 Enrollment: 52. Includes ESL, Special needs, French Imm, Academic Performance (2004-2008), and Overall rating.

Table for Southern Okanagan [Public] Oliver, Gr 12 Enrollment: 92. Includes ESL, Special needs, French Imm, Academic Performance (2004-2008), and Overall rating.

OKANAGAN SKAHA

Table for Penticon [Public] Penticon, Gr 12 Enrollment: 296. Includes ESL, Special needs, French Imm, Academic Performance (2004-2008), and Overall rating.

Table for Princess Margaret [Public] Penticon, Gr 12 Enrollment: 143. Includes ESL, Special needs, French Imm, Academic Performance (2004-2008), and Overall rating.

Table for Summerland [Public] Summerland, Gr 12 Enrollment: 139. Includes ESL, Special needs, French Imm, Academic Performance (2004-2008), and Overall rating.

SOUTHEAST KOOTENAY

Table for Elkford [Public] Elkford, Gr 12 Enrollment: 21. Includes ESL, Special needs, French Imm, Academic Performance (2004-2008), and Overall rating.

Table for Fernie [Public] Fernie, Gr 12 Enrollment: 68. Includes ESL, Special needs, French Imm, Academic Performance (2004-2008), and Overall rating.

Table for Mount Baker [Public] Cranbrook, Gr 12 Enrollment: 295. Includes ESL, Special needs, French Imm, Academic Performance (2004-2008), and Overall rating.

Table for Sparwood [Public] Sparwood, Gr 12 Enrollment: 62. Includes ESL, Special needs, French Imm, Academic Performance (2004-2008), and Overall rating.

VERNON

Table for Charles Bloom [Public] Lumby, Gr 12 Enrollment: 77. Includes ESL, Special needs, French Imm, Academic Performance (2004-2008), and Overall rating.

Table for Clarence Fulton [Public] Vernon, Gr 12 Enrollment: 179. Includes ESL, Special needs, French Imm, Academic Performance (2004-2008), and Overall rating.

Kalamalka [Public] Vernon		Gr 12 Enrollment: 136			
ESL (%): 0.0	Special needs (%): 4.2	French Imm (%): 0.0			
Actual rating vs predicted based		2007-08		Last 5 Years	
"on parents' avg. inc. of \$82,100: 0.8"		Rank: 61/316		37/267	
Academic Performance	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Average exam mark	74.2	71.2	71.1	71.1	71.2
Percentage of exams failed	2.5	5.9	6.0	5.1	5.7
School vs exam mark difference	6.1	6.7	4.1	3.5	2.3
English gender gap	F 0.8	F 0.3	F 3.8	F 5.9	F 10.1
Math gender gap	F 4.0	F 2.9	F 3.7	F 0.3	F 2.0
Graduation rate	100.0	100.0	97.2	99.2	99.2
Delayed advancement rate	2.0	7.3	8.5	15.8	2.6
Overall rating out of 10	8.2	7.6	7.5	7.9	7.6

Vernon [Public] Vernon		Gr 12 Enrollment: 209			
ESL (%): 0.2	Special needs (%): 7.3	French Imm (%): 0.0			
Actual rating vs predicted based		2007-08		Last 5 Years	
"on parents' avg. inc. of \$64,200: -0.5"		Rank: 208/316		185/267	
Academic Performance	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Average exam mark	68.3	69.0	65.4	64.7	66.4
Percentage of exams failed	11.1	9.4	11.6	13.6	9.3
School vs exam mark difference	6.9	6.4	7.6	7.9	7.2
English gender gap	F 2.6	F 4.6	F 2.2	F 2.4	F 4.4
Math gender gap	F 3.1	M 0.9	F 3.3	F 5.5	F 4.7
Graduation rate	96.3	95.5	95.1	94.1	95.7
Delayed advancement rate	30.9	37.1	27.7	21.1	13.6
Overall rating out of 10	5.7	5.6	5.7	5.4	5.6

Vernon Christian [Independent] Vernon		Gr 12 Enrollment: 22			
ESL (%): 0.0	Special needs (%): n/a	French Imm (%): n/a			
Actual rating vs predicted based		2007-08		Last 5 Years	
"on parents' avg. inc. of \$62,100: 1.4"		Rank: 74/316		n/a	
Academic Performance	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Average exam mark	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	69.3
Percentage of exams failed	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	6.7
School vs exam mark difference	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4.3
English gender gap	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	F 6.9
Math gender gap	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	F 0.8
Graduation rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100.0
Delayed advancement rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1.9
Overall rating out of 10	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	7.4

W L Seaton [Public] Vernon		Gr 12 Enrollment: 153			
ESL (%): 2.1	Special needs (%): 7.8	French Imm (%): 25.2			
Actual rating vs predicted based		2007-08		Last 5 Years	
"on parents' avg. inc. of \$55,900: -1.0"		Rank: 267/316		211/267	
Academic Performance	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Average exam mark	70.7	69.4	65.3	64.0	64.6
Percentage of exams failed	10.4	10.1	16.6	16.7	15.6
School vs exam mark difference	7.7	7.2	7.8	6.8	6.3
English gender gap	F 3.5	F 4.0	F 2.5	F 4.3	F 6.3
Math gender gap	F 4.1	F 0.5	F 5.4	F 5.4	F 5.6
Graduation rate	93.8	97.2	87.1	94.1	98.3
Delayed advancement rate	27.4	30.2	42.1	31.9	37.2
Overall rating out of 10	5.8	6.0	4.5	5.2	4.7

Clearwater [Public] Clearwater Gr 12 Enrollment: 51
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 18.0 French Imm (%): 0.0
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Overall rating out of 10 4.5 2.4 3.0 5.0 5.4

St Ann's [Independent] Kamloops Gr 12 Enrollment: 53
ESL (%): 0.2 Special needs (%): n/a French Imm (%): n/a
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Overall rating out of 10 7.3 5.7 6.7 8.0 8.0

Lakes District [Public] Burns Lake Gr 12 Enrollment: 91
ESL (%): 5.1 Special needs (%): 11.8 French Imm (%): 0.0
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Overall rating out of 10 4.9 4.6 5.4 5.5 3.4

Kamloops Christian [Independent] Kamloops Gr 12 Enrollment: 29
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): n/a French Imm (%): n/a
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Overall rating out of 10 6.6 5.5 7.0 7.8 5.7

Valleyview [Public] Kamloops Gr 12 Enrollment: 138
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 4.5 French Imm (%): 0.0
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Overall rating out of 10 5.2 7.3 6.5 6.8 6.3

Nechako Valley [Public] Vanderhoof Gr 12 Enrollment: 117
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 8.4 French Imm (%): 0.0
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Overall rating out of 10 4.0 3.3 4.4 4.4 4.6

Logan Lake [Public] Logan Lake Gr 12 Enrollment: 20
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 8.5 French Imm (%): 0.0
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Overall rating out of 10 5.0 4.6 4.5 5.7 5.9

Westside [Public] Kamloops Gr 12 Enrollment: 145
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 9.5 French Imm (%): 0.0
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Overall rating out of 10 4.6 5.5 5.8 6.2 6.0

NORTH OKANAGAN-SHUSWAP
A.L. Fortune [Public] Enderby Gr 12 Enrollment: 76
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 14.0 French Imm (%): 0.0
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Overall rating out of 10 3.2 4.1 4.5 4.7 5.2

Norkam [Public] Kamloops Gr 12 Enrollment: 159
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 13.7 French Imm (%): 0.0
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Overall rating out of 10 5.7 5.4 4.6 5.6 5.6

NECHAKO LAKES
Ebus Academy [Public] Vanderhoof Gr 12 Enrollment: 39
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 5.9 French Imm (%): 0.0
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Overall rating out of 10 n/a n/a n/a n/a 3.7

Anchor Academy (DL) [Ind.] Salmon Arm Gr 12 Enrollment: 37
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): n/a French Imm (%): n/a
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Overall rating out of 10 n/a n/a n/a n/a 0.3

Sa-Hali [Public] Kamloops Gr 12 Enrollment: 137
ESL (%): 0.3 Special needs (%): 6.5 French Imm (%): 0.0
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Overall rating out of 10 7.9 7.1 6.4 7.0 5.9

Fort St James [Public] Fort St James Gr 12 Enrollment: 57
ESL (%): 18.5 Special needs (%): 14.5 French Imm (%): 0.0
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Overall rating out of 10 2.5 3.2 4.1 3.3 3.9

Eagle River [Public] Sicamous Gr 12 Enrollment: 40
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 16.2 French Imm (%): 0.0
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Overall rating out of 10 5.2 3.4 5.4 4.9 5.0

South Kamloops [Public] Kamloops Gr 12 Enrollment: 294
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 3.7 French Imm (%): 16.2
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Overall rating out of 10 7.1 7.7 7.2 7.1 6.9

Fraser Lake [Public] Fraser Lake Gr 12 Enrollment: 32
ESL (%): 5.6 Special needs (%): 11.8 French Imm (%): 0.0
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Overall rating out of 10 4.1 3.7 5.1 5.2 5.8

Pleasant Valley [Public] Armstrong Gr 12 Enrollment: 130
ESL (%): 0.2 Special needs (%): 10.5 French Imm (%): 0.0
Academic Performance 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008
Overall rating out of 10 5.5 5.3 5.2 6.0 5.0

ROCKY MOUNTAIN**David Thompson [Public] Invermere Gr 12 Enrollment: 91**

ESL (%): 1.2	Special needs (%): 6.6	French Imm (%): 0.0			
Actual rating vs predicted based	2007-08	Last 5 Years			
"on parents' avg. inc. of \$38,000: 1.0"	Rank: 181/316	147/267			
Academic Performance	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Average exam mark	67.7	68.5	66.3	65.3	67.1
Percentage of exams failed	7.9	7.1	9.6	14.3	10.2
School vs exam mark difference	4.9	4.1	5.2	6.9	5.1
English gender gap	F 1.5	M 4.3	F 0.9	F 4.0	F 5.4
Math gender gap	M 2.0	F 2.6	F 3.9	F 4.0	M 0.7
Graduation rate	93.9	97.6	98.0	88.2	93.0
Delayed advancement rate	36.0	31.4	37.5	41.2	13.3
Overall rating out of 10	6.3	6.6	6.2	5.2	6.0

Golden [Public] Golden Gr 12 Enrollment: 87

ESL (%): 0.5	Special needs (%): 8.3	French Imm (%): 16.3			
Actual rating vs predicted based	2007-08	Last 5 Years			
"on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a"	Rank: 139/316	169/267			
Academic Performance	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Average exam mark	66.1	66.0	65.2	64.9	67.7
Percentage of exams failed	12.1	16.5	17.3	13.8	7.4
School vs exam mark difference	9.7	10.6	9.4	6.7	4.2
English gender gap	M 1.6	F 4.5	M 1.9	F 5.7	F 7.1
Math gender gap	F 5.7	F 0.3	M 1.7	M 0.6	F 6.7
Graduation rate	98.1	100.0	98.9	96.3	100.0
Delayed advancement rate	0.0	0.0	7.9	15.0	12.2
Overall rating out of 10	5.7	5.0	5.8	6.0	6.5

Selkirk [Public] Kimberley Gr 12 Enrollment: 72

ESL (%): 1.0	Special needs (%): 9.7	French Imm (%): 0.0			
Actual rating vs predicted based	2007-08	Last 5 Years			
"on parents' avg. inc. of \$54,200: -1.0"	Rank: 267/316	204/267			
Academic Performance	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Average exam mark	67.1	63.7	64.2	62.5	64.6
Percentage of exams failed	8.6	16.6	14.1	14.1	11.6
School vs exam mark difference	7.9	8.2	11.4	11.9	8.4
English gender gap	F 0.6	F 0.2	F 1.6	F 4.1	F 8.4
Math gender gap	F 2.6	F 2.0	F 9.4	F 0.7	M 2.7
Graduation rate	96.4	98.8	98.6	93.2	91.0
Delayed advancement rate	11.4	20.8	24.9	13.6	25.2
Overall rating out of 10	6.5	5.7	4.8	5.0	4.7

Yukon

YUKON

F.H. Collins (Public) Whitehorse		Gr 12 Enrollment: 124			
ESL (%): n/a	Special needs (%): n/a	French Imm (%): n/a			
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a		2007-08	Last 5 Years		
		Rank:	166/316	n/a	
Academic Performance	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Average exam mark	n/a	64.3	66.5	64.0	67.7
Percentage of exams failed	n/a	17.0	15.6	17.7	12.0
School vs exam mark difference	n/a	8.6	4.8	5.3	2.8
English gender gap	n/a	F 3.0	F 2.9	F 9.4	F 4.7
Math gender gap	n/a	F 2.8	F 5.4	F 2.3	F 7.1
Graduation rate	n/a	96.8	95.8	96.3	97.0
Delayed advancement rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	n/a	5.2	5.9	5.7	6.2

Porter Creek (Public) Whitehorse		Gr 12 Enrollment: 129			
ESL (%): n/a	Special needs (%): n/a	French Imm (%): n/a			
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a		2007-08	Last 5 Years		
		Rank:	251/316	n/a	
Academic Performance	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Average exam mark	n/a	65.3	62.2	60.8	64.2
Percentage of exams failed	n/a	18.4	18.8	25.4	15.0
School vs exam mark difference	n/a	9.9	7.5	5.9	5.4
English gender gap	n/a	F 3.6	F 7.3	F 5.3	F 8.0
Math gender gap	n/a	F 1.8	F 2.6	M 5.1	F 5.6
Graduation rate	n/a	98.3	95.1	91.9	98.5
Delayed advancement rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	n/a	5.0	4.5	4.0	5.0

Vanier Catholic (Public) Whitehorse		Gr 12 Enrollment: 83			
ESL (%): n/a	Special needs (%): n/a	French Imm (%): n/a			
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a		2007-08	Last 5 Years		
		Rank:	70/316	n/a	
Academic Performance	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Average exam mark	n/a	66.5	70.4	67.4	70.8
Percentage of exams failed	n/a	17.9	9.6	9.5	5.5
School vs exam mark difference	n/a	8.0	7.3	5.4	3.2
English gender gap	n/a	F 0.5	F 4.8	F 1.2	F 5.3
Math gender gap	n/a	F 0.6	F 0.2	M 0.7	M 3.0
Graduation rate	n/a	95.2	98.6	94.3	98.7
Delayed advancement rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	n/a	5.9	7.0	6.9	7.5

Watson Lake High (Public) Watson Lake		Gr 12 Enrollment: 16			
ESL (%): n/a	Special needs (%): n/a	French Imm (%): n/a			
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a		2007-08	Last 5 Years		
		Rank:	306/316	n/a	
Academic Performance	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Average exam mark	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	59.3
Percentage of exams failed	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	23.3
School vs exam mark difference	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	7.4
English gender gap	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	F 11.6
Math gender gap	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	F 5.0
Graduation rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	86.7
Delayed advancement rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.1

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 313) 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 2007/2008. 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 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; and certain alternative schools that do not offer a full program of courses.

The exclusion of a school from the *Report Card* should not 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	Rank		School name	City	Overall rating	
	2007/2008	Last 5 years			2007/2008	Last 5 years
1	1	1	Southridge	Surrey	10.0	10.0
1	1	1	St George's	Vancouver	10.0	10.0
1	1	1	York House	Vancouver	10.0	10.0
1	4	1	West Point Grey	Vancouver	10.0	9.9
5	4	5	Crofton House	Vancouver	9.9	9.9
6	4	6	Little Flower	Vancouver	9.7	9.9
6	16	6	Mulgrave	West Vancouver	9.7	8.8
8	15	8	St Margaret's	Victoria	9.6	8.9
9	11	9	Meadowridge	Maple Ridge	9.5	9.3
10	8	10	St Michaels	Victoria	9.3	9.6
10	9	10	Brentwood College	Mill Bay	9.3	9.4
10	9	10	Shawnigan Lake	Shawnigan Lake	9.3	9.4
10	12	10	Glenlyon Norfolk	Victoria	9.3	9.2
14	17	14	Pacific Academy	Surrey	9.2	8.7
14	49	14	Timothy Christian	Chilliwack	9.2	7.6
16	7	16	Vancouver College	Vancouver	9.1	9.7
16	12	16	University Hill	Vancouver	9.1	9.2
16	14	16	Collingwood	West Vancouver	9.1	9.0
19	19	19	St Thomas Aquinas	North Vancouver	9.0	8.6

Rank	Rank		School name	City	Overall rating	
	2007/2008	Last 5 years			2007/2008	Last 5 years
20	n/a	20	Maxwell International	Shawnigan Lake	8.8	n/a
21	17	21	Lord Byng	Vancouver	8.7	8.7
22	26	22	St Thomas More	Burnaby	8.6	8.1
22	37	22	White Rock Christian	Surrey	8.6	7.8
22	49	22	Abbotsford Christian	Abbotsford	8.6	7.6
22	n/a	22	Relevant	Surrey	8.6	n/a
22	n/a	22	Southpointe	Delta	8.6	n/a
27	26	27	Richmond Christian	Richmond	8.4	8.1
27	31	27	Okanagan Mission	Kelowna	8.4	7.9
27	37	27	Immaculata	Kelowna	8.4	7.8
27	55	27	Holy Cross	Surrey	8.4	7.4
31	19	31	Kelowna Christian	Kelowna	8.3	8.6
31	22	31	Sentinel	West Vancouver	8.3	8.4
31	29	31	Mennonite Educational Institute	Abbotsford	8.3	8.0
31	37	31	Highroad	Chilliwack	8.3	7.8
31	49	31	St John's	Vancouver	8.3	7.6
36	22	36	Rockridge	West Vancouver	8.2	8.4
37	19	37	Prince Of Wales	Vancouver	8.1	8.6
37	29	37	Handsworth	North Vancouver	8.1	8.0

Rank		School name	City	Overall rating		Rank		School name	City	Overall rating	
2007/2008	Last 5 years			2007/2008	Last 5 years	2007/2008	Last 5 years			2007/2008	Last 5 years
37	37	Langley Fine Arts	Fort Langley	8.1	7.8	93	n/a	Ebenezer	Smithers	7.2	n/a
37	64	Credo Christian	Langley	8.1	7.2	98	64	Gleneagle	Coquitlam	7.1	7.2
41	26	Archbishop Carney	Port Coquitlam	8.0	8.1	98	97	Clayton Heights	Surrey	7.1	6.8
41	31	Maple Ridge Christian	Maple Ridge	8.0	7.9	98	110	Burnaby Mountain	Burnaby	7.1	6.6
41	55	Whistler	Whistler	8.0	7.4	98	155	Maple Ridge	Maple Ridge	7.1	6.0
41	78	St Ann's	Kamloops	8.0	7.1	98	n/a	Cedars Christian	Prince George	7.1	n/a
45	31	Claremont	Victoria	7.9	7.9	98	n/a	Langley Fundamental	Langley	7.1	n/a
45	31	Kitsilano	Vancouver	7.9	7.9	104	37	Mount Douglas	Victoria	7.0	7.8
45	n/a	Regent Christian	Surrey	7.9	n/a	104	64	Parkland	Sidney	7.0	7.2
48	24	Point Grey	Vancouver	7.8	8.2	104	64	Seaquam	Delta	7.0	7.2
48	45	Magee	Vancouver	7.8	7.7	104	86	Notre Dame	Vancouver	7.0	7.0
48	55	L V Rogers	Nelson	7.8	7.4	104	90	Johnston Heights	Surrey	7.0	6.9
48	59	Robert Bateman	Abbotsford	7.8	7.3	104	97	R. E. Mountain	Langley	7.0	6.8
48	78	Campbell River Christian	Campbell River	7.8	7.1	104	136	Chemainus	Chemainus	7.0	6.3
48	78	Moscrop	Burnaby	7.8	7.1	111	59	New Westminster	New Westminster	6.9	7.3
48	n/a	Heritage Woods	Port Moody	7.8	n/a	111	64	South Kamloops	Kamloops	6.9	7.2
55	31	Semiahmoo	Surrey	7.7	7.9	111	110	Killarney	Vancouver	6.9	6.6
55	45	Fraser Heights	Surrey	7.7	7.7	111	147	D P Todd	Prince George	6.9	6.1
55	59	Kelowna	Kelowna	7.7	7.3	111	147	R C Palmer	Richmond	6.9	6.1
55	59	Oak Bay	Victoria	7.7	7.3	111	169	Frank Hurt	Surrey	6.9	5.8
55	64	Fleetwood Park	Surrey	7.7	7.2	117	64	Sparwood	Sparwood	6.8	7.2
55	64	Richmond	Richmond	7.7	7.2	117	78	Port Moody	Port Moody	6.8	7.1
61	24	West Vancouver	West Vancouver	7.6	8.2	117	102	Fraser Valley Christian	Surrey	6.8	6.7
61	37	Elgin Park	Surrey	7.6	7.8	117	102	Gulf Islands	Salt Spring Island	6.8	6.7
61	37	Kalamalka	Vernon	7.6	7.8	117	n/a	Carver Christian	Burnaby	6.8	n/a
61	45	Pinetree	Coquitlam	7.6	7.7	117	n/a	Mount Cheam Christian	Chilliwack	6.8	n/a
61	59	Dover Bay	Nanaimo	7.6	7.3	123	78	Burnaby North	Burnaby	6.7	7.1
61	64	J N Burnett	Richmond	7.6	7.2	123	97	Sullivan Heights	Surrey	6.7	6.8
61	86	Delta	Delta	7.6	7.0	123	110	Lambrick Park	Victoria	6.7	6.6
61	n/a	Nanaimo Christian	Nanaimo	7.6	n/a	123	123	St John Brebeuf	Abbotsford	6.7	6.5
61	n/a	Sir Alexander MacKenzie	Hagensborg	7.6	n/a	123	129	Tamanawis	Surrey	6.7	6.4
70	64	Argyle	North Vancouver	7.5	7.2	123	n/a	Duncan Christian	Duncan	6.7	n/a
70	64	Dr. Charles Best	Coquitlam	7.5	7.2	123	n/a	Panorama Ridge	Surrey	6.7	n/a
70	102	Unity Christian School	Chilliwack	7.5	6.7	130	64	Yale	Abbotsford	6.6	7.2
70	n/a	Vanier Catholic	Whitehorse	7.5	n/a	130	78	Princess Margaret	Surrey	6.6	7.1
74	49	Seycove	North Vancouver	7.4	7.6	130	102	Highland	Comox	6.6	6.7
74	53	St Patrick's	Vancouver	7.4	7.5	130	110	Riverside	Port Coquitlam	6.6	6.6
74	78	J Lloyd Crowe	Trail	7.4	7.1	130	110	Sardis	Chilliwack	6.6	6.6
74	102	Walnut Grove	Langley	7.4	6.7	130	147	Hugh Boyd	Richmond	6.6	6.1
74	n/a	Vernon Christian	Vernon	7.4	n/a	130	n/a	Abbotsford Traditional	Abbotsford	6.6	n/a
79	31	Hugh McRoberts	Richmond	7.3	7.9	130	n/a	Burnsview	Delta	6.6	n/a
79	45	Sir Winston Churchill	Vancouver	7.3	7.7	130	n/a	Delview	Delta	6.6	n/a
79	53	Pacific Christian	Victoria	7.3	7.5	139	86	Penticton	Penticton	6.5	7.0
79	55	Rossland	Rossland	7.3	7.4	139	110	Brookwood	Langley	6.5	6.6
79	64	Langley Christian	Langley	7.3	7.2	139	110	D W Poppy	Langley	6.5	6.6
79	64	W J Mouat	Abbotsford	7.3	7.2	139	129	Boundary Central	Midway	6.5	6.4
79	78	Earl Marriott	Surrey	7.3	7.1	139	136	Ballenas	Parksville	6.5	6.3
79	90	North Surrey	Surrey	7.3	6.9	139	169	Golden	Golden	6.5	5.8
79	90	Robert Alexander McMath	Richmond	7.3	6.9	139	175	Thomas Haney	Maple Ridge	6.5	5.7
79	97	Houston	Houston	7.3	6.8	139	175	Windermere	Vancouver	6.5	5.7
79	97	Windsor	North Vancouver	7.3	6.8	139	n/a	King David	Vancouver	6.5	n/a
79	102	South Delta	Delta	7.3	6.7	139	n/a	Queen Charlotte	Queen Charlotte	6.5	n/a
79	140	Osoyoos	Osoyoos	7.3	6.2	149	102	Centennial	Coquitlam	6.4	6.7
79	n/a	Steveston-London	Richmond	7.3	n/a	149	110	Kwalikum	Qualicum Beach	6.4	6.6
93	37	St Andrew's	Victoria	7.2	7.8	149	110	Stelly's	Saanichton	6.4	6.6
93	86	Stanley Humphries	Castlegar	7.2	7.0	149	110	Sutherland	North Vancouver	6.4	6.6
93	90	Eric Hamber	Vancouver	7.2	6.9	149	136	Terry Fox	Port Coquitlam	6.4	6.3
93	129	Revelstoke	Revelstoke	7.2	6.4	149	140	Burnaby South	Burnaby	6.4	6.2

Rank		School name	City	Overall rating		Rank		School name	City	Overall rating	
2007/2008	Last 5 years			2007/2008	Last 5 years	2007/2008	Last 5 years			2007/2008	Last 5 years
149	147	Mount Baker	Cranbrook	6.4	6.1	208	162	Rick Hansen	Abbotsford	5.6	5.9
149	147	Reynolds	Victoria	6.4	6.1	208	185	Vernon	Vernon	5.6	5.6
149	185	Langley	Langley	6.4	5.6	208	190	Caledonia	Terrace	5.6	5.5
149	n/a	A.R. MacNeill	Richmond	6.4	n/a	208	196	Carson Graham	North Vancouver	5.6	5.4
159	110	Lord Tweedsmuir	Surrey	6.3	6.6	208	196	MacKenzie	Mackenzie	5.6	5.4
159	123	Burnaby Central	Burnaby	6.3	6.5	208	196	Norkam	Kamloops	5.6	5.4
159	129	Valleyview	Kamloops	6.3	6.4	219	169	Georges P Vanier	Courtenay	5.5	5.8
159	155	Salmon Arm	Salmon Arm	6.3	6.0	219	169	Kwantlen Park	Surrey	5.5	5.8
159	162	Southern Okanagan	Oliver	6.3	5.9	219	169	Vancouver Technical	Vancouver	5.5	5.8
159	190	Chilliwack	Chilliwack	6.3	5.5	219	190	Brooks	Powell River	5.5	5.5
159	n/a	Distance Ed - South Island	Victoria	6.3	n/a	219	190	Ladysmith	Ladysmith	5.5	5.5
166	140	Pitt Meadows	Pitt Meadows	6.2	6.2	219	211	Correlieu	Quesnel	5.5	5.2
166	155	Duchess Park	Prince George	6.2	6.0	219	247	John Oliver	Vancouver	5.5	4.2
166	155	Smithers	Smithers	6.2	6.0	219	n/a	Distance Ed - Fraser Valley	Chilliwack	5.5	n/a
166	162	Fernie	Fernie	6.2	5.9	219	n/a	Heritage Christian Online	Kelowna	5.5	n/a
166	175	Pender Harbour	Madeira Park	6.2	5.7	228	175	Brocklehurst	Kamloops	5.4	5.7
166	n/a	F.H. Collins	Whitehorse	6.2	n/a	228	196	Garibaldi	Maple Ridge	5.4	5.4
172	90	Bulkley Valley Christian	Smithers	6.1	6.9	228	221	Woodlands	Nanaimo	5.4	5.0
172	110	George Elliot	Winfield	6.1	6.6	228	249	Clearwater	Clearwater	5.4	4.1
172	123	Cambie	Richmond	6.1	6.5	232	204	Alpha	Burnaby	5.3	5.3
172	136	David Thompson	Vancouver	6.1	6.3	232	211	Aldergrove Community	Aldergrove	5.3	5.2
172	140	J V Humphries	Kaslo	6.1	6.2	232	221	Heritage Park	Mission	5.3	5.0
172	140	Mark R. Isfeld	Courtenay	6.1	6.2	232	249	Princeton	Princeton	5.3	4.1
172	162	Clarence Fulton	Vernon	6.1	5.9	232	n/a	Distance Ed - S. Central Interior	Merritt	5.3	n/a
172	n/a	Heritage Christian	Kelowna	6.1	n/a	232	n/a	Vancouver Learning Network	Vancouver	5.3	n/a
172	n/a	Sands	Delta	6.1	n/a	238	175	Nakusp	Nakusp	5.2	5.7
181	102	Summerland	Summerland	6.0	6.7	238	190	North Delta	Delta	5.2	5.5
181	147	David Thompson	Invermere	6.0	6.1	238	204	Agassiz	Agassiz	5.2	5.3
181	147	Wellington	Nanaimo	6.0	6.1	238	204	Gladstone	Vancouver	5.2	5.3
181	162	Elphinstone	Gibsons	6.0	5.9	238	211	College Heights	Prince George	5.2	5.2
181	175	Belmont	Victoria	6.0	5.7	238	221	Quesnel	Quesnel	5.2	5.0
181	185	Westsyde	Kamloops	6.0	5.6	238	234	King George	Vancouver	5.2	4.7
187	90	Sa-Hali	Kamloops	5.9	6.9	238	234	Pemberton	Pemberton	5.2	4.7
187	110	Prince Charles	Creston	5.9	6.6	238	241	A L Fortune	Enderby	5.2	4.4
187	123	Similkameen	Keremeos	5.9	6.5	238	247	Williams Lake	Williams Lake	5.2	4.2
187	129	Enver Creek	Surrey	5.9	6.4	248	175	North Peace	Fort St John	5.1	5.7
187	204	Kelly Road	Prince George	5.9	5.3	248	241	Queen Elizabeth	Surrey	5.1	4.4
187	218	Logan Lake	Logan Lake	5.9	5.1	248	n/a	Home Learners' Link	Victoria	5.1	n/a
193	129	Mount Sentinel	South Slokan	5.8	6.4	251	190	Hope	Hope	5.0	5.5
193	162	Carihi	Campbell River	5.8	5.9	251	196	L A Matheson	Surrey	5.0	5.4
193	185	Charles Bloom	Lumby	5.8	5.6	251	196	Pleasant Valley	Armstrong	5.0	5.4
193	229	Fraser Lake	Fraser Lake	5.8	4.8	251	204	South Peace	Dawson Creek	5.0	5.3
193	n/a	Samuel Robertson Tech	Maple Ridge	5.8	n/a	251	229	Eagle River	Sicamous	5.0	4.8
198	90	Elkford	Elkford	5.7	6.9	251	234	Spectrum	Victoria	5.0	4.7
198	123	Kamloops Christian	Kamloops	5.7	6.5	251	n/a	Porter Creek	Whitehorse	5.0	n/a
198	155	Matthew McNair	Richmond	5.7	6.0	258	175	Esquimalt	Victoria	4.9	5.7
198	155	Princess Margaret	Penticton	5.7	6.0	258	185	Howe Sound	Squamish	4.9	5.6
198	162	Cowichan	Duncan	5.7	5.9	258	224	Nanaimo District	Nanaimo	4.9	4.9
198	169	Guildford Park	Surrey	5.7	5.8	261	175	Timberline	Campbell River	4.8	5.7
198	196	Cariboo Hill	Burnaby	5.7	5.4	261	224	Victoria High	Victoria	4.8	4.9
198	204	Hatzic	Mission	5.7	5.3	261	229	Columnetza	Williams Lake	4.8	4.8
198	211	Rutland	Kelowna	5.7	5.2	261	234	Fraser Valley Adventist	Aldergrove	4.8	4.7
198	n/a	David Stoddart	Clinton	5.7	n/a	261	238	Sir Charles Tupper	Vancouver	4.8	4.6
208	123	Frances Kelsey	Mill Bay	5.6	6.5	261	249	Ashcroft	Ashcroft	4.8	4.1
208	129	Mount Boucherie	Kelowna	5.6	6.4	267	175	Grand Forks	Grand Forks	4.7	5.7
208	140	Mission	Mission	5.6	6.2	267	196	Peter Skene Ogden	100 Mile House	4.7	5.4
208	140	Templeton	Vancouver	5.6	6.2	267	204	Selkirk	Kimberley	4.7	5.3
208	147	Westview	Maple Ridge	5.6	6.1	267	211	W L Seaton	Vernon	4.7	5.2

Rank		School name	City	Overall rating		Rank		School name	City	Overall rating	
2007/	Last 5			2007/	Last 5	2007/	Last 5			2007/	Last 5
2008	years			2008	years	2008	years			2008	years
267	n/a	Byrne Creek	Burnaby	4.7	n/a	294	211	Valemount	Valemount	3.8	5.2
267	n/a	Traditional Learning DL	Surrey	4.7	n/a	294	265	Gold River	Gold River	3.8	2.4
273	211	Chase	Chase	4.6	5.2	296	246	North Island	Port McNeill	3.7	4.3
273	224	H D Stafford	Langley	4.6	4.9	296	n/a	Ebus Academy	Vanderhoof	3.7	n/a
273	229	Uduelet	Uduelet	4.6	4.8	298	238	Abbotsford Collegiate	Abbotsford	3.6	4.6
273	249	Nechako Valley	Vanderhoof	4.6	4.1	299	229	Lakes District	Burns Lake	3.4	4.8
277	155	Chatelech	Sechelt	4.5	6.0	299	254	Charles Hays	Prince Rupert	3.4	4.0
277	254	McBride	McBride	4.5	4.0	301	257	Fort Nelson	Fort Nelson	3.3	3.7
277	256	John Barsby	Nanaimo	4.5	3.9	301	264	Barriere	Barriere	3.3	2.6
277	n/a	Prespatou	Prespatou	4.5	n/a	301	n/a	Learn @ Home 8-12	Nanaimo	3.3	n/a
281	n/a	Distance Ed - North Island	Courtenay	4.4	n/a	304	257	Port Hardy	Port Hardy	3.2	3.7
282	218	Alberni District	Port Alberni	4.3	5.1	304	259	Lake Cowichan	Lake Cowichan	3.2	3.5
282	224	Chetwynd	Chetwynd	4.3	4.9	306	262	Lillooet	Lillooet	2.1	3.3
282	224	Prince George	Prince George	4.3	4.9	306	n/a	Abbotsford Virtual	Abbotsford	2.1	n/a
282	238	Prince Rupert	Prince Rupert	4.3	4.6	306	n/a	Purpose	New Westminster	2.1	n/a
282	241	Edward Milne	Sooke	4.3	4.4	306	n/a	Watson Lake High	Watson Lake	2.1	n/a
282	n/a	Salmo	Salmo	4.3	n/a	310	249	Cedar	Nanaimo	2.0	4.1
288	218	Merritt	Merritt	4.2	5.1	311	263	Hazelton	Hazelton	1.3	3.0
288	241	Britannia	Vancouver	4.2	4.4	312	n/a	Anchor Academy (DL)	Salmon Arm	0.3	n/a
290	241	Mount Elizabeth	Kitimat	4.1	4.4	313	266	Nisga'a	New Aiyansh	0.0	0.2
291	n/a	Surrey Connect DL	Surrey	4.0	n/a	313	267	George M Dawson	Masset	0.0	0.0
292	259	Tumbler Ridge	Tumbler Ridge	3.9	3.5	313	n/a	Delta Access	Delta	0.0	n/a
292	261	Fort St James	Fort St James	3.9	3.4	313	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 *Report Card*?” 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.

About this publication

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

Distribution

These publications are available from <<http://www.fraserinstitute.org>> in Portable Document Format (PDF) and can be read with Adobe Acrobat® or with Adobe Reader®, which is available free of charge from Adobe Systems Inc. To download Adobe Reader, go to this link: <<http://www.adobe.com/products/acrobat/readstep2.html>> with your Browser. We encourage you to install the most recent version.

Ordering publications

For information about ordering the printed publications of the Fraser Institute, please contact the publications coordinator

- ‡ e-mail: sales@fraserinstitute.ca
- ‡ telephone: 604.688.0221 ext. 580 or, toll free, 1.800.665.3558 ext. 580
- ‡ fax: 604.688.8539.

Media

For media enquiries, please contact our Communications Department

- ‡ 604.714.4582
- ‡ e-mail: communications@fraserinstitute.org.

Disclaimer

The authors of this publication have worked independently and opinions expressed by them are, therefore, their own, and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the supporters, trustees, or other staff of the Fraser Institute. This publication in no way implies that the Fraser Institute, its trustees, or staff are in favor of, or oppose the passage of, any bill; or that they support or oppose any particular political party or candidate.

Copyright

Copyright© 2009 by 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 passages quoted in critical articles and reviews.

ISSNs

1707–2395 Studies in Education Policy (English online edition)

1492–1863 Studies in Education Policy (English print edition)

Printed and bound in Canada.

Date of issue

June 2009

Editing

Lindsey Thomas Martin

Typesetting

Nick Murphy

Cover design

Bill Ray

Images for cover

Boys in school ©Steve Stone; iStock

Girl solving a math problem on blackboard ©Bart Coenders; iStock

Attentive reading ©Grigory Bibikov; iStock

Library series ©Willie B. Thomas; iStock

8-year old schoolgirl doing homework ©mamahoohooba; iStock

Student working in class ©Bonnie Jacobs; iStock

Supporting the Fraser Institute

To learn how to support the Fraser Institute, please contact

- ‡ Development Department, Fraser Institute
Fourth Floor, 1770 Burrard Street
Vancouver, British Columbia, V6J 3G7 Canada
- ‡ telephone, toll-free: 1.800.665.3558 ext. 586
- ‡ e-mail: development@fraserinstitute.org.

About 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 locations 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.

菲沙研究所的願景乃一自由而昌盛的世界，當中每個人得以從更豐富的選擇、具競爭性的市場及自我承擔責任而獲益。我們的使命在於量度、研究並使人知悉競爭市場及政府干預對個人福祉的影響。

Nous envisageons un monde libre et prospère, où chaque personne bénéficie d'un plus grand choix, de marchés concurrentiels et de responsabilités individuelles. Notre mission consiste à mesurer, à étudier et à communiquer l'effet des marchés concurrentiels et des interventions gouvernementales sur le bien-être des individus.

تتمثل رؤيتنا في وجود عالم حر ومزدهر يستفيد فيه الأفراد من القدرة على الاختيار بشكل أكبر، والأسواق التنافسية، والمسؤولية الشخصية. أما رسالتنا فهي قياس، ودراسة، وتوصيل تأثير الأسواق التنافسية والتدخلات الحكومية المتعلقة بالرفاه الاجتماعي للأفراد.

Nuestra visión es un mundo libre y próspero donde los individuos se beneficien de una mayor oferta, la competencia en los mercados y la responsabilidad individual. Nuestra misión es medir, estudiar y comunicar el impacto de la competencia en los mercados y la intervención gubernamental en el bienestar de los individuos.

Editorial Advisory Board

Prof. Armen Alchian

Prof. James Gwartney

Prof. Terry Anderson

Prof. H.G. Johnson*

Prof. Robert Barro

Prof. Ronald W. Jones

Prof. Michael Bliss

Dr. Jerry Jordan

Prof. James M. Buchanan†

Prof. David Laidler**

Prof. Jean-Pierre Centi

Prof. Richard G. Lipsey**

Prof. Thomas J. Courchene**

Prof. Ross McKittrick

Prof. John Chant

Prof. Michael Parkin

Prof. Bev Dahlby

Prof. F.G. Pennance*

Prof. Erwin Diewert

Prof. Friedrich Schneider

Prof. Stephen Easton

Prof. L.B. Smith

Prof. J.C. Herbert Emery

Prof. George Stigler*†

Prof. Jack L. Granatstein

Mr. Vito Tanzi

Prof. Herbert G. Grubel

Sir Alan Walters

Prof. Friedrich A. Hayek*†

Prof. Edwin G. West*

* deceased; ** withdrawn; † Nobel Laureate