

OCTOBER 2004

# Report Card on New Brunswick's Anglophone High Schools 2004 Edition

*Peter Cowley, Stephen Easton, and Darlene Savoy*

## Contents

<i>Introduction</i> .....	3
<i>Key academic indicators of school performance</i> .....	5
<i>Notes</i> .....	8
<i>Detailed school results</i> .....	8
<i>Ranking the schools</i> .....	13
<i>Appendix: Calculating the Overall rating out of 10</i> .....	15
<i>About the authors and Acknowledgments</i> .....	17

Studies in Education Policy are published periodically throughout the year by The Fraser Institute, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

The Fraser Institute is an independent Canadian economic and social research and educational organization. It has as its objective the redirection of public attention to the role of competitive markets in providing for the well-being of Canadians. Where markets work, the Institute's interest lies in trying to discover prospects for improvement. Where markets do not work, its interest lies in finding the reasons. Where competitive markets have been replaced by government control, the interest of the Institute lies in documenting objectively the nature of the improvement or deterioration resulting from government intervention. The work of the Institute is assisted by an Editorial Advisory Board of internationally renowned economists. The Fraser Institute is a national, federally chartered non-profit organization financed by the sale of its publications and the tax-deductible contributions of its members, foundations, and other supporters; it receives no government funding.

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

For media enquiries, please contact Suzanne Walters, Director of Communications via telephone: 604.714.4582; via e-mail: [suzanne@fraserinstitute.ca](mailto:suzanne@fraserinstitute.ca)

To learn more about the Institute, please visit our web site at [www.fraserinstitute.ca](http://www.fraserinstitute.ca).

Copyright© 2004 The Fraser Institute. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles and reviews.

The authors of this study have worked independently and opinions expressed by them are, therefore, their own, and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the members or trustees of The Fraser Institute.

Editing and design: Kristin McCahon and Lindsey Thomas Martin  
Typesetting by Nick Murphy

Printed and bound in Canada.  
ISSN 1492-1863 Studies in Education Policy (English print edition).  
ISSN 1707-2395 Studies in Education Policy (English online edition).

Date of issue: October 2004

---

**The Fraser Institute, Fourth Floor, 1770 Burrard Street, Vancouver, BC, V6J 3G7**

For information about membership, please contact the Development Department:

in **Vancouver**

- via telephone: 604.688.0221 ext. 586; via fax: 604.688.8539
- via e-mail: [membership@fraserinstitute.ca](mailto:membership@fraserinstitute.ca)

in **Calgary**

- via telephone: 403.216.7175 or, toll-free 1.866.716.7175;
- via fax: 403.234.9010; via e-mail: [barrym@fraserinstitute.ca](mailto:barrym@fraserinstitute.ca).

in **Toronto**

- via telephone: 416.363.6575;
- via fax: 416.934.1639.



# Introduction

The *Report Card on New Brunswick's Anglophone High Schools* 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 can 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 can use the results to identify areas of academic performance in which improvement can be made.

The Fraser Institute's report cards are now well established in Canada. In the United States, the departments of education in virtually all the states publish annual report cards on schools—for all school levels—many of which are not dissimilar to the Institute's series. In the United Kingdom, the national Department for Education and Skills publishes a wide variety of data on school performance.

Report cards on schools are becoming commonplace. But, are they effective? Certainly, anecdotal evidence provided to the authors by parents and school administrators confirm their usefulness. Further, research suggests that real gains in school performance can result from their introduction. In an article published in 2001, Caroline Hoxby, a Harvard professor of Economics well known for her work related to education, showed that students in American states that published report cards experienced faster improvement in their scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) than did students in states that did not publish report cards. Hoxby concludes, "Statewide standardized tests and school report cards may be unpleas-

ant for ineffectual educators, but they should not be controversial with parents or policy makers who want to see higher achievement. Schools conduct themselves better when their constituents are informed."<sup>1</sup>

We are also encouraged by recent research<sup>2</sup> suggesting that annual report cards on schools are particularly effective in reducing the gap in academic achievement between groups of students. The Fraser Institute began reporting achievement gaps in 2000 with the introduction of the gender-gap indicators. Early in 2004, the Institute published a *Report Card on Aboriginal Education in British Columbia*<sup>3</sup> in order to draw public attention to the chronically poor academic achievement of that student group.

## **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 or not 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. 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* encourages schools to improve**

Certainly, the act of publicly rating and ranking schools attracts attention. This attention can provide both a carrot and a stick. 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 just incentive. It 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 use the *Report Card* as a source of information about opportunities for improving their schools.

### ***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.<sup>4</sup> 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 or of schools where the characteristics of the school and the student body are similar, 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 "Beacon Schools" program<sup>5</sup> identifies schools across the country that have demonstrated expertise in a wide variety of challenging aspects of the management of schools and the teaching and counselling of their students. The administrators at these Beacon Schools are committed to helping other schools improve.

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.

### **You can contribute to the *Report Card*'s development**

This *Report Card*, like those for schools in other provinces will be regularly improved in content and design. Improvements are often suggested by the comments and criticism provided to us by readers. We welcome your suggestions, comments, and criticisms. Please such direct correspondence via e-mail to: [reportcards@fraserinstitute.ca](mailto:reportcards@fraserinstitute.ca).



# 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 New Brunswick's Department of Education, we rate each school on a scale from zero to 10. We base our overall rating of each school's academic performance on six indicators:

- 1 average provincial examination mark in grade-11 English (all levels);
- 2 average provincial examination mark in grade-11 Mathematics (all levels);
- 3 percentage of provincial examinations (in grade-11 English and grade-11 Mathematics) failed;
- 4 difference between the school mark and provincial examination mark in these same courses;
- 5 difference between male and female students in the value of indicator (1) for grade-11 English only; and,
- 6 difference between male and female students in the value of indicator (2) for grade-11 Mathematics only.

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 provincial examination marks*

These indicators (in the tables *Average exam mark – English* and *Average exam mark – Math*) is the average percentage achieved by a school's students on the uniform final examinations in all levels of grade-11 English and grade-11 Mathematics. For each school, the indicator is the average of the scores achieved by the school's students in all levels of the two courses at all sittings during the year.

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 provincial examinations in all levels of grade-11 English and grade-11 Mathematics. It was

derived by dividing the sum, for each school, of all these 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. For this reason, it seems reasonable to use the percentage of examinations failed in these courses as an additional indicator of the effectiveness of the teaching in high schools.

### ***3 Difference between school mark and examination mark***

For each school, this indicator (in the tables *School vs exam mark difference*) gives the absolute value of the difference between the average mark obtained on the provincial examinations and the average “school” mark—the accumulation of all the results from tests, essays, quizzes, and so on given in class—for all levels of grade-11 English and grade-11 Mathematics.<sup>6</sup>

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

The effectiveness of school-based assessments

can be determined by a comparison to external assessments of the students. In courses that include a provincial examination, the Department of Education, the same authority that designed the course, administers a uniform examination that 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 different from those achieved by its students on the final examinations, then the school is not providing an accurate indicator of the extent to which students are learning the course material.

## **Two indicators of consistency in teaching and assessment**

### ***The Gender gap indicators***

Research<sup>7</sup> has shown systematic sex-based differences in academic results in Canadian secondary schools. These differences are particularly apparent where the local school rather than the ministry of education makes assessments. However, the same research found that “there appears to be no compelling evidence that girls and boys should, given effective teaching and counselling, experience differential rates of success.”<sup>8</sup> Further, “[t]he differences described by each indicator vary from school to school over a considerable range of values.”<sup>9</sup>

The *Gender gap* indicators measure the difference, if any, in the average examination marks for grade-11 English and grade-11 Mathematics achieved by boys and girls at the school. The indicators report the size of the difference and the more successful sex. Schools experiencing high gender gaps should investigate classroom practice to determine why one sex receives better grades than the other.

## **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?"

To derive this rating, the results for each of the

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

The standardized data were then combined as required to produce six 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. (See the Appendix for a description of the calculation of the *Overall rating out of 10*.)





# Notes

- 1 Caroline Hoxby, *Testing Is about Openness and Openness Works* (Hoover Institution, July 30, 2001), <[http://www-hoover.stanford.edu/pubaffairs/we/current/hoxby\\_0701.html](http://www-hoover.stanford.edu/pubaffairs/we/current/hoxby_0701.html)> (as of August 6, 2004).
- 2 Eric A. Hanushek and Margaret E. Raymond, *The Effect of School Accountability Systems on the Level and Distribution of Student Achievement*, <<http://edpro.stanford.edu/eah/papers/equity.jeea.nov03.pdf>> (as of August 6, 2004).
- 3 Peter Cowley and Stephen Easton, *Report Card on Aboriginal Education in British Columbia*, Studies in Education Policy (Vancouver, BC: The Fraser Institute, 2004).
- 4 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., *School Matters: The Junior Years* (Wells, Somerset: Open Books, 1988); and Laura Lein et al., *Hope for Urban Education: A Study of Nine High-Performing, High-Poverty Urban Elementary Schools* (STAR Center at the Charles A. Dana Center, University of Texas at Austin, 1999), <<http://www.ed.gov/pubs/urbanhope/index.html>> (as of August 6, 2004).
- 5 See the Beacon Schools program site at <<http://www.standards.dfee.gov.uk/beaconschools/>> (as of August 6, 2004).
- 6 A student's final mark for a course is derived from both the mark received on the course's uniform provincial examination and a mark provided by the school. The final mark is a weighted average of the examination mark and the school mark. Weightings vary from course to course.
- 7 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).
- 8 Cowley and Easton, *Boys, Girls, and Grades*: page 7.
- 9 Cowley and Easton, *Boys, Girls, and Grades*: page 17.





# Detailed school reports

## How to read these 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 Department of Education's web site at <[http://www.gnb.ca/0000/pub\\_alpha-e.asp](http://www.gnb.ca/0000/pub_alpha-e.asp)>.

Kennebecasis Valley High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 264		- A
Rothesay		2002-2003	Last 3 yrs	
Late Entry (%): 17.4		15 / 46	19 / 40	
<b>Academic Performance</b>		<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>
C - Average exam mark - English	59.1	66.4	72.8	
D - Average exam mark - Math	56.3	64.7	70.9	
E - Percentage of exams failed	36.7	19.5	20.0	
F - School vs exam mark difference	17.4	11.9	9.2	
G - Grade 11 English gender gap	F 4.2	F 3.6	F 2.7	
H - Grade 11 Math gender gap	M 2.2	M 7.4	F 2.9	
I - Overall rating out of 10	6.1	6.0	7.2	

### A (right)—Gr 11 Enrollment

The grade-11 enrollment on September 30, 2002. 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 (left)—Late Entry (%)

The proportion of students enrolled in grades 9 through 12 who are at least a year older than most of the students at their grade level. Late entry is an indication of the past academic achievement of the students. A high proportion of late-entry students may partially explain lower student performance at the school.

### B (right)—Overall academic ranking

The school's overall academic rank in the province for 2002/2003 and for the last three years. The overall academic rank is based on the *Overall rating out of 10* for 2002/2003. The school's rank for the last three years is based on the average of the overall ratings achieved in the most recent three years. These rankings show how the school has done academically compared to the other schools in the province. A high ranking over three years indicates consistently strong results at the school.

### C—Average exam mark – grade-11 English and

### D—Average exam mark – grade-11 Mathematics

The average mark (%) achieved by the school's students on all the grade-11 provincial examinations in English and Mathematics.

### E—Percentage of exams failed

The proportion of all the provincial examinations in grade-11 English and grade-11 Mathematics written by students at the school that received a failing grade.

### F—School vs exam mark difference

The difference (in percentage points) between the average mark received at the school and the provincial examination mark in grade-11 English and grade-11 Mathematics. A large difference usually indicates that the school has been "inflating" grades.

### G—grade-11 English gender gap and

### H—grade-11 Math gender gap

The difference (in percentage points) between boys and girls in their average examination marks in

grade-11 English and grade-11 Mathematics. 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—Overall rating out of 10*

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

## Other notes

### *Note 1*

Not all the province's high schools are included in the tables or the ranking. Excluded are schools at which fewer than 15 students were enrolled in grade 11 and schools that did not generate a sufficiently large set of student data to enable the calculation of an *Overall rating out of 10*.

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

### *Note 2*

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 3*

You can compare a school's results with these all-schools results.

**Average values for all schools 2002/2003**

Late Entry (%): 23.2			
<b>Academic Performance</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>
Average exam mark - English	53.5	63.2	67.3
Average exam mark - Math	54.8	62.3	61.3
Percentage of exams failed	41.8	21.1	33.0
School vs exam mark difference	17.1	12.2	11.6
Grade 11 English gender gap *	3.7	3.3	3.9
Grade 11 Math gender gap *	3.6	4.0	3.7
<b>Overall rating out of 10</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>6.2</b>

- Note: These results reflect the average size of the gender gaps. In 2002/2003, the English gender gap favoured females at 91.5% of schools, males at 6.4% of schools, and was even at 2.1% of schools. The Math gender gap favoured males at 60.0% of schools, and females at 40.0% of schools.

### *Note 4*

If you have questions about the *Report Card*, contact Peter Cowley at The Fraser Institute at 604.714.4556 or by e-mail at [reportcards@fraserinstitute.ca](mailto:reportcards@fraserinstitute.ca).

McAdam High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 27		
	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs		
Late Entry (%):	36.1	1 / 46	4 / 40	
<b>Academic Performance</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	
Average exam mark - English	48.6	68.2	70.4	
Average exam mark - Math	56.7	74.8	72.1	
Percentage of exams failed	46.0	6.7	17.9	
School vs exam mark difference	22.2	7.3	6.5	
Grade 11 English gender gap	M 4.9	n/a	F 4.4	
Grade 11 Math gender gap	M 10.6	n/a	F 9.5	
<b>Overall rating out of 10</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>10.0</b>	

Blackville School		Gr 11 enrollment: 39		
	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs		
Late Entry (%):	22.3	2 / 46	1 / 40	
<b>Academic Performance</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	
Average exam mark - English	52.0	60.1	71.0	
Average exam mark - Math	63.2	73.4	70.2	
Percentage of exams failed	31.0	8.5	21.7	
School vs exam mark difference	15.7	8.6	7.9	
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 6.7	F 4.1	F 3.1	
Grade 11 Math gender gap	M 0.4	M 6.7	F 4.6	
<b>Overall rating out of 10</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>8.4</b>	<b>9.5</b>	

Bathurst High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 199		
	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs		
Late Entry (%):	19.7	2 / 46	2 / 40	
<b>Academic Performance</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	
Average exam mark - English	58.7	66.5	70.6	
Average exam mark - Math	54.4	59.7	69.5	
Percentage of exams failed	35.1	16.3	19.9	
School vs exam mark difference	12.8	11.3	7.2	
Grade 11 English gender gap	M 2.9	F 3.8	F 3.7	
Grade 11 Math gender gap	M 4.2	M 6.3	M 2.2	
<b>Overall rating out of 10</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>9.5</b>	

Woodstock High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 151		
	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs		
Late Entry (%):	13.1	4 / 46	4 / 40	
<b>Academic Performance</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	
Average exam mark - English	58.9	64.4	71.6	
Average exam mark - Math	60.5	67.3	70.1	
Percentage of exams failed	24.7	17.2	16.1	
School vs exam mark difference	14.8	11.0	9.1	
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 3.7	F 2.7	F 5.5	
Grade 11 Math gender gap	M 1.1	M 2.5	F 1.8	
<b>Overall rating out of 10</b>	<b>8.7</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>9.3</b>	

Tobique Valley High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 55		
	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs		
Late Entry (%):	20.2	5 / 46	9 / 40	
<b>Academic Performance</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	
Average exam mark - English	51.5	62.5	69.9	
Average exam mark - Math	47.2	64.4	64.6	
Percentage of exams failed	54.0	21.1	15.6	
School vs exam mark difference	21.7	11.0	7.7	
Grade 11 English gender gap	M 9.1	M 2.6	M 0.1	
Grade 11 Math gender gap	M 12.7	M 9.1	F 2.1	
<b>Overall rating out of 10</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>9.2</b>	

Upper Miramichi Regional High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 33		
	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs		
Late Entry (%):	20.0	6 / 46	n/a	
<b>Academic Performance</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	
Average exam mark - English	50.4	57.1	70.3	
Average exam mark - Math	n/a	n/a	66.0	
Percentage of exams failed	41.9	23.3	22.2	
School vs exam mark difference	15.8	21.9	8.6	
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 2.0	M 4.0	F 5.4	
Grade 11 Math gender gap	n/a	n/a	F 1.6	
<b>Overall rating out of 10</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>9.0</b>	

Chipman Forest Avenue School		Gr 11 enrollment: 38		
	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs		
Late Entry (%):	21.4	7 / 46	n/a	
<b>Academic Performance</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	
Average exam mark - English	57.3	65.2	65.8	
Average exam mark - Math	n/a	n/a	65.7	
Percentage of exams failed	27.5	9.6	27.3	
School vs exam mark difference	13.3	9.2	11.0	
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 9.7	F 0.5	F 6.9	
Grade 11 Math gender gap	n/a	n/a	F 10.0	
<b>Overall rating out of 10</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>8.1</b>	

Petitcodiac Regional School		Gr 11 enrollment: 69		
	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs		
Late Entry (%):	18.4	8 / 46	6 / 40	
<b>Academic Performance</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	
Average exam mark - English	56.3	62.9	69.5	
Average exam mark - Math	61.5	58.4	68.1	
Percentage of exams failed	25.2	27.2	23.4	
School vs exam mark difference	13.0	10.3	7.4	
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 4.1	F 3.1	F 2.8	
Grade 11 Math gender gap	M 5.5	M 5.2	M 0.1	
<b>Overall rating out of 10</b>	<b>9.4</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>7.9</b>	

Moncton High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 300		
	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs		
Late Entry (%):	34.1	9 / 46	n/a	
<b>Academic Performance</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	
Average exam mark - English	54.0	66.4	70.2	
Average exam mark - Math	57.2	n/a	73.9	
Percentage of exams failed	38.9	10.8	19.6	
School vs exam mark difference	16.0	9.7	8.2	
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 3.5	F 4.4	F 3.7	
Grade 11 Math gender gap	F 1.4	n/a	M 5.7	
<b>Overall rating out of 10</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>7.5</b>	

Hampton High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 172		
	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs		
Late Entry (%):	21.6	10 / 46	7 / 40	
<b>Academic Performance</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	
Average exam mark - English	57.9	65.9	68.6	
Average exam mark - Math	53.9	71.2	64.7	
Percentage of exams failed	35.8	11.7	28.5	
School vs exam mark difference	13.5	8.3	8.5	
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 3.5	F 3.0	F 3.5	
Grade 11 Math gender gap	F 0.3	M 3.3	M 0.3	
<b>Overall rating out of 10</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>7.9</b>	<b>7.4</b>	

Bonar Law Memorial School		Gr 11 enrollment: 82		
	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs		
Late Entry (%):	40.1	10 / 46	12 / 40	
<b>Academic Performance</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	
Average exam mark - English	57.0	62.1	66.5	
Average exam mark - Math	52.7	54.9	64.3	
Percentage of exams failed	37.8	34.6	28.7	
School vs exam mark difference	10.6	11.9	12.0	
Grade 11 English gender gap	M 0.9	F 1.8	F 1.8	
Grade 11 Math gender gap	F 1.1	M 2.8	M 7.6	
<b>Overall rating out of 10</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>7.4</b>	

Carleton North Senior High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 204		
	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs		
Late Entry (%):	20.4	12 / 46	3 / 40	
<b>Academic Performance</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	
Average exam mark - English	54.5	64.4	66.2	
Average exam mark - Math	63.3	74.4	70.3	
Percentage of exams failed	29.8	8.7	25.0	
School vs exam mark difference	13.9	8.6	9.0	
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 2.0	F 1.6	F 3.9	
Grade 11 Math gender gap	M 4.4	M 0.8	M 1.1	
<b>Overall rating out of 10</b>	<b>8.7</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>7.3</b>	

Harrison Trimble High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 224		
	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs		
Late Entry (%):	36.0	12 / 46	7 / 40	
<b>Academic Performance</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	
Average exam mark - English	56.9	66.1	69.3	
Average exam mark - Math	58.0	63.6	66.1	
Percentage of exams failed	31.9	16.6	25.6	
School vs exam mark difference	12.1	10.7	9.9	
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 1.6	M 0.9	F 4.2	
Grade 11 Math gender gap	F 0.9	M 4.0	M 4.2	
<b>Overall rating out of 10</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>7.3</b>	

Dalhousie Regional High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 99		
	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs		
Late Entry (%):	26.5	12 / 46	21 / 40	
<b>Academic Performance</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	
Average exam mark - English	49.6	62.9	65.9	
Average exam mark - Math	51.6	66.0	64.9	
Percentage of exams failed	49.7	18.9	35.9	
School vs exam mark difference	19.1	12.9	12.8	
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 1.4	M 0.4	F 7.7	
Grade 11 Math gender gap	M 1.4	M 3.6	M 5.7	
<b>Overall rating out of 10</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>7.3</b>	

Kennebecasis Valley High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 264		
	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs		
Late Entry (%):	17.4	15 / 46	19 / 40	
<b>Academic Performance</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	
Average exam mark - English	59.1	66.4	72.8	
Average exam mark - Math	56.3	64.7	70.9	
Percentage of exams failed	36.7	19.5	20.0	
School vs exam mark difference	17.4	11.9	9.2	
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 4.2	F 3.6	F 2.7	
Grade 11 Math gender gap	M 2.2	M 7.4	F 2.9	
<b>Overall rating out of 10</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>7.2</b>	

Fredericton High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 466		
	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs		
Late Entry (%):	18.3	16 / 46	12 / 40	
<b>Academic Performance</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	
Average exam mark - English	55.3	66.6	70.8	
Average exam mark - Math	56.2	64.2	69.0	
Percentage of exams failed	38.6	18.7	21.2	
School vs exam mark difference	16.4	10.3	9.4	
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 6.1	F 3.5	F 4.6	
Grade 11 Math gender gap	M 0.5	F 0.1	M 2.7	
<b>Overall rating out of 10</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>7.0</b>	

Harvey High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 49		
	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs		
Late Entry (%):	22.4	17 / 46	10 / 40	
<b>Academic Performance</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	
Average exam mark - English	50.4	69.9	66.1	
Average exam mark - Math	58.5	71.9	56.5	
Percentage of exams failed	48.2	11.8	41.8	
School vs exam mark difference	20.6	12.2	13.5	
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 3.1	F 4.1	F 9.6	
Grade 11 Math gender gap	F 2.1	M 1.5	F 5.5	
<b>Overall rating out of 10</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>6.9</b>	

Leo Hayes High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 404		
	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs		
Late Entry (%):	18.4	17 / 46	34 / 40	
<b>Academic Performance</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	
Average exam mark - English	49.0	63.2	70.0	
Average exam mark - Math	47.0	65.9	66.3	
Percentage of exams failed	56.6	21.1	23.1	
School vs exam mark difference	23.3	11.5	9.7	
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 5.5	F 0.9	F 4.2	
Grade 11 Math gender gap	F 2.4	M 0.9	F 0.4	
<b>Overall rating out of 10</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>6.9</b>	

North & South Esk Regional High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 60		
	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs		
Late Entry (%):	20.3	19 / 46	11 / 40	
<b>Academic Performance</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	
Average exam mark - English	51.8	64.4	68.2	
Average exam mark - Math	63.9	64.5	64.5	
Percentage of exams failed	36.6	21.1	28.2	
School vs exam mark difference	15.4	12.6	11.2	
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 4.4	F 5.0	F 0.6	
Grade 11 Math gender gap	F 1.2	F 3.8	F 2.0	
<b>Overall rating out of 10</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>6.5</b>	

Oromocto High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 276		
	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs		
Late Entry (%):	23.1	19 / 46	16 / 40	
<b>Academic Performance</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	
Average exam mark - English	54.0	64.7	66.1	
Average exam mark - Math	58.8	69.7	69.0	
Percentage of exams failed	34.9	13.3	28.8	
School vs exam mark difference	13.9	9.7	8.7	
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 0.8	F 1.3	F 3.5	
Grade 11 Math gender gap	M 1.6	M 2.5	M 3.1	
<b>Overall rating out of 10</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>6.5</b>	

Bellefleur Regional High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 43	
Springfield		2002-2003	Last 3 yrs
Late Entry (%): 26.9		19 / 46	21 / 40
<b>Academic Performance</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>
Average exam mark - English	49.4	63.6	65.5
Average exam mark - Math	43.0	61.9	56.8
Percentage of exams failed	60.9	16.9	45.7
School vs exam mark difference	22.3	10.7	13.2
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 3.3	F 6.6	F 5.0
Grade 11 Math gender gap	M 6.6	M 9.1	M 1.5
<b>Overall rating out of 10</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>6.5</b>

John Caldwell School		Gr 11 enrollment: 74	
Grand Falls	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs	
Late Entry (%): 10.3	25 / 46	20 / 40	
Academic Performance		2001	2002
Average exam mark - English	53.0	61.2	61.8
Average exam mark - Math	54.5	55.6	63.7
Percentage of exams failed	43.2	30.4	37.1
School vs exam mark difference	14.5	14.6	13.8
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 0.3	F 5.8	F 5.5
Grade 11 Math gender gap	F 1.6	F 2.5	M 1.4
Overall rating out of 10	7.0	5.7	6.3

Stanley Regional High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 36	
Stanley	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs	
Late Entry (%): 18.0	26 / 46	12 / 40	
Academic Performance		2001	2002
Average exam mark - English	56.0	59.9	62.3
Average exam mark - Math	54.6	63.6	62.8
Percentage of exams failed	42.4	23.3	33.3
School vs exam mark difference	17.4	15.4	11.6
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 6.4	F 10.3	F 0.6
Grade 11 Math gender gap	F 1.9	M 1.8	M 0.4
Overall rating out of 10	7.3	6.5	6.2

Grand Manan Community School		Gr 11 enrollment: 33	
Grand Manan	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs	
Late Entry (%): 25.4	27 / 46	17 / 40	
Academic Performance		2001	2002
Average exam mark - English	53.0	63.2	67.0
Average exam mark - Math	46.5	58.3	47.2
Percentage of exams failed	49.0	17.7	40.0
School vs exam mark difference	24.6	11.3	12.4
Grade 11 English gender gap	M 8.8	F 4.6	M 1.6
Grade 11 Math gender gap	M 11.6	M 4.4	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	6.1	7.5	5.9

St. Malachy's High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 231	
Saint John	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs	
Late Entry (%): 40.9	28 / 46	12 / 40	
Academic Performance		2001	2002
Average exam mark - English	56.4	66.1	69.3
Average exam mark - Math	62.2	60.6	63.2
Percentage of exams failed	29.3	21.3	31.5
School vs exam mark difference	12.0	9.8	10.5
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 2.4	F 3.8	F 0.8
Grade 11 Math gender gap	M 3.8	F 0.5	M 8.0
Overall rating out of 10	7.8	6.6	5.8

Sir James Dunn Academy		Gr 11 enrollment: 38	
St. Andrews	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs	
Late Entry (%): 10.1	28 / 46	n/a	
Academic Performance		2001	2002
Average exam mark - English	60.7	65.9	69.9
Average exam mark - Math	49.3	n/a	59.3
Percentage of exams failed	43.2	5.6	40.3
School vs exam mark difference	23.5	14.7	14.4
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 2.8	F 5.8	M 1.4
Grade 11 Math gender gap	M 13.7	n/a	F 1.2
Overall rating out of 10	7.7	n/a	5.8

Sussex Regional High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 234	
Sussex	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs	
Late Entry (%): 20.8	30 / 46	33 / 40	
Academic Performance		2001	2002
Average exam mark - English	55.9	64.2	67.5
Average exam mark - Math	44.8	51.5	56.1
Percentage of exams failed	47.1	31.4	39.8
School vs exam mark difference	17.8	14.2	15.2
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 5.4	F 4.2	F 7.0
Grade 11 Math gender gap	F 5.2	F 4.9	M 0.1
Overall rating out of 10	4.8	4.5	5.7

Miramichi Valley High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 225	
Miramichi	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs	
Late Entry (%): 22.0	31 / 46	17 / 40	
Academic Performance		2001	2002
Average exam mark - English	54.1	61.8	64.5
Average exam mark - Math	63.5	64.9	65.3
Percentage of exams failed	29.7	22.9	34.0
School vs exam mark difference	11.5	10.1	9.0
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 2.5	F 0.9	F 3.9
Grade 11 Math gender gap	M 6.6	F 1.3	M 0.9
Overall rating out of 10	8.5	5.5	5.4

Hartland High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 71	
Hartland	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs	
Late Entry (%): 19.0	31 / 46	30 / 40	
Academic Performance		2001	2002
Average exam mark - English	50.8	64.2	65.5
Average exam mark - Math	52.9	68.3	63.2
Percentage of exams failed	49.4	16.1	35.3
School vs exam mark difference	20.0	13.7	13.3
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 3.5	F 2.4	F 9.5
Grade 11 Math gender gap	M 10.5	F 0.2	M 1.1
Overall rating out of 10	4.4	5.9	5.4

Fundy High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 106	
St. George	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs	
Late Entry (%): 21.7	33 / 46	35 / 40	
Academic Performance		2001	2002
Average exam mark - English	51.2	60.5	64.9
Average exam mark - Math	45.8	51.1	49.4
Percentage of exams failed	54.6	38.8	42.6
School vs exam mark difference	21.1	16.9	14.7
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 5.2	F 2.2	F 3.3
Grade 11 Math gender gap	F 0.3	M 2.8	M 13.2
Overall rating out of 10	4.8	3.6	5.1

Nackawic Senior High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 103	
Nackawic	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs	
Late Entry (%): 26.1	34 / 46	27 / 40	
Academic Performance		2001	2002
Average exam mark - English	46.7	62.3	63.8
Average exam mark - Math	50.9	66.2	60.6
Percentage of exams failed	56.4	19.9	43.5
School vs exam mark difference	20.5	10.8	11.4
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 3.3	F 7.5	F 2.1
Grade 11 Math gender gap	F 6.1	F 1.7	M 3.9
Overall rating out of 10	4.4	7.1	5.0

St. Stephen High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 166	
Old Ridge	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs	
Late Entry (%): 27.4	34 / 46	32 / 40	
Academic Performance		2001	2002
Average exam mark - English	54.9	62.5	67.0
Average exam mark - Math	55.8	54.9	59.3
Percentage of exams failed	37.1	25.9	37.5
School vs exam mark difference	16.8	15.6	13.8
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 2.9	F 3.5	F 2.9
Grade 11 Math gender gap	E	M 2.4	M 3.5
Overall rating out of 10	5.7	4.6	5.0

Bernice MacNaughton High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 169	
Moncton	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs	
Late Entry (%): 18.3	36 / 46	n/a	
Academic Performance		2001	2002
Average exam mark - English	n/a	64.9	69.2
Average exam mark - Math	n/a	n/a	58.6
Percentage of exams failed	n/a	13.5	34.0
School vs exam mark difference	n/a	12.1	13.9
Grade 11 English gender gap	n/a	F 3.6	F 4.7
Grade 11 Math gender gap	n/a	n/a	F 2.6
Overall rating out of 10	n/a	n/a	4.9

Doaktown Consolidated High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 24	
Doaktown	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs	
Late Entry (%): 21.4	36 / 46	n/a	
Academic Performance		2001	2002
Average exam mark - English	49.3	62.3	64.1
Average exam mark - Math	n/a	n/a	48.0
Percentage of exams failed	65.2	24.0	43.9
School vs exam mark difference	28.0	17.5	17.1
Grade 11 English gender gap	M 2.2	F 2.3	F 4.7
Grade 11 Math gender gap	n/a	n/a	F 15.4
Overall rating out of 10	n/a	n/a	4.9

Minto Memorial High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 51	
Minto	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs	
Late Entry (%): 17.1	38 / 46	21 / 40	
Academic Performance		2001	2002
Average exam mark - English	48.4	60.7	62.9
Average exam mark - Math	58.4	71.3	59.2
Percentage of exams failed	45.0	12.4	47.4
School vs exam mark difference	14.6	10.4	10.8
Grade 11 English gender gap	M 0.2	F 2.4	F 3.3
Grade 11 Math gender gap	F 0.4	M 7.7	F 0.4
Overall rating out of 10	6.4	7.6	4.5

Tantramar Regional High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 145	
Sackville	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs	
Late Entry (%): 21.7	39 / 46	27 / 40	
Academic Performance		2001	2002
Average exam mark - English	55.3	64.0	66.5
Average exam mark - Math	61.9	64.2	55.2
Percentage of exams failed	32.8	20.2	41.7
School vs exam mark difference	15.3	11.4	14.1
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 4.1	F 1.6	F 8.4
Grade 11 Math gender gap	F 1.4	M 5.5	F 2.5
Overall rating out of 10	6.5	5.7	4.4

James M. Hill Memorial High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 194	
Miramichi	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs	
Late Entry (%): 24.7	40 / 46	29 / 40	
Academic Performance		2001	2002
Average exam mark - English	52.1	64.3	67.8
Average exam mark - Math	59.5	67.6	56.9
Percentage of exams failed	37.9	16.6	36.8
School vs exam mark difference	15.7	11.4	14.4
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 2.3	F 2.8	F 7.2
Grade 11 Math gender gap	M 0.6	M 5.7	M 0.5
Overall rating out of 10	5.1	6.6	4.3

Caledonia Regional High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 67	
Hillsborough	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs	
Late Entry (%): 16.6	41 / 46	30 / 40	
Academic Performance		2001	2002
Average exam mark - English	48.5	58.6	62.9
Average exam mark - Math	54.5	61.4	52.1
Percentage of exams failed	48.0	21.5	54.1
School vs exam mark difference	16.5	10.2	14.9
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 4.7	F 2.0	F 2.0
Grade 11 Math gender gap	M 5.7	F 4.3	M 2.5
Overall rating out of 10	5.7	6.0	3.9

Harbour View High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 267	
Saint John	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs	
Late Entry (%): 41.7	41 / 46	36 / 40	
Academic Performance		2001	2002
Average exam mark - English	52.9	62.0	66.9
Average exam mark - Math	53.3	58.7	57.1
Percentage of exams failed	44.0	21.7	36.0
School vs exam mark difference	14.7	10.9	10.8
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 4.8	F 4.5	E
Grade 11 Math gender gap	E	M 0.7	M 9.0
Overall rating out of 10	4.6	4.5	3.9

J.M.A. Armstrong/Salisbury		Gr 11 enrollment: 90	
Salisbury	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs	
Late Entry (%): 23.9	43 / 46	37 / 40	
Academic Performance		2001	2002
Average exam mark - English	49.1	60.6	63.0
Average exam mark - Math	49.1	48.2	51.0
Percentage of exams failed	55.8	38.8	54.8
School vs exam mark difference	20.3	18.5	14.7
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 3.6	F 2.5	F 3.3
Grade 11 Math gender gap	F 0.4	M 0.9	F 5.0
Overall rating out of 10	4.9	3.7	3.4

Saint John High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 283	
Saint John	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs	
Late Entry (%): 21.8	44 / 46	38 / 40	
Academic Performance		2001	2002
Average exam mark - English	53.2	65.4	68.7
Average exam mark - Math	56.0	63.7	53.2
Percentage of exams failed	40.4	21.9	35.0
School vs exam mark difference	15.2	9.5	11.1
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 8.9	F 3.2	F 3.6
Grade 11 Math gender gap	M 2.4	M 6.3	M 2.9
Overall rating out of 10	3.7	4.7	2.6

Southern Victoria High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 81	
Perth-Andover	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs	
Late Entry (%): 18.1	45 / 46	39 / 40	
Academic Performance		2001	2002
Average exam mark - English	54.1	57.7	60.0
Average exam mark - Math	44.9	53.4	45.2
Percentage of exams failed	48.8	37.7	58.3
School vs exam mark difference	23.9	16.2	20.7
Grade 11 English gender gap	M 0.7	F 1.7	F 1.9
Grade 11 Math gender gap	F 1.3	M 4.7	M 2.3
Overall rating out of 10	4.5	3.7	2.3

Simonds High School		Gr 11 enrollment: 320	
Saint John	2002-2003	Last 3 yrs	
Late Entry (%): 35.5	46 / 46	40 / 40	
Academic Performance		2001	2002
Average exam mark - English	51.1	62.3	63.1
Average exam mark - Math	44.3	51.3	47.7
Percentage of exams failed	55.9	32.8	53.9
School vs exam mark difference	20.0	13.5	16.6
Grade 11 English gender gap	F 2.0	F 1.3	F 5.0
Grade 11 Math gender gap	M 1.0	M 0.2	M 0.3
Overall rating out of 10	2.3	4.0	2.0



# 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 46) 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 2002/2003. Each school's three-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 three years of data were available "n/a" appears in the table.

Not all the province's high schools are included in the tables or the ranking. Excluded are schools at which fewer than 15 students were enrolled in grade 11 and schools that did not generate a sufficiently large set of student data to enable the calculation of an *Overall rating out of 10*.

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

Provincial rank		School name	City	Overall Rating	
2002/ 2003	Last 3 years			2002/ 2003	Last 3 years
1	4	McAdam High School	McAdam	10.0	8.3
2	1	Blackville School	Blackville	9.5	8.6
2	2	Bathurst High School	Bathurst	9.5	8.5
4	4	Woodstock High School	Woodstock	9.3	8.3
5	9	Tobique Valley High School	Plaster Rock	9.2	7.3
6	n/a	Upper Miramichi Regional High School	Boiestown	9.0	n/a
7	n/a	Chipman Forest Avenue School	Chipman	8.1	n/a
8	6	Petitcodiac Regional School	Petitcodiac	7.9	8.0
9	n/a	Moncton High School	Moncton	7.5	n/a
10	7	Hampton High School	Hampton	7.4	7.6
10	12	Bonar Law Memorial School	Rexton	7.4	6.7
12	3	Carleton North Senior High School	Bristol	7.3	8.4
12	7	Harrison Trimble High School	Moncton	7.3	7.6
12	21	Dalhousie Regional High School	Dalhousie	7.3	6.2
15	19	Kennebecasis Valley High School	Rothsay	7.2	6.4
16	12	Fredericton High School	Fredericton	7.0	6.7
17	10	Harvey High School	Harvey Station	6.9	7.2
17	34	Leo Hayes High School	Fredericton	6.9	4.9
19	11	North & South Esk Regional High School	Sunny Corner	6.5	6.9
19	16	Oromocto High School	Oromocto	6.5	6.6
19	21	Belleisle Regional High School	Springfield	6.5	6.2
19	21	Riverview High School	Riverview	6.5	6.2
23	25	Sugarloaf Senior High School	Campbellton	6.4	5.8
23	26	Rothsay High School	Rothsay	6.4	5.7

Provincial rank		School name	City	Overall Rating	
2002/ 2003	Last 3 years			2002/ 2003	Last 3 years
25	20	John Caldwell School	Grand Falls	6.3	6.3
26	12	Stanley Regional High School	Stanley	6.2	6.7
27	17	Grand Manan Community School	Grand Manan	5.9	6.5
28	12	St. Malachy's High School	Saint John	5.8	6.7
28	n/a	Sir James Dunn Academy	St. Andrews	5.8	n/a
30	33	Sussex Regional High School	Sussex	5.7	5.0
31	17	Miramichi Valley High School	Miramichi	5.4	6.5
31	30	Hartland High School	Hartland	5.4	5.2
33	35	Fundy High School	St. George	5.1	4.5
34	27	Nackawic Senior High School	Nackawic	5.0	5.5
34	32	St. Stephen High School	Old Ridge	5.0	5.1
36	n/a	Bernice MacNaughton High School	Moncton	4.9	n/a
36	n/a	Doaktown Consolidated High School	Doaktown	4.9	n/a
38	21	Minto Memorial High School	Minto	4.5	6.2
39	27	Tantramar Regional High School	Sackville	4.4	5.5
40	29	James M. Hill Memorial High School	Miramichi	4.3	5.3
41	30	Caledonia Regional High School	Hillsborough	3.9	5.2
41	36	Harbour View High School	Saint John	3.9	4.3
43	37	J.M.A. Armstrong/Salisbury Middle School	Salisbury	3.4	4.0
44	38	Saint John High School	Saint John	2.6	3.7
45	39	Southern Victoria High School	Perth-Andover	2.3	3.5
46	40	Simonds High School	Saint John	2.0	2.8





## Appendix: 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?” The following is a simplified description of the procedure used to convert the raw indicator data into the *Overall rating out of 10*.

- 1 For each indicator, for each school, for each year, the by-subject area, by-subject level results were converted into standardized or “Z” scores by solving the equation

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

where  $X$  is the individual school’s result,  $\mu$  is the mean of the all-schools distribution of results, and  $\sigma$  is the standard deviation of the same all-schools distribution.

- 2 For each indicator, these standardized data were then aggregated to produce weighted average indicator values. The weighting used was the number of examinations written in each subject area at each level at the school relative to the total number of examinations written at the school.
- 3 For each indicator, these weighted average results were then re-standardized.
- 4 The six 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-grade-11 English*—16.7%, *Average exam mark-grade-11 Math*—16.7%, *Percentage of exams failed*—33.3%, *School vs exam mark difference*—16.7%, *grade-11 English gender gap*—8.3%, and *grade-11 Math gender gap*—8.3%. For schools for which there were no gender-gap results, the *School vs exam mark difference* was weighted at 33.3%.
- 5 This summary standardized score was then standardized.

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

- 6 The maximum and minimum standardized scores were set at 2.0 and –3.29 respectively. Scores equal to, or greater than, 2.0 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.



- 7 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*,  $\mu$  is the average calculated according to the formula:

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

where  $\sigma$  is the standard deviation calculated according to the formula:

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

and  $\text{StanScore}$  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  $2.0$ .

- 8 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 & Acknowledgments

## *Peter Cowley*

Peter Cowley is the Director of School Performance Studies at The Fraser Institute. Upon graduation from the University of British Columbia (B.Comm. 1974), Mr Cowley accepted a marketing post with Procter & Gamble in Toronto. Shortly thereafter he returned to Vancouver to begin a long career in marketing and general management in the furniture-manufacturing sector. During his assignments in general management, process improvement was a special focus and interest. In 1994, Mr Cowley 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 in 1999 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*. Editions published in 2003 included *Report Cards* on secondary schools in British Columbia, Alberta, and Quebec as well as *Report Cards* on elementary schools in British Columbia, Alberta, and Ontario. He continues his research on education and related issues for The Fraser Institute.

## *Stephen T. Easton*

Stephen T. Easton is a professor of Economics at Simon Fraser University and a Senior Scholar at The Fraser Institute. 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 *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). He was also co-author of *A Secondary Schools Report Card for British Columbia* (1998), *The 1999 Report Card on British Columbia's Secondary Schools, Boys, Girls, and Grades: Academic Gender Balance in British Columbia's Secondary Schools* (1999), and *The 1999 Report Card on Alberta's High Schools*. 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* (Toronto: 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* (Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1997) and *Education in Canada: An Analysis of Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Schooling* (Vancouver: The Fraser Institute, 1988). His editorials have been carried by the *Vancouver Sun*, the *Globe and Mail*, the *Financial Post*, the *Ottawa Citizen*, and many other newspapers around the country. Professor Easton continues his work as co-author of the Institute's *Report Cards* on schools in Alberta and British Columbia.

## *Darlene Savoy*

Darlene Savoy is Data Analyst in the department of School Performance Studies at The Fraser Institute, where she assembles the data for, and automates the production of, the Institute's school report cards and the Progress

Planner website. She was raised and educated in New Brunswick and holds a Bachelor of Computer Science with a minor in Philosophy from the University of New Brunswick. Prior to joining the Institute, Ms. Savoy worked for over seven years as a computer programmer and data analyst in the private and public sectors of Canada and the United States.

## **Acknowledgments**

The Fraser Institute wishes to acknowledge the generous support for this project from the Max Bell Foundation. Thanks also to the employees of the Corporate Data and Analysis Section and the Data Management Services section of the Policy & Planning Branch at the New Brunswick Department of Education for their help in the acquisition and verification of the data.