

MARCH 2004

Report Card on British Columbia's Secondary Schools

2004 Edition

Peter Cowley and Stephen Easton

Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	3
<i>Key academic indicators of school performance</i>	7
<i>Other indicators of school performance</i>	13
<i>Detailed school results</i>	15
<i>Ranking the schools</i>	47
<i>Appendix: Calculating the Overall rating out of 10</i>	53
<i>About the authors & Acknowledgments</i>	55

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 Where competitive markets have been replaced by government control, the interest of the Institute lies in documenting objectively the nature of the improvement or deterioration resulting from government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.

For information about membership in The Fraser Institute, please contact the Development Department via mail to: The Fraser Institute, 4th Floor, 1770 Burrard Street, Vancouver, BC, V6J 3G7; via telephone: 604.688.0221 ext. 586; via fax: 604.688.8539; via e-mail: membership@fraserinstitute.ca.

In Calgary, please contact us via telephone: 403.216.7175 or, toll-free 1.866.716.7175; via fax: 403.234.9010; via e-mail: barrym@fraserinstitute.ca.

In Toronto, please contact us via telephone: 416.363.6575; via fax: 416.601.7322.

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 book sales coordinator via our toll-free order line: 1.800.665.3558, ext. 580; via telephone: 604.688.0221, ext. 580; via fax: 604.688.8539; via e-mail: sales@fraserinstitute.ca.

For media enquiries, please contact Suzanne Walters, Director of Communications via telephone: 604.714.4582 or, from Toronto, 416.363.6575, ext. 582; via e-mail: suzannew@fraserinstitute.ca

To learn more about the Institute, please visit our web site at 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: March 2004



Introduction

The *Report Card on British Columbia's Secondary 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 49 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

unpleasant 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."¹

We are also encouraged by recent research² suggesting that annual school report cards are particularly effective in reducing the academic achievement gap 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 the *Report Card on Aboriginal Education in British Columbia*³ in order to draw public attention to the chronically poor academic achievement of that group of students. We plan to maintain the focus on Aboriginal academic results either by annually publishing new editions of the *Report Card on Aboriginal Education* or by incorporating the results into this general *Report Card*.

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* facilitates school improvement

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 eagerly 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.⁴ 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 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 "Beacon Schools" program⁵ 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.

What plans do we have for future editions?

Beyond effectiveness— a measure of school efficiency

In 2003, The Fraser Institute published a study of British Columbia's system of allocating funds for certain operating grants to school districts and independent schools.⁶ The study concluded that

the allocation system is seriously flawed in that it presents school districts with incentives that are contrary to the best interests of the students. The study also found that there was substantial variation in the productivity of individual schools: some schools produced more student course completions per funded student—a reasonable and available measure of learning—than did other schools.

A new Ministry initiative requires school boards to annually report school-level expenditure budgets beginning in September 2004. These new data, together with currently available information, will enable us to design a more accurate indicator of school-by-school efficiency.

Beyond academic results— the Sports participation rate

Due to a dearth of data regarding other aspects of school performance, the *Report Card* has, to date, rated schools only on the basis of academic performance and progress. It has always been our desire to broaden the focus of the *Report Card* and we now have access to data that offer the opportunity to do so.

Most schools provide their students with an opportunity to participate in a variety of extra-curricular activities. Sports are a popular extra-curricular activity enjoyed by a significant number of the

province's secondary school students and there is some evidence that student participation in sports is beneficial in a variety of ways.⁷ Schools that encourage their students to join inter-school sports teams are encouraging their students to participate in an active and healthy life style, to engage in positive competition, and to build teamwork and leadership skills. We, therefore, consider the *Sports participation rate* to be a reasonable indicator of the extent to which the school encourages its students to take advantage of beneficial extra-curricular activities offered by the school.

The indicator measures the rate of participation in inter-school sports by students at the school. In addition, the data allow the comparison of participation rates by male and female students. The table below indicates the sports participation rates at a selection of schools for the Fall term of the 2003/2004 school year.

This sample illustrates the variation among schools both in the total participation rate and, within schools, between the sexes. We shall continue the development of this new indicator, which we hope to include in next year's edition. In the meantime, we welcome comments and criticism from interested parties wishing to discuss the indicator in more detail.

Table 1: Participation rate on inter-school sports teams, Fall 2003/2004

School name	Team Registrations	Student Enrollment	Team Registrations	Student Enrollment	Sport Participation Rate (%)		
	Female	Female	Male	Male	Female	Male	Total
L V Rogers Secondary	118	359	84	377	32.9	22.3	27.4
Immaculata Regional High School	89	140	122	126	63.6	96.8	79.3
Langley Secondary	112	424	89	418	26.4	21.3	23.9
Elgin Park Secondary	110	527	107	585	20.9	18.3	19.5
Hugh Boyd Secondary	125	417	160	475	30	33.7	32.0
Sir Charles Tupper Secondary	113	469	166	512	24.1	32.4	28.4
Vancouver College	n/a	n/a	315	667	n/a	47.2	47.2
Brooks Secondary	82	223	78	248	36.8	31.5	34.0
Westview Secondary	76	436	56	596	17.4	9.4	12.8
Duchess Park Secondary	121	477	130	450	25.4	28.9	27.1
Lambrick Park Secondary	164	297	186	404	55.2	46.0	49.9
Ladysmith Secondary	102	417	89	400	24.5	22.3	23.4
Norkam Secondary	86	459	183	543	18.7	33.7	26.8
Brentwood College	75	110	66	130	68.2	50.8	58.8
Lakes District Secondary	71	231	108	254	30.7	42.5	36.9

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

The *Report Card* will benefit from the input of interested parties. We welcome your suggestions, comments, and criticisms. Please such direct correspondence via e-mail to: reportcards@fraserinstitute.ca.

Notes

- 1 Caroline Hoxby, *Testing Is about Openness and Openness Works* (Hoover Institution, July 30, 2001). Digital document: http://www-hoover.stanford.edu/pubaffairs/we/current/hoxby_0701.html (as of January 2, 2003).
- 2 Eric A. Hanushek and Margaret E. Raymond, *The Effect of School Accountability Systems on the Level and Distribution of Student Achievement*, digital document: <http://edpro.stanford.edu/eah/papers/equity.jeea.nov03.pdf> (as of January 27, 2004)
- 3 Peter Cowley and Easton, Stephen, *Report Card on Aboriginal Education in British Columbia: 2004 Edition*, 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., *Successful Texas Schoolwide Programs: Research Study Results* (STAR Center at the Charles A. Dana Center, University of Texas at Austin), digital document: <http://www.starcenter.org/products/pdf/successfulreport.pdf> (as of June 3, 2002).
- 5 See the website of the Beacon Schools program: <http://www.standards.dfee.gov.uk/beaconschools/>.
- 6 Peter Cowley, Stephen Easton, and Davin Li, *The \$100,000,000 Giveaway: Who Says Education Doesn't Get Enough Money?* Studies in Education Policy (Vancouver, BC: The Fraser Institute, 2003).
- 7 National Centre for Culture and Recreation Statistics, Australian Bureau of Statistics, *The Social Impacts of Sport and Physical Recreation—An Annotated Bibliography*. Prepared on behalf of the Recreation and Sport Industry Statistical Group May 2001. Digital document: <http://www.sport.act.gov.au/docs/Socialimpacts.pdf>.



Key academic indicators of school performance

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

- (1) average provincial examination mark;
- (2) percentage of provincial examinations failed;
- (3) difference between the school mark and examination mark in provincially examinable courses;
- (4) difference between male and female students in the value of indicator (3) for English 12 only;
- (5) difference between male and female students in the value of indicator (3) for Mathematics 12 only;
- (6) provincially examinable courses taken per student;
- (7) graduation rate;
- (8) composite dropout 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 provincial examination mark*

This indicator (in the tables *Average exam mark*) is the average percentage achieved by a school's students on the uniform final examinations in all of the provincially examinable courses.² For each school, the indicator is the average of the mean scores achieved by the school's students in each of the provincial 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 provincial examinations. It was derived by dividing the sum, for each school, of all 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. There is good reason to have confidence in this indicator as a measure of effective teaching. A student need only successfully complete one provincially examinable course in order to graduate. Such a student's course of study may not include the prerequisites for all post-secondary educational options but it will be sufficient for graduation from secondary school. Thus, students enroll in the provincially examinable courses, in large measure, because they want to take them. Further, their success in grade 12 reflects to a certain extent how well students have been prepared in the lower grades. All of the 19 provincially examinable courses have prerequisite courses. Indeed, depending on the school, admission to the grade-12 course may require that the student have received a prescribed minimum grade in the prerequisite lower-level course. Since the decision to take provincially examinable courses is, for the most part, voluntary and requires demonstrated success in previous courses, it seems reasonable to use the percentage of examinations failed in these courses as an additional indicator of the effectiveness of the teaching in secondary schools.

3 *Difference between school mark and examination mark*

For each school, this indicator (in the tables *School vs exam mark difference*) gives the average of the absolute value of the difference between the average mark obtained on the provincial examinations and the average "school" mark—the accumulation of all the results from tests, essays, quizzes, and so on given in class—for all the provincially examinable courses.³

Effective teaching includes regular testing so that

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

The effectiveness of school-based assessments can be determined by a comparison to external assessments of the students. In each provincially examinable course, the Ministry of Education, the same authority that designed the course, administers a uniform examination. This examination will test the students' knowledge of the material contained in the course. If the marks assigned by the school are a reasonably accurate reflection of students' understanding, they should be roughly the same as the mark gained on the provincial examination. Thus, if a school has accurately assessed a student as consistently working at a C+ level, the student's examination result will be at a similar level. If, however, a school is consistently granting marks substantially higher or lower than those achieved by its students on the final examinations, then the school is not providing an accurate indicator of the extent to which knowledge of the course material is being acquired.

An indicator of consistency in teaching and assessment

The Gender gap indicators

Research⁴ has shown systematic sex-based differences in academic results in British Columbia's

secondary schools. These differences are particularly apparent where the local school rather than the Ministry of Education makes assessments. However, the same research found that “there appears to be no compelling evidence that girls and boys should, given effective teaching and counselling, experience differential rates of success.”⁵ Further, “[t]he differences described by each indicator vary from school to school over a considerable range of values.”⁶

The *Gender gap* indicators measure the difference, if any, in the average Mathematics 12 and English 12 school marks for boys and girls when their respective average examination marks in the same courses are taken into account. For each course, the indicator value is determined according to the formula:

$$\frac{(\text{Female school mark} - \text{Female exam mark}) - (\text{Male school mark} - \text{Male exam mark})}{\text{Female school mark} + \text{Male school mark}}$$

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

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

Three 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 three 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.

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

1 Composite drop-out rate

This indicator measures the extent to which schools keep their students in school and progressing in a timely manner toward completion of their diploma

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

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

Where a school does not enroll grade-8 students, the net drop-out rate is calculated using the three-year average grade-8 drop-out rate for the school district in which the school is located.

Where a school does not enroll grade 10 or grade 11 students, no *Composite drop-out 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 detailed in the Appendix.

It is appropriate to include this indicator in the *Report Card* as it appears that the existing *Graduation rate* indicator will soon be of little use in differentiating among schools. The average value for all schools on this indicator has risen steadily from 84.5% in the 1992/1993 school year to 94.7% in 2002/2003. As a matter of simple mechanics, an indicator that is unvarying is not a useful one for determining differences in effectiveness among schools.

2 Graduation rate

This indicator, related to the *Composite drop-out rate*, compares the number of "potential" graduates 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 potential 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.

3 Provincially examinable courses taken per student

This indicator (in the tables *Exams taken per student*) measures the average number of provincially examinable courses completed by the students at a school. It is derived by summing the participation rates for all the provincially examinable courses taken at that school. (The *participation rate* is the ratio, for a school, between the number of students writing the provincial examination in a particular subject and the number of students enrolled in grade 12.)

In their senior years, students have freedom to choose from a considerable variety of courses. Their choices will have an impact upon their literacy, numeracy, and analytical skills upon graduation. Their choices also affect the immediate post-secondary options open to them.

Provincially examinable courses offer study at the senior level in a variety of core disciplines: English, mathematics, the sciences, the humanities, and other languages. The Ministry has included courses in each discipline that reflect the post-secondary ambitions of different groups of students and, far from being courses only for a university-bound elite, these courses teach skills and knowledge that will benefit students no matter what they plan to do after graduation. Further, it is the marks obtained in these courses that are commonly used by post-secondary institutions—institutes of technology and community colleges as well as universities—to assess the applicant's readiness for further study and for admission to programs with limited enrolment. Thus, for most students a decision to take advantage of these courses is a good one and a

school that is successful in encouraging students to take these courses shows that it offers practical, well-informed counselling.

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 eight standardized scores—one for each indicator—for each school, for each year. The eight 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 six indicators. The *Composite drop-out rate* indicator is included in the calculation of the overall rating beginning in the 2001/2002 year. (See the Appendix for an explanation of the calculation of the *Overall rating out of 10*.)

Notes

- 1 The data from which these indicators are derived are contained in publicly accessible databases maintained by British Columbia's Ministry of Education for two purposes. School-level statistics describing student enrolment, programs offered, and certain characteristics of the school district provide the basis for determining the annual per-student operating grant each district will receive. Analysis of this same material aids the Ministry's staff in the assessment and planning of proposed capital projects as well as general policy planning. The Data Management Unit collects these data and much of it is available to the public on the Branch's web site (<http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/k12datareports/>). The nature and extent of the data is indicated by the School Level Data Collection Manuals also available on this web site.

Statistics on individual student performance are captured so that the Ministry is able to produce a transcript of marks for each student upon graduation from grade 12. This transcript lists all the grade-11 and grade-12 courses that the student attempted and the results achieved. These results include the school mark for all such courses as well as the provincial examination mark for any provincially examinable grade-12 courses. Summary data files (at the school, district, and provincial levels) are available for public perusal on the Branch's web site (<http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/exams/standrep.htm>). The Ministry provides values for the relevant statistics, for all public and independent secondary schools, for each of the 11 school years from September 1992 to August 2003.
- 2 The following provincially examinable courses were offered for at least some of the years between 1993/1994 and 2002/2003: Applications of Mathematics 12, Applications of Physics 12 (discontinued in 2001/2002), Biology 12, Chemistry 12, Communications 12, English 12, English Literature 12, French 12, Français Langue 12, Geography 12, Geology 12, German 12, History 12, Japanese 12, Latin 12 (discontinued in 1997/1998), Mandarin 12, Principles of Mathematics 12, Physics 12, Punjabi 12, Spanish 12 and Technical and Professional Communications 12. Students enrolled in schools run by the Francophone Education Authority may write some of these examinations in French.
- 3 A student's final mark for a provincially examinable 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 the weighted average of the examination mark that accounts for 40% and the school mark that accounts for the remaining 60%.
- 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, Subsection 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),



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 on the school's effectiveness.

The Socioeconomic indicator

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

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

family). When a school had more highly educated parents, the *Overall rating* at the school was likely to be higher.¹

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

For example, during the 2002/2003 school year, Kelowna Christian School, an independent school in Kelowna, achieved an *Overall rating* of 8.9 and yet, when the family characteristics of the student body are taken into account, the school was expected to achieve a rating of only about 6.6. The difference of 2.3 is reported in the tables. On the other hand, the actual *Overall rating* of Lambrick Park Secondary in Victoria was 6.3, although its predicted rating was 7.3. The reported difference for Lambrick Park is -1.0. This measurement suggests that Kelowna Christian is more successful than Lambrick Park in enabling all of its students to reach their potential.

This measure of the effect of the socio-economic background of a school's student body is presented with two important notes of caution. First, only about one-third of the variation among schools in the overall rating is associated with family characteristics like the level of parents' education. Clearly, many other factors—including good teaching, counselling, and school administration—contribute to the effectiveness of schools. Second, the statistical

measures used describe past relationships between a socio-economic characteristic and a measure of school effectiveness. It should not be inferred that these relationships will or should 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 socio-economic 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.

Is the school improving academically? The *Trends* indicator

For all the indicators, the *Report Card* provides a number of years of data. Unlike a simple snapshot of one year's results, this historical record provides evidence of change (or lack of change) over time. However, it can sometimes be difficult to determine whether a school's performance is improving or deteriorating simply by scanning several years of data.

In order to detect trends in the performance

indicators more easily, we developed the *Trends* indicator. It uses statistical analysis to identify those dimensions of school performance in which there has likely been real change rather than a fluctuation in results caused by random occurrences. Since standardizing makes historical data more comparable, the standardized scores rather than raw data are used to determine the trends. Because calculation of trends is uncertain when only a small number of data points is available, a trend is indicated only in those circumstances where at least five years of data are available and where it is determined to be statistically significant. In this context, "statistically significant" means that, nine times out of 10, the trend that is noted is real; that is, it would not have happened just by chance.

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

A (right)—Gr 12 Enrollment

The grade 12 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 —The percentage of English as a second language students at the school

—The percentage of students with special needs at the school

These statistics report two characteristics of the school's student body. They can be used to find other schools with similar student characteristics when you want to compare academic results.

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

This statistic compares the school's actual *Overall rating out of 10* with the rating that we would predict based on the average number of years of education of the most educated parent in each student's family. A positive difference suggests that the school is effective in enabling its students to succeed regardless of their socio-economic background.

C (right)—Overall academic ranking

The school's overall academic rank in the province for 2002/2003 and for the last five years. The overall

DISTRICT NAME									
School Name (Public or Independent)					Gr 12 Enrollment: 183				
B - ESL (%): 12.5					Special needs (%): 4.9				
C - Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 15.1 yrs: 0.4					Overall ranking:		2002-03		Last 5 Years
							69/279		43/253
Academic Performance	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Trends	
D - Average exam mark	70.0	70.0	69.1	70.2	71.5	72.0	70.5	—	
E - Percentage of exams failed	8.0	10.7	11.8	9.8	6.5	6.5	9.7	—	
F - School vs exam mark difference	6.7	4.5	7.3	5.4	3.8	4.8	4.6	▲	
G - English 12 gender gap	F 2.3	M 4.4	M 1.5	M 1.3	M 0.8	M 0.4	F 0.7	▲	
H - Math 12 gender gap	F 5.9	F 5.4	F 4.5	F 5.3	F 4.8	F 0.6	F 0.5	—	
I - Exams taken per student	4.4	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.4	3.9	4.4	—	
J - Graduation rate	97.8	91.8	95.0	94.4	94.8	94.2	93.2	▼	
K - Composite dropout rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	17.9	12.7	19.4	16.9	n/a	
L - Overall rating out of 10	8.2	7.3	7.5	7.3	7.6	7.5	7.2	—	

academic rank is based on the *Overall rating out of 10* for 2002/2003. The school's rank for the last five years is based on the average of the overall ratings achieved in 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 mark (%) achieved by the school's students on all the grade-12 provincial examinations.

E—Percentage of exams failed

The percentage of all the provincial examinations written by students at the school that received a failing grade.

F—School vs exam mark difference

The difference (in percentage points) between the marks received at the school and the provincial examination marks. A large difference usually indicates that the school has been “inflating” grades.

G—English 12 gender gap

H—Math 12 gender gap

The difference (in percentage points) between boys and girls in the extent to which their school marks in English 12 and Math 12 are different from their examination marks. Where the difference favours girls, the value is preceded by an **F**; where the difference favours boys, the value is preceded by an **M**. An **E** means that there is no difference between the girls and the boys on this measure. Most often, girls' school marks exceed the corresponding examination marks by more than do those of the boys. This may mean either that girls do better on work assigned at the school or that school-based marking favours female students. Small differences indicate that the school is doing a good job for all its students.

I—Exams taken per student

The number of provincial examinations taken in each school divided by the grade-12 enrollment. Taking

more provincially examinable courses provides students with greater post-secondary opportunities.

J—Graduation rate

The percentage of potential 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.

K—Composite dropout rate

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

L—Overall rating out of 10

The *Overall rating out of 10* takes into account the school's performance on all of these indicators. Schools may have different results in the eight indicators (*Average exam mark*, *Graduation rate*, etc.) but the same overall rating. Here is an example.

Average Gr 12 Enrollment:	Moscrio 258	South Kamloops 149
Academic Performance	2002/2003	2002/2003
Average exam mark	72.8	71.3
Percentage of exams failed	7.6	6.1
School vs exam mark difference	5.7	6.3
English 12 gender gap*	F 0.2	F 4.3
Math 12 gender gap*	F 4.1	F 0.8
Exams taken per student	3.0	2.8
Graduation rate	95.7	95.7
Composite dropout rate	29.2	19.9
Overall rating out of 10	6.8	6.8

M—Trends

An upward pointing arrow (▲) at the end of an indicator row means that the school is probably improving on that indicator; a downward pointing arrow (▼) means that the school is probably getting worse. The researchers had to be at least 90% sure that the changes were not just random before rating an indicator as improving or getting worse. A dash (—) indicates that there is no significant change; “n/a” indicates that there was insufficient data available with which to calculate a trend.

The measurement of trends is based on the most recent five years of data.

Note that for *Percentage of exams failed*, *School vs exam mark differences*, the two gender-gap indicators, and the *Composite drop-out rate*, a statistically significant downward trend in the data will lead to upward pointing arrow (▲) in the *Trends* column. For example, a decreasing *Percentage of exams failed* indicates improvement and so an upward pointing arrow (▲) is displayed.

Other notes

Note 1

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

Note 2

Not all the province's secondary schools are included in the tables or the ranking. Of the approximately 400 schools for which any provincial examination results were received, this *Report Card* looked at 279. 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 in no way be construed as a judgement of the school's effectiveness.

Note 3

The tables showing the detailed school results are

organized according to four geographic regions of the province as follows: the Lower Mainland, Vancouver Island and the Coast, the Fraser Valley and Southern BC, and the Interior and Northern BC. Within each geographic region, school districts are grouped alphabetically. Finally, within each school district, both public and private schools are listed in order of their 2002/2003 provincial ranking. Where there are ties, the schools are listed in order of their provincial ranking for the last five years.

Note 4

Some students may write a provincial examination more than once. In this study, students are counted only once in the *Exams taken per student* indicator.

Note 5

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 6

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

AVERAGE VALUES FOR ALL SCHOOLS 2002/2003

	Average Gr 12 Enrollment: 177							
	Average Special Needs (%): 9.9							
	Average ESL (%): 4.0							
	Average Parents' Education: 14.4							
Academic Performance	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Trend
Average exam mark	67.5	67.3	67.3	68.1	69.0	69.3	69.7	▲
Percentage of exams failed	11.8	12.4	13.0	12.1	11.4	9.9	10.1	▲
School vs exam mark difference	6.2	6.3	6.4	6.4	5.8	5.5	6.2	—
English 12 gender gap*	3.0	2.9	2.6	2.5	3.0	2.9	2.9	—
Math 12 gender gap*	3.6	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.0	3.0	2.7	▲
Exams taken per student	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.9	▲
Graduation rate	91.4	92.2	92.8	93.8	94.1	94.7	94.7	up
Composite dropout rate	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.6	23.1	22.2	21.5	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	6.2	6.2	6.2	6.3	6.2	6.2	6.2	n/a

* These results reflect the average size of the gender gaps. In 2002-2003, the English gender gap favoured females at 78.3% of schools, males at 21.3% of schools, and was even at 0.4% of schools. The Math gender gap favoured females at 63.2% of schools, males at 25.6% of schools, and was even at 1.2% schools.

Note 7

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.

List of cities and school districts

City	School district	City	School district
100 Mile House	Cariboo-Chilcotin	Lillooet	Gold Trail
Abbotsford	Abbotsford	Logan Lake	Kamloops/Thompson
Agassiz	Fraser-Cascade	Lumby	Vernon
Aldergrove	Langley	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
Comox	Comox Valley	New Westminster	New Westminster
Coquitlam	Coquitlam	North Vancouver	North Vancouver
Courtenay	Comox Valley	Oliver	Okanagan Similkameen
Cranbrook	Southeast Kootenay	Osoyoos	Okanagan Similkameen
Creston	Kootenay Lake	Parksville	Qualicum
Dawson Creek	Peace River South	Pemberton	Howe Sound
Delta	Delta	Penticton	Okanagan Skaha
Duncan	Cowichan Valley	Pitt Meadows	Maple Ridge-Pitt Meadows
Elkford	Southeast Kootenay	Port Alberni	Alberni
Enderby	North Okanagan-Shuswap	Port Coquitlam	Coquitlam
Fernie	Southeast Kootenay	Port Hardy	Vancouver Island North
Fort Langley	Langley	Port McNeill	Vancouver Island North
Fort Nelson	Fort Nelson	Port Moody	Coquitlam
Fort St James	Nechako Lakes	Powell River	Powell River
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
Hudson's Hope	Peace River North	Salmo	Kootenay Lake
Invermere	Rocky Mountain	Salmon Arm	North Okanagan-Shuswap
Kamloops	Kamloops/Thompson	Salt Spring Island	Gulf Islands
Kaslo	Kootenay Lake	Sechelt	Sunshine Coast
Kelowna	Central Okanagan	Shawnigan Lake	Cowichan Valley
Keremeos	Okanagan Similkameen	Sicamous	North Okanagan-Shuswap
Kimberley	Rocky Mountain	Sidney	Saanich
Kitimat	Coast Mountains	Smithers	Bulkley Valley
Ladysmith	Nanaimo-Ladysmith	Sooke	Sooke
Lake Cowichan	Cowichan Valley	South Slokan	Kootenay Lake
Langley	Langley	Sparwood	Southeast Kootenay

List of cities and school districts

City	School district
Squamish	Howe Sound
Summerland	Okanagan Skaha
Surrey	Surrey
Terrace	Coast Mountains
Trail	Kootenay-Columbia
Tumbler Ridge	Peace River South
Ucluelet	Alberni
Valemount	Prince George
Vancouver	Francophone Education Authority
Vancouver	Vancouver
Vanderhoof	Nechako Lakes

City	School district
Vernon	Vernon
Victoria	Francophone Education Authority
Victoria	Greater Victoria
Victoria	Saanich
Victoria	Sooke
Waglisla	Central Coast
West Vancouver	West Vancouver
Whistler	Howe Sound
Williams Lake	Cariboo-Chilcotin
Winfield	Central Okanagan

Index of school districts

School district	Page	School district	Page
Abbotsford	36	Mission	39
Alberni	30	Nanaimo-Ladysmith	33
Arrow Lakes	36	Nechako Lakes	44
Boundary	36	New Westminster	23
Bulkley Valley	42	Nicola-Similkameen	40
Burnaby	21	Nisga'a	34
Campbell River	30	North Okanagan-Shuswap	44
Cariboo-Chilcotin	42	North Vancouver	23
Central Coast	30	Okanagan Similkameen	40
Central Okanagan	37	Okanagan Skaha	40
Chilliwack	37	Peace River North	44
Coast Mountains	30	Peace River South	44
Comox Valley	31	Powell River	34
Coquitlam	21	Prince George	45
Cowichan Valley	31	Prince Rupert	34
Delta	22	Qualicum	34
Fort Nelson	42	Quesnel	45
Francophone Education Authority (Lower Mainland) ..	22	Revelstoke	46
Francophone Education Authority (Island)	31	Richmond	24
Fraser-Cascade	38	Rocky Mountain	46
Gold Trail	42	Saanich	34
Greater Victoria	32	Sooke	34
Gulf Islands	33	Southeast Kootenay	40
Haida Gwaii/Queen Charlotte	33	Sunshine Coast	35
Howe Sound	33	Surrey	25
Kamloops/Thompson	43	Vancouver	26
Kootenay Lake	38	Vancouver Island North	35
Kootenay-Columbia	38	Vancouver Island West	35
Langley	38	Vernon	41
Maple Ridge-Pitt Meadows	22	West Vancouver	29

Windermere Community Secondary (Public)		Gr 12 Enrollment: 242						
ESL (%): 7.6		Special needs (%): 10.8						
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 12.9 yrs: -0.2		2002-03 Last 5 Years 237/279 194/253						
Overall academic ranking:								
Academic Performance	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Trends
Average exam mark	64.4	65.7	66.1	61.8	67.8	70.1	67.7	—
Percentage of exams failed	14.9	15.4	14.4	22.7	13.6	10.5	13.9	—
School vs exam mark difference	5.4	5.4	4.4	7.5	3.4	5.0	5.9	—
English 12 gender gap	F 1.4	M 1.4	F 4.0	M 1.3	M 0.9	F 3.6	F 3.3	—
Math 12 gender gap	M 3.3	F 1.4	F 2.6	F 0.4	F 1.6	F 2.0	F 6.6	—
Exams taken per student	3.1	3.1	2.9	3.1	3.0	3.2	3.1	—
Graduation rate	89.8	90.6	91.3	88.0	89.2	85.6	87.5	▼
Composite dropout rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	28.0	28.3	21.5	25.5	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	6.0	6.1	6.1	4.8	5.7	5.7	4.8	—

Britannia Community Secondary (Public)		Gr 12 Enrollment: 156						
ESL (%): 6.9		Special needs (%): 14.7						
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of n/a yrs: n/a		2002-03 Last 5 Years 237/279 219/253						
Overall academic ranking:								
Academic Performance	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Trends
Average exam mark	64.7	62.7	61.2	64.6	66.2	66.5	68.6	▲
Percentage of exams failed	15.5	17.4	26.7	18.6	13.7	13.1	8.5	▲
School vs exam mark difference	8.2	8.3	6.0	6.1	6.0	3.6	5.5	—
English 12 gender gap	F 3.6	F 2.4	F 2.1	F 0.1	F 5.3	F 0.1	M 3.5	—
Math 12 gender gap	M 2.5	M 1.8	F 1.1	F 8.6	F 0.7	M 1.2	F 2.4	—
Exams taken per student	3.1	3.2	2.8	2.3	3.4	3.2	2.4	—
Graduation rate	89.6	93.7	87.3	89.8	90.7	92.0	87.7	—
Composite dropout rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	45.4	39.3	24.9	43.3	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	5.4	5.6	4.1	4.5	5.7	5.9	4.8	—

John Oliver Secondary (Public)		Gr 12 Enrollment: 237						
ESL (%): 9.4		Special needs (%): 9.8						
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 13.0 yrs: -1.9		2002-03 Last 5 Years 268/279 245/253						
Overall academic ranking:								
Academic Performance	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Trends
Average exam mark	58.5	62.4	60.5	60.6	61.1	63.8	63.8	—
Percentage of exams failed	29.1	19.2	24.3	26.7	26.1	19.3	21.7	—
School vs exam mark difference	9.7	7.7	5.5	9.2	6.0	4.7	8.1	—
English 12 gender gap	F 2.1	F 2.1	F 2.2	M 0.1	F 2.5	F 0.5	M 1.3	—
Math 12 gender gap	F 3.5	F 5.4	M 0.1	F 2.0	M 2.2	F 4.5	M 1.3	—
Exams taken per student	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.4	2.6	3.0	2.6	—
Graduation rate	86.2	83.4	84.6	86.6	77.1	81.1	83.2	—
Composite dropout rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	45.3	42.9	37.0	37.3	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	3.3	3.9	4.4	3.6	2.5	4.2	3.2	—

WEST VANCOUVER

Collingwood School (Independent)		Gr 12 Enrollment: 95						
ESL (%): n/a		Special needs (%): n/a						
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 17.0 yrs: 1.0		2002-03 Last 5 Years 12/279 11/253						
Overall academic ranking:								
Academic Performance	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Trends
Average exam mark	72.7	75.0	74.4	73.6	74.1	74.2	76.6	—
Percentage of exams failed	4.9	5.4	5.9	7.5	6.1	6.3	5.5	—
School vs exam mark difference	7.6	6.0	6.4	4.5	6.0	6.3	5.4	—
English 12 gender gap	M 0.7	M 1.2	M 2.4	F 3.6	F 4.2	F 2.2	F 0.8	—
Math 12 gender gap	F 2.8	M 1.3	F 8.1	F 1.0	F 2.4	M 2.2	F 1.5	—
Exams taken per student	5.7	5.5	4.8	4.4	5.0	5.3	4.8	—
Graduation rate	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	98.7	98.9	98.9	—
Composite dropout rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	9.7	10.0	9.3	9.0	8.9	9.4	9.3	—

West Vancouver Secondary (Public)		Gr 12 Enrollment: 412						
ESL (%): 6.0		Special needs (%): 8.4						
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 17.1 yrs: 0.0		2002-03 Last 5 Years 21/279 22/253						
Overall academic ranking:								
Academic Performance	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Trends
Average exam mark	69.8	70.3	69.8	70.5	73.7	73.7	76.0	▲
Percentage of exams failed	9.8	8.4	10.0	9.4	5.8	5.4	3.4	▲
School vs exam mark difference	5.0	5.4	3.6	4.5	2.4	4.1	2.4	—
English 12 gender gap	F 3.0	F 0.8	F 1.8	M 0.3	F 2.9	F 2.3	M 3.0	—
Math 12 gender gap	F 4.4	F 0.9	F 5.8	M 1.6	F 0.2	M 0.4	F 2.0	—
Exams taken per student	3.9	3.9	3.7	4.0	4.0	3.9	4.0	—
Graduation rate	90.8	91.4	86.7	92.2	96.5	97.4	96.2	▲
Composite dropout rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	19.4	13.4	13.7	13.0	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	7.2	7.7	7.0	7.5	8.4	8.2	8.4	▲

Sentinel Secondary (Public)		Gr 12 Enrollment: 193						
ESL (%): 11.4		Special needs (%): 4.4						
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 17.1 yrs: -0.4		2002-03 Last 5 Years 28/279 29/253						
Overall academic ranking:								
Academic Performance	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Trends
Average exam mark	73.0	73.0	70.4	73.6	72.1	71.6	75.0	—
Percentage of exams failed	5.6	7.5	13.2	8.5	11.1	10.8	6.9	—
School vs exam mark difference	4.4	5.3	6.7	3.6	4.0	6.7	4.3	—
English 12 gender gap	F 0.1	F 0.9	F 2.7	M 3.0	F 1.3	F 2.5	M 1.6	—
Math 12 gender gap	F 4.1	F 2.2	F 3.8	F 3.0	F 2.9	F 2.1	M 2.7	—
Exams taken per student	5.2	5.2	5.1	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.6	▼
Graduation rate	94.1	94.8	93.9	95.2	89.8	96.0	96.6	—
Composite dropout rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	15.4	29.5	26.3	20.4	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	9.1	9.1	7.9	8.4	7.0	7.1	8.0	—

Edward Milne Community School [Public]								Gr 12 Enrollment: 130			
ESL (%): 0.3								Special needs (%): 12.0			
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 12.7 yrs: -0.6								2002-03 Last 5 Years			
								Overall academic ranking: 250/279 228/253			
Academic Performance	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Trends			
Average exam mark	64.6	65.7	69.9	68.3	65.9	69.4	67.4	—			
Percentage of exams failed	14.8	16.0	9.1	8.8	15.0	9.0	15.3	▼			
School vs exam mark difference	5.6	7.2	5.8	6.0	6.3	7.0	8.0	▼			
English 12 gender gap	n/a	F 4.5	F 4.5	F 5.9	F 3.5	F 6.9	F 1.9	—			
Math 12 gender gap	n/a	M 0.1	M 4.6	F 4.1	F 1.4	M 5.1	M 1.9	—			
Exams taken per student	0.9	1.9	1.7	1.5	1.8	1.8	1.6	—			
Graduation rate	92.3	90.5	82.3	90.6	81.7	85.9	91.8	—			
Composite dropout rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	55.9	51.2	56.5	52.1	n/a			
Overall rating out of 10	5.2	5.4	5.1	5.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	▼			

SUNSHINE COAST

Pender Harbour Elementary/Secondary [Public]								Gr 12 Enrollment: 28			
ESL (%): 0.0								Special needs (%): 15.2			
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 15.7 yrs: 0.1								2002-03 Last 5 Years			
								Overall academic ranking: 58/279 43/253			
Academic Performance	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Trends			
Average exam mark	70.5	70.1	70.7	70.5	77.1	70.5	74.3	—			
Percentage of exams failed	7.0	6.6	6.2	4.0	4.3	8.2	6.9	—			
School vs exam mark difference	4.7	6.1	7.8	6.5	4.8	4.5	6.3	—			
English 12 gender gap	F 1.8	F 2.0	M 3.6	F 0.5	F 4.8	M 5.5	F 6.7	—			
Math 12 gender gap	n/a	n/a	F 9.0	n/a	F 1.5	n/a	F 0.5	n/a			
Exams taken per student	2.5	2.2	2.4	2.9	2.6	2.2	3.5	—			
Graduation rate	93.3	93.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	96.0	96.0	▼			
Composite dropout rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.7	n/a			
Overall rating out of 10	7.3	6.9	7.2	7.6	8.2	6.8	7.3	—			

Elphinstone Secondary [Public]								Gr 12 Enrollment: 131			
ESL (%): 0.0								Special needs (%): 15.9			
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of n/a yrs: n/a								2002-03 Last 5 Years			
								Overall academic ranking: 130/279 110/253			
Academic Performance	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Trends			
Average exam mark	71.4	69.9	71.9	66.4	69.5	70.8	70.2	—			
Percentage of exams failed	5.1	8.2	7.0	10.4	9.7	7.1	10.9	—			
School vs exam mark difference	3.8	5.0	5.3	4.0	7.8	5.1	5.7	—			
English 12 gender gap	F 0.3	M 2.2	F 1.3	F 1.4	F 2.4	F 4.1	F 3.4	▼			
Math 12 gender gap	F 6.1	F 0.2	F 7.6	F 4.4	F 2.0	F 7.5	M 0.4	—			
Exams taken per student	2.9	3.1	2.9	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.4	▲			
Graduation rate	88.2	94.2	90.6	90.4	97.3	97.5	92.8	—			
Composite dropout rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	33.1	21.7	25.2	27.4	n/a			
Overall rating out of 10	7.2	7.4	6.9	6.1	6.5	6.5	6.4	—			

Chateleux Secondary [Public]								Gr 12 Enrollment: 156			
ESL (%): 0.4								Special needs (%): 15.2			
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 14.0 yrs: 0.1								2002-03 Last 5 Years			
								Overall academic ranking: 155/279 74/253			
Academic Performance	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Trends			
Average exam mark	69.1	71.6	73.7	72.3	72.1	71.1	69.7	▼			
Percentage of exams failed	8.1	6.7	5.4	7.5	4.8	6.5	6.2	—			
School vs exam mark difference	7.9	4.4	3.8	4.6	5.0	3.9	6.2	▼			
English 12 gender gap	F 7.1	F 3.5	F 2.7	F 6.2	M 0.1	F 7.4	F 5.9	—			
Math 12 gender gap	F 9.2	F 0.9	F 4.6	F 0.7	F 0.5	M 2.8	F 4.8	—			
Exams taken per student	2.8	2.9	2.7	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.8	—			
Graduation rate	88.6	92.6	88.0	94.6	97.5	89.8	95.5	—			
Composite dropout rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	37.2	32.4	29.6	31.6	n/a			
Overall rating out of 10	5.9	7.5	7.0	7.4	7.7	6.2	6.1	—			

VANCOUVER ISLAND NORTH

North Island Secondary [Public]								Gr 12 Enrollment: 101			
ESL (%): 0.0								Special needs (%): 12.8			
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of n/a yrs: n/a								2002-03 Last 5 Years			
								Overall academic ranking: 215/279 219/253			
Academic Performance	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Trends			
Average exam mark	63.0	64.7	64.3	60.5	65.6	65.1	66.0	—			
Percentage of exams failed	18.3	12.8	14.6	21.0	15.9	15.9	15.5	—			
School vs exam mark difference	7.1	6.1	8.1	11.2	5.7	6.5	6.3	—			
English 12 gender gap	F 4.0	F 3.1	F 3.5	M 2.2	M 1.2	F 3.6	F 4.9	—			
Math 12 gender gap	F 2.2	M 3.9	F 4.4	F 2.8	F 4.0	F 2.2	M 1.7	—			
Exams taken per student	2.0	2.1	2.0	2.3	2.3	2.7	2.6	—			
Graduation rate	87.2	92.6	91.9	91.6	96.9	94.5	93.0	—			
Composite dropout rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	36.8	25.0	21.4	23.1	n/a			
Overall rating out of 10	4.3	5.5	4.9	4.4	5.6	5.1	5.2	—			

Port Hardy Secondary [Public]								Gr 12 Enrollment: 76			
ESL (%): 0.0								Special needs (%): 17.5			
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 12.5 yrs: 0.4								2002-03 Last 5 Years			
								Overall academic ranking: 215/279 244/253			
Academic Performance	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Trends			
Average exam mark	66.3	67.4	62.7	63.4	62.9	71.6	69.9	—			
Percentage of exams failed	13.0	12.1	23.8	21.1	19.7	8.5	9.2	▲			
School vs exam mark difference	5.0	3.1	8.9	10.8	8.0	5.1	6.2	▲			
English 12 gender gap	F 4.1	M 0.9	F 2.2	M 0.9	F 4.5	M 4.0	F 3.2	—			
Math 12 gender gap	n/a	F 4.8	F 11.3	F 5.6	F 10.0	F 2.1	M 15.5	—			
Exams taken per student	1.5	1.6	1.5	1.9	1.6	1.7	1.9	—			
Graduation rate	88.4	91.9	86.8	85.9	83.3	94.6	95.4	—			
Composite dropout rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	54.2	58.3	37.4	29.3	n/a			
Overall rating out of 10	5.1	5.8	3.2	4.0	2.8	5.6	5.2	—			

VANCOUVER ISLAND WEST

Gold River Secondary [Public]								Gr 12 Enrollment: 23			
ESL (%): 0.0								Special needs (%): 24.0			
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 14.3 yrs: -1.4								2002-03 Last 5 Years			
								Overall academic ranking: 237/279 242/253			
Academic Performance	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Trends			
Average exam mark	62.8	67.5	66.7	71.6	56.9	57.2	64.8	—			
Percentage of exams failed	12.3	12.3	15.0	0.0	36.8	32.1	11.1	—			
School vs exam mark difference	5.1	5.8	7.5	8.4	13.6	13.3	8.0	—			
English 12 gender gap	F 4.8	F 11.1	F 9.3	n/a	F 0.8	F 2.4	F 5.5	n/a			
Math 12 gender gap	F 2.0	n/a	F 2.1	n/a	n/a	M 1.1	n/a	n/a			
Exams taken per student	2.0	1.5	2.3	1.4	2.8	2.2	2.0	—			
Graduation rate	87.5	86.4	100.0	100.0	89.5	81.0	100.0	—			
Composite dropout rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	19.6	27.2	59.3	38.4	n/a			
Overall rating out of 10	5.0	5.2	6.2	6.7	2.1	1.5	4.8	—			

VERNON

Kalamalka Secondary [Public]		Gr 12 Enrollment: 130						
ESL (%): 0.0		Special needs (%): 7.3						
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 14.9 yrs: 0.7		2002-03			Last 5 Years			
		Overall academic ranking: 55/279			55/253			
Academic Performance	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Trends
Average exam mark	68.3	68.8	68.4	71.8	69.7	69.2	72.7	—
Percentage of exams failed	10.7	9.8	12.2	6.5	8.8	7.9	5.8	—
School vs exam mark difference	8.1	9.1	9.0	7.4	7.6	9.2	7.8	—
English 12 gender gap	F 1.0	F 0.8	F 4.0	F 1.7	M 0.6	F 2.0	F 5.2	—
Math 12 gender gap	F 1.3	F 5.2	M 1.5	F 5.1	F 3.3	M 1.2	M 1.1	—
Exams taken per student	3.3	3.0	2.7	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.2	—
Graduation rate	92.8	99.0	97.7	95.8	94.4	99.2	98.4	—
Composite dropout rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	22.4	15.1	8.8	6.8	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	7.1	7.4	6.8	7.5	6.9	7.4	7.4	—

Vernon Secondary [Public]		Gr 12 Enrollment: 213						
ESL (%): 0.0		Special needs (%): 7.6						
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 14.0 yrs: -0.2		2002-03			Last 5 Years			
		Overall academic ranking: 188/279			165/253			
Academic Performance	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Trends
Average exam mark	67.2	67.4	66.4	66.1	65.3	67.3	67.1	—
Percentage of exams failed	10.8	12.3	11.5	10.2	12.6	11.6	12.9	▼
School vs exam mark difference	5.8	7.9	8.5	7.4	6.9	5.4	7.7	—
English 12 gender gap	F 4.2	F 4.8	M 2.3	F 3.1	M 0.4	F 1.5	F 2.2	—
Math 12 gender gap	F 3.2	F 5.2	F 0.6	F 3.9	F 2.8	F 1.0	M 0.3	—
Exams taken per student	2.0	2.2	2.3	2.8	2.6	2.4	2.7	—
Graduation rate	90.2	90.6	87.7	91.9	94.5	94.6	96.1	▲
Composite dropout rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	46.0	34.7	30.8	27.3	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	6.0	5.7	5.5	6.0	5.7	5.8	5.7	—

Clarence Fulton Secondary [Public]		Gr 12 Enrollment: 175						
ESL (%): 0.3		Special needs (%): 10.6						
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 13.6 yrs: 0.9		2002-03			Last 5 Years			
		Overall academic ranking: 118/279			99/253			
Academic Performance	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Trends
Average exam mark	67.5	66.0	66.3	69.0	69.1	67.0	68.0	—
Percentage of exams failed	9.4	14.2	14.8	8.3	9.3	12.5	7.7	—
School vs exam mark difference	5.9	7.4	9.5	5.7	7.7	8.1	7.1	—
English 12 gender gap	F 2.5	M 1.0	M 0.2	F 2.4	F 4.5	F 2.9	F 3.3	—
Math 12 gender gap	F 0.3	F 5.9	F 5.6	M 0.3	F 1.5	M 0.4	F 2.8	—
Exams taken per student	2.0	2.6	2.8	2.9	2.8	2.9	2.7	—
Graduation rate	95.1	91.8	97.7	95.7	99.4	98.4	98.1	—
Composite dropout rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	14.2	8.3	11.6	14.2	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	6.6	5.7	6.3	7.2	6.8	6.3	6.5	—

Charles Bloom Secondary [Public]		Gr 12 Enrollment: 93						
ESL (%): 0.0		Special needs (%): 8.8						
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 13.1 yrs: -0.8		2002-03			Last 5 Years			
		Overall academic ranking: 247/279			199/253			
Academic Performance	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Trends
Average exam mark	64.3	65.9	62.1	66.8	67.6	66.2	65.8	—
Percentage of exams failed	12.1	9.6	23.4	6.1	7.1	9.6	15.8	—
School vs exam mark difference	5.9	4.0	11.9	4.9	4.6	5.0	7.6	—
English 12 gender gap	F 0.7	F 2.8	M 2.1	F 2.5	M 1.1	F 2.5	F 5.5	—
Math 12 gender gap	M 8.2	F 4.7	M 4.2	M 2.5	M 0.6	F 1.4	F 0.5	—
Exams taken per student	2.0	2.2	1.8	2.3	2.2	2.3	2.0	—
Graduation rate	89.7	92.1	91.3	96.6	98.8	96.7	91.4	—
Composite dropout rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	8.3	19.2	22.3	27.6	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	4.9	5.8	3.0	6.7	6.8	5.8	4.4	—

W L Seaton Secondary [Public]		Gr 12 Enrollment: 199						
ESL (%): 1.8		Special needs (%): 6.0						
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 13.6 yrs: 0.6		2002-03			Last 5 Years			
		Overall academic ranking: 148/279			89/253			
Academic Performance	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Trends
Average exam mark	66.7	67.1	70.0	71.7	72.7	73.5	71.6	—
Percentage of exams failed	13.4	13.1	8.0	6.6	5.5	4.8	7.3	—
School vs exam mark difference	7.1	3.9	4.7	7.1	9.2	6.6	6.6	—
English 12 gender gap	F 3.1	F 3.8	M 0.7	F 1.3	F 0.3	F 3.5	F 4.2	▼
Math 12 gender gap	F 0.8	M 1.3	F 1.1	F 1.3	F 3.3	F 4.7	F 8.3	▼
Exams taken per student	2.2	2.5	2.1	2.3	2.5	2.2	2.4	—
Graduation rate	89.2	87.3	94.7	92.8	96.1	95.8	96.9	—
Composite dropout rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	28.2	11.6	18.7	18.5	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	5.8	5.7	6.9	6.8	7.0	6.7	6.2	▼

Quesnel Secondary [Public]		Gr 12 Enrollment: 213						
ESL (%): 0.0		Special needs (%): 17.0						
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 13.5 yrs: -1.5		2002-03 Last 5 Years						
		Overall academic ranking: 256/279 225/253						
Academic Performance	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Trends
Average exam mark	63.1	64.2	62.3	63.3	67.1	65.4	65.9	—
Percentage of exams failed	16.4	15.0	18.7	17.0	11.7	11.2	15.1	—
School vs exam mark difference	6.6	7.1	9.6	7.8	7.4	7.4	7.7	—
English 12 gender gap	F 5.6	F 1.2	F 3.9	F 3.3	F 5.1	F 1.5	F 7.0	—
Math 12 gender gap	F 1.2	F 2.2	F 12.5	F 1.0	F 1.6	F 0.9	M 4.2	—
Exams taken per student	2.0	2.4	2.2	2.3	2.5	2.2	2.4	—
Graduation rate	91.0	95.4	93.5	93.8	96.8	94.5	91.0	—
Composite dropout rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	36.0	26.4	28.4	43.4	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	4.8	5.8	3.8	5.0	5.8	5.2	4.1	—

REVELSTOKE

Revelstoke Secondary [Public]		Gr 12 Enrollment: 125						
ESL (%): 0.6		Special needs (%): 10.1						
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 12.9 yrs: 1.1		2002-03 Last 5 Years						
		Overall academic ranking: 155/279 120/253						
Academic Performance	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Trends
Average exam mark	61.7	64.6	64.5	72.1	68.1	67.1	67.2	—
Percentage of exams failed	18.6	15.0	17.8	6.5	8.8	9.5	9.8	—
School vs exam mark difference	7.9	7.1	6.6	4.6	4.6	5.0	5.0	—
English 12 gender gap	F 1.6	F 5.6	F 3.6	F 1.9	F 7.6	M 0.8	M 1.6	—
Math 12 gender gap	M 2.7	F 8.6	F 7.4	F 2.3	F 2.1	F 3.6	F 4.3	—
Exams taken per student	2.2	2.7	2.1	2.6	2.7	3.2	2.5	—
Graduation rate	91.0	96.0	92.8	92.5	97.2	97.0	98.0	▲
Composite dropout rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	28.9	33.8	39.5	34.7	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	4.9	5.9	5.1	7.2	6.5	6.4	6.1	—

ROCKY MOUNTAIN

Selkirk Secondary [Public]		Gr 12 Enrollment: 121						
ESL (%): 0.3		Special needs (%): 9.5						
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 14.0 yrs: 0.8		2002-03 Last 5 Years						
		Overall academic ranking: 99/279 80/253						
Academic Performance	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Trends
Average exam mark	67.4	66.2	67.5	67.4	68.6	68.7	68.5	▼
Percentage of exams failed	8.0	10.9	12.9	8.9	10.0	9.3	7.6	—
School vs exam mark difference	4.0	5.7	6.7	5.9	4.6	4.3	6.1	—
English 12 gender gap	F 3.9	F 4.1	F 0.5	F 2.5	F 0.1	F 0.5	M 0.9	—
Math 12 gender gap	F 2.2	F 4.1	F 4.5	F 3.5	F 3.7	F 3.9	F 3.8	—
Exams taken per student	2.2	2.5	2.6	2.8	2.6	2.8	2.3	—
Graduation rate	96.4	89.3	96.8	94.9	98.2	96.6	99.0	—
Composite dropout rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	12.0	7.6	14.9	12.6	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	6.8	5.8	6.7	6.9	7.1	6.8	6.7	—

David Thompson Secondary [Public]		Gr 12 Enrollment: 118						
ESL (%): 0.9		Special needs (%): 9.7						
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 13.8 yrs: 0.5		2002-03 Last 5 Years						
		Overall academic ranking: 148/279 133/253						
Academic Performance	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Trends
Average exam mark	67.8	69.8	67.1	65.5	67.5	68.3	67.7	—
Percentage of exams failed	10.0	8.4	10.3	13.2	12.4	11.9	10.4	—
School vs exam mark difference	4.6	6.3	5.9	6.6	7.8	4.6	5.9	—
English 12 gender gap	F 0.2	F 1.5	M 2.5	F 2.2	M 1.2	F 7.7	F 0.7	—
Math 12 gender gap	F 0.7	F 0.1	F 5.8	F 8.0	F 6.0	F 1.8	F 1.0	—
Exams taken per student	3.1	3.0	2.7	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.5	—
Graduation rate	88.2	97.4	95.7	94.4	97.0	98.1	96.1	—
Composite dropout rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	52.1	35.9	17.3	27.6	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	7.1	8.0	6.6	6.0	6.1	6.3	6.2	—

Golden Secondary [Public]		Gr 12 Enrollment: 83						
ESL (%): 2.0		Special needs (%): 9.7						
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. ed. of 13.3 yrs: 0.5		2002-03 Last 5 Years						
		Overall academic ranking: 174/279 150/253						
Academic Performance	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Trends
Average exam mark	65.6	63.7	62.5	64.7	63.5	68.0	65.8	—
Percentage of exams failed	16.3	18.6	18.7	13.7	16.2	10.0	12.8	—
School vs exam mark difference	9.9	8.5	8.5	7.0	8.6	7.2	6.4	—
English 12 gender gap	F 1.4	M 1.7	M 3.6	M 0.7	F 3.0	F 3.2	F 4.5	—
Math 12 gender gap	M 0.4	F 3.1	F 1.7	M 1.5	F 6.3	F 2.5	F 1.4	—
Exams taken per student	2.5	2.7	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.6	—
Graduation rate	87.1	90.8	98.9	97.2	97.8	97.7	98.9	—
Composite dropout rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	15.8	22.2	13.9	19.3	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	5.2	5.3	5.9	6.6	5.4	6.2	5.9	—



Ranking the schools

Important notes to the rankings

In this table, schools are ranked (on the left hand side of the page) in descending order (from 1 to 279) 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 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 were 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 in no way be construed as a judgement of the school's effectiveness.

Provincial rank				Overall Rating	
2002/ 2003	Last 5 years	School name	City	2002/ 2003	Last 5 years
1	1	St George's School	Vancouver	10.0	10.0
1	1	Crofton House	Vancouver	10.0	10.0
1	1	York House School	Vancouver	10.0	10.0
1	1	Little Flower Academy	Vancouver	10.0	10.0
1	6	University Hill Secondary	Vancouver	10.0	9.8
6	1	Brentwood College	Mill Bay	9.9	10.0
7	6	St Michaels University School	Victoria	9.7	9.8
8	6	Southridge Senior Secondary	Surrey	9.6	9.8
9	9	St Margaret's	Victoria	9.5	9.7
9	10	Glenlyon-Norfolk Senior School	Victoria	9.5	9.4
9	n/a	West Point Grey Academy	Vancouver	9.5	n/a
12	11	Collingwood School	West Vancouver	9.3	9.2
12	13	Vancouver College	Vancouver	9.3	8.5
14	12	Shawnigan Lake	Shawnigan Lake	9.0	9.1
14	13	Pacific Academy	Surrey	9.0	8.5
16	38	Kelowna Christian School	Kelowna	8.9	7.5
16	n/a	Kwantlen Park Secondary	Surrey	8.9	n/a
18	15	Lord Byng Secondary	Vancouver	8.8	8.3
19	n/a	Maxwell International Baha'i School	Shawnigan Lake	8.6	n/a
20	n/a	Campbell River Christian School	Campbell River	8.5	n/a
21	22	West Vancouver Secondary	West Vancouver	8.4	7.9

Provincial rank		School name	City	Overall Rating	
2002/ 2003	Last 5 years			2002/ 2003	Last 5 years
22	18	Prince Of Wales Secondary	Vancouver	8.3	8.2
22	22	Mennonite Educational Institute	Abbotsford	8.3	7.9
24	15	Archbishop Carney Secondary	Port Coquitlam	8.2	8.3
24	19	Handsworth Secondary School	North Vancouver	8.2	8.1
24	43	Claremont Secondary School	Victoria	8.2	7.4
27	22	John Peterson Secondary	Kamloops	8.1	7.9
28	15	Point Grey Secondary	Vancouver	8.0	8.3
28	20	St Patrick's Regional Secondary	Vancouver	8.0	8.0
28	28	Magee Secondary	Vancouver	8.0	7.8
28	29	Sentinel Secondary	West Vancouver	8.0	7.7
28	38	Mount Douglas Sr. Secondary	Victoria	8.0	7.5
28	n/a	St John's	Vancouver	8.0	n/a
34	29	Sir Winston Churchill Secondary	Vancouver	7.9	7.7
34	38	Rossland Secondary	Rossland	7.9	7.5
36	22	Timothy Christian School	Chilliwack	7.8	7.9
36	22	St Thomas Aquinas	North Vancouver	7.8	7.9
36	29	Elgin Park Secondary	Surrey	7.8	7.7
36	43	St Thomas More Collegiate	Burnaby	7.8	7.4
36	74	Brookwood Secondary	Langley	7.8	6.9
36	80	Elkford Secondary	Elkford	7.8	6.8
36	n/a	Haney-Pitt Meadows Christian School	Maple Ridge	7.8	n/a
43	29	Langley Fine Arts School	Fort Langley	7.7	7.7
43	35	Pacific Christian School	Victoria	7.7	7.6
43	52	New Westminster Secondary	New Westminster	7.7	7.3
43	55	Whistler Secondary	Whistler	7.7	7.2
43	65	Gulf Islands Secondary	Salt Spring Island	7.7	7.1
43	99	Johnston Heights Secondary	Surrey	7.7	6.6
49	20	Frances Kelsey Secondary	Mill Bay	7.6	8.0
49	22	Semiahmoo Secondary	Surrey	7.6	7.9
49	43	Fraser Valley Christian High	Surrey	7.6	7.4
49	55	Notre Dame Regional Secondary	Vancouver	7.6	7.2
49	80	Pinetree Secondary School	Coquitlam	7.6	6.8
54	29	St Andrew's Regional High	Victoria	7.5	7.7
55	55	Kalamalka Secondary	Vernon	7.4	7.2
55	55	W J Mouat Secondary	Abbotsford	7.4	7.2
55	99	Duncan Christian School	Duncan	7.4	6.6
58	29	Kitsilano Secondary	Vancouver	7.3	7.7
58	35	L V Rogers Secondary	Nelson	7.3	7.6
58	43	Pender Harbour Elementary/Secondary	Madeira Park	7.3	7.4
58	43	Parkland Secondary School	Sidney	7.3	7.4
58	55	Mount Sentinel Secondary	South Slokan	7.3	7.2
58	55	Robert Bateman Secondary	Abbotsford	7.3	7.2
58	65	Seaquam Secondary	Delta	7.3	7.1
58	65	Highland Secondary	Comox	7.3	7.1
58	80	Port Moody Secondary	Port Moody	7.3	6.8
58	80	Gleneagle Secondary School	Coquitlam	7.3	6.8
58	114	Max Cameron Secondary	Powell River	7.3	6.4
69	35	Dover Bay Secondary	Nanaimo	7.2	7.6
69	43	Yale Secondary	Abbotsford	7.2	7.4
69	43	Hugh McRoberts Secondary	Richmond	7.2	7.4
69	43	Argyle Secondary	North Vancouver	7.2	7.4
69	52	Earl Marriott Secondary	Surrey	7.2	7.3

Provincial rank		School name	City	Overall Rating	
2002/ 2003	Last 5 years			2002/ 2003	Last 5 years
69	52	Oak Bay Secondary	Victoria	7.2	7.3
69	55	Eric Hamber Secondary	Vancouver	7.2	7.2
69	89	Immaculata Regional High School	Kelowna	7.2	6.7
69	99	Steveston Secondary	Richmond	7.2	6.6
78	43	Stelly's Secondary School	Saanichton	7.1	7.4
78	55	Sparwood Secondary	Sparwood	7.1	7.2
78	55	Seycove Secondary Community	North Vancouver	7.1	7.2
78	74	Penticton Secondary	Penticton	7.1	6.9
78	80	Langley Christian School	Langley	7.1	6.8
78	89	Sutherland Secondary	North Vancouver	7.1	6.7
84	38	Holy Cross Regional High School	Surrey	7.0	7.5
84	65	Sa-Hali Secondary	Kamloops	7.0	7.1
84	140	Pleasant Valley Secondary	Armstrong	7.0	6.1
84	157	White Rock Christian Academy	Surrey	7.0	5.9
84	n/a	Highroad Academy	Chilliwack	7.0	n/a
84	n/a	Clayton Heights Secondary	Surrey	7.0	n/a
90	89	Sardis Secondary	Chilliwack	6.9	6.7
90	114	Enver Creek Secondary	Surrey	6.9	6.4
90	133	Houston Secondary	Houston	6.9	6.2
93	55	Burnaby North Secondary	Burnaby	6.8	7.2
93	71	South Kamloops Secondary	Kamloops	6.8	7.0
93	89	Okanagan Mission Secondary	Kelowna	6.8	6.7
93	120	Mount Boucherie Secondary	Kelowna	6.8	6.3
93	140	Cowichan Secondary	Duncan	6.8	6.1
93	n/a	Moscrop Secondary	Burnaby	6.8	n/a
99	71	Centennial Secondary	Coquitlam	6.7	7.0
99	80	Selkirk Secondary	Kimberley	6.7	6.8
99	80	Stanley Humphries Secondary	Castlegar	6.7	6.8
99	89	Delta Secondary	Delta	6.7	6.7
99	99	George Elliot Secondary	Winfield	6.7	6.6
99	110	J N Burnett Secondary	Richmond	6.7	6.5
99	133	Fleetwood Park Secondary	Surrey	6.7	6.2
99	214	Mission Secondary	Mission	6.7	5.1
99	n/a	Kelowna Secondary	Kelowna	6.7	n/a
99	n/a	Fraser Heights Secondary	Surrey	6.7	n/a
109	65	St Ann's Academy	Kamloops	6.6	7.1
109	74	Abbotsford Christian School	Abbotsford	6.6	6.9
109	99	Lord Tweedsmuir Secondary	Surrey	6.6	6.6
109	114	D W Poppy Secondary	Langley	6.6	6.4
109	114	Maple Ridge Secondary	Maple Ridge	6.6	6.4
109	120	J Lloyd Crowe Secondary	Trail	6.6	6.3
109	157	Prince Charles Secondary	Creston	6.6	5.9
109	177	Terry Fox Secondary	Port Coquitlam	6.6	5.6
109	n/a	L'Ecole Victor Brodeur	Victoria	6.6	n/a
118	71	Summerland Secondary	Summerland	6.5	7.0
118	80	Killarney Secondary	Vancouver	6.5	6.8
118	89	Thomas Haney Centre	Maple Ridge	6.5	6.7
118	99	Clarence Fulton Secondary	Vernon	6.5	6.6
118	99	South Delta Secondary	Delta	6.5	6.6
118	99	Boundary Central Secondary	Midway	6.5	6.6
118	99	Smithers Secondary	Smithers	6.5	6.6
118	177	Carihi Secondary	Campbell River	6.5	5.6

Provincial rank		School name	City	Overall Rating	
2002/ 2003	Last 5 years			2002/ 2003	Last 5 years
118	206	King George Secondary	Vancouver	6.5	5.2
118	214	Matthew McNair Secondary	Richmond	6.5	5.1
118	n/a	Burnaby Mountain Secondary	Burnaby	6.5	n/a
118	n/a	Kitsilano Secondary	Vancouver	6.5	n/a
130	74	Richmond Christian School	Richmond	6.4	6.9
130	89	Logan Lake Elementary/Secondary	Logan Lake	6.4	6.7
130	110	Elphinstone Secondary	Gibsons	6.4	6.5
130	114	Ballenas Secondary	Parksville	6.4	6.4
130	150	Fernie Secondary School	Fernie	6.4	6.0
130	150	Mountain Secondary	Langley	6.4	6.0
130	150	R C Palmer Secondary	Richmond	6.4	6.0
130	n/a	Robert Alexander McMath Secondary	Richmond	6.4	n/a
138	38	Credo Christian High School	Langley	6.3	7.5
138	65	Chemainus Secondary	Chemainus	6.3	7.1
138	74	Lambrick Park Secondary	Victoria	6.3	6.9
138	80	Windsor Secondary	North Vancouver	6.3	6.8
138	99	Wellington Secondary	Nanaimo	6.3	6.6
138	120	Cariboo Hill Secondary	Burnaby	6.3	6.3
138	140	Rick Hansen Secondary	Abbotsford	6.3	6.1
138	157	Westview Secondary	Maple Ridge	6.3	5.9
138	n/a	Sullivan Heights Secondary	Surrey	6.3	n/a
138	n/a	Dr. Charles Best Secondary School	Coquitlam	6.3	n/a
148	89	W L Seaton Secondary	Vernon	6.2	6.7
148	110	David Thompson Secondary	Vancouver	6.2	6.5
148	133	David Thompson Secondary	Invermere	6.2	6.2
148	133	Carson Graham Secondary	North Vancouver	6.2	6.2
148	133	Kwalikum Secondary	Qualicum Beach	6.2	6.2
148	157	Peter Skene Ogden Secondary	100 Mile House	6.2	5.9
148	n/a	Fraser Academy	Vancouver	6.2	n/a
155	74	Chatelech Secondary	Sechelt	6.1	6.9
155	89	Agassiz Elementary/Secondary	Agassiz	6.1	6.7
155	99	J V Humphries Elementary/Secondary	Kaslo	6.1	6.6
155	110	Duchess Park Secondary	Prince George	6.1	6.5
155	120	Revelstoke Secondary	Revelstoke	6.1	6.3
155	120	Burnaby Central Secondary	Burnaby	6.1	6.3
155	120	Southern Okanagan Secondary	Oliver	6.1	6.3
155	120	Timberline Secondary School	Campbell River	6.1	6.3
155	120	Valleyview Secondary	Kamloops	6.1	6.3
155	161	Pitt Meadows Secondary	Pitt Meadows	6.1	5.8
155	161	Riverside Secondary	Port Coquitlam	6.1	5.8
155	165	Cambie Secondary	Richmond	6.1	5.7
155	177	Hope Secondary	Hope	6.1	5.6
168	120	Walnut Grove Secondary	Langley	6.0	6.3
168	140	Hugh Boyd Secondary	Richmond	6.0	6.1
168	150	Princess Margaret Secondary	Surrey	6.0	6.0
168	165	Howe Sound Secondary	Squamish	6.0	5.7
168	n/a	Cedars Christian School	Prince George	6.0	n/a
168	n/a	Kamloops Christian	Kamloops	6.0	n/a
174	114	D P Todd Secondary	Prince George	5.9	6.4
174	150	Golden Secondary	Golden	5.9	6.0
174	150	Prince Rupert Secondary	Prince Rupert	5.9	6.0
174	161	Tamanawis Secondary	Surrey	5.9	5.8

Provincial rank		School name	City	Overall Rating	
2002/ 2003	Last 5 years			2002/ 2003	Last 5 years
174	161	Vancouver Technical Secondary	Vancouver	5.9	5.8
174	177	Tumbler Ridge Secondary	Tumbler Ridge	5.9	5.6
174	199	Chetwynd Secondary	Chetwynd	5.9	5.3
181	120	Burnaby South Secondary	Burnaby	5.8	6.3
181	133	Alpha Secondary	Burnaby	5.8	6.2
181	140	St John Brebeuf Regional High	Abbotsford	5.8	6.1
181	140	Salmon Arm Sr. Secondary	Salmon Arm	5.8	6.1
181	177	North Peace Secondary	Fort St John	5.8	5.6
181	188	A L Fortune Secondary	Enderby	5.8	5.5
181	206	Gladstone Secondary	Vancouver	5.8	5.2
188	89	Grand Forks Secondary	Grand Forks	5.7	6.7
188	165	Vernon Secondary	Vernon	5.7	5.7
188	165	Hatzic Secondary School	Mission	5.7	5.7
188	199	Brooks Secondary	Powell River	5.7	5.3
188	206	Caledonia Sr. Secondary	Terrace	5.7	5.2
193	120	Charles E London Secondary	Richmond	5.6	6.3
193	120	Georges P Vanier Secondary	Courtenay	5.6	6.3
193	165	Garibaldi Secondary	Maple Ridge	5.6	5.7
193	165	Spectrum Community School	Victoria	5.6	5.7
193	199	L A Matheson Secondary	Surrey	5.6	5.3
193	199	Belmont Secondary	Victoria	5.6	5.3
199	140	Kelly Road Secondary	Prince George	5.5	6.1
199	165	Alberni District Secondary	Port Alberni	5.5	5.7
199	165	Heritage Park Secondary	Mission	5.5	5.7
199	177	Bulkley Valley Christian School	Smithers	5.5	5.6
199	194	Correliou Secondary	Quesnel	5.5	5.4
199	199	Chilliwack Secondary	Chilliwack	5.5	5.3
199	n/a	Chilliwack Christian School	Chilliwack	5.5	n/a
206	150	Osoyoos Secondary	Osoyoos	5.4	6.0
206	165	H D Stafford Secondary	Langley	5.4	5.7
206	188	North Surrey Secondary	Surrey	5.4	5.5
206	194	Aldergrove Community Secondary	Aldergrove	5.4	5.4
206	194	Fraser Valley Adventist Academy	Aldergrove	5.4	5.4
211	188	Prince George Secondary	Prince George	5.3	5.5
211	188	Esquimalt Community School	Victoria	5.3	5.5
211	194	Valemount Secondary	Valemount	5.3	5.4
211	242	Hazelton Secondary	Hazelton	5.3	4.3
215	140	Mount Baker Secondary	Cranbrook	5.2	6.1
215	177	Langley Secondary	Langley	5.2	5.6
215	177	Woodlands Secondary	Nanaimo	5.2	5.6
215	188	Clearwater Secondary	Clearwater	5.2	5.5
215	219	North Island Secondary	Port McNeill	5.2	5.0
215	225	Nakusp Secondary	Nakusp	5.2	4.8
215	244	Port Hardy Secondary	Port Hardy	5.2	4.2
222	140	Ladysmith Secondary	Ladysmith	5.1	6.1
222	206	North Delta Senior Secondary	Delta	5.1	5.2
222	234	Mackenzie Secondary	Mackenzie	5.1	4.5
225	140	Richmond Secondary	Richmond	5.0	6.1
225	219	Victoria High School	Victoria	5.0	5.0
225	238	Fraser Lake Elementary/Secondary	Fraser Lake	5.0	4.4
228	165	Abbotsford Sr. Secondary	Abbotsford	4.9	5.7
228	165	Merritt Secondary	Merritt	4.9	5.7

Provincial rank		School name	City	Overall Rating	
2002/ 2003	Last 5 years			2002/ 2003	Last 5 years
228	177	Rutland Secondary	Kelowna	4.9	5.6
228	177	Templeton Secondary	Vancouver	4.9	5.6
228	206	Queen Elizabeth Secondary	Surrey	4.9	5.2
228	206	Chase Secondary	Chase	4.9	5.2
228	231	Guildford Park Secondary	Surrey	4.9	4.6
228	238	Sir Charles Tupper Secondary	Vancouver	4.9	4.4
228	n/a	Williams Lake Secondary	Williams Lake	4.9	n/a
237	188	South Peace Secondary	Dawson Creek	4.8	5.5
237	194	Windermere Community Secondary	Vancouver	4.8	5.4
237	199	Norkam Secondary	Kamloops	4.8	5.3
237	214	Nanaimo District Secondary	Nanaimo	4.8	5.1
237	219	Britannia Community Secondary	Vancouver	4.8	5.0
237	234	John Barsby Community School	Nanaimo	4.8	4.5
237	242	Gold River Secondary	Gold River	4.8	4.3
244	225	Frank Hurt Secondary	Surrey	4.7	4.8
245	214	Westsyde Secondary	Kamloops	4.6	5.1
245	228	Mount Elizabeth Secondary	Kitimat	4.6	4.7
247	177	Brocklehurst Secondary	Kamloops	4.4	5.6
247	199	Charles Bloom Secondary	Lumby	4.4	5.3
247	247	Pemberton Secondary School	Pemberton	4.4	3.4
250	214	Barriere Secondary	Barriere	4.3	5.1
250	219	Reynolds Secondary	Victoria	4.3	5.0
250	228	Edward Milne Community School	Sooke	4.3	4.7
250	238	Nechako Valley Secondary	Vanderhoof	4.3	4.4
254	234	Lake Cowichan Secondary	Lake Cowichan	4.2	4.5
254	234	Eagle River Secondary	Sicamous	4.2	4.5
256	120	College Heights Secondary	Prince George	4.1	6.3
256	219	Columnnetza Secondary	Williams Lake	4.1	5.0
256	224	Queen Charlotte Secondary	Queen Charlotte	4.1	4.9
256	225	Quesnel Secondary	Quesnel	4.1	4.8
260	165	Similkameen Elementary/Secondary	Keremeos	4.0	5.7
260	206	Fort Nelson Secondary	Fort Nelson	4.0	5.2
260	238	Sir Alexander MacKenzie Secondary	Hagensborg	4.0	4.4
260	n/a	Cedar Community Secondary	Nanaimo	4.0	n/a
264	231	Lillooet Secondary	Lillooet	3.9	4.6
264	245	Lakes District Secondary	Burns Lake	3.9	3.6
266	228	McBride Secondary	McBride	3.8	4.7
267	206	Charles Hays Secondary	Prince Rupert	3.7	5.2
268	245	John Oliver Secondary	Vancouver	3.2	3.6
269	133	Ucluelet Secondary	Ucluelet	3.1	6.2
270	248	Fort St James Secondary	Fort St James	3.0	3.0
271	n/a	Hudson's Hope School	Hudson's Hope	2.9	n/a
272	231	Salmo Secondary	Salmo	2.1	4.6
272	252	Nisga'a Elementary/Secondary	New Aiyansh	2.1	0.6
274	249	Princeton Secondary	Princeton	1.6	2.9
275	n/a	Anne Stevenson Secondary	Williams Lake	1.5	n/a
276	250	Ashcroft Secondary	Ashcroft	1.3	2.2
277	251	George M Dawson Secondary	Masset	0.0	0.7
277	252	Bella Bella Community School	Waglisla	0.0	0.6
277	n/a	Kitimat City High	Kitimat	0.0	n/a



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 The *School vs exam mark difference* for each course and the English 12 and Mathematics 12 *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 eight 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*—20%, *Percentage of exams failed*—20%, *School vs exam mark difference*—10%, *English 12 gender gap*—5%, *Math 12 gender gap*—5%, *Exams taken per student*—20%, *Graduation rate*—10%, and *Composite dropout rate*—10%. 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 20%. Where no *Composite dropout rate* could be calculated, the *Graduation rate* was weighted at 20%.
- 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 & 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 Proctor and 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 been co-author of 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), pages 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*, the *Stirling chain* 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.

Acknowledgments

The Fraser Institute wishes to acknowledge the generous support for this project from the Lotte and John Hecht Memorial Foundation and the Max Bell Foundation. Thanks also to the employees of the Information

Department at the British Columbia Ministry of Education for their help in the acquisition and verification of the data. Once again this year, we also wish to thank all of those who took the time to share with us their comments and criticisms. Without the contributions of these interested individuals, improvement would have been slower. We hope that the *Report Card on British Columbia's Secondary Schools: 2004 Edition* will elicit more ideas.