

Studies in Education Policy



April 2012

Report Card on Secondary Schools in British Columbia and Yukon 2012

by Peter Cowley, Stephen Easton, and Michael Thomas



April 2012

Report Card on Secondary Schools in British Columbia and Yukon 2012

By Peter Cowley, Stephen Easton, and Michael Thomas

Contents

Introduction / 3

Key academic indicators of school performance / 5

Other indicators of school performance / 10

Detailed school reports / 12

How does your school stack up? / 36

Appendix: Calculating the *Overall rating out of 10* / 40

About the authors / 42

Acknowledgments / 43

Publishing information / 44

Supporting the Fraser Institute / 45

Purpose, funding, & independence / 46

About the Fraser Institute / 47

Editorial Board / 48

Introduction

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

The Report Card helps parents choose

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

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

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

The Report Card facilitates school improvement

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

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

Some schools do better than others

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

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

Comparisons are at the heart of the improvement process

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

There is great benefit in identifying schools that are particularly effective. By studying the techniques used in schools where students are successful, less effective schools may find ways to improve.

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

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

The *Report Card* program benefits from the input of interested parties. We welcome your suggestions, comments, and criticisms. Please call Michael Thomas, Associate Director of School Performance Studies at 416.363.6575.

Notes

- 1 See, for instance, Michael Rutter et al., *Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children* (Harvard University Press, 1979); Peter Mortimore et al., *School Matters: The Junior Years* (Open Books, 1988).

Key academic indicators of school performance

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

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

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

Three indicators of effective teaching

1 *Average mandatory examination marks*

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

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

2 *Percentage of provincial examinations failed*

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

ing grade was awarded by the total number of such examinations written by the students of that school.

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

3 *Difference between school mark and examination mark*

For each school, this indicator (in the tables *School vs exam mark difference*) gives the average amount (for all grade-10, grade-11, and grade-12 courses with a mandatory provincial exam) by which the “school” mark—the assessment of each student’s learning that is made by the school—exceeds the exam mark in that course.³

Effective teaching includes regular testing so that students may be aware of their progress. For such assessment to be useful, it must accurately reflect the student’s understanding of the course. As a systematic policy, inflation of school-awarded grades will be counterproductive. Students who believe they are already successful when they are not will be less likely to invest the extra effort needed to master the course material. In the end, they will be poorer for not having achieved the level of understanding that they could have gained through additional study.

The effectiveness of school-based assessments can be determined by a comparison to external assessments of the students. In each course that includes a mandatory provincial examination, the Ministry of Education, the same authority that designed the course, administers a uniform examination. This examination will test the students’ knowledge of the material contained in the course. If the marks assigned by the school are a reasonably accurate reflection of students’ understanding, they should be roughly the same as the mark gained on the provincial examination. Thus, if a school has accurately assessed a student as consistently working at a C+ level, the student’s examination result will be at a similar level. If, however, a school is consistently granting marks substantially higher than those

achieved by its students on the final examinations, then the school is not providing an accurate indicator of the extent to which knowledge of the course material is being acquired.

An indicator of consistency in teaching and assessment

The Gender gap indicators

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

The *Gender gap* indicators measure the difference, if any, in the average exam marks in Mathematics 10 and English 10 for boys and girls. The indicator reports the size of the difference and the more successful sex.

Two indicators of practical, well-informed counselling

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

Will these young people make good decisions? It is unrealistic to presume that they can do so without advice. What practical, well-informed counselling can they call upon? While parents, in the main, are willing to help, many lack the information they need to be able to provide good advice. It falls, therefore,

to the schools to shoulder some responsibility for advising students and their parents about educational choices.

The final two indicators used in the calculation of the *Overall rating out of 10* assess the counsel given by the schools by measuring the quality of the decisions taken by the students about their education. Of course, wise students will seek guidance not only from the counsellors designated by the schools but also from teachers and administrators, parents, and other relatives. Where students have strong support from family and community, the school's responsibility for counselling may be lighter; where students do not have such strong support, the school's role may be more challenging. These indicators measure the school's success in using the tools at its disposal to help students make good decisions about their education.

Of the decisions that senior students must make, perhaps the most important is the decision to remain in school, do the work, and graduate with their class. Effective counselling will encourage students to make appropriate choices.

1 *Delayed advancement rate*

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

The indicator is calculated as follows. For each school, for each of grades 10, 11, and 12, a rate of

successful transition is determined by first summing the number of students who either graduate in the current school year or re-enroll in a higher grade in the following year and then dividing that sum by the number of students enrolled in the grade in the current year. Then, for each grade, a dropout rate is determined by subtracting the rate of successful transition from 1. Each of the three dropout rates is then reduced by the grade-8 dropout rate at the school to produce a net dropout rate for each grade. We have adopted the grade-8 drop-out rate as an estimate of the "involuntary" drop-out rate caused by events such as emigration or death that lead to the disappearance of students from the school system.

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

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

2 *Graduation rate*

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

Graduation from secondary school retains considerable value since it increases options for post-secondary education. Further, graduates from secondary school who decide to enter the work force immedi-

ately will, on average, find more job opportunities than those who have not graduated. By completing the 11 years of schooling in preparation for the final secondary school year, students have already demonstrated a reasonable ability to handle the basic courses offered by the school. Moreover, for the majority of students, the minimum requirements for graduation are not onerous. The chance that students will not graduate solely because they are unable to meet the intellectual demands of the curriculum is, therefore, relatively small.

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

In general, how is the school doing academically?

The Overall rating out of 10

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

To derive this rating, the results for each of the indicators for each school year were first standardized. Standardization is a statistical procedure whereby sets of raw data with different characteristics are converted into sets of values with "standard" sta-

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

The standardized data were then combined as required to produce seven standardized scores—one for each indicator—for each school, for each year. The standardized scores were weighted and combined to produce an overall standardized score. Finally, this score was converted into an overall rating out of 10. It is from this *Overall rating out of 10* that the school's provincial rank is determined. For schools teaching only one sex, there are, of course, no results for the *Gender gap* indicators. In these cases, the *Overall rating* is derived using the remaining seven indicators. (See the Appendix for an explanation of the calculation of the *Overall rating out of 10*.)

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

Notes

- 1 The data from which these indicators are derived is provided by British Columbia's Ministry of Education.
- 2 In 2010/2011 school year, mandatory provincial examinations were administered in the following grade-10, grade-11, and grade-12 subjects: Applications of Mathematics 10; BC First Nations Studies 12; Civic Studies 11; Communications 12; English 10; English 12; English 12 First Peoples; Essentials of Mathematics 10; Français Langue Première 10; Français Langue Première 12; Principles of Mathematics 10; Science 10; and Social Studies 11.
- 3 A student's final mark for all courses that include a mandatory provincial examination is derived from both the mark received on the course's pro-

-
- vincial examination and a mark provided by the school.
- 4 Peter Cowley and Stephen Easton, *Boys, Girls, and Grades: Academic Gender Balance in British Columbia's Secondary Schools*, Public Policy Sources 22 (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 (Fraser Institute, 2001), pages 8–9.

Other indicators of school performance

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

The Socioeconomic indicator

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

The socioeconomic indicator was derived as follows. First, using enrollment data from the Ministry of Education sorted by Dissemination Area (a census geography) and 2006 census data provided by Statistics Canada, we established a profile of the student body's home characteristics for each of the schools in the *Report Card*. We then used multiple regression analysis to determine which of the home characteristics were associated with variations in school performance as measured by the *Overall rating out of 10*. Taking into account all of the socioeconomic variables simultaneously, we identified one characteristic that was significantly associated with the *Overall rating*: the average parental income from wages, salaries, and unemployment. When a school had higher income parents, the *Overall rating* at the school was likely to be higher.¹

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

For example, during the 2010/2011 school year, J. N. Burnett Secondary School, a public school in Richmond, achieved an *Overall rating* of 7.3 and yet, when the average parental income of the student body is taken into account, the school was expected to achieve a rating of only about 5.6. The difference of 1.7 is reported in the tables. On the other hand, the actual *Overall rating* of Hugh Boyd Secondary School, another public school in Richmond was 5.0, although its predicted rating was 5.9. The reported difference for Hugh Boyd Secondary is -0.9. This measurement suggests that J. N. Burnett Secondary is more successful than Hugh Boyd Secondary in enabling all of its students to reach their potential.

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

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

The *Student characteristics* indicators

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

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

Notes

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

Detailed school reports

How to read the tables

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

More information regarding schools may be found

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

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

SCHOOL DISTRICT							
School name [Affiliation] City	Gr 12 Enrollment: 60 – A						
B—	ESL (%): 0.0	Special needs (%): 8.9		French Imm (%): 0.0			
	Actual rating vs predicted based			2010-11	Last 5 Years		
C—	on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a		Rank: 218/280		182/261		
Academic Performance							
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Trend	
D—	Average exam mark	66.0	63.4	64.4	62.2	62.9	—
E—	Percentage of exams failed	10.5	11.3	10.3	14.8	15.7	▼
F—	School vs exam mark difference	3.8	4.2	3.6	4.6	4.4	—
G—	English gender gap	F 2.0	F 4.1	F 1.8	n/a	F 0.7	n/a
H—	Math gender gap	M 0.5	F 2.7	F 5.7	n/a	M 13.3	n/a
I—	Graduation rate	89.1	94.1	95.5	96.8	97.9	▲
J—	Delayed advancement rate	34.1	19.6	11.7	23.8	20.0	—
K—	Overall rating out of 10	6.3	5.6	5.5	4.5	4.9	▼

A—Gr 12 Enrollment

The grade-12 enrollment on September 30, 2010. Indicator results for small schools tend to be more variable than do those for larger schools and caution should be used in interpreting the results for smaller schools.

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

These statistics report the percentage of students for whom English is a second-language; the percentage of

students with special needs; and the percentage of students registered in French Immersion programs at the school. When you want to compare academic results, these statistics can be used to find other schools where the student body has similar characteristics.

C (left)—Actual rating vs predicted based on average parental employment income

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

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

C (right)—Academic ranking

The school's overall academic rank in the province for 2010/2011 and for the most recent five years. These rankings show how the school has done academically compared to the other schools in the province. A high ranking over five years indicates consistently strong results at the school.

D—Average exam mark

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

E—Percentage of exams failed

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

F—School vs exam mark difference

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

G—English 10 gender gap

H—Math 10 gender gap

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

I—Graduation rate

The percentage of eligible graduates enrolled on

September 30 who actually graduate in the same school year. Higher rates of graduation indicate that the school is doing a good job of keeping students on track and focused on their work during their final year.

J—Delayed advancement rate

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

K—Overall rating out of 10

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

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

L—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 indicating a trend. A dash indicates that there is no significant change. Where insufficient data were available, "n/a" appears in the column. Note that for the two Gender gap indicators, Percentage of exams failed, School vs exam mark difference and Delayed advancement rate a downward trend in the data will lead to an upward-pointing arrow in the trend column. For example, decreasing Percentage of exams failed indicates improvement and so an upward-pointing arrow is displayed.

Other notes

Note 1

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

Note 2

The tables showing the detailed school results are organized by five geographic regions as follows: (1) Lower Mainland, (2) Vancouver Island and the Coast, (3) Fraser Valley and Southern British Columbia, (4) Interior, Northern British Columbia, and (5) Yukon. Within each geographic region, school districts are grouped alphabetically. Finally, within each school district, both public and independent (private) schools are listed alphabetically.

Note 3

Not all the province's secondary schools are included in the tables or the ranking. Of all the schools for which any mandatory provincial examination results were reported, this *Report Card* rated 280. Excluded are schools at which fewer than 15 students were enrolled in grade 12 and schools that did not generate a sufficiently large set of student data to enable the calculation of an *Overall rating out of 10*. Also excluded from the ratings and rankings are: centres for adult education and continuing education; schools that cater largely to non-resident foreign students; and certain alternative schools that do not offer a full program of courses.

The exclusion of a school from the *Report Card* should not be construed as a judgement of the school's effectiveness.

Note 4

Where there were insufficient data available with

which to calculate an indicator or where a school was not in operation during a specific year, "n/a" appears in the tables.

Note 5

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

Note 6

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

Note 7

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

Average values for all schools 2010/2011							Gr 12 Enrollment: 173
ESL (%): 3.4	Special Needs (%): 9.3		French Immersion (%): 15.3				
Average Parents' Income: \$68,300							
Academic Performance	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Trend	
Average exam mark	66.9	68.7	68.6	69.0	68.6	—	
Percentage of exams failed	11.8	9.1	8.7	8.1	10.2	—	
School vs exam mark difference	5.8	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.9	—	
English gender gap	3.8	6.0	4.5	5.1	5.8	—	
Math gender gap	3.0	3.3	2.6	2.7	2.8	—	
Graduation rate	93.6	94.9	95.8	95.8	95.5	—	
Delayed advancement rate	20.8	23.1	19.0	17.0	17.7	—	
Overall rating out of 10	6.3	6.2	6.0	6.0	6.0	n/a	

*These results reflect the average size of the gender gaps. In 2010/2011, the English gender gap favoured females at 98.0% of schools and males at 2.0% of schools. The Math gender gap favoured females at 46.2% of schools, males at 50.0% of schools, and was even at 3.2% schools.

Note 8

If you have questions about the *Report Card*, please contact Michael Thomas at the Fraser Institute at 416.363.6575.

List of cities and school districts

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

Index of school districts

School district	Page
Abbotsford	28
Alberni	24
Arrow Lakes	28
Boundary	28
Bulkley Valley	32
Burnaby	17
Campbell River	24
Cariboo-Chilcotin	32
Central Okanagan	28
Chilliwack	29
Coast Mountains	24
Comox Valley	24
Coquitlam	17
Cowichan Valley	24
Delta	18
Fort Nelson	32
Fraser-Cascade	29
Gold Trail	32
Greater Victoria	25
Gulf Islands	25
Haida Gwaii/Queen Charlotte	25
Kamloops/Thompson	32
Kootenay-Columbia	30
Kootenay Lake	29
Langley	30
Maple Ridge-Pitt Meadows	18
Mission	30
Nanaimo-Ladysmith	25
Nechako Lakes	33

School district	Page
New Westminster	19
Nicola-Similkameen	31
Nisga'a	26
North Okanagan-Shuswap	33
North Vancouver	19
Okanagan Similkameen	31
Okanagan Skaha	31
Peace River North	33
Peace River South	33
Powell River	26
Prince George	33
Prince Rupert	26
Qualicum	26
Quesnel	34
Revelstoke	34
Richmond	19
Rocky Mountain	34
Saanich	26
Sea To Sky	26
Sooke	26
Southeast Kootenay	31
Sunshine Coast	27
Surrey	20
Vancouver	21
Vancouver Island North	27
Vernon	31
West Vancouver	23
Yukon	35

Pinetree [Public] Coquitlam Gr 12 Enrollment: 363. ESL (%): 12.1 Special needs (%): 6.7 French Imm (%): 0.0. Academic Performance 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 Trend

Port Moody [Public] Port Moody Gr 12 Enrollment: 343. ESL (%): 6.0 Special needs (%): 7.1 French Imm (%): 0.0. Academic Performance 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 Trend

Riverside [Public] Port Coquitlam Gr 12 Enrollment: 329. ESL (%): 1.3 Special needs (%): 12.2 French Imm (%): 14.5. Academic Performance 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 Trend

Terry Fox [Public] Port Coquitlam Gr 12 Enrollment: 408. ESL (%): 1.7 Special needs (%): 14.7 French Imm (%): 0.0. Academic Performance 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 Trend

DELTA

Burnsview [Public] Delta Gr 12 Enrollment: 122. ESL (%): 4.0 Special needs (%): 10.8 French Imm (%): 48.7. Academic Performance 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 Trend

Delta [Public] Delta Gr 12 Enrollment: 311. ESL (%): 1.3 Special needs (%): 16.7 French Imm (%): 0.0. Academic Performance 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 Trend

Delview [Public] Delta Gr 12 Enrollment: 140. ESL (%): 3.7 Special needs (%): 12.9 French Imm (%): 0.0. Academic Performance 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 Trend

North Delta [Public] Delta Gr 12 Enrollment: 240. ESL (%): 5.5 Special needs (%): 10.6 French Imm (%): 0.0. Academic Performance 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 Trend

Sands [Public] Delta Gr 12 Enrollment: 176. ESL (%): 1.8 Special needs (%): 13.5 French Imm (%): 0.0. Academic Performance 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 Trend

Seaquam [Public] Delta Gr 12 Enrollment: 275. ESL (%): 3.3 Special needs (%): 11.1 French Imm (%): 0.0. Academic Performance 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 Trend

South Delta [Public] Delta Gr 12 Enrollment: 235. ESL (%): 1.0 Special needs (%): 14.3 French Imm (%): 18.4. Academic Performance 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 Trend

Southpointe [Independent] Delta Gr 12 Enrollment: 31. ESL (%): 0.3 Special needs (%): n/a French Imm (%): n/a. Academic Performance 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 Trend

MAPLE RIDGE-PITT MEADOWS

Garibaldi [Public] Maple Ridge Gr 12 Enrollment: 163. ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 13.7 French Imm (%): 0.0. Academic Performance 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 Trend

Maple Ridge [Public] Maple Ridge Gr 12 Enrollment: 221. ESL (%): 0.3 Special needs (%): 10.1 French Imm (%): 27.7. Academic Performance 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 Trend

Meadowridge [Independent] Maple Ridge Gr 12 Enrollment: 41. ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): n/a French Imm (%): n/a. Academic Performance 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 Trend

Pitt Meadows [Public] Pitt Meadows Gr 12 Enrollment: 188. ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 10.7 French Imm (%): 13.4. Academic Performance 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 Trend

Samuel Robertson Tech [Public] Maple Ridge Gr 12 Enrollment: 227. ESL (%): 0.3 Special needs (%): 11.8 French Imm (%): 0.0. Academic Performance 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 Trend

Thomas Haney [Public] Maple Ridge Gr 12 Enrollment: 181. ESL (%): 1.2 Special needs (%): 9.2 French Imm (%): 0.0. Academic Performance 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 Trend

Windermere [Public] Vancouver		Gr 12 Enrollment: 215				
ESL (%): 9.0	Special needs (%): 12.9	2010-11		Last 5 Years		
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$44,500: 0.3		Rank: 181/280		150/261		
Academic Performance	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Trend
Average exam mark	64.9	67.4	66.6	66.8	67.8	—
Percentage of exams failed	12.5	9.0	8.6	9.4	10.0	—
School vs exam mark difference	3.2	1.6	3.4	2.4	2.7	—
English gender gap	F 2.5	F 3.3	F 6.8	F 2.5	F 8.3	—
Math gender gap	F 3.2	F 3.1	F 1.6	M 2.7	F 2.6	—
Graduation rate	93.2	92.1	93.7	91.2	93.2	—
Delayed advancement rate	23.8	18.5	23.3	22.7	34.1	▼
Overall rating out of 10	6.3	6.5	5.6	5.4	5.4	▼

York House [Independent] Vancouver		Gr 12 Enrollment: 57				
ESL (%): 0.0	Special needs (%): n/a	2010-11		Last 5 Years		
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$118,800: 2.0		Rank: 1/280		1/261		
Academic Performance	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Trend
Average exam mark	82.8	85.7	85.2	87.1	85.7	—
Percentage of exams failed	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	—
School vs exam mark difference	2.8	0.4	1.9	0.0	0.9	—
English gender gap	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Math gender gap	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Graduation rate	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	—
Delayed advancement rate	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	—
Overall rating out of 10	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	—

Collingwood [Independent] West Vancouver		Gr 12 Enrollment: 100				
ESL (%): 0.0	Special needs (%): n/a	2010-11		Last 5 Years		
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$153,900: -0.2		Rank: 12/280		9/261		
Academic Performance	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Trend
Average exam mark	77.1	79.1	81.7	80.3	80.5	—
Percentage of exams failed	1.4	1.6	0.2	1.1	0.6	—
School vs exam mark difference	4.3	2.7	1.8	1.4	1.8	▲
English gender gap	F 1.2	F 4.7	F 0.7	F 4.5	F 4.5	—
Math gender gap	F 2.5	F 3.2	F 1.0	F 2.7	F 1.6	—
Graduation rate	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	—
Delayed advancement rate	0.0	0.0	2.6	4.3	0.0	—
Overall rating out of 10	9.1	9.1	9.7	8.8	9.2	—

Rockridge [Public] West Vancouver		Gr 12 Enrollment: 125				
ESL (%): 5.5	Special needs (%): 13.5	2010-11		Last 5 Years		
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$218,500: -3.8		Rank: 25/280		25/261		
Academic Performance	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Trend
Average exam mark	71.7	74.3	73.9	74.7	74.9	▲
Percentage of exams failed	3.9	2.3	3.7	2.6	4.5	▼
School vs exam mark difference	4.4	2.2	3.7	1.9	3.6	—
English gender gap	F 1.4	F 2.9	F 0.4	F 3.6	M 2.4	—
Math gender gap	F 2.2	M 4.0	F 2.9	F 2.1	M 2.0	—
Graduation rate	99.3	96.7	99.3	97.1	100.0	—
Delayed advancement rate	3.2	10.4	8.1	6.4	0.5	—
Overall rating out of 10	8.2	8.2	7.9	7.8	8.2	—

Sentinel [Public] West Vancouver		Gr 12 Enrollment: 198				
ESL (%): 5.4	Special needs (%): 4.5	2010-11		Last 5 Years		
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$137,200: -0.4		Rank: 23/280		22/261		
Academic Performance	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Trend
Average exam mark	73.2	74.0	74.8	76.3	76.9	—
Percentage of exams failed	5.6	3.1	4.1	3.0	2.6	—
School vs exam mark difference	2.9	1.9	2.3	1.4	1.5	—
English gender gap	F 5.6	F 5.5	F 5.0	F 3.9	F 5.7	—
Math gender gap	F 0.2	F 0.2	M 1.3	M 0.4	M 0.6	—
Graduation rate	98.7	98.0	96.9	98.9	97.9	—
Delayed advancement rate	9.2	5.9	10.6	8.1	5.7	—
Overall rating out of 10	8.2	8.3	7.8	8.2	8.4	—

West Vancouver [Public] West Vancouver		Gr 12 Enrollment: 323				
ESL (%): 9.0	Special needs (%): 12.4	2010-11		Last 5 Years		
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$107,600: -0.3		Rank: 53/280		47/261		
Academic Performance	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Trend
Average exam mark	70.9	72.5	72.1	72.2	72.9	—
Percentage of exams failed	6.3	6.4	6.5	6.1	6.9	—
School vs exam mark difference	4.5	2.2	3.2	3.7	3.7	—
English gender gap	M 0.1	F 5.7	F 2.9	F 3.0	F 4.3	—
Math gender gap	F 0.4	M 3.7	M 2.1	M 1.2	M 0.5	—
Graduation rate	95.2	98.7	99.3	95.7	98.1	—
Delayed advancement rate	11.9	6.4	8.8	11.5	7.0	—
Overall rating out of 10	7.8	7.6	7.3	6.9	7.3	—

SUNSHINE COAST

Chateleux [Public] Sechelt		Gr 12 Enrollment: 104				
ESL (%): 0.5	Special needs (%): 16.4	2010-11		Last 5 Years		French Imm (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$73,800: -0.5		Rank: 157/280		202/261		
Academic Performance	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Trend
Average exam mark	61.9	63.0	66.6	63.3	67.7	—
Percentage of exams failed	19.7	16.2	9.9	13.0	10.7	—
School vs exam mark difference	6.7	5.8	4.5	6.6	4.9	—
English gender gap	F 2.0	M 1.3	F 10.7	F 5.7	F 4.6	—
Math gender gap	F 4.3	M 8.6	F 4.6	M 5.8	M 1.2	—
Graduation rate	97.0	93.4	94.6	96.3	95.0	—
Delayed advancement rate	18.3	25.9	22.2	17.3	29.2	—
Overall rating out of 10	5.2	4.5	5.0	4.4	5.7	—

Elphinstone [Public] Gibsons		Gr 12 Enrollment: 120				
ESL (%): 0.9	Special needs (%): 11.5	2010-11		Last 5 Years		French Imm (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$86,000: 0.1		Rank: 86/280		109/261		
Academic Performance	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Trend
Average exam mark	65.8	66.5	68.2	68.9	68.2	—
Percentage of exams failed	9.8	9.5	6.6	6.4	6.5	—
School vs exam mark difference	7.9	4.5	4.2	4.3	4.6	▲
English gender gap	F 2.9	F 9.1	F 10.0	F 5.0	F 8.4	—
Math gender gap	F 4.3	M 4.2	F 0.6	M 0.1	F 3.4	—
Graduation rate	98.4	97.5	97.0	99.2	100.0	—
Delayed advancement rate	21.6	11.0	10.3	13.5	6.2	—
Overall rating out of 10	6.1	6.0	6.3	6.7	6.8	▲

Pender Harbour [Public] Madeira Park		Gr 12 Enrollment: 36				
ESL (%): 0.0	Special needs (%): 20.3	2010-11		Last 5 Years		French Imm (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$61,700: -3.1		Rank: 272/280		236/261		
Academic Performance	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Trend
Average exam mark	64.5	66.5	64.8	62.0	61.8	▼
Percentage of exams failed	16.2	13.1	12.0	23.4	22.3	▼
School vs exam mark difference	8.4	4.1	7.1	9.4	8.3	—
English gender gap	F 5.8	F 3.8	F 11.3	F 12.2	n/a	n/a
Math gender gap	F 4.4	M 5.4	M 3.1	M 4.4	n/a	n/a
Graduation rate	87.0	96.6	93.1	100.0	88.2	—
Delayed advancement rate	21.4	11.5	1.6	13.2	n/a	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	4.8	6.2	4.6	3.9	2.6	—

VANCOUVER ISLAND NORTH

North Island [Public] Port McNeill		Gr 12 Enrollment: 77				
ESL (%): 0.0	Special needs (%): 19.8	2010-11		Last 5 Years		French Imm (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$60,900: -1.1		Rank: 230/280		247/261		
Academic Performance	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Trend
Average exam mark	58.8	60.4	59.2	63.1	62.6	—
Percentage of exams failed	26.1	20.8	18.9	15.0	18.6	—
School vs exam mark difference	7.6	7.1	8.8	7.3	7.3	—
English gender gap	F 8.4	F 16.7	F 9.2	F 10.7	F 5.5	—
Math gender gap	F 8.5	M 1.0	M 0.4	F 4.9	F 3.5	—
Graduation rate	92.2	97.4	98.5	93.1	98.4	—
Delayed advancement rate	33.2	21.6	11.7	35.2	23.9	—
Overall rating out of 10	3.5	3.7	3.6	3.2	4.6	—

Port Hardy [Public] Port Hardy		Gr 12 Enrollment: 57				
ESL (%): 13.4	Special needs (%): 24.5	2010-11		Last 5 Years		French Imm (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$50,300: -2.4		Rank: 268/280		255/261		
Academic Performance	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Trend
Average exam mark	57.4	60.3	61.2	61.4	60.5	▲
Percentage of exams failed	25.5	22.8	19.3	19.1	22.0	▲
School vs exam mark difference	8.0	8.6	3.4	6.9	6.6	—
English gender gap	F 4.9	F 5.5	F 5.3	F 10.0	F 16.1	▼
Math gender gap	F 5.6	M 0.8	F 1.5	F 2.5	M 0.8	—
Graduation rate	100.0	90.9	94.9	100.0	94.6	—
Delayed advancement rate	52.8	44.5	39.8	35.4	56.2	—
Overall rating out of 10	3.3	3.2	3.9	3.9	2.9	—

NICOLA-SIMILKAMEEN

Table for Nicola-Silkameen school division. Includes columns for Merritt [Public] Merritt, Gr 12 Enrollment: 133, and Academic Performance metrics from 2007 to 2011.

Table for Princess Margaret [Public] Penticton. Includes columns for Princess Margaret [Public] Penticton, Gr 12 Enrollment: 157, and Academic Performance metrics from 2007 to 2011.

Table for Clarence Fulton [Public] Vernon. Includes columns for Clarence Fulton [Public] Vernon, Gr 12 Enrollment: 160, and Academic Performance metrics from 2007 to 2011.

Table for Princeton [Public] Princeton. Includes columns for Princeton [Public] Princeton, Gr 12 Enrollment: 42, and Academic Performance metrics from 2007 to 2011.

Table for Summerland [Public] Summerland. Includes columns for Summerland [Public] Summerland, Gr 12 Enrollment: 139, and Academic Performance metrics from 2007 to 2011.

Table for Kalamalka [Public] Vernon. Includes columns for Kalamalka [Public] Vernon, Gr 12 Enrollment: 153, and Academic Performance metrics from 2007 to 2011.

OKANAGAN SIMILKAMEEN

Table for Osyoos [Public] Osyoos. Includes columns for Osyoos [Public] Osyoos, Gr 12 Enrollment: 53, and Academic Performance metrics from 2007 to 2011.

SOUTHEAST KOOTENAY

Table for Fernie [Public] Fernie. Includes columns for Fernie [Public] Fernie, Gr 12 Enrollment: 70, and Academic Performance metrics from 2007 to 2011.

Table for Vernon [Public] Vernon. Includes columns for Vernon [Public] Vernon, Gr 12 Enrollment: 196, and Academic Performance metrics from 2007 to 2011.

Table for Similkameen [Public] Keremeos. Includes columns for Similkameen [Public] Keremeos, Gr 12 Enrollment: 40, and Academic Performance metrics from 2007 to 2011.

Table for Mount Baker [Public] Cranbrook. Includes columns for Mount Baker [Public] Cranbrook, Gr 12 Enrollment: 305, and Academic Performance metrics from 2007 to 2011.

Table for Vernon Christian [Independent] Vernon. Includes columns for Vernon Christian [Independent] Vernon, Gr 12 Enrollment: 21, and Academic Performance metrics from 2007 to 2011.

Table for Southern Okanagan [Public] Oliver. Includes columns for Southern Okanagan [Public] Oliver, Gr 12 Enrollment: 90, and Academic Performance metrics from 2007 to 2011.

Table for Sparwood [Public] Sparwood. Includes columns for Sparwood [Public] Sparwood, Gr 12 Enrollment: 53, and Academic Performance metrics from 2007 to 2011.

Table for W L Seaton [Public] Vernon. Includes columns for W L Seaton [Public] Vernon, Gr 12 Enrollment: 127, and Academic Performance metrics from 2007 to 2011.

OKANAGAN SKAHA

Table for Penticton [Public] Penticton. Includes columns for Penticton [Public] Penticton, Gr 12 Enrollment: 320, and Academic Performance metrics from 2007 to 2011.

VERNON

Table for Charles Bloom [Public] Lumby. Includes columns for Charles Bloom [Public] Lumby, Gr 12 Enrollment: 64, and Academic Performance metrics from 2007 to 2011.

Table for W L Seaton [Public] Vernon (continued). Includes columns for W L Seaton [Public] Vernon, Gr 12 Enrollment: 127, and Academic Performance metrics from 2007 to 2011.

Kelly Road [Public] Prince George		Gr 12 Enrollment: 217				
ESL (%): 0.0	Special needs (%): 9.5	French Imm (%): 0.0				
Actual rating vs predicted based		2010-11		Last 5 Years		
on parents' avg. inc. of \$78,700: -2.5		Rank: 252/280		197/261		
Academic Performance	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Trend
Average exam mark	62.4	63.8	65.6	67.5	62.9	—
Percentage of exams failed	18.5	11.7	8.7	6.8	18.1	—
School vs exam mark difference	6.2	3.6	3.2	5.2	7.9	—
English gender gap	F 4.3	F 0.7	F 4.5	F 2.5	F 9.8	—
Math gender gap	F 5.5	M 3.2	M 1.8	F 4.8	F 0.1	—
Graduation rate	87.4	97.3	93.9	94.6	92.7	—
Delayed advancement rate	22.7	20.1	30.2	17.9	26.2	—
Overall rating out of 10	4.8	5.9	5.4	5.7	3.9	—

MacKenzie [Public] Mackenzie		Gr 12 Enrollment: 60				
ESL (%): 0.0	Special needs (%): 8.9	French Imm (%): 0.0				
Actual rating vs predicted based		2010-11		Last 5 Years		
on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a		Rank: 218/280		182/261		
Academic Performance	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Trend
Average exam mark	66.0	63.4	64.4	62.2	62.9	—
Percentage of exams failed	10.5	11.3	10.3	14.8	15.7	▼
School vs exam mark difference	3.8	4.2	3.6	4.6	4.4	—
English gender gap	F 2.0	F 4.1	F 1.8	n/a	F 0.7	n/a
Math gender gap	M 0.5	F 2.7	F 5.7	n/a	M 13.3	n/a
Graduation rate	89.1	94.1	95.5	96.8	97.9	▲
Delayed advancement rate	34.1	19.6	11.7	23.8	20.0	—
Overall rating out of 10	6.3	5.6	5.5	4.5	4.9	▼

Prince George [Public] Prince George		Gr 12 Enrollment: 348				
ESL (%): 0.7	Special needs (%): 9.9	French Imm (%): 0.0				
Actual rating vs predicted based		2010-11		Last 5 Years		
on parents' avg. inc. of \$65,400: -0.2		Rank: 157/280		224/261		
Academic Performance	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Trend
Average exam mark	63.1	64.2	64.0	64.3	65.7	—
Percentage of exams failed	15.9	13.1	12.1	10.7	9.8	▲
School vs exam mark difference	6.9	7.6	6.7	6.2	4.7	—
English gender gap	F 1.9	F 6.9	F 4.7	F 8.3	F 6.2	—
Math gender gap	M 3.3	F 3.2	M 3.3	F 3.2	M 1.2	—
Graduation rate	86.0	92.5	91.1	92.6	94.6	—
Delayed advancement rate	18.6	37.1	30.6	29.9	23.0	—
Overall rating out of 10	4.9	4.3	4.2	4.2	5.7	—

Valemount [Public] Valemount		Gr 12 Enrollment: 20				
ESL (%): 0.0	Special needs (%): 7.1	French Imm (%): 0.0				
Actual rating vs predicted based		2010-11		Last 5 Years		
on parents' avg. inc. of \$72,500: -0.1		Rank: 133/280		n/a		
Academic Performance	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Trend
Average exam mark	65.5	65.0	64.7	n/a	67.3	n/a
Percentage of exams failed	8.4	13.9	14.3	n/a	10.3	n/a
School vs exam mark difference	7.7	7.2	5.9	n/a	4.9	n/a
English gender gap	F 3.0	M 5.7	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Math gender gap	F 8.5	M 8.0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Graduation rate	95.5	92.6	100.0	n/a	100.0	n/a
Delayed advancement rate	0.0	42.8	0.0	n/a	n/a	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	6.2	3.8	5.3	n/a	6.1	n/a

QUESNEL

Correlieu [Public] Quesnel		Gr 12 Enrollment: 313				
ESL (%): 1.7	Special needs (%): 10.4	French Imm (%): 3.0				
Actual rating vs predicted based		2010-11		Last 5 Years		
on parents' avg. inc. of \$66,400: -1.4		Rank: 237/280		212/261		
Academic Performance	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Trend
Average exam mark	62.3	64.6	65.1	64.1	62.4	—
Percentage of exams failed	15.3	10.5	11.1	13.8	16.5	▼
School vs exam mark difference	5.7	4.9	3.8	5.8	9.0	—
English gender gap	F 4.8	F 7.9	F 9.5	F 4.5	F 10.7	—
Math gender gap	F 3.5	M 1.1	M 1.2	F 2.2	E	—
Graduation rate	90.2	97.2	96.1	94.7	98.0	—
Delayed advancement rate	30.8	40.0	37.7	18.1	15.3	—
Overall rating out of 10	5.1	5.5	4.8	4.8	4.5	—

REVELSTOKE

Revelstoke [Public] Revelstoke		Gr 12 Enrollment: 80				
ESL (%): 0.2	Special needs (%): 15.8	French Imm (%): 0.0				
Actual rating vs predicted based		2010-11		Last 5 Years		
on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a		Rank: 61/280		89/261		
Academic Performance	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Trend
Average exam mark	64.6	68.4	67.0	70.9	70.0	▲
Percentage of exams failed	13.0	5.3	5.6	3.5	6.9	—
School vs exam mark difference	6.4	3.1	3.8	0.7	3.1	—
English gender gap	F 6.0	F 5.4	F 2.5	F 2.6	F 0.9	▲
Math gender gap	F 2.3	M 0.8	F 4.4	M 0.7	M 3.4	—
Graduation rate	94.4	96.7	96.7	98.8	100.0	▲
Delayed advancement rate	33.5	9.9	22.7	19.6	21.2	—
Overall rating out of 10	5.5	7.2	6.3	7.5	7.2	—

ROCKY MOUNTAIN

David Thompson [Public] Invermere		Gr 12 Enrollment: 97				
ESL (%): 1.1	Special needs (%): 11.0	French Imm (%): 0.0				
Actual rating vs predicted based		2010-11		Last 5 Years		
on parents' avg. inc. of \$42,100: 1.1		Rank: 133/280		161/261		
Academic Performance	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Trend
Average exam mark	65.3	67.1	65.4	67.0	67.1	—
Percentage of exams failed	14.3	10.2	11.3	8.3	9.5	—
School vs exam mark difference	6.9	5.1	8.0	5.2	3.7	—
English gender gap	F 4.0	F 5.4	F 0.2	F 5.7	F 7.0	—
Math gender gap	F 4.0	M 0.7	M 6.9	M 0.4	M 0.4	—
Graduation rate	88.2	93.0	96.7	98.8	96.5	▲
Delayed advancement rate	41.2	13.3	3.8	27.4	21.5	—
Overall rating out of 10	5.2	6.0	5.4	5.9	6.1	▲

Golden [Public] Golden		Gr 12 Enrollment: 76				
ESL (%): 0.0	Special needs (%): 10.1	French Imm (%): 18.9				
Actual rating vs predicted based		2010-11		Last 5 Years		
on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a		Rank: 211/280		166/261		
Academic Performance	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Trend
Average exam mark	64.9	67.7	66.3	65.0	65.5	▼
Percentage of exams failed	13.8	7.4	8.9	10.5	13.6	—
School vs exam mark difference	6.7	4.2	7.4	6.9	6.9	—
English gender gap	F 5.7	F 7.1	F 0.7	F 2.7	F 5.6	—
Math gender gap	M 0.6	F 6.7	M 2.6	F 2.3	M 4.9	—
Graduation rate	96.3	100.0	98.6	95.5	98.5	—
Delayed advancement rate	15.0	12.2	14.6	20.9	21.5	▼
Overall rating out of 10	6.0	6.5	5.8	4.9	5.0	▼

Selkirk [Public] Kimberley		Gr 12 Enrollment: 68				
ESL (%): 1.7	Special needs (%): 9.9	French Imm (%): 0.0				
Actual rating vs predicted based		2010-11		Last 5 Years		
on parents' avg. inc. of \$55,400: 1.2		Rank: 93/280		175/261		
Academic Performance	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Trend
Average exam mark	62.5	64.6	67.0	67.7	69.4	▲
Percentage of exams failed	14.1	11.6	6.5	7.3	6.1	▲
School vs exam mark difference	11.9	8.4	6.0	6.6	3.6	▲
English gender gap	F 4.1	F 8.4	F 9.8	F 7.4	F 5.4	—
Math gender gap	F 0.7	M 2.7	M 2.4	M 3.4	M 5.9	▼
Graduation rate	93.2	91.0	93.6	97.4	96.9	—
Delayed advancement rate	13.6	25.2	13.1	19.9	9.4	—
Overall rating out of 10	5.0	4.7	5.4	5.7	6.7	▲

Yukon

YUKON

F.H. Collins (Public) Whitehorse		Gr 12 Enrollment: 137				
ESL (%): n/a	Special needs (%): 0.0	French Imm (%): 0.0				
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a		2010-11		Last 5 Years		
		Rank: 164/280		175/261		
Academic Performance	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Trend
Average exam mark	64.0	67.7	68.2	68.3	67.4	—
Percentage of exams failed	17.7	12.0	12.0	10.5	11.7	▲
School vs exam mark difference	5.3	2.8	2.8	3.6	4.8	—
English gender gap	F 9.4	F 4.7	F 0.2	F 9.7	F 4.9	—
Math gender gap	F 2.3	F 7.1	F 6.3	F 2.3	M 7.4	—
Graduation rate	96.3	97.0	84.2	98.0	95.2	—
Delayed advancement rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	5.7	6.2	4.1	6.1	5.6	—

Porter Creek (Public) Whitehorse		Gr 12 Enrollment: 112				
ESL (%): n/a	Special needs (%): 0.0	French Imm (%): 0.0				
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a		2010-11		Last 5 Years		
		Rank: 249/280		232/261		
Academic Performance	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Trend
Average exam mark	60.8	64.2	64.2	62.0	60.6	—
Percentage of exams failed	25.4	15.0	13.9	18.1	21.4	—
School vs exam mark difference	5.9	5.4	2.8	5.1	3.3	—
English gender gap	F 5.3	F 8.0	F 10.6	F 3.3	F 7.1	—
Math gender gap	M 5.1	F 5.6	F 8.7	M 2.5	F 1.3	—
Graduation rate	91.9	98.5	97.5	98.9	91.7	—
Delayed advancement rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	4.0	5.0	4.6	4.9	4.0	—

Vanier Catholic (Public) Whitehorse		Gr 12 Enrollment: 82				
ESL (%): n/a	Special needs (%): 0.0	French Imm (%): 0.0				
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a		2010-11		Last 5 Years		
		Rank: 164/280		104/261		
Academic Performance	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Trend
Average exam mark	67.4	70.8	67.1	70.4	66.2	—
Percentage of exams failed	9.5	5.5	9.0	4.0	13.4	—
School vs exam mark difference	5.4	3.2	2.7	3.8	4.3	—
English gender gap	F 1.2	F 5.3	M 3.0	F 3.5	F 3.4	—
Math gender gap	M 0.7	M 3.0	F 5.0	F 4.2	M 1.0	—
Graduation rate	94.3	98.7	93.7	96.0	94.4	—
Delayed advancement rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	6.9	7.5	5.8	6.6	5.6	—

How does your school stack up?

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 ten (shown on the right hand side of the table) for the school year 2010/2011. Each school's five-year average ranking and Overall rating out of ten are also listed. The higher the overall rating (out of 10), the higher the rank awarded to the school. Where schools tied in the overall rating, they were awarded the same rank. Where less than five years of data was available "n/a" appears in the table.

Not all the province's secondary schools are included in the tables or the ranking. Excluded are schools at which fewer than fifteen regular day students were enrolled in grade 12 and schools that did

not generate a sufficiently large set of student data to enable the calculation of an Overall rating out of ten. 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.

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

Rank	Rank		School name	City	Overall rating	
	2010/2011	Last 5 years			2010/2011	Last 5 years
1	1	York House	Vancouver	10.0	10.0	
2	4	Crofton House	Vancouver	9.9	9.7	
3	4	Little Flower	Vancouver	9.7	9.7	
3	12	Glenlyon Norfolk	Victoria	9.7	9.0	
5	2	Southridge	Surrey	9.6	9.8	
5	2	St George's	Vancouver	9.6	9.8	
5	8	Brentwood College	Mill Bay	9.6	9.3	
8	4	West Point Grey	Vancouver	9.4	9.7	
8	9	Vancouver College	Vancouver	9.4	9.2	
10	7	Meadowridge	Maple Ridge	9.3	9.4	
10	n/a	Timothy Christian	Chilliwack	9.3	n/a	
12	9	Collingwood	West Vancouver	9.2	9.2	
12	33	King David	Vancouver	9.2	7.8	
14	9	St Michaels	Victoria	9.0	9.2	
15	14	University Hill	Vancouver	8.8	8.8	
15	17	St Thomas More	Burnaby	8.8	8.6	
15	n/a	Relevant	Surrey	8.8	n/a	
18	18	Lord Byng	Vancouver	8.7	8.5	
19	14	Southpointe	Delta	8.6	8.8	

Rank	Rank		School name	City	Overall rating	
	2010/2011	Last 5 years			2010/2011	Last 5 years
19	18	Kelowna Christian	Kelowna	8.6	8.5	
19	30	Richmond Christian	Richmond	8.6	7.9	
22	16	Pacific Academy	Surrey	8.5	8.7	
23	13	Shawnigan Lake	Shawnigan Lake	8.4	8.9	
23	22	Sentinel	West Vancouver	8.4	8.2	
25	20	St Thomas Aquinas	North Vancouver	8.2	8.4	
25	21	Highroad	Chilliwack	8.2	8.3	
25	25	Rockridge	West Vancouver	8.2	8.1	
28	22	Mennonite Educational Institute	Abbotsford	8.1	8.2	
28	25	Prince Of Wales	Vancouver	8.1	8.1	
30	22	Okanagan Mission	Kelowna	8.0	8.2	
30	25	Abbotsford Christian	Abbotsford	8.0	8.1	
30	30	Langley Fine Arts	Fort Langley	8.0	7.9	
30	36	Pacific Christian	Victoria	8.0	7.7	
30	47	Langley Christian	Langley	8.0	7.4	
35	30	Archbishop Carney	Port Coquitlam	7.9	7.9	
35	36	Heritage Woods	Port Moody	7.9	7.7	
37	36	Kalamalka	Vernon	7.8	7.7	
37	47	Credo Christian	Langley	7.8	7.4	

Rank		School name	City	Overall rating		Rank		School name	City	Overall rating	
2010/2011	Last 5 years			2010/2011	Last 5 years	2010/2011	Last 5 years			2010/2011	Last 5 years
37	n/a	Langley Fundamental	Langley	7.8	n/a	93	175	Selkirk	Kimberley	6.7	5.5
40	40	Whistler	Whistler	7.7	7.6	98	81	Moscrop	Burnaby	6.6	6.8
40	53	Dr. Charles Best	Coquitlam	7.7	7.3	98	81	North Surrey	Surrey	6.6	6.8
42	53	Robert Alexander McMath	Richmond	7.6	7.3	98	104	Yale	Abbotsford	6.6	6.5
42	74	Windsor	North Vancouver	7.6	7.0	98	109	Similkameen	Keremeos	6.6	6.4
42	81	Unity Christian	Chilliwack	7.6	6.8	98	n/a	Heritage Christian	Kelowna	6.6	n/a
42	n/a	Vernon Christian	Vernon	7.6	n/a	103	65	Gleneagle	Coquitlam	6.5	7.1
46	33	St Ann's	Kamloops	7.5	7.8	103	77	Port Moody	Port Moody	6.5	6.9
46	40	Rossland	Rossland	7.5	7.6	103	94	Notre Dame	Vancouver	6.5	6.6
46	59	Walnut Grove	Langley	7.5	7.2	103	128	Clarence Fulton	Vernon	6.5	6.2
49	36	White Rock Christian	Surrey	7.4	7.7	103	141	Southern Okanagan	Oliver	6.5	6.0
49	40	Point Grey	Vancouver	7.4	7.6	108	74	J Lloyd Crowe	Trail	6.4	7.0
49	47	St Andrew's	Victoria	7.4	7.4	108	74	W J Mouat	Abbotsford	6.4	7.0
49	53	Magee	Vancouver	7.4	7.3	108	89	Cedars Christian	Prince George	6.4	6.7
53	29	Immaculata	Kelowna	7.3	8.0	108	94	Burnsview	Delta	6.4	6.6
53	33	Handsworth	North Vancouver	7.3	7.8	108	94	Maple Ridge	Maple Ridge	6.4	6.6
53	47	West Vancouver	West Vancouver	7.3	7.4	108	94	Stanley Humphries	Castlegar	6.4	6.6
53	53	Claremont	Victoria	7.3	7.3	108	104	Penticton	Penticton	6.4	6.5
53	53	J N Burnett	Richmond	7.3	7.3	108	109	Riverside	Port Coquitlam	6.4	6.4
53	94	Mark R. Isfeld	Courtenay	7.3	6.6	108	117	Brookswood	Langley	6.4	6.3
53	n/a	King's Christian	Salmon Arm	7.3	n/a	108	117	Sands	Delta	6.4	6.3
53	n/a	Steveston-London	Richmond	7.3	n/a	108	128	Valleyview	Kamloops	6.4	6.2
61	25	St John's	Vancouver	7.2	8.1	119	94	Sullivan Heights	Surrey	6.3	6.6
61	44	Elgin Park	Surrey	7.2	7.5	119	109	Sardis	Chilliwack	6.3	6.4
61	53	Seycove	North Vancouver	7.2	7.3	119	128	Fernie	Fernie	6.3	6.2
61	59	Argyle	North Vancouver	7.2	7.2	119	128	Princess Margaret	Penticton	6.3	6.2
61	59	Fraser Heights	Surrey	7.2	7.2	119	128	R C Palmer	Richmond	6.3	6.2
61	59	Richmond	Richmond	7.2	7.2	119	216	Lake Cowichan	Lake Cowichan	6.3	4.8
61	81	Surrey Christian	Surrey	7.2	6.8	119	n/a	Panorama Ridge	Surrey	6.3	n/a
61	89	Revelstoke	Revelstoke	7.2	6.7	126	77	Robert Bateman	Abbotsford	6.2	6.9
69	47	Semiahmoo	Surrey	7.1	7.4	126	81	Earl Marriott	Surrey	6.2	6.8
69	65	Kelowna	Kelowna	7.1	7.1	126	94	Lambrick Park	Victoria	6.2	6.6
69	n/a	Mount Cheam Christian	Chilliwack	7.1	n/a	126	144	Duchess Park	Prince George	6.2	5.9
69	n/a	Queen Charlotte	Queen Charlotte	7.1	n/a	126	144	Sutherland	North Vancouver	6.2	5.9
73	44	L V Rogers	Nelson	7.0	7.5	126	161	Guildford Park	Surrey	6.2	5.7
73	44	Regent Christian	Surrey	7.0	7.5	126	188	Vancouver Technical	Vancouver	6.2	5.3
73	47	Dover Bay	Nanaimo	7.0	7.4	133	117	Sa-Hali	Kamloops	6.1	6.3
73	65	Hugh McRoberts	Richmond	7.0	7.1	133	117	St John Brebeuf	Abbotsford	6.1	6.3
73	65	Pinetree	Coquitlam	7.0	7.1	133	128	Smithers	Smithers	6.1	6.2
73	77	South Delta	Delta	7.0	6.9	133	161	David Thompson	Invermere	6.1	5.7
73	81	New Westminster	New Westminster	7.0	6.8	133	n/a	Nanaimo Christian	Nanaimo	6.1	n/a
80	65	Oak Bay	Victoria	6.9	7.1	133	n/a	Valemount	Valemount	6.1	n/a
80	65	Sir Winston Churchill	Vancouver	6.9	7.1	139	89	Chemainus	Chemainus	6.0	6.7
80	65	St Patrick's	Vancouver	6.9	7.1	139	117	Osoyoos	Osoyoos	6.0	6.3
80	81	George Elliot	Winfield	6.9	6.8	139	128	Lord Tweedsmuir	Surrey	6.0	6.2
80	89	Mount Douglas	Victoria	6.9	6.7	139	144	Abbotsford Traditional	Abbotsford	6.0	5.9
80	94	Burnaby North	Burnaby	6.9	6.6	139	175	Vernon	Vernon	6.0	5.5
86	40	Holy Cross	Surrey	6.8	7.6	144	94	Eric Hamber	Vancouver	5.9	6.6
86	59	R. E. Mountain	Langley	6.8	7.2	144	117	Killarney	Vancouver	5.9	6.3
86	65	Delta	Delta	6.8	7.1	144	144	Burnaby Central	Burnaby	5.9	5.9
86	65	Kitsilano	Vancouver	6.8	7.1	144	150	Chilliwack	Chilliwack	5.9	5.8
86	81	Seaquam	Delta	6.8	6.8	148	94	D W Poppy	Langley	5.8	6.6
86	109	Elphinstone	Gibsons	6.8	6.4	148	117	Clayton Heights	Surrey	5.8	6.3
86	150	J V Humphries	Kaslo	6.8	5.8	148	117	D P Todd	Prince George	5.8	6.3
93	59	Fleetwood Park	Surrey	6.7	7.2	148	136	Delview	Delta	5.8	6.1
93	77	Parkland	Sidney	6.7	6.9	148	136	Stelly's	Saanichton	5.8	6.1
93	89	Burnaby Mountain	Burnaby	6.7	6.7	148	150	Mount Baker	Cranbrook	5.8	5.8
93	104	Highland	Comox	6.7	6.5	148	150	Mount Boucherie	Kelowna	5.8	5.8

Rank		School name	City	Overall rating		Rank		School name	City	Overall rating	
2010/2011	Last 5 years			2010/2011	Last 5 years	2010/2011	Last 5 years			2010/2011	Last 5 years
148	161	Rutland	Kelowna	5.8	5.7	211	166	Golden	Golden	5.0	5.6
148	232	Clearwater	Clearwater	5.8	4.5	211	166	Matthew McNair	Richmond	5.0	5.6
157	117	David Thompson	Vancouver	5.7	6.3	211	202	Peter Skene Ogden	100 Mile House	5.0	5.0
157	136	Terry Fox	Port Coquitlam	5.7	6.1	211	228	Merritt	Merritt	5.0	4.6
157	141	Salmon Arm	Salmon Arm	5.7	6.0	211	246	Barriere	Barriere	5.0	3.9
157	175	Enver Creek	Surrey	5.7	5.5	211	n/a	A.R. MacNeill	Richmond	5.0	n/a
157	182	Cariboo Hill	Burnaby	5.7	5.4	218	182	MacKenzie	Mackenzie	4.9	5.4
157	202	Chatelech	Sechelt	5.7	5.0	218	202	Brooks	Powell River	4.9	5.0
157	224	Prince George	Prince George	5.7	4.7	218	202	Fraser Lake	Fraser Lake	4.9	5.0
164	104	Vanier Catholic	Whitehorse	5.6	6.5	218	212	John Oliver	Vancouver	4.9	4.9
164	109	Houston	Houston	5.6	6.4	218	232	Princeton	Princeton	4.9	4.5
164	166	Westview	Maple Ridge	5.6	5.6	223	175	Belmont	Victoria	4.8	5.5
164	175	F.H. Collins	Whitehorse	5.6	5.5	223	197	College Heights	Prince George	4.8	5.1
164	175	Georges P Vanier	Courtenay	5.6	5.5	223	202	Gladstone	Vancouver	4.8	5.0
164	197	Heritage Park	Mission	5.6	5.1	223	216	Alpha	Burnaby	4.8	4.8
164	202	Nakusp	Nakusp	5.6	5.0	223	216	Sir Charles Tupper	Vancouver	4.8	4.8
164	236	Mount Elizabeth	Kitimat	5.6	4.4	223	228	Prince Rupert	Prince Rupert	4.8	4.6
172	109	South Kamloops	Kamloops	5.5	6.4	229	166	Mount Sentinel	South Slokan	4.7	5.6
172	109	Sparwood	Sparwood	5.5	6.4	230	182	Cowichan	Duncan	4.6	5.4
172	150	Reynolds	Victoria	5.5	5.8	230	182	Pleasant Valley	Armstrong	4.6	5.4
172	150	Rick Hansen	Abbotsford	5.5	5.8	230	193	Agassiz	Agassiz	4.6	5.2
172	161	Templeton	Vancouver	5.5	5.7	230	216	Esquimalt	Victoria	4.6	4.8
172	182	Charles Bloom	Lumby	5.5	5.4	230	216	Ladysmith	Ladysmith	4.6	4.8
172	188	Nanaimo District	Nanaimo	5.5	5.3	230	224	King George	Vancouver	4.6	4.7
172	193	Timberline	Campbell River	5.5	5.2	230	247	North Island	Port McNeill	4.6	3.7
172	202	Carson Graham	North Vancouver	5.5	5.0	237	166	Norkam	Kamloops	4.5	5.6
181	117	Johnston Heights	Surrey	5.4	6.3	237	212	Correlieu	Quesnel	4.5	4.9
181	117	Kwalikum	Qualicum Beach	5.4	6.3	237	228	Queen Elizabeth	Surrey	4.5	4.6
181	128	Tamanawis	Surrey	5.4	6.2	240	202	Howe Sound	Squamish	4.4	5.0
181	136	Princess Margaret	Surrey	5.4	6.1	240	236	Alberni District	Port Alberni	4.4	4.4
181	144	Frank Hurt	Surrey	5.4	5.9	242	212	South Peace	Dawson Creek	4.3	4.9
181	144	Thomas Haney	Maple Ridge	5.4	5.9	242	224	North Delta	Delta	4.3	4.7
181	150	Burnaby South	Burnaby	5.4	5.8	242	232	Victoria High	Victoria	4.3	4.5
181	150	Windermere	Vancouver	5.4	5.8	245	193	Langley	Langley	4.2	5.2
181	166	Cambie	Richmond	5.4	5.6	245	216	L A Matheson	Surrey	4.2	4.8
181	166	Hope	Hope	5.4	5.6	245	243	Nechako Valley	Vanderhoof	4.2	4.2
181	166	Pemberton	Pemberton	5.4	5.6	248	241	Aldergrove Community	Aldergrove	4.1	4.3
181	166	Pitt Meadows	Pitt Meadows	5.4	5.6	249	216	Kwantlen Park	Surrey	4.0	4.8
181	175	Carihi	Campbell River	5.4	5.5	249	232	Porter Creek	Whitehorse	4.0	4.5
181	197	A L Fortune	Enderby	5.4	5.1	249	236	Byrne Creek	Burnaby	4.0	4.4
181	202	Grand Forks	Grand Forks	5.4	5.0	252	188	Westsyde	Kamloops	3.9	5.3
181	202	W L Seaton	Vernon	5.4	5.0	252	197	Kelly Road	Prince George	3.9	5.1
181	n/a	GW Graham	Chilliwack	5.4	n/a	252	224	Garibaldi	Maple Ridge	3.9	4.7
198	104	Carver Christian	Burnaby	5.3	6.5	252	250	Britannia	Vancouver	3.9	3.6
198	109	Boundary Central	Midway	5.3	6.4	252	254	Abbotsford Collegiate	Abbotsford	3.9	3.5
198	150	Summerland	Summerland	5.3	5.8	257	193	Caledonia	Terrace	3.8	5.2
198	161	Centennial	Coquitlam	5.3	5.7	257	243	North Peace	Fort St John	3.8	4.2
198	188	Frances Kelsey	Mill Bay	5.3	5.3	259	216	Samuel Robertson Tech	Maple Ridge	3.7	4.8
198	212	Spectrum	Victoria	5.3	4.9	259	228	Eagle River	Sicamous	3.7	4.6
204	136	Ballenas	Parksville	5.2	6.1	261	243	Woodlands	Nanaimo	3.6	4.2
204	141	Gulf Islands	Salt Spring Island	5.2	6.0	261	256	Fort Nelson	Fort Nelson	3.6	3.3
204	182	Wellington	Nanaimo	5.2	5.4	261	257	Cedar	Nanaimo	3.6	3.2
204	236	Edward Milne	Sooke	5.2	4.4	264	197	Mission	Mission	3.5	5.1
208	150	Prince Charles	Creston	5.1	5.8	264	241	Williams Lake	Williams Lake	3.5	4.3
208	188	Hatzic	Mission	5.1	5.3	266	250	John Barsby	Nanaimo	3.3	3.6
208	n/a	Abbotsford School of Integrated Arts-Sumas	Abbotsford	5.1	n/a	267	247	Lakes District	Burns Lake	3.0	3.7
211	150	Hugh Boyd	Richmond	5.0	5.8	268	255	Port Hardy	Port Hardy	2.9	3.4
						269	247	Fort St James	Fort St James	2.8	3.7

Rank		School name	City	Overall rating		Rank		School name	City	Overall rating	
2010/2011	Last 5 years			2010/2011	Last 5 years	2010/2011	Last 5 years			2010/2011	Last 5 years
269	250	Columneetza	Williams Lake	2.8	3.6	275	258	Charles Hays	Prince Rupert	2.0	3.0
271	n/a	Tumbler Ridge	Tumbler Ridge	2.7	n/a	277	260	Lillooet	Lillooet	1.8	2.1
272	236	Pender Harbour	Madeira Park	2.6	4.4	278	261	Hazelton	Hazelton	0.5	1.3
272	258	Chase	Chase	2.6	3.0	279	n/a	George M Dawson	Masset	0.0	n/a
272	n/a	Salmo	Salmo	2.6	n/a	279	n/a	Nisga'a	New Aiyansh	0.0	n/a
275	250	Chetwynd	Chetwynd	2.0	3.6						

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 compared to other schools in the *Report Card*?” The following is a simplified description of the procedure used to convert the raw indicator data into the *Overall rating out of 10*.

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

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

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

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

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

4 These weighted average results were then re-standardized.

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

6 This summary standardized score was then standardized.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

About the authors

Peter Cowley

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

Stephen T. Easton

Stephen T. Easton 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). A co-author of *A Secondary Schools Report Card for British Columbia* (1998), *Boys, Girls, and Grades: Academic Gender Balance in British Columbia's Secondary Schools* (1999) and the *Report Card on Aboriginal Education in British Columbia* (2004), he has continued to co-author the *Report Cards* of British Columbia, Alberta, New Brunswick and, most recently, Ontario. Other publications about education include "Do We Have a Problem Yet? Women and Men in Higher Education," in David Laidler (ed.), *Renovating the Ivory Tower: Canadian Universities and the Knowledge Economy* (Toronto: C.D. Howe Institute, 2002), pp. 60–79; "Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose" in Stephen B. Lawton, Rodney Reed, and Fons van Wieringen, *Restructuring Public Schooling* (Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1997) and *Education in Canada: An Analysis of Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Schooling* (Vancouver: the Fraser Institute, 1988). His editorials have been carried by the *Vancouver Sun*, the *Globe and Mail*, the *National Post*, the *Ottawa Citizen*, the *Stirling chain* and many other newspapers around the country.

Michael Thomas

Michael Thomas is the Associate Director, Report Cards Program, School Performance Studies and Program Director of Children First: School Choice Trust at the Fraser Institute. He graduated from York University with a B.A. in Political Science in 1997. Before joining the Fraser Institute in 2005, Mr. Thomas served as a policy advisor to the Ontario Minister of Education, where his files included adult education, students at risk, new curriculum initiatives, student health initiatives, and the community use of schools. Mr. Thomas is a former public school trustee, who served on the Toronto District School Board from 1997 to 2000. He has also held positions within the City of Toronto, and the Ontario Ministries of Tourism and Recreation and Citizenship.

Acknowledgments

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

Publishing information

Distribution

These publications are available from <<http://www.fraserinstitute.org>> in Portable Document Format (PDF) and can be read with Adobe Acrobat® 7 or Adobe Reader®, versions 7 or later. Adobe Reader® X, the most recent version, is available free of charge from Adobe Systems Inc. at <<http://get.adobe.com/reader/>>. Readers who have trouble viewing or printing our PDF files using applications from other manufacturers (e.g., Apple's Preview) should use Reader® or Acrobat®.

Ordering publications

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

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

Media

For media enquiries, please contact our Communications Department:

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

Copyright

Copyright © 2012 by the Fraser Institute. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written

permission except in the case of brief passages quoted in critical articles and reviews.

ISSN / ISBN

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

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

Date of issue

April 2012

Editing

Lindsey Thomas Martin

Typesetting

Nick Murphy

Cover design

Bill Ray

Images for cover

- ✎ Boys in school ©Steve Stone; iStock
- ✎ Girl solving a math problem on blackboard ©Bart Coenders; iStock
- ✎ Attentive reading ©Grigory Bibikov; iStock
- ✎ Library series ©Willie B. Thomas; iStock
- ✎ 8-year old schoolgirl doing homework ©mamahoooba; iStock
- ✎ Student working in class ©Bonnie Jacobs; iStock

Supporting the Fraser Institute

To learn how to support the Fraser Institute, please contact

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

Lifetime patrons

For their long-standing and valuable support contributing to the success of the Fraser Institute, the following people have been recognized and inducted as Lifetime Patrons of the Fraser Institute.

Sonja Bata

Serge Darkazanli

Fred Mannix

Charles Barlow

John Dobson

Con Riley

Ev Berg

Raymond Heung

Catherine Windels

Art Grunder

Bill Korol

Jim Chaplin

Bill Mackness

Purpose, funding, & independence

The Fraser Institute provides a useful public service. We report objective information about the economic and social effects of current public policies, and we offer evidence-based research and education about policy options that can improve the quality of life.

The Institute is a non-profit organization. Our activities are funded by charitable donations, unrestricted grants, ticket sales, and sponsorships from events, the licensing of products for public distribution, and the sale of publications.

All research is subject to rigorous review by external experts, and is conducted and published separately from the Institute's Board of Trustees and its donors.

The opinions expressed by the authors are those

of the individuals themselves, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Institute, its Board of Trustees, its donors and supporters, or its staff. This publication in no way implies that the Fraser Institute, its trustees, or staff are in favour of, or oppose the passage of, any bill; or that they support or oppose any particular political party or candidate.

As a healthy part of public discussion among fellow citizens who desire to improve the lives of people through better public policy, the Institute welcomes evidence-focused scrutiny of the research we publish, including verification of data sources, replication of analytical methods, and intelligent debate about the practical effects of policy recommendations.

About the Fraser Institute

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

Founded in 1974, we are an independent Canadian research and educational organization with locations throughout North America and international partners in over 85 countries. Our work is financed by tax-deductible contributions from thousands of indi-

viduals, organizations, and foundations. In order to protect its independence, the Institute does not accept grants from government or contracts for research.

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

Peer review—validating the accuracy of our research

The Fraser Institute maintains a rigorous peer review process for its research. New research, major research projects, and substantively modified research conducted by the Fraser Institute are reviewed by a minimum of one internal expert and two external experts. Reviewers are expected to have a recognized expertise in the topic area being addressed. Whenever possible, external review is a blind process.

Commentaries and conference papers are reviewed by internal experts. Updates to previously reviewed research or new editions of previously reviewed research are not reviewed unless the

update includes substantive or material changes in the methodology.

The review process is overseen by the directors of the Institute's research departments who are responsible for ensuring all research published by the Institute passes through the appropriate peer review. If a dispute about the recommendations of the reviewers should arise during the Institute's peer review process, the Institute has an Editorial Advisory Board, a panel of scholars from Canada, the United States, and Europe to whom it can turn for help in resolving the dispute.

Editorial Board

Members

Prof. Armen Alchian	Prof. Bev Dahlby	Prof. Ronald W. Jones
Prof. Terry L. Anderson	Prof. Erwin Diewert	Dr. Jerry Jordan
Prof. Robert Barro	Prof. Stephen Easton	Prof. Ross McKittrick
Prof. Michael Bliss	Prof. J.C. Herbert Emery	Prof. Michael Parkin
Prof. James M. Buchanan†	Prof. Jack L. Granatstein	Prof. Friedrich Schneider
Prof. Jean-Pierre Centi	Prof. Herbert G. Grubel	Prof. Lawrence B. Smith
Prof. John Chant	Prof. James Gwartney	Mr. Vito Tanzi

Past members

Prof. Friedrich A. Hayek* †	Prof. F.G. Penance*	Sir Alan Walters*
Prof. H.G. Johnson*	Prof. George Stigler* †	Prof. Edwin G. West*

* deceased; † Nobel Laureate