

Studies in Education Policy



May 2017

Report Card on British Columbia's Secondary Schools 2017

by Peter Cowley and Stephen Easton



Contents

Introduction / 3

Key academic indicators of school performance / 5

Other indicators of school performance / 10

Detailed school reports / 11

How does your school stack up? / 34

Appendix: Calculating *the Overall rating out of 10* / 38

About the Authors / 40

Publishing information / 41

Supporting the Fraser Institute / 42

Purpose, funding, & independence / 42

About the Fraser Institute / 43

Editorial Board / 44

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 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 students' characteristics, 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 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 contact Peter Cowley, Director of School Performance Studies, at peter.cowley@fraserinstitute.org.

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 between the school mark and the examination mark in the courses considered in (1) and (2) above;
- (4) average difference between male and female students in their exam mark in English 10;
- (5) average difference between male and female students in their exam mark in Mathematics 10;
- (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 ($1 - \text{net drop-out rate}$) for grades 10 through 12 is determined and their product is calculated. This three-year composite successful transition rate is then subtracted from 1 to produce the *Delayed advancement rate* indicator that appears in the detailed tables.

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

2 *Graduation rate*

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

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

immediately will likely 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" statistical

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 enrolling 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 five 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 the 2015/2016 school year, mandatory provincial examinations were administered in the following grade-10, grade-11, and grade-12 subjects: BC First Nations Studies 12; Civic Studies 11; Communications 12; English 10; English 10 First Peoples; English 12; English 12 First Peoples; Français langue première 10; Français langue première 12; Math 10, Apprenticeship and Workplace; Math 10, Foundations of Mathematics and Pre-calculus 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 the 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*, p. 7.
 - 6 Cowley and Easton, *Boys, Girls, and Grades*, p. 17.
 - 7 See *School Act*, BC, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section 1b.
 - 8 Richard Marceau and Peter Cowley, *Report Card on Quebec's Secondary Schools: 2001 Edition*, Studies in Education Policy (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 *Trend* indicator

Is the school improving academically? For most schools, the Report Card includes five years of results. Unlike a simple snapshot of one year's results, this historical record provides evidence of change (or lack thereof) over time.

In order to detect trends in the performance indicators, we developed the Trend indicator. This indicator uses statistical analysis to identify those dimensions of school performance in which there has been real change rather than a fluctuation in results caused by random occurrences.

To calculate the trends, the standardized scores rather than raw data are used. Standardizing makes historical data more comparable and the trend mea-

surement more reliable. 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 five years of data are available and where a trend is determined to be statistically significant. For this indicator we have defined the term "statistically significant" to mean that, nine times out of 10, the trend that is noted is real, that is, it did not happen just by chance.

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.

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](#) and on the web sites of local school districts and individual schools.

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] Location	Gr 12 Enrollment: 279					
B—ESL (%): 2.2	Special needs (%): 12.9		French Imm (%): 0.0			
Actual rating vs predicted based			2015-16	Last 5 Years		
C—on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a	Rank: 188/293		196/264			
Academic Performance	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Trend
D—Average exam mark	63.1	66.4	64.5	65.6	66.1	▲
E—Percentage of exams failed	16.7	13.6	13.5	14.1	10.9	▲
F—School vs exam mark difference	7.1	5.4	5.9	5.2	5.1	▲
G—English gender gap	F 2.7	F 4.1	F 6.4	F 5.0	F 6.5	▼
H—Math gender gap	M 0.1	F 2.3	F 1.1	M 3.6	F 5.3	▼
I—Graduation rate	95.9	95.3	94.8	95.0	94.6	▼
J—Delayed advancement rate	18.6	14.2	13.8	12.6	19.6	—
K—Overall rating out of 10	4.9	4.9	5.1	5.3	5.5	▲

A—Gr 12 Enrollment

The grade-12 enrollment on September 30, 2015. 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.

PLEASE NOTE THAT, BECAUSE OF DELAYS IN RECEIVING THIS YEAR'S DATA FOR THE "Special needs (%)" INDICATOR, IN THIS EDITION THE DATA FOR THAT INDICATOR REFER TO THE 2014/2015 SCHOOL YEAR.

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

(This indicator could not be calculated for this edition.)

C (right)—Academic ranking

The school's overall academic rank in the province for 2015/2016 and for the most recent five years. These rankings show how the school has done academically compared to the other schools in the *Report Card*. 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 a provincial examination 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 awarded by the school and the provincial examination mark in all the courses in which a 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 Foundations of Math and Pre-calculus 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 school's 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

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

Note 2

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 293. Excluded are schools at which fewer than 10 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: distributed learning schools, centres for adult education and continuing education 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 3

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 4

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

Note 5

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

Note 6

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

Average values for all schools 2015/2016							Gr 12 Enrollment: 164
ESL (%): 3.6	Special Needs (%): 10.6			French Immersion (%): 4.4			
Average Parents' Income: \$ n/a							
Academic Performance	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Trend	
Average exam mark	68.9	70.1	69.5	69.0	69.0	—	
Percentage of exams failed	10.1	8.8	9.7	10.2	10.6	—	
School vs exam mark difference	4.7	4.6	5.3	6.0	6.4	▼	
English gender gap*	4.9	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.9	—	
Math gender gap*	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.9	—	
Graduation rate	95.6	96.3	95.7	96.3	95.9	—	
Delayed advancement rate	16.4	13.4	14.0	12.9	13.9	—	
Overall rating out of 10	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	n/a	

* These results reflect the average size of the gender gaps. In 2015/2016, the English gender gap favoured females at 95.9% of schools and males at 4.1% of schools. The Math gender gap favoured females at 66.1% of schools, males at 32.7% of schools, and was even at 1.2% schools.

Note 7

If you have questions about the *Report Card*, please contact Peter Cowley, co-author of the *Report Card*, at peter.cowley@fraserinstitute.org.

List of cities and school districts

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

Index of school districts

School district	Page
Abbotsford	27
Alberni	23
Arrow Lakes	27
Boundary	27
Bulkley Valley	31
Burnaby	16
Campbell River	23
Cariboo-Chilcotin	31
Central Okanagan	27
Chilliwack	28
Coast Mountains	23
Comox Valley	23
Coquitlam	16
Cowichan Valley	23
Delta	17
Fort Nelson	31
Fraser-Cascade	28
Gold Trail	31
Greater Victoria	24
Gulf Islands	25
Haida Gwaii/Queen Charlotte	25
Kamloops/Thompson	31
Kootenay-Columbia	29
Kootenay Lake	28
Langley	29
Maple Ridge-Pitt Meadows	17
Mission	29
Nanaimo-Ladysmith	25

School district	Page
Nechako Lakes	32
New Westminster	18
Nicola-Similkameen	29
North Okanagan-Shuswap	32
North Vancouver	18
Okanagan Similkameen	30
Okanagan Skaha	30
Peace River North	32
Peace River South	32
Powell River	25
Prince George	32
Prince Rupert	25
Qualicum	25
Quesnel	33
Revelstoke	33
Richmond	18
Rocky Mountain	33
Saanich	25
Sea To Sky	26
Sooke	26
Southeast Kootenay	30
Sunshine Coast	26
Surrey	19
Vancouver	20
Vancouver Island North	26
Vancouver Island West	26
Vernon	30
West Vancouver	22

David Thompson [Public] Vancouver Gr 12 Enrollment: 344

ESL (%): 8.2 Special needs (%): 9.5 French Imm (%): 0.0
 Actual rating vs predicted based
 on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 2015-16 Last 5 Years
 86/293 109/264

Academic Performance 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 Trend

Average exam mark 68.0 70.6 72.0 71.2 70.7 —
 Percentage of exams failed 12.0 8.4 8.1 7.3 7.3 ▲
 School vs exam mark difference 2.9 1.8 1.8 4.6 3.5 —
 English gender gap F 6.0 F 4.6 F 1.7 F 3.2 F 1.3 ▲
 Math gender gap F 3.6 M 0.4 M 0.7 F 3.7 M 2.3 —
 Graduation rate 91.9 92.7 93.9 94.7 95.5 ▲
 Delayed advancement rate 25.7 19.4 15.1 17.2 17.9 —
Overall rating out of 10 5.4 6.0 6.9 6.4 6.9 ▲

Eric Hamber [Public] Vancouver Gr 12 Enrollment: 332

ESL (%): 3.3 Special needs (%): 11.2 French Imm (%): 0.1
 Actual rating vs predicted based
 on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 2015-16 Last 5 Years
 61/293 72/264

Academic Performance 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 Trend

Average exam mark 71.5 73.9 73.3 74.3 73.7 ▲
 Percentage of exams failed 9.7 6.4 6.0 3.8 5.9 ▲
 School vs exam mark difference 4.2 2.2 1.7 1.8 2.3 ▲
 English gender gap F 3.5 F 2.4 F 2.4 F 7.2 F 1.4 —
 Math gender gap M 3.8 M 2.1 M 1.0 M 1.0 F 2.1 —
 Graduation rate 96.7 94.1 97.4 95.6 96.4 —
 Delayed advancement rate 30.3 28.0 23.1 19.4 23.8 —
Overall rating out of 10 6.0 6.5 7.3 7.4 7.3 ▲

Gladstone [Public] Vancouver Gr 12 Enrollment: 217

ESL (%): 5.1 Special needs (%): 16.1 French Imm (%): 0.0
 Actual rating vs predicted based
 on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 2015-16 Last 5 Years
 177/293 156/264

Academic Performance 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 Trend

Average exam mark 67.7 69.1 68.3 66.9 66.0 —
 Percentage of exams failed 10.5 10.2 9.4 13.1 11.7 —
 School vs exam mark difference 6.3 4.0 5.8 6.6 7.9 —
 English gender gap F 4.0 F 5.2 F 6.6 F 2.8 F 3.0 —
 Math gender gap M 5.6 F 2.3 F 2.8 M 0.5 M 0.7 ▲
 Graduation rate 98.0 94.7 96.2 97.9 96.5 —
 Delayed advancement rate 25.7 22.3 25.2 11.6 17.9 —
Overall rating out of 10 5.4 5.5 5.5 6.0 5.6 —

John Oliver [Public] Vancouver Gr 12 Enrollment: 206

ESL (%): 13.2 Special needs (%): 15.8 French Imm (%): 0.0
 Actual rating vs predicted based
 on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 2015-16 Last 5 Years
 229/293 205/264

Academic Performance 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 Trend

Average exam mark 64.3 65.6 65.9 67.1 64.0 —
 Percentage of exams failed 14.8 12.9 13.6 9.6 16.0 —
 School vs exam mark difference 3.5 3.5 2.8 2.9 4.2 —
 English gender gap F 4.4 F 1.5 F 0.3 F 4.2 F 2.9 —
 Math gender gap M 1.7 F 2.0 M 6.5 M 3.1 F 4.9 —
 Graduation rate 96.3 87.6 94.7 93.8 90.7 —
 Delayed advancement rate 33.9 26.5 25.0 25.7 23.4 ▲
Overall rating out of 10 5.0 4.4 5.2 5.8 4.6 —

Killarney [Public] Vancouver Gr 12 Enrollment: 421

ESL (%): 7.0 Special needs (%): 14.4 French Imm (%): 0.0
 Actual rating vs predicted based
 on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 2015-16 Last 5 Years
 142/293 156/264

Academic Performance 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 Trend

Average exam mark 69.5 71.3 69.4 69.2 69.2 —
 Percentage of exams failed 9.8 9.2 10.0 9.1 9.8 —
 School vs exam mark difference 3.9 3.0 5.1 4.7 4.5 —
 English gender gap F 4.1 F 4.3 F 7.8 F 5.1 F 2.8 —
 Math gender gap F 1.9 F 0.8 F 2.0 F 2.2 M 0.5 —
 Graduation rate 91.4 92.8 88.9 94.1 95.3 —
 Delayed advancement rate 29.6 25.4 32.6 27.4 26.8 —
Overall rating out of 10 5.6 5.7 4.8 5.7 6.1 —

King David [Independent] Vancouver Gr 12 Enrollment: 35

ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 21.0 French Imm (%): 0.0
 Actual rating vs predicted based
 on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 2015-16 Last 5 Years
 21/293 19/264

Academic Performance 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 Trend

Average exam mark 75.3 79.0 78.0 75.9 76.4 —
 Percentage of exams failed 0.7 0.7 1.7 0.6 1.4 —
 School vs exam mark difference 4.3 3.5 3.2 4.3 4.8 —
 English gender gap F 0.1 n/a M 5.2 F 2.2 M 4.4 n/a
 Math gender gap F 1.5 n/a M 8.5 F 2.3 M 0.1 n/a
 Graduation rate 100.0 95.5 100.0 100.0 100.0 —
 Delayed advancement rate 0.0 9.3 0.0 0.5 1.7 —
Overall rating out of 10 8.4 8.1 8.1 8.5 8.6 —

King George [Public] Vancouver Gr 12 Enrollment: 90

ESL (%): 9.2 Special needs (%): 10.3 French Imm (%): 0.0
 Actual rating vs predicted based
 on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 2015-16 Last 5 Years
 193/293 214/264

Academic Performance 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 Trend

Average exam mark 66.5 67.0 66.6 67.5 68.5 —
 Percentage of exams failed 14.1 12.1 13.9 11.7 9.0 —
 School vs exam mark difference 4.8 5.7 7.7 5.0 5.2 —
 English gender gap F 8.2 F 3.0 F 6.0 F 3.1 F 0.7 —
 Math gender gap M 1.6 M 8.3 F 2.1 F 3.0 F 0.9 —
 Graduation rate 94.4 93.2 85.9 97.3 85.9 —
 Delayed advancement rate 27.6 24.2 36.7 16.2 24.7 —
Overall rating out of 10 5.0 4.2 3.4 6.0 5.4 —

Kitsilano [Public] Vancouver Gr 12 Enrollment: 286

ESL (%): 2.6 Special needs (%): 10.5 French Imm (%): 33.9
 Actual rating vs predicted based
 on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 2015-16 Last 5 Years
 71/293 60/264

Academic Performance 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 Trend

Average exam mark 73.1 74.4 73.9 71.1 71.9 —
 Percentage of exams failed 6.6 6.1 6.0 6.8 5.5 ▲
 School vs exam mark difference 1.1 1.3 1.4 3.1 3.5 ▼
 English gender gap F 4.0 F 1.9 F 5.2 F 6.5 F 5.2 —
 Math gender gap F 1.6 F 2.0 F 0.4 F 3.9 F 1.0 —
 Graduation rate 95.4 97.7 93.3 96.9 94.1 —
 Delayed advancement rate 21.8 16.8 19.8 11.8 12.9 —
Overall rating out of 10 7.1 7.4 7.0 6.8 7.1 —

Little Flower [Independent] Vancouver Gr 12 Enrollment: 96

ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 1.5 French Imm (%): 0.0
 Actual rating vs predicted based
 on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 2015-16 Last 5 Years
 1/293 3/264

Academic Performance 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 Trend

Average exam mark 82.1 84.5 85.1 86.7 85.8 ▲
 Percentage of exams failed 1.1 1.5 0.2 0.6 0.0 ▲
 School vs exam mark difference 2.2 2.0 0.9 0.9 1.6 ▲
 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 1.1 0.0 1.0 0.7 0.0 —
Overall rating out of 10 9.3 9.7 10.0 10.0 10.0 ▲

Lord Byng [Public] Vancouver Gr 12 Enrollment: 273

ESL (%): 9.1 Special needs (%): 9.7 French Imm (%): 0.0
 Actual rating vs predicted based
 on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 2015-16 Last 5 Years
 19/293 17/264

Academic Performance 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 Trend

Average exam mark 78.1 78.6 80.2 79.5 78.9 —
 Percentage of exams failed 3.3 2.2 2.0 1.7 1.8 ▲
 School vs exam mark difference 2.3 1.8 1.6 2.4 2.8 —
 English gender gap F 5.2 F 2.5 F 5.5 F 4.9 F 4.7 —
 Math gender gap M 0.7 F 1.0 F 2.2 F 2.8 F 2.0 ▼
 Graduation rate 98.7 99.6 98.0 98.7 99.2 —
 Delayed advancement rate 2.1 10.9 9.5 2.9 5.8 —
Overall rating out of 10 8.3 8.5 8.4 8.7 8.7 ▲

Magee [Public] Vancouver Gr 12 Enrollment: 257

ESL (%): 4.6 Special needs (%): 8.5 French Imm (%): 0.0
 Actual rating vs predicted based
 on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 2015-16 Last 5 Years
 61/293 44/264

Academic Performance 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 Trend

Average exam mark 74.7 74.9 75.2 74.4 73.7 —
 Percentage of exams failed 4.2 4.2 4.8 5.6 5.0 —
 School vs exam mark difference 2.6 3.1 2.9 3.9 4.7 —
 English gender gap F 3.0 F 4.3 F 7.0 F 2.8 F 1.7 —
 Math gender gap F 2.8 F 0.5 F 1.2 M 2.2 F 2.4 —
 Graduation rate 97.7 95.8 96.5 98.6 96.1 —
 Delayed advancement rate 12.0 11.0 6.4 11.8 13.9 —
Overall rating out of 10 7.5 7.3 7.4 7.5 7.3 —

Notre Dame [Independent] Vancouver Gr 12 Enrollment: 126

ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 5.8 French Imm (%): 0.0
 Actual rating vs predicted based
 on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 2015-16 Last 5 Years
 67/293 60/264

Academic Performance 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 Trend

Average exam mark 71.0 70.7 72.1 70.0 71.4 —
 Percentage of exams failed 5.4 6.0 5.2 7.3 5.7 —
 School vs exam mark difference 5.6 6.2 5.5 8.8 7.6 —
 English gender gap F 7.5 F 2.6 F 0.4 F 5.4 F 5.2 —
 Math gender gap F 0.6 M 1.7 F 0.8 F 4.8 F 2.7 —
 Graduation rate 100.0 97.9 99.2 100.0 100.0 —
 Delayed advancement rate 3.5 1.1 4.0 2.5 2.3 —
Overall rating out of 10 7.1 7.0 7.5 6.6 7.2 —

Point Grey [Public] Vancouver Gr 12 Enrollment: 220

ESL (%): 5.1 Special needs (%): 9.0 French Imm (%): 0.0
 Actual rating vs predicted based
 on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 2015-16 Last 5 Years
 46/293 44/264

Academic Performance 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 Trend

Average exam mark 74.4 75.4 77.1 75.0 74.3 —
 Percentage of exams failed 6.2 5.9 3.4 5.8 5.0 —
 School vs exam mark difference 3.6 4.4 3.3 5.7 4.9 —
 English gender gap F 4.1 F 3.7 F 2.4 F 5.2 F 1.4 —
 Math gender gap E 0.3 F 0.3 M 3.4 F 1.0 M 1.4 —
 Graduation rate 96.4 96.0 96.2 98.7 98.0 —
 Delayed advancement rate 10.1 9.7 10.1 6.5 9.3 —
Overall rating out of 10 7.3 7.0 7.7 7.4 7.6 —

Prince Of Wales [Public] Vancouver Gr 12 Enrollment: 248

ESL (%): 12.2 Special needs (%): 10.2 French Imm (%): 0.0
 Actual rating vs predicted based
 on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 2015-16 Last 5 Years
 50/293 36/264

Academic Performance 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 Trend

Average exam mark 76.4 77.0 77.0 77.1 75.6 —
 Percentage of exams failed 3.2 3.6 4.6 3.4 4.5 —
 School vs exam mark difference 4.3 3.7 4.7 4.2 5.4 —
 English gender gap F 3.4 F 5.0 F 3.3 F 2.5 F 2.4 —
 Math gender gap F 2.1 F 3.7 M 0.2 F 3.3 F 3.3 —
 Graduation rate 97.0 97.8 97.2 97.9 97.8 ▲
 Delayed advancement rate 10.1 10.0 15.0 9.7 8.5 —
Overall rating out of 10 7.7 7.4 7.4 7.9 7.5 —

Sir Charles Tupper [Public] Vancouver Gr 12 Enrollment: 224

ESL (%): 8.5 Special needs (%): 16.5 French Imm (%): 0.0
 Actual rating vs predicted based
 on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 2015-16 Last 5 Years
 142/293 181/264

Academic Performance 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 Trend

Average exam mark 65.8 68.1 67.1 66.9 67.5 —
 Percentage of exams failed 14.0 11.1 10.9 10.2 9.8 ▲
 School vs exam mark difference 7.2 10.3 8.1 7.3 6.6 —
 English gender gap F 6.2 F 4.0 F 3.1 F 4.7 M 0.4 —
 Math gender gap F 1.6 M 0.1 M 1.6 M 6.7 F 2.8 —
 Graduation rate 96.2 98.8 96.1 97.0 96.0 —
 Delayed advancement rate 29.6 20.6 28.6 23.5 21.7 —
Overall rating out of 10 4.7 5.1 5.2 5.3 6.1 ▲

Sir Winston Churchill [Public] Vancouver Gr 12 Enrollment: 447

ESL (%): 7.8 Special needs (%): 6.3 French Imm (%): 25.9
 Actual rating vs predicted based
 on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 2015-16 Last 5 Years
 46/293 49/264

Academic Performance 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 Trend

Average exam mark 72.9 74.2 75.0 75.1 73.7 —
 Percentage of exams failed 7.4 6.2 6.2 4.9 5.8 ▲
 School vs exam mark difference 3.1 2.8 2.5 3.2 3.9 —
 English gender gap F 2.6 F 3.0 F 5.7 F 4.6 F 2.0 —
 Math gender gap M 0.3 M 1.3 M 0.0 M 1.6 F 1.7 ▼
 Graduation rate 96.4 96.5 97.0 95.2 97.5 —
 Delayed advancement rate 10.2 13.2 12.1 12.0 8.4 —
Overall rating out of 10 7.2 7.1 7.3 7.4 7.6 ▲

St George's [Independent] Vancouver Gr 12 Enrollment: 164

ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 3.8 French Imm (%): 0.0
 Actual rating vs predicted based
 on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 2015-16 Last 5 Years
 5/293 4/264

Academic Performance 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 Trend

Average exam mark 83.9 83.7 84.2 83.7 84.3 —
 Percentage of exams failed 0.4 0.8 0.1 0.4 0.1 ▲
 School vs exam mark difference 2.1 2.7 2.7 2.6 3.3 —
 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 99.3 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 —
 Delayed advancement rate 1.2 0.8 0.0 0.0 1.4 —
Overall rating out of 10 9.5 9.4 9.6 9.9 9.9 ▲

St John's [Independent] Vancouver Gr 12 Enrollment: 41

ESL (%): 8.4 Special needs (%): 3.8 French Imm (%): 0.0
 Actual rating vs predicted based
 on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 2015-16 Last 5 Years
 13/293 16/264

Academic Performance 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 Trend

Average exam mark 76.2 80.4 80.0 76.2 78.4 —
 Percentage of exams failed 1.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 ▲
 School vs exam mark difference 9.6 0.5 0.0 2.4 0.8 —
 English gender gap F 7.3 M 6.8 F 6.4 M 3.2 M 1.4 ▲
 Math gender gap F 5.3 F 2.5 F 0.9 M 1.2 M 6.4 —
 Graduation rate 100.0 100.0 100.0 97.6 100.0 —
 Delayed advancement rate 7.0 3.1 3.1 0.0 0.3 ▲
Overall rating out of 10 7.0 8.9 9.1 8.7 9.1 —

Stelly's [Public] Saanichton		Gr 12 Enrollment: 193				
ESL (%): 0.5	Special needs (%): 9.4	French Imm (%): 21.1		2015-16		Last 5 Years
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a		Rank: 193/293		150/264		
Academic Performance	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Trend
Average exam mark	70.0	71.2	70.9	69.6	69.2	—
Percentage of exams failed	7.6	7.3	7.3	11.5	10.4	—
School vs exam mark difference	3.8	4.8	5.4	7.2	8.6	▼
English gender gap	F 3.6	F 2.7	F 10.8	F 4.2	F 6.2	—
Math gender gap	F 3.2	F 3.0	F 1.8	M 3.8	M 2.3	—
Graduation rate	85.7	93.5	93.5	93.8	94.8	▲
Delayed advancement rate	24.8	20.3	17.2	20.0	20.7	—
Overall rating out of 10	5.8	5.9	5.9	5.3	5.4	—

SEA TO SKY

Howe Sound [Public] Squamish		Gr 12 Enrollment: 196				
ESL (%): 2.2	Special needs (%): 10.1	French Imm (%): 13.5		2015-16		Last 5 Years
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a		Rank: 177/293		128/264		
Academic Performance	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Trend
Average exam mark	69.3	68.5	66.9	66.6	66.2	▼
Percentage of exams failed	8.7	8.8	11.7	12.6	13.5	▼
School vs exam mark difference	5.1	6.1	6.7	8.4	8.5	▼
English gender gap	F 4.2	F 5.2	F 5.9	F 4.3	F 5.3	—
Math gender gap	M 2.8	F 0.2	F 3.6	M 2.6	F 0.7	—
Graduation rate	96.6	99.4	97.6	98.8	97.2	—
Delayed advancement rate	7.8	0.2	7.1	3.8	6.7	—
Overall rating out of 10	6.4	6.5	5.7	5.8	5.6	▼

Pemberton [Public] Pemberton		Gr 12 Enrollment: 54				
ESL (%): 13.5	Special needs (%): 19.6	French Imm (%): 12.8		2015-16		Last 5 Years
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a		Rank: 71/293		172/264		
Academic Performance	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Trend
Average exam mark	66.5	67.4	66.7	67.4	69.0	—
Percentage of exams failed	12.5	10.6	13.6	10.9	11.1	▲
School vs exam mark difference	5.8	6.2	7.1	4.9	5.8	—
English gender gap	F 5.5	F 8.5	F 2.0	F 12.5	M 1.1	—
Math gender gap	M 5.5	F 4.7	M 4.7	F 4.1	F 1.7	▲
Graduation rate	100.0	90.0	93.2	94.9	100.0	—
Delayed advancement rate	29.4	27.2	21.1	19.1	13.3	▲
Overall rating out of 10	5.3	4.2	5.1	5.4	7.1	—

Whistler [Public] Whistler		Gr 12 Enrollment: 84				
ESL (%): 6.0	Special needs (%): 13.0	French Imm (%): 18.6		2015-16		Last 5 Years
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a		Rank: 50/293		72/264		
Academic Performance	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Trend
Average exam mark	71.3	72.9	73.4	73.4	75.1	▲
Percentage of exams failed	5.7	2.6	4.1	5.2	4.7	—
School vs exam mark difference	6.8	5.8	4.1	7.2	6.1	—
English gender gap	E	F 1.7	F 13.4	F 12.2	F 9.5	—
Math gender gap	M 4.4	M 5.0	F 8.2	F 2.1	F 4.9	—
Graduation rate	96.7	97.8	98.6	95.8	100.0	—
Delayed advancement rate	3.7	10.8	7.8	7.8	0.0	—
Overall rating out of 10	6.8	7.2	6.7	6.5	7.5	—

SOOKE

Edward Milne [Public] Sooke		Gr 12 Enrollment: 161				
ESL (%): 6.5	Special needs (%): 13.6	French Imm (%): 13.2		2015-16		Last 5 Years
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a		Rank: 254/293		223/264		
Academic Performance	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Trend
Average exam mark	64.1	66.2	64.5	63.9	63.4	—
Percentage of exams failed	15.5	12.1	16.4	15.3	18.3	—
School vs exam mark difference	5.1	5.0	5.9	5.7	8.8	—
English gender gap	F 4.9	F 4.3	F 10.0	F 4.0	F 5.0	—
Math gender gap	F 0.8	F 0.3	F 3.1	M 2.5	M 8.5	▼
Graduation rate	89.6	88.1	92.3	93.3	94.0	—
Delayed advancement rate	25.9	29.9	18.0	24.5	25.8	—
Overall rating out of 10	4.8	4.5	4.5	4.8	4.1	—

SUNSHINE COAST

Chatelech [Public] Sechelt		Gr 12 Enrollment: 103				
ESL (%): 3.1	Special needs (%): 22.8	French Imm (%): 0.0		2015-16		Last 5 Years
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a		Rank: 154/293		150/264		
Academic Performance	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Trend
Average exam mark	65.4	66.4	68.5	67.6	67.2	▲
Percentage of exams failed	18.0	12.5	11.7	9.8	14.0	—
School vs exam mark difference	7.2	7.1	4.2	4.5	5.4	▲
English gender gap	F 6.8	F 9.0	F 4.4	F 5.2	F 7.7	—
Math gender gap	M 3.6	M 2.0	F 3.3	F 3.5	F 2.3	—
Graduation rate	100.0	100.0	97.2	100.0	100.0	—
Delayed advancement rate	6.7	6.3	17.0	6.8	6.9	—
Overall rating out of 10	5.0	5.1	5.8	6.5	6.0	▲

Elphinstone [Public] Gibsons		Gr 12 Enrollment: 97				
ESL (%): 2.3	Special needs (%): 18.7	French Imm (%): 0.0		2015-16		Last 5 Years
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a		Rank: 46/293		72/264		
Academic Performance	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Trend
Average exam mark	69.7	70.1	69.3	71.0	70.3	—
Percentage of exams failed	6.4	5.7	7.4	4.8	6.4	—
School vs exam mark difference	4.8	4.0	4.9	4.0	5.8	—
English gender gap	F 4.5	F 7.7	F 6.0	F 4.3	F 4.1	—
Math gender gap	M 0.7	F 6.0	M 1.2	M 6.5	F 1.3	—
Graduation rate	100.0	99.2	96.5	97.1	100.0	—
Delayed advancement rate	4.4	7.7	9.6	2.2	0.0	—
Overall rating out of 10	7.1	6.5	6.4	7.1	7.6	—

VANCOUVER ISLAND NORTH

North Island [Public] Port McNeill		Gr 12 Enrollment: 60				
ESL (%): 14.8	Special needs (%): 22.6	French Imm (%): 0.0		2015-16		Last 5 Years
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a		Rank: 260/293		245/264		
Academic Performance	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Trend
Average exam mark	61.2	59.9	63.4	61.3	60.4	—
Percentage of exams failed	18.8	21.4	13.6	19.4	20.7	—
School vs exam mark difference	8.0	7.5	4.3	4.5	5.5	▲
English gender gap	F 4.7	F 10.1	F 6.9	F 4.7	F 8.8	—
Math gender gap	M 0.7	M 3.1	M 7.2	M 11.3	F 8.3	▼
Graduation rate	95.3	95.6	98.5	96.4	100.0	—
Delayed advancement rate	29.2	25.5	28.6	17.9	30.9	—
Overall rating out of 10	3.9	2.3	5.0	4.3	3.9	—

Port Hardy [Public] Port Hardy		Gr 12 Enrollment: 32				
ESL (%): 24.7	Special needs (%): 21.6	French Imm (%): 0.0		2015-16		Last 5 Years
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a		Rank: 278/293		253/264		
Academic Performance	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Trend
Average exam mark	59.9	59.4	61.6	60.2	60.2	—
Percentage of exams failed	24.6	23.9	16.5	21.3	23.9	—
School vs exam mark difference	6.0	5.7	3.2	4.8	7.7	—
English gender gap	F 10.5	M 1.2	n/a	F 16.8	n/a	n/a
Math gender gap	M 1.8	F 10.1	n/a	F 1.9	n/a	n/a
Graduation rate	95.2	100.0	92.5	81.1	90.5	—
Delayed advancement rate	48.6	26.2	12.1	42.4	32.2	—
Overall rating out of 10	3.2	3.5	5.0	1.7	2.7	—

VANCOUVER ISLAND WEST

Gold River [Public] Gold River		Gr 12 Enrollment: 18				
ESL (%): 0.0	Special needs (%): 22.8	French Imm (%): 0.0		2015-16		Last 5 Years
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a		Rank: 210/293		n/a		
Academic Performance	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Trend
Average exam mark	n/a	n/a	62.8	n/a	67.2	n/a
Percentage of exams failed	n/a	n/a	19.7	n/a	11.5	n/a
School vs exam mark difference	n/a	n/a	11.5	n/a	7.5	n/a
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	n/a	n/a	94.1	n/a	92.3	n/a
Delayed advancement rate	n/a	n/a	31.6	n/a	14.3	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	n/a	n/a	2.4	n/a	5.1	n/a

Fraser Valley and Southern British Columbia

ABBOTSFORD

Abbotsford Christian [Independent] Abbotsford Gr 12 Enrollment: 83

ESL (%): 0.0	Special needs (%): 7.9	French Imm (%): 0.0	
Actual rating vs predicted based			
Rank: 120/293			
Academic Performance			
Average exam mark	70.2	73.6	72.0
Percentage of exams failed	5.0	2.8	6.3
School vs exam mark difference	3.7	1.0	2.6
English gender gap	F 2.1	F 6.7	F 7.5
Math gender gap	F 1.9	M 6.1	F 1.8
Graduation rate	98.5	100.0	98.7
Delayed advancement rate	6.3	4.3	5.1
Overall rating out of 10	7.2	7.7	7.8

Abbotsford Collegiate [Public] Abbotsford Gr 12 Enrollment: 279

ESL (%): 2.2	Special needs (%): 12.9	French Imm (%): 0.0	
Actual rating vs predicted based			
Rank: 188/293			
Academic Performance			
Average exam mark	63.1	66.4	64.5
Percentage of exams failed	16.7	13.6	13.5
School vs exam mark difference	7.1	5.4	5.9
English gender gap	F 2.7	F 4.1	F 6.4
Math gender gap	M 0.1	F 2.3	F 1.1
Graduation rate	95.9	95.3	94.8
Delayed advancement rate	18.6	14.2	13.8
Overall rating out of 10	4.9	4.9	5.1

Abbotsford Traditional [Public] Abbotsford Gr 12 Enrollment: 118

ESL (%): 1.0	Special needs (%): 3.5	French Imm (%): 0.0	
Actual rating vs predicted based			
Rank: 154/293			
Academic Performance			
Average exam mark	67.1	69.2	68.7
Percentage of exams failed	10.2	7.8	6.9
School vs exam mark difference	8.5	7.4	6.9
English gender gap	F 4.5	F 3.0	F 3.2
Math gender gap	F 3.5	M 5.6	F 1.3
Graduation rate	93.1	91.9	96.9
Delayed advancement rate	6.0	8.5	4.1
Overall rating out of 10	5.4	5.3	6.5

ASIA - Sumas Mountain [Public] Abbotsford Gr 12 Enrollment: 42

ESL (%): 1.2	Special needs (%): 20.5	French Imm (%): 0.0	
Actual rating vs predicted based			
Rank: 86/293			
Academic Performance			
Average exam mark	65.6	67.5	66.3
Percentage of exams failed	14.2	11.5	11.3
School vs exam mark difference	5.0	5.5	5.7
English gender gap	F 2.6	F 5.8	F 5.0
Math gender gap	M 9.9	M 4.8	F 10.0
Graduation rate	100.0	97.3	93.6
Delayed advancement rate	13.5	25.9	19.9
Overall rating out of 10	5.2	5.0	4.7

Dashmesh Punjabi [Independent] Abbotsford Gr 12 Enrollment: 28

ESL (%): 0.0	Special needs (%): 0.0	French Imm (%): 0.0	
Actual rating vs predicted based			
Rank: 81/293			
Academic Performance			
Average exam mark	n/a	74.6	74.3
Percentage of exams failed	n/a	5.3	1.5
School vs exam mark difference	n/a	9.1	4.4
English gender gap	n/a	F 1.9	F 6.3
Math gender gap	n/a	F 3.3	F 1.8
Graduation rate	n/a	90.0	100.0
Delayed advancement rate	n/a	10.0	5.9
Overall rating out of 10	n/a	5.9	7.9

MEI [Independent] Abbotsford Gr 12 Enrollment: 147

ESL (%): 0.0	Special needs (%): 5.6	French Imm (%): 0.0	
Actual rating vs predicted based			
Rank: 30/293			
Academic Performance			
Average exam mark	73.7	74.2	75.0
Percentage of exams failed	3.1	3.1	2.2
School vs exam mark difference	4.3	4.3	4.1
English gender gap	F 3.1	F 7.1	F 2.7
Math gender gap	M 1.5	F 1.1	M 1.5
Graduation rate	96.9	99.4	98.5
Delayed advancement rate	5.6	1.5	0.4
Overall rating out of 10	7.6	7.6	8.1

Rick Hansen [Public] Abbotsford Gr 12 Enrollment: 174

ESL (%): 5.9	Special needs (%): 9.7	French Imm (%): 0.0	
Actual rating vs predicted based			
Rank: 223/293			
Academic Performance			
Average exam mark	68.0	70.2	67.5
Percentage of exams failed	9.2	7.7	11.9
School vs exam mark difference	5.9	4.9	8.5
English gender gap	F 2.6	F 4.3	F 2.7
Math gender gap	F 0.1	F 3.1	F 0.9
Graduation rate	97.1	93.5	91.0
Delayed advancement rate	18.4	12.9	16.1
Overall rating out of 10	6.2	5.8	4.8

Robert Bateman [Public] Abbotsford Gr 12 Enrollment: 270

ESL (%): 0.6	Special needs (%): 13.1	French Imm (%): 0.0	
Actual rating vs predicted based			
Rank: 177/293			
Academic Performance			
Average exam mark	68.7	68.5	69.6
Percentage of exams failed	8.3	9.2	8.6
School vs exam mark difference	3.4	4.5	3.8
English gender gap	F 1.9	F 8.8	F 5.2
Math gender gap	M 1.9	F 1.0	M 0.8
Graduation rate	96.2	93.8	94.9
Delayed advancement rate	16.1	11.8	20.0
Overall rating out of 10	6.6	5.4	6.1

St John Brebeuf [Independent] Abbotsford Gr 12 Enrollment: 72

ESL (%): 0.0	Special needs (%): 6.9	French Imm (%): 0.0	
Actual rating vs predicted based			
Rank: 254/293			
Academic Performance			
Average exam mark	72.1	72.3	71.6
Percentage of exams failed	5.7	6.5	8.5
School vs exam mark difference	11.0	9.9	10.9
English gender gap	M 3.3	M 1.1	F 0.1
Math gender gap	M 4.6	M 5.3	M 0.3
Graduation rate	100.0	98.5	98.4
Delayed advancement rate	4.3	4.5	4.8
Overall rating out of 10	6.4	6.1	6.4

WJ Moutat [Public] Abbotsford Gr 12 Enrollment: 369

ESL (%): 2.8	Special needs (%): 8.9	French Imm (%): 24.2	
Actual rating vs predicted based			
Rank: 154/293			
Academic Performance			
Average exam mark	68.9	70.8	70.2
Percentage of exams failed	8.1	5.5	8.3
School vs exam mark difference	3.8	2.9	3.7
English gender gap	F 6.4	F 2.2	F 5.5
Math gender gap	M 0.3	F 0.5	F 1.0
Graduation rate	96.2	97.6	93.8
Delayed advancement rate	12.7	10.2	16.3
Overall rating out of 10	6.5	7.1	6.2

Yale [Public] Abbotsford Gr 12 Enrollment: 340

ESL (%): 0.5	Special needs (%): 10.2	French Imm (%): 0.1	
Actual rating vs predicted based			
Rank: 91/293			
Academic Performance			
Average exam mark	70.5	72.8	70.7
Percentage of exams failed	5.2	3.6	5.3
School vs exam mark difference	6.3	6.0	7.4
English gender gap	F 1.6	F 6.4	F 4.2
Math gender gap	M 1.4	M 4.1	M 1.5
Graduation rate	96.1	98.6	98.2
Delayed advancement rate	11.3	7.3	9.2
Overall rating out of 10	6.8	6.9	6.7

ARROW LAKES

Nakusp [Public] Nakusp Gr 12 Enrollment: 33

ESL (%): 0.0	Special needs (%): 13.3	French Imm (%): 0.0	
Actual rating vs predicted based			
Rank: 286/293			
Academic Performance			
Average exam mark	65.7	66.5	65.3
Percentage of exams failed	14.5	9.6	9.1
School vs exam mark difference	4.3	6.8	9.1
English gender gap	F 10.3	n/a	n/a
Math gender gap	M 1.7	n/a	n/a
Graduation rate	94.6	97.4	90.0
Delayed advancement rate	15.4	7.9	6.2
Overall rating out of 10	5.2	5.1	4.6

BOUNDARY

Boundary Central [Public] Midway Gr 12 Enrollment: 32

ESL (%): 0.0	Special needs (%): 9.9	French Imm (%): 0.0	
Actual rating vs predicted based			
Rank: 260/293			
Academic Performance			
Average exam mark	68.7	69.6	68.5
Percentage of exams failed	10.7	6.8	12.7
School vs exam mark difference	9.2	7.9	9.3
English gender gap	n/a	n/a	n/a
Math gender gap	n/a	n/a	n/a
Graduation rate	100.0	100.0	95.5
Delayed advancement rate	13.8	20.0	15.8
Overall rating out of 10	5.1	5.1	4.8

Grand Forks [Public] Grand Forks Gr 12 Enrollment: 60

ESL (%): 0.0	Special needs (%): 10.6	French Imm (%): 0.0	
Actual rating vs predicted based			
Rank: 61/293			
Academic Performance			
Average exam mark	68.4	69.2	69.6
Percentage of exams failed	8.3	7.9	6.3
School vs exam mark difference	3.9	3.7	4.2
English gender gap	F 9.4	F 4.0	F 6.5
Math gender gap	F 3.6	F 10.7	E 7.7
Graduation rate	96.6	93.2	94.3
Delayed advancement rate	13.0	9.0	5.5
Overall rating out of 10	6.1	5.8	6.7

CENTRAL OKANAGAN

Aberdeen Hall Senior [Independent] Kelowna Gr 12 Enrollment: 31

ESL (%): 0.0	Special needs (%): 7.5	French Imm (%): 0.0	
Actual rating vs predicted based			
Rank: 28/293			
Academic Performance			
Average exam mark	n/a	n/a	79.9
Percentage of exams failed	n/a	n/a	1.8
School vs exam mark difference	n/a	n/a	3.5
English gender gap	n/a	n/a	M 5.6
Math gender gap	n/a	n/a	F 3.2
Graduation rate	n/a	n/a	100.0
Delayed advancement rate	n/a	n/a	0.0
Overall rating out of 10	n/a	n/a	8.6

Table for Mount Sentinel [Public] South Slokan Gr 12 Enrollment: 55. Includes columns for Academic Performance (2012-2016) and Trend. Overall rating out of 10 is 5.4.

Table for Credo Christian [Independent] Langley Gr 12 Enrollment: 42. Includes columns for Academic Performance (2012-2016) and Trend. Overall rating out of 10 is 7.7.

Table for Langley Fundamental [Public] Langley Gr 12 Enrollment: 99. Includes columns for Academic Performance (2012-2016) and Trend. Overall rating out of 10 is 7.8.

Table for Prince Charles [Public] Creston Gr 12 Enrollment: 101. Includes columns for Academic Performance (2012-2016) and Trend. Overall rating out of 10 is 5.8.

Table for D W Poppy [Public] Langley Gr 12 Enrollment: 149. Includes columns for Academic Performance (2012-2016) and Trend. Overall rating out of 10 is 6.0.

Table for R. E. Mountain [Public] Langley Gr 12 Enrollment: 244. Includes columns for Academic Performance (2012-2016) and Trend. Overall rating out of 10 is 7.2.

KOOTENAY-COLUMBIA

Table for J Lloyd Crowe [Public] Trail Gr 12 Enrollment: 161. Includes columns for Academic Performance (2012-2016) and Trend. Overall rating out of 10 is 6.5.

Table for Fraser Valley Adventist [Independent] Aldergrove Gr 12 Enrollment: 17. Includes columns for Academic Performance (2012-2016) and Trend. Overall rating out of 10 is n/a.

Table for Walnut Grove [Public] Langley Gr 12 Enrollment: 350. Includes columns for Academic Performance (2012-2016) and Trend. Overall rating out of 10 is 6.8.

MISSION

Table for Mission [Public] Mission Gr 12 Enrollment: 357. Includes columns for Academic Performance (2012-2016) and Trend. Overall rating out of 10 is n/a.

Table for Stanley Humphries [Public] Castlegar Gr 12 Enrollment: 124. Includes columns for Academic Performance (2012-2016) and Trend. Overall rating out of 10 is 5.6.

Table for Langley [Public] Langley Gr 12 Enrollment: 262. Includes columns for Academic Performance (2012-2016) and Trend. Overall rating out of 10 is 4.5.

LANGLEY

Table for Aldergrove Community [Public] Aldergrove Gr 12 Enrollment: 148. Includes columns for Academic Performance (2012-2016) and Trend. Overall rating out of 10 is 5.0.

Table for Langley Christian [Independent] Langley Gr 12 Enrollment: 72. Includes columns for Academic Performance (2012-2016) and Trend. Overall rating out of 10 is 7.1.

NICOLA-SIMILKAMEEN

Table for Merritt [Public] Merritt Gr 12 Enrollment: 132. Includes columns for Academic Performance (2012-2016) and Trend. Overall rating out of 10 is 3.4.

Table for Brookwood [Public] Langley Gr 12 Enrollment: 189. Includes columns for Academic Performance (2012-2016) and Trend. Overall rating out of 10 is 6.3.

Table for Langley Fine Arts [Public] Fort Langley Gr 12 Enrollment: 100. Includes columns for Academic Performance (2012-2016) and Trend. Overall rating out of 10 is 7.5.

Table for Princeton [Public] Princeton Gr 12 Enrollment: 40. Includes columns for Academic Performance (2012-2016) and Trend. Overall rating out of 10 is 5.4.

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 293) 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 2015/2016. 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 10 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: distributed learning schools, centres for adult education and continuing education, 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.

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---				---Overall rating---			
2015/	Last			2015/	Last		
2016	5	Trend	School name	2016	5		
			City				
1	1	—	York House	Vancouver	10.0	10.0	
1	2	—	Crofton House	Vancouver	10.0	9.9	
1	3	▲	Little Flower	Vancouver	10.0	9.8	
1	8	▲	Relevant	Surrey	10.0	9.4	
5	4	—	Southridge	Surrey	9.9	9.7	
5	4	▲	St George's	Vancouver	9.9	9.7	
5	6	—	West Point Grey	Vancouver	9.9	9.6	
8	7	▲	Collingwood	West Vancouver	9.8	9.5	
9	11	—	Southpointe	Delta	9.7	8.9	
10	n/a	n/a	Timothy Christian	Chilliwack	9.4	n/a	
11	11	—	Richmond Christian	Richmond	9.2	8.9	
11	56	▲	Deer Lake SDA	Burnaby	9.2	7.2	
13	16	—	St John's	Vancouver	9.1	8.6	
14	n/a	n/a	Stratford Hall	Vancouver	9.0	n/a	
15	9	—	St Michaels	Victoria	8.9	9.0	
15	11	—	Shawnigan Lake	Shawnigan Lake	8.9	8.9	
15	n/a	n/a	Glenlyon Norfolk	Victoria	8.9	n/a	
18	26	▲	Vernon Christian	Vernon	8.8	8.0	
19	17	▲	Lord Byng	Vancouver	8.7	8.5	

---Rank---				---Overall rating---			
2015/	Last			2015/	Last		
2016	5	Trend	School name	2016	5		
			City				
19	n/a	n/a	Mulgrave	West Vancouver	8.7	n/a	
21	9	—	Brentwood College	Mill Bay	8.6	9.0	
21	14	—	Vancouver College	Vancouver	8.6	8.7	
21	19	—	King David	Vancouver	8.6	8.3	
24	31	—	St Ann's	Kamloops	8.5	7.7	
25	20	—	Okanagan Mission	Kelowna	8.3	8.2	
26	14	▼	Meadowridge	Maple Ridge	8.2	8.7	
26	18	—	St Thomas More	Burnaby	8.2	8.4	
28	20	—	St Thomas Aquinas	North Vancouver	8.1	8.2	
28	n/a	n/a	Aberdeen Hall Senior	Kelowna	8.1	n/a	
30	20	—	Kelowna Christian	Kelowna	8.0	8.2	
30	20	—	University Hill	Vancouver	8.0	8.2	
30	24	—	Pacific Academy	Surrey	8.0	8.1	
30	24	—	Sentinel	West Vancouver	8.0	8.1	
30	28	—	Credo Christian	Langley	8.0	7.8	
30	31	—	MEI	Abbotsford	8.0	7.7	
36	28	—	Handsworth	North Vancouver	7.9	7.8	
36	39	▲	Semiahmoo	Surrey	7.9	7.5	
36	n/a	n/a	St Margaret's	Victoria	7.9	n/a	

---Rank---				---Overall rating---				---Rank---				---Overall rating---		
2015/	Last			2015/	Last			2015/	Last			2015/	Last	
2016	5	Trend	School name	2016	5	Trend	School name	2016	5	Trend	School name	2016	5	
			City				City				City			
39	39	—	Holy Cross	Surrey	7.8	7.5		91	96	—	Seaquam	Delta	6.8	6.5
39	72	▲	White Rock Christian	Surrey	7.8	6.9		91	96	—	South Delta	Delta	6.8	6.5
39	n/a	n/a	Fountainview	Lillooet	7.8	n/a		91	137	—	Thomas Haney	Maple Ridge	6.8	5.9
39	n/a	n/a	Lions Gate Christian	North Vancouver	7.8	n/a		101	72	—	Dover Bay	Nanaimo	6.7	6.9
43	26	—	Archbishop Carney	Port Coquitlam	7.7	8.0		101	72	—	Kalamalka	Vernon	6.7	6.9
43	44	▲	Rockridge	West Vancouver	7.7	7.4		101	81	—	St Patrick's	Vancouver	6.7	6.8
43	49	—	Windsor	North Vancouver	7.7	7.3		101	90	—	Burnsview	Delta	6.7	6.6
46	36	—	Robert Alexander McMath	Richmond	7.6	7.6		101	103	—	Penticton	Penticton	6.7	6.4
46	44	—	Point Grey	Vancouver	7.6	7.4		101	109	—	Unity Christian	Chilliwack	6.7	6.3
46	49	▲	Sir Winston Churchill	Vancouver	7.6	7.3		101	196	—	Sparwood	Sparwood	6.7	5.1
46	72	—	Elphinstone	Gibsons	7.6	6.9		108	49	▼	St Andrew's	Victoria	6.6	7.3
50	31	▼	Heritage Woods	Port Moody	7.5	7.7		108	60	▼	Gleneagle	Coquitlam	6.6	7.1
50	36	—	Prince Of Wales	Vancouver	7.5	7.6		108	60	▼	Oak Bay	Victoria	6.6	7.1
50	39	—	Elgin Park	Surrey	7.5	7.5		108	96	—	L V Rogers	Nelson	6.6	6.5
50	44	—	Hugh McRoberts	Richmond	7.5	7.4		108	n/a	n/a	Phil & Jennie Gaglardi Academy	Comox	6.6	n/a
50	56	—	J N Burnett	Richmond	7.5	7.2		113	60	—	Fleetwood Park	Surrey	6.5	7.1
50	72	—	Whistler	Whistler	7.5	6.9		113	87	—	North Surrey	Surrey	6.5	6.7
50	n/a	n/a	Campbell River Christian	Campbell River	7.5	n/a		113	90	—	Southern Okanagan	Oliver	6.5	6.6
50	n/a	n/a	Inquiry Hub	Coquitlam	7.5	n/a		113	103	—	Delta	Delta	6.5	6.4
58	31	▼	Dr. Charles Best	Coquitlam	7.4	7.7		113	120	—	Vernon	Vernon	6.5	6.1
58	39	—	Revelstoke	Revelstoke	7.4	7.5		113	188	▲	G W Graham	Chilliwack	6.5	5.2
58	90	▲	Summerland	Summerland	7.4	6.6		113	n/a	n/a	Westside Preparatory	Vancouver	6.5	n/a
61	44	—	Magee	Vancouver	7.3	7.4		120	49	—	Abbotsford Christian	Abbotsford	6.4	7.3
61	44	—	Richmond	Richmond	7.3	7.4		120	60	—	Immaculata	Kelowna	6.4	7.1
61	71	—	Seycove	North Vancouver	7.3	7.0		120	81	—	Surrey Christian	Surrey	6.4	6.8
61	72	▲	Eric Hamber	Vancouver	7.3	6.9		120	90	—	George Elliot	Winfield	6.4	6.6
61	96	▲	Grand Forks	Grand Forks	7.3	6.5		120	96	—	Beattie	Kamloops	6.4	6.5
61	n/a	n/a	Queen Margaret's	Duncan	7.3	n/a		120	96	—	King's Christian	Salmon Arm	6.4	6.5
67	28	▼	Highroad	Chilliwack	7.2	7.8		120	109	—	Lord Tweedsmuir	Surrey	6.4	6.3
67	36	—	Heritage Christian	Kelowna	7.2	7.6		120	120	—	Sands	Delta	6.4	6.1
67	60	—	Notre Dame	Vancouver	7.2	7.1		128	49	▼	Langley Fundamental	Langley	6.3	7.3
67	n/a	n/a	Bulkley Valley Christian	Smithers	7.2	n/a		128	109	—	Osoyoos	Osoyoos	6.3	6.3
71	31	—	Mark R. Isfeld	Courtenay	7.1	7.7		128	116	—	Sardis	Chilliwack	6.3	6.2
71	49	—	Carver Christian	Burnaby	7.1	7.3		128	116	—	Vancouver Technical	Vancouver	6.3	6.2
71	49	—	Langley Fine Arts	Fort Langley	7.1	7.3		128	144	—	Duchess Park	Prince George	6.3	5.8
71	60	—	Kelowna	Kelowna	7.1	7.1		128	150	—	South Kamloops	Kamloops	6.3	5.7
71	60	—	Kitsilano	Vancouver	7.1	7.1		128	n/a	n/a	Mount Cheam Christian	Chilliwack	6.3	n/a
71	60	—	Pinetree	Coquitlam	7.1	7.1		135	96	—	Riverside	Port Coquitlam	6.2	6.5
71	81	—	Claremont	Victoria	7.1	6.8		135	103	—	Fraser Heights	Surrey	6.2	6.4
71	81	—	Princess Margaret	Penticton	7.1	6.8		135	103	—	Port Moody	Port Moody	6.2	6.4
71	109	—	J Lloyd Crowe	Trail	7.1	6.3		135	109	—	Highland	Comox	6.2	6.3
71	172	—	Pemberton	Pemberton	7.1	5.4		135	120	▲	Princess Margaret	Surrey	6.2	6.1
81	39	—	Steveston-London	Richmond	7.0	7.5		135	137	—	Similkameen	Keremeos	6.2	5.9
81	56	—	Langley Christian	Langley	7.0	7.2		135	137	▲	Tamanawis	Surrey	6.2	5.9
81	56	—	New Westminster	New Westminster	7.0	7.2		142	60	—	Regent Christian	Surrey	6.1	7.1
81	103	▲	R C Palmer	Richmond	7.0	6.4		142	72	▼	Mount Douglas	Victoria	6.1	6.9
81	n/a	n/a	Dasmesh Punjabi	Abbotsford	7.0	n/a		142	109	—	Burnaby North	Burnaby	6.1	6.3
86	81	—	Cedars Christian	Prince George	6.9	6.8		142	120	—	Mount Baker	Cranbrook	6.1	6.1
86	90	—	Argyle	North Vancouver	6.9	6.6		142	120	—	Panorama Ridge	Surrey	6.1	6.1
86	109	▲	David Thompson	Vancouver	6.9	6.3		142	128	—	Enver Creek	Surrey	6.1	6.0
86	156	—	ASIA - Sumas Mountain	Abbotsford	6.9	5.6		142	137	—	Maple Ridge	Maple Ridge	6.1	5.9
86	n/a	n/a	Khalsa (Surrey)	Surrey	6.9	n/a		142	144	—	Valleyview	Kamloops	6.1	5.8
91	60	—	Selkirk	Kimberley	6.8	7.1		142	150	—	Windermere	Vancouver	6.1	5.7
91	72	—	R. E. Mountain	Langley	6.8	6.9		142	156	—	Killarney	Vancouver	6.1	5.6
91	72	—	Walnut Grove	Langley	6.8	6.9		142	156	—	Kwalikum	Qualicum Beach	6.1	5.6
91	81	—	Yale	Abbotsford	6.8	6.8		142	181	▲	Sir Charles Tupper	Vancouver	6.1	5.3
91	87	—	Moscrop	Burnaby	6.8	6.7		154	103	—	W J Mouat	Abbotsford	6.0	6.4
91	87	—	West Vancouver	West Vancouver	6.8	6.7		154	128	—	Abbotsford Traditional	Abbotsford	6.0	6.0
91	90	—	Earl Marriott	Surrey	6.8	6.6		154	128	—	Carihi	Campbell River	6.0	6.0

---Rank---					-Overall rating-		---Rank---					-Overall rating-	
2015/	Last				2015/	Last	2015/	Last			2015/	Last	
2016	5	Trend	School name	City	2016	5	2016	5	2016	5	2016	5	2016
273	257	—	North Peace	Fort St John	3.0	3.1	283	262	—	Lillooet	Lillooet	2.4	2.5
275	258	—	Chetwynd	Chetwynd	2.9	3.0	285	240	—	Clearwater	Clearwater	2.2	4.0
275	n/a	n/a	George M Dawson	Masset	2.9	n/a	286	245	▼	Nakusp	Nakusp	2.0	3.9
277	253	—	Fraser Lake	Fraser Lake	2.8	3.2	287	188	—	Nanaimo Christian	Nanaimo	1.9	5.2
278	253	—	Port Hardy	Port Hardy	2.7	3.2	287	253	—	South Peace	Dawson Creek	1.9	3.2
278	n/a	n/a	Tumbler Ridge	Tumbler Ridge	2.7	n/a	289	260	▼	Barriere	Barriere	1.7	2.7
280	238	▼	Wellington	Nanaimo	2.6	4.1	290	253	—	Chase	Chase	1.4	3.2
280	248	▼	Byrne Creek	Burnaby	2.6	3.7	291	263	—	John Barsby	Nanaimo	1.2	2.2
280	252	—	Desert Sands	Ashcroft	2.6	3.3	292	260	▼	MacKenzie	Mackenzie	0.3	2.7
283	245	—	Duncan Christian	Duncan	2.4	3.9	293	264	▼	Hazelton	Hazelton	0.0	1.3

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 and Mathematics *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 gender gap*—6%, *Math 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 *Delayed advancement rate* could be calculated, the *Graduation rate* was weighted at 25%.

6 This summary standardized score was then standardized.

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

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

population. We chose, therefore, to set the minimum score so as to disregard such extreme differences.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

About the Authors

Peter Cowley

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

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.

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:

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

Media

For media enquiries, please contact our Communications Department:

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

In Toronto, contact our media specialist:

- ✎ via telephone at 416.363.6575, ext. 238.

Copyright

Copyright © 2017 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

May 2017

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 us

- ✎ via post: Development Department, Fraser Institute
Fourth Floor, 1770 Burrard Street
Vancouver, British Columbia, V6J 3G7 Canada
- ✎ via telephone from Canada, toll-free: 1.800.665.3558 ext. 548
- ✎ via e-mail: development@fraserinstitute.org
- ✎ or visit our webpage: <<http://www.fraserinstitute.org/support-us/overview.aspx>>.

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 Directors 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 Directors, its donors and supporters, or its staff. This publication in no way implies that the Fraser Institute, its directors, 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 mission is to improve the quality of life for Canadians, their families and future generations by studying, measuring and broadly communicating the effects of government policies, entrepreneurship and choice on their well-being.

Notre mission consiste à améliorer la qualité de vie des Canadiens et des générations à venir en étudiant, en mesurant et en diffusant les effets des politiques gouvernementales, de l'entrepreneuriat et des choix sur leur bien-être.

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. Terry L. Anderson

Prof. Stephen Easton

Dr. Jerry Jordan

Prof. Robert Barro

Prof. J.C. Herbert Emery

Prof. Ross McKittrick

Prof. Michael Bliss

Prof. Jack L. Granatstein

Prof. Michael Parkin

Prof. Jean-Pierre Centi

Prof. Herbert G. Grubel

Prof. Friedrich Schneider

Prof. John Chant

Prof. James Gwartney

Prof. Lawrence B. Smith

Prof. Bev Dahlby

Prof. Ronald W. Jones

Mr. Vito Tanzi

Prof. Erwin Diewert

Past members

Prof. Armen Alchian*

Prof. H.G. Johnson*

Sir Alan Walters*

Prof. James M. Buchanan* †

Prof. F.G. Pennance*

Prof. Edwin G. West*

Prof. Friedrich A. Hayek* †

Prof. George Stigler* †

* deceased; † Nobel Laureate