

# Studies in Education Policy



July 2016

## Report Card on Alberta's High Schools 2016

by Peter Cowley and Stephen Easton





July 2016

# Report Card on Alberta's High Schools 2016

By Peter Cowley and Stephen Easton

# Contents

Introduction / 3

Key academic indicators of school performance / 5

Other indicators of school performance / 10

Notes / 11

Detailed school reports / 12

How does your school stack up? / 36

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

About the Authors / 42

Publishing information / 43

Supporting the Fraser Institute / 44

Purpose, funding, & independence / 44

About the Fraser Institute / 45

Editorial Board / 46

# Introduction

The *Report Card on Alberta's High Schools 2016* (hereafter, *Report Card*) collects a variety of relevant, objective indicators of school performance into one, easily accessible public document so that anyone can analyze and compare the performance of individual schools. By doing so, the *Report Card* assists parents when they choose a school for their children and encourages and assists all those seeking to improve their schools.

## **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 are 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 more information by visiting the school and interviewing teachers and school administrators. The web sites of [Alberta Education](#), local school districts, and individual schools can also be sources of useful information. And, 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 aids school improvement**

Certainly, the act of publicly rating and ranking schools attracts attention. Schools that perform well or show consistent improvement are applauded. The results of poorly performing schools and those whose performance is deteriorating generate concern. This attention, in itself, provides an incentive for all those connected with a school to redouble their efforts to improve student results. However, the *Report Card* offers more than just incentive: it includes a variety of indicators, each of which reports results for an aspect of school performance that might be improved. School administrators who are dedicated to improvement accept the *Report Card* as another source of evidence that their schools can do a better job.

## *Some schools do better than others*

In order to improve a school, one must believe that improvement is achievable. The *Report Card on Alberta's High Schools*, like all the other editions, provides evidence about what can be accomplished. It demonstrates clearly that even when we take into account factors such as the students' family background, which some believe dictates the degree of academic success that students will have in school, some schools do better than others. This finding confirms research results from other countries.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, it will come as no great surprise to experienced parents and educators that the data consistently suggest that what goes on in the schools makes a difference to

student success and that some schools make more of a difference than others.

### *Comparisons are at the heart of the improvement process*

By comparing a school's latest results with those of earlier years, we can see if the school is improving. By comparing a school's results with those of neighbouring schools, or of schools with similar school and student characteristics, we 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 proven

techniques used in schools where students are successful, less effective schools may find ways to improve. Comparisons are at the heart of improvement and making comparisons among schools is made simpler and more meaningful by the *Report Card's* indicators, ratings, and rankings.

### **You can contribute to the development of the *Report Card***

The *Report Card* program benefits from the input of interested parties. We welcome your suggestions, comments, and criticisms. Please contact co-author Peter Cowley at [peter.cowley@fraserinstitute.org](mailto:peter.cowley@fraserinstitute.org).

# 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 Alberta Education (the provincial ministry of education) we rate each school on a scale from zero to 10. We base our overall rating of each school's academic performance on eight indicators:

- (1) average diploma examination mark;
- (2) percentage of diploma examinations failed;
- (3) difference between the school mark and examination mark in diploma courses;
- (4)<sup>2</sup> difference between male and female students in the average value of their exam marks in English 30-1/2;
- (5)<sup>2</sup> difference between male and female students in the average value of their exam marks in Mathematics 30-1/2;
- (6)<sup>2</sup> diploma courses taken per student;
- (7) diploma completion rate;
- (8) 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 diploma examination mark

This indicator (in the tables *Average exam mark*) is the average percentage achieved by a school's students on the uniform final examinations in all of the diploma courses at all sittings during the year. In the calculation of this indicator, each course result is weighted by the relative number of students who completed the course.

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 diploma 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 diploma examinations failed

For each school, this indicator (in the tables *Percentage of exams failed*) provides the rate of failure (as a percentage) in the diploma examinations. It was derived by dividing the sum, for each school, of all diploma examinations written by a school's students at all sittings during the year where a failing grade was awarded, by the total number of such examinations

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

There is good reason to have confidence in this indicator as a measure of effective teaching. A student need only successfully complete two diploma courses in order to graduate. Such a student's course of study may not include the prerequisites for all post-secondary educational options but it will be sufficient for graduation from high school. Thus, students enroll in the diploma courses, in large measure, because they want to take them. Further, their success in grade 12 reflects to a certain extent how well students have been prepared in the lower grades. All of the diploma courses have prerequisite courses. Indeed, depending on the school, admission to some of the grade-12 courses may require that the student have received a prescribed minimum grade in the prerequisite lower-level course. Since the decision to take diploma courses is, for the most part, voluntary and requires demonstrated success in previous courses, it seems reasonable to use the percentage of examinations failed in these courses as an additional indicator of the effectiveness of the teaching in high schools.

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

For each school, this indicator (in the tables *School vs exam mark difference*) gives the average amount (for all of the diploma courses) 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.<sup>3</sup>

Effective teaching includes regular assessment so that students and teachers alike may be aware of a student's progress. For such assessment to be useful, it must reflect the student's understanding of the course accurately. As a systematic policy, inflation of the grades awarded by the school 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 through additional study.

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

## **An indication of consistency in teaching and assessment**

### *The Gender gap indicators*

Research<sup>4</sup> has shown that, in British Columbia's secondary schools, there are systematic differences between the academic results achieved by boys and those achieved by girls. These differences are particularly apparent where the local school makes the assessments. These findings are supported by data from Alberta Education. However, the same research found that "there appears to be no compelling evidence that girls and boys should, given effective teaching and counselling, experience differential rates of success."<sup>5</sup> Further, "[t]he differences described by each indicator vary from school to school over a considerable range of values."<sup>6</sup>

The *Gender gap* indicators measure the difference, if any, between the average exam marks in English 30-1 or English 30-2 and Mathematics 30-1



or 30-2—depending upon which courses have the largest enrolment—for boys and girls. The indicator reports the size of the difference and the more successful sex.

### Three indicators of practical, well-informed counselling

While they are attending high school, students must make a number of decisions of considerable significance about their education. They will, for instance, annually decide whether to begin or continue learning a second language. In grade 10, they are required to choose between different streams in several core subject areas. In all the senior high-school years, they will face the choice of completing high school or abandoning it in favour of full-time work.

Will these young people make good decisions? It is unrealistic to presume that they can do so without advice. What practical, well-informed counselling can they call upon? While parents, in the main, are willing to help, many lack the information they need to be able to provide good advice. It falls, therefore, to the schools to shoulder some responsibility for advising students and their parents about educational choices.

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

There are two very important decisions that senior students must make. First, they must decide whether

or not to remain in school, do the work, and graduate with their class. Second, they must decide whether or not to take a number of academically challenging diploma courses. 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 diploma program. It uses data that report the educational status of students one year after they have enrolled in a given grade at any school in Alberta. 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*,<sup>7</sup> 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 8, 10, 11, and 12, a rate of successful transition is determined by first summing the number of students who either receive a diploma in the current school year or re-enroll in a higher grade in the following year and then dividing that sum by the number of students enrolled in the grade in the current year. Then, for each grade, an unsuccessful transition rate is determined by subtracting the rate of successful transition from 1. The unsuccessful transition rates for grades 10, 11, and 12 are then reduced by the grade-8 unsuccessful transition rate at the school in order to produce a net unsuccessful transition rate for each grade of senior high school. We have adopted the grade-8 unsuccessful transition rate as an estimate of the effect on student transition of such events 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 complements of the net unsuccessful

ful transition rates (1 – net unsuccessful transition rate) for grades 10 through 12 are 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 or division. Where a school does not enroll students in any of grade 10, 11, or 12, no *Delayed advancement rate* can be calculated.

## 2 Diploma completion rate

This indicator, related to the *Delayed advancement rate*, reports the percentage of first-time grade-12 students who received a diploma in the reported school year. It is derived from data provided by Alberta Education. Graduation from high school retains considerable value since it increases options for post-secondary education. Further, graduates from high school who decide to enter the work force immediately will, on average, find more job opportunities than those who have not graduated.

By completing the 11 years of schooling in preparation for the final high-school year, students have already demonstrated a reasonable ability to handle the basic courses offered by the school. Moreover, for the majority of students, the minimum requirements for graduation are not onerous. The chance that students will not graduate solely because they are unable to meet the intellectual demands of the curriculum is, therefore, relatively small.

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

## 3 Diploma courses taken per student

Please note: This statistic is not available in this edition. This indicator (in the tables *Courses taken per student*) measures the average number of diploma courses completed by those students at the school who completed their third year of high school during the reported year. It is derived by summing each school's diploma course participation rates provided by Alberta Education.

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

Diploma courses offer study at the senior level in a variety of core disciplines: English language arts (or French for francophone students), Mathematics, the sciences, and the humanities. Alberta Education has developed courses in each discipline that reflect the post-secondary ambitions of different groups of students and, far from being courses only for a university-bound elite, these courses teach skills and knowledge that will benefit students, no matter what they plan to do after graduation. Further, it is the marks obtained in these courses that are commonly used by post-secondary institutions—institutes of technology and community colleges as well as universities—to assess the applicant's readiness for further study and for admission to programs with limited enrollment. Thus, for most students a decision to take advantage of these courses is a good one and a school that is successful in encouraging students to take these courses shows that it offers practical, well-informed counselling.

## **In general, how is the school doing academically? The Overall rating out of 10**

While each of the indicators is important, it is almost always the case that any 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, portfolio assessment, and class participation to rate a student, we have combined all the indicators to produce an overall school rating. The Overall rating is not an absolute measure. That is, if a school scores a 10 out of 10 that does not mean that it has achieved perfection. It simply means that when all the indicators were taken into account, that school performed better than all the other schools in the *Report Card*. Thus, the overall rating of school performance answers the question, "In general, how is the school doing, academically compared to other schools 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 eight standardized scores—one for each indicator—for each school, for each year. The eight standardized scores were weighted and combined to produce an overall standardized score. Finally, this score was converted into an overall rating. It is from this *Overall rating out of 10* that the school's provincial rank is determined.

For schools where either of the *Gender gap* indicators could not be calculated, *Gender gap* results were not used in the calculation of the *Overall rating*. In such cases the *Overall rating* was derived using the remaining six indicators. (See Appendix 1 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.

# Other indicators of school performance

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

## The *Trend* indicator

Is the school improving academically? For most schools, the *Report Card* includes several 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 measurement 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.

## Indicators of student characteristics and programs

This edition includes three indicators that provide more information about the students that the school serves. The alternative French program indicator (in the tables *Alt. French (%)*) reports the proportion of the school's students who are registered in French immersion or other alternative French languages programs. This indicator does not include core French or Francophone programs.

The English as a second language indicator (in the tables *ESL (%)*) reports the proportion of the school's students who are registered in ESL programs. Finally, the special needs indicator (in the tables *Special needs (%)*) reports the proportion of the school's students who have identified special needs. This indicator excludes gifted students.

These indicators provide useful information that readers can use to compare the results at schools serving students with similar characteristics.

# Notes

- 1 See, for instance, Michael Rutter et al., *Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979) and Peter Mortimore et al., *School Matters: The Junior Years* (Wells, Somerset: Open Books, 1988).
- 2 These indicators are not included in this edition.
- 3 For calculating the final mark, the school-awarded mark and the diploma examination mark each count for 50%.
- 4 Peter Cowley and Stephen Easton, *Boys, Girls, and Grades: Academic Gender Balance in British Columbia's Secondary Schools*. Public Policy Sources 22 (Vancouver, BC: The Fraser Institute, 1999).
- 5 Cowley and Easton, *Boys, Girls, and Grades*: page 7.
- 6 Cowley and Easton, *Boys, Girls, and Grades*: page 17.
- 7 A detailed discussion of the Transition Rate indicator will be found on page 8 of Richard Marceau and Peter Cowley, *Bulletin des écoles secondaires du Québec: Édition 2001 / Report Card on Quebec's Secondary Schools: 2001 Edition* (Montréal, QC and Vancouver, BC: Institut économique de Montréal and The Fraser Institute, 2001), where it is called *Promotion rate* or *Taux de promotion*.

# 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 each school. 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. More information regarding schools may be found on Alberta Education's web site at <http://www.education.alberta.ca/> and on the web sites of Alberta's local school authorities and of individual schools. And, of course, a sound academic

program should be complemented by effective programs in areas of school activity not measured by the *Report Card*.

**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.**

A – GEOGRAPHICAL AREA						
School name [Affiliation] Location	Gr 12 Enrollment: 108 – B					
C – ESL (%): 1.5	Special needs (%): 14.1		Alt. French (%): 0.0			
D – Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$	n/a: n/a		Rank: 106/307		2014-15 Last 5 Years 63/246	
Academic Performance	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Trend
E – Average exam mark	69.2	66.6	68.9	65.1	65.2	—
F – Percentage of exams failed	7.4	12.1	5.7	12.8	14.0	—
G – School vs exam mark difference	3.0	4.7	3.4	6.5	8.1	▼
H – Language Arts gender gap	M 2.1	M 1.6	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
I – Math gender gap	M 10.1	M 5.0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
J – Courses taken per student	4.1	3.6	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
K – Diploma completion rate	86.5	81.0	88.5	84.8	92.2	—
L – Delayed advancement rate	23.3	25.3	16.7	18.7	10.8	▲
M – Overall rating out of 10	7.4	6.5	8.0	6.6	6.7	—

### A—Geographical area

Each of the schools in the *Report Card* has been assigned to a geographical area based on the city or town in which the school is located. The Edmonton, Calgary, and Red Deer areas include only schools located in those cities; other areas may include schools in several cities or towns. To find the results of a school, find the city or town where it is located in the *List of cities and geographical areas* below and note the geographical area to which it has been assigned. Geographical areas appear in the *Detailed Tables* in

alphabetical order and the page number upon which the results for each area begin may be found in the *Index of geographical areas* below. Within each geographical area, the schools are listed in alphabetical order.

### B—Gr 12 Enrollment

The number of regular day students enrolled in grade 12 as of September 30, 2014. Indicator results for small schools tend to be more variable than do those for larger schools and caution should be used in inter-

preting the results for smaller schools.

### **C—ESL (%); Special needs (%); Alt. French (%)**

These statistics report the percentage of students enrolled in English-as-a-Second-Language programs; the percentage of students with special needs; and the percentage of students enrolled in French immersion or other alternative programs in French. This percentage does not include those enrolled in Francophone programs or in regular French courses.

When you want to compare academic results, these statistics can be used to find other schools where the student body has similar characteristics.

### **D (left)—Actual rating vs predicted based on average parental employment income**

This statistic is not available in this edition.

### **D (right)—Overall academic ranking**

The school's overall academic rank in the province for the school year 2014/2015 and for the most recent five years. The 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.

### **E—Average exam mark**

The average mark (as a percentage) achieved by the grade-12 students on all the school's diploma examinations. Note that all the indicators of academic performance (except the *Courses taken per student* and the *Overall rating out of 10*) are expressed as percentage points.

### **F—Percentage of exams failed**

The percentage of all the diploma examinations written by grade-12 students at the school that received a grade below 50%.

### **G—School vs exam mark**

The difference (in percentage points) between the marks received from the school for diploma courses and the corresponding examination marks. Where the exam marks are higher, the result is set to zero.

Large differences usually indicate grade inflation by the school.

### **H—English 30-1 gender gap**

### **I—Math 30-1 gender gap**

These statistics are not available in this edition.

### **J—Courses taken per student**

This statistic is not available in this edition.

### **K—Diploma completion rate**

The percentage of students, enrolled in grade 12 for the first time, who received a diploma in the same school year. Higher completion rates mean that the school is doing a good job of keeping students on track and focused on their work during their final year.

### **L—Delayed advancement rate**

The percentage of the school's grade-10 students who are not likely to complete grade 12 within three years. Low *Delayed advancement rates* indicate that the school's students are likely to complete their high school program in the normal time.

### **M—Overall rating out of 10**

The *Overall rating out of 10* takes into account the school's performance on the five academic performance indicators (*E, F, G, K, and L above*) to answer the question, "In general, how is the school doing academically compared to other schools in the *Report Card*?"

### **N—Trend**

In the Trend column, 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; "n/a" indicates that there were insufficient data available with which to calculate a trend. Note that for *Percentage of exams failed*, *School vs exam mark*, the two *Gender gap* indicators, and the

*Delayed advancement rate*, a statistically significant downward trend in the data will lead to an upward-pointing arrow in the trend column. For example, a decreasing percentage of examinations failed indicates improvement and so an upward-pointing arrow is displayed.

## Other notes

### Note 1

Not all of the province's high schools are included in the tables or the ranking. Of all the schools in the province at which any diploma examination results were generated, 307 are included in this *Report Card*. 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 centres for adult education and continuing education; some home-schooling support centres, 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 considered to be a judgement of the school's effectiveness.**

### Note 2

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

### Note 3

In accordance with its regulations regarding the privacy of personal information, where school results involved less than six students, Alberta Education provided no data.

### 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

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

Average values for all schools 2014/2015						
Average Gr 12 Enrollment: 154						
ESL (%): 8.7	Special Needs (%): 13.9	Alt. French program (%): 2.9				
Average Parents' Income: \$ n/a						
Academic Performance	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Trend
Average exam mark	63.8	64.3	64.5	64.4	64.6	▲
Percentage of exams failed	18.7	17.7	17.7	17.6	17.6	—
School vs exam mark difference	8.1	7.6	8.0	8.5	8.4	—
Language Arts gender gap *	2.7	2.9	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Math gender gap *	4.2	4.5	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Courses taken per student*	3.9	3.9	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Diploma completion rate	82.4	82.7	82.6	82.3	82.8	—
Delayed advancement rate	20.2	20.4	20.5	23.0	20.5	—
<b>Overall rating out of 10</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>n/a</b>

\* These indicators are not available this year.

### Note 6

If you have questions about the *Report Card*, contact Peter Cowley, Director, School Performance Studies at [peter.cowley@fraserinstitute.org](mailto:peter.cowley@fraserinstitute.org).



**List of cities and school districts**

<b>School city</b>	<b>Geographical area</b>	<b>School city</b>	<b>Geographical area</b>
Acme	Acme Area	Edmonton	Edmonton
Airdrie	Airdrie Area	Edson	Edson/Whitecourt Area
Ardrossan	Vegreville/Fort Saskatchewan Area	Elk Point	St. Paul/Bonnyville Area
Ashmont	Athabasca/Smoky Lake Area	Evansburg	St. Albert/Stony Plain Area
Athabasca	Athabasca/Smoky Lake Area	Fairview	Peace River Area
Banff	Banff Area	Falun	Wetaskiwin/Drayton Valley Area
Barrhead	Barrhead/Westlock Area	Foremost	Taber/Medicine Hat Area
Bassano	Brooks Area	Forestburg	Stettler Area
Bawlf	Camrose Area	Fort Macleod	Fort MacLeod Area
Beaumont	Leduc Area	Fort McMurray	Fort McMurray Area
Beaverlodge	Grande Prairie Area	Fort Saskatchewan	Vegreville/Fort Saskatchewan Area
Beiseker	Acme Area	Fox Creek	Edson/Whitecourt Area
Bentley	Rocky Mountain House Area	Glendon	St. Paul/Bonnyville Area
Black Diamond	Okotoks Area	Grande Cache	Jasper/Hinton Area
Bonnyville	St. Paul/Bonnyville Area	Grande Prairie	Grande Prairie Area
Bow Island	Taber/Medicine Hat Area	Grassy Lake	Taber/Medicine Hat Area
Bowden	Olds/Didsbury Area	Grimshaw	Peace River Area
Boyle	Athabasca/Smoky Lake Area	Hanna	Drumheller/Three Hills Area
Breton	Wetaskiwin/Drayton Valley Area	Hay Lakes	Camrose Area
Brooks	Brooks Area	High Level	High Level/Fort Vermilion Area
Buck Lake	Wetaskiwin/Drayton Valley Area	High Prairie	Grande Prairie Area
Calgary	Calgary	High River	High River Area
Calmar	Leduc Area	Hinton	Jasper/Hinton Area
Camrose	Camrose Area	Hughenden	Wainwright/Vermilion Area
Canmore	Banff Area	Innisfail	Olds/Didsbury Area
Cardston	Lethbridge Area	Jasper	Jasper/Hinton Area
Caroline	Rocky Mountain House Area	Kitscoty	Wainwright/Vermilion Area
Carstairs	Acme Area	La Crete	High Level/Fort Vermilion Area
Castor	Stettler Area	Lac La Biche	Athabasca/Smoky Lake Area
Champion	Picture Butte Area	Lacombe	Lacombe/Ponoka Area
Chestermere	Strathmore Area	Lamont	Vegreville/Fort Saskatchewan Area
Claresholm	Picture Butte Area	Leduc	Leduc Area
Coaldale	Lethbridge Area	Lethbridge	Lethbridge Area
Coalhurst	Lethbridge Area	Lundbreck	Fort MacLeod Area
Cochrane	Cochrane/Bragg Creek Area	Magrath	Lethbridge Area
Cold Lake	St. Paul/Bonnyville Area	Mallaig	St. Paul/Bonnyville Area
Coleman	Picture Butte Area	Manning	High Level/Fort Vermilion Area
Condor	Rocky Mountain House Area	Marwayne	Wainwright/Vermilion Area
Consort	Stettler Area	Mayerthorpe	Edson/Whitecourt Area
Coronation	Stettler Area	Medicine Hat	Taber/Medicine Hat Area
Cremona	Olds/Didsbury Area	Milk River	Lethbridge Area
Crossfield	Airdrie Area	Morinville	Barrhead/Westlock Area
Daysland	Camrose Area	Morrin	Drumheller/Three Hills Area
Delburne	Stettler Area	Namao	Barrhead/Westlock Area
Devon	Leduc Area	Nanton	High River Area
Didsbury	Olds/Didsbury Area	New Norway	Camrose Area
Donnelly	Peace River Area	New Sarepta	Sherwood Park Area
Drayton Valley	Wetaskiwin/Drayton Valley Area	Okotoks	Okotoks Area
Drumheller	Drumheller/Three Hills Area	Olds	Olds/Didsbury Area
Duchess	Brooks Area	Onoway	St. Albert/Stony Plain Area
Dunmore	Taber/Medicine Hat Area	Oyen	Drumheller/Three Hills Area
Eckville	Rocky Mountain House Area	Paradise Valley	Wainwright/Vermilion Area

## List of cities and school districts

School city	Geographical area
Peace River	Peace River Area
Picture Butte	Picture Butte Area
Pincher Creek	Fort MacLeod Area
Plamondon	Athabasca/Smoky Lake Area
Ponoka	Lacombe/Ponoka Area
Provost	Wainwright/Vermilion Area
Raymond	Lethbridge Area
Red Deer	Red Deer
Redwater	Vegreville/Fort Saskatchewan Area
Rimbey	Lacombe/Ponoka Area
Rocky Mountain House	Rocky Mountain House Area
Rosemary	Brooks Area
Ryley	Camrose Area
Sedgewick	Wainwright/Vermilion Area
Sexsmith	Grande Prairie Area
Sherwood Park	Sherwood Park Area
Slave Lake	Athabasca/Smoky Lake Area
Smoky Lake	Athabasca/Smoky Lake Area
Spirit River	Grande Prairie Area
Spruce Grove	St. Albert/Stony Plain Area
St. Albert	St. Albert/Stony Plain Area
St. Paul	St. Paul/Bonnyville Area
Standard	Strathmore Area
Stettler	Stettler Area

School city	Geographical area
Stirling	Lethbridge Area
Stony Plain	St. Albert/Stony Plain Area
Strathmore	Strathmore Area
Sundre	Olds/Didsbury Area
Sylvan Lake	Rocky Mountain House Area
Taber	Taber/Medicine Hat Area
Thorhild	Athabasca/Smoky Lake Area
Thorsby	Leduc Area
Three Hills	Drumheller/Three Hills Area
Tofield	Sherwood Park Area
Trochu	Drumheller/Three Hills Area
Two Hills	Vegreville/Fort Saskatchewan Area
Valleyview	Grande Prairie Area
Vauxhall	Taber/Medicine Hat Area
Vegreville	Vegreville/Fort Saskatchewan Area
Vermilion	Wainwright/Vermilion Area
Viking	Wainwright/Vermilion Area
Vulcan	High River Area
Wainwright	Wainwright/Vermilion Area
Warburg	Wetaskiwin/Drayton Valley Area
Warner	Lethbridge Area
Westlock	Barrhead/Westlock Area
Wetaskiwin	Wetaskiwin/Drayton Valley Area
Whitecourt	Edson/Whitecourt Area

**Index of geographical areas**

<b>Geographical area</b>	<b>Page</b>
Acme Area . . . . .	18
Airdrie Area . . . . .	18
Athabasca/Smoky Lake Area . . . . .	18
Banff Area . . . . .	19
Barrhead/Westlock Area . . . . .	19
Brooks Area . . . . .	19
Calgary . . . . .	19
Camrose Area . . . . .	22
Cochrane/Bragg Creek Area . . . . .	22
Drumheller/Three Hills Area . . . . .	23
Edmonton . . . . .	23
Edson/Whitecourt Area . . . . .	25
Fort Macleod Area . . . . .	25
Fort McMurray Area . . . . .	26
Grande Prairie Area . . . . .	26
High Level/Fort Vermilion Area . . . . .	26
High River Area . . . . .	27
Jasper/Hinton Area . . . . .	27

<b>Geographical area</b>	<b>Page</b>
Lacombe/Ponoka Area . . . . .	27
Leduc Area . . . . .	27
Lethbridge Area . . . . .	28
Okotoks Area . . . . .	28
Olds/Didsbury Area . . . . .	29
Peace River Area . . . . .	29
Picture Butte Area . . . . .	30
Red Deer . . . . .	30
Rocky Mountain House Area . . . . .	30
Sherwood Park Area . . . . .	30
St. Albert/Stony Plain Area . . . . .	31
St. Paul/Bonnyville Area . . . . .	31
Stettler Area . . . . .	32
Strathmore Area . . . . .	32
Taber/Medicine Hat Area . . . . .	32
Vegreville/Fort Saskatchewan Area . . . . .	33
Wainwright/Vermilion Area . . . . .	34
Wetaskiwin/Drayton Valley Area . . . . .	34









Springbank [Public] Calgary Gr 12 Enrollment: 129
ESL (%): 2.8 Special needs (%): 9.4 Alt. French (%): 13.6
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 72.9 73.2 70.2 71.9 72.2 —

Westmount [Charter] Calgary Gr 12 Enrollment: 79
ESL (%): 24.6 Special needs (%): 12.7 Alt. French (%): 0.0
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 71.9 74.1 76.2 75.9 78.5 ▲

New Norway [Public] New Norway Gr 12 Enrollment: 15
ESL (%): 2.4 Special needs (%): 10.9 Alt. French (%): 0.0
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 65.3 65.6 70.4 59.0 64.9 —

St. Francis [Separate] Calgary Gr 12 Enrollment: 463
ESL (%): 15.2 Special needs (%): 12.6 Alt. French (%): 9.1
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 67.1 68.3 69.1 69.6 68.6 —

William Aberhart [Public] Calgary Gr 12 Enrollment: 416
ESL (%): 6.7 Special needs (%): 14.3 Alt. French (%): 48.9
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 71.0 72.5 70.9 71.5 72.2 —

Our Lady of Mount Pleasant [Separate] Camrose Gr 12 Enrollment: 40
ESL (%): 5.4 Special needs (%): 7.5 Alt. French (%): 0.0
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 56.4 61.3 64.6 56.1 62.0 —

St. Mary's [Separate] Calgary Gr 12 Enrollment: 247
ESL (%): 32.1 Special needs (%): 8.7 Alt. French (%): 15.6
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 66.3 66.1 65.3 64.5 62.4 ▼

Bawlf [Public] Bawlf Gr 12 Enrollment: 33
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 12.3 Alt. French (%): 0.0
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 70.8 70.1 68.1 65.5 68.8 —

Ryley [Public] Ryley Gr 12 Enrollment: 20
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 20.9 Alt. French (%): 0.0
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 70.0 64.2 64.5 62.9 55.9 ▼

Webber [Private] Calgary Gr 12 Enrollment: 49
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): n/a Alt. French (%): 0.0
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 82.0 80.8 81.4 83.5 83.9 —

Camrose [Public] Camrose Gr 12 Enrollment: 169
ESL (%): 0.9 Special needs (%): 16.6 Alt. French (%): 5.2
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 63.6 63.2 66.1 65.5 64.2 —

COCHRANE/BRAGG CREEK AREA
Bow Valley [Public] Cochrane Gr 12 Enrollment: 108
ESL (%): 1.5 Special needs (%): 14.1 Alt. French (%): 0.0
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 69.2 66.6 68.9 65.1 65.2 —

West Island College [Private] Calgary Gr 12 Enrollment: 64
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 0.0 Alt. French (%): 17.9
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 77.8 76.8 77.7 76.6 79.8 —

Daysland [Public] Daysland Gr 12 Enrollment: 25
ESL (%): n/a Special needs (%): 13.4 Alt. French (%): 0.0
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 65.3 60.7 63.1 62.3 63.9 —

Cochrane [Public] Cochrane Gr 12 Enrollment: 175
ESL (%): n/a Special needs (%): 16.8 Alt. French (%): 16.9
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 70.3 68.5 70.6 67.5 67.9 —

Western Canada [Public] Calgary Gr 12 Enrollment: 604
ESL (%): 14.5 Special needs (%): 8.5 Alt. French (%): 23.9
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 74.2 75.0 75.8 75.1 75.9 —

Hay Lakes [Public] Hay Lakes Gr 12 Enrollment: 11
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 8.1 Alt. French (%): 0.0
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 62.0 68.8 63.5 72.7 57.7 —

St. Timothy [Separate] Cochrane Gr 12 Enrollment: 40
ESL (%): 5.7 Special needs (%): 20.3 Alt. French (%): 0.0
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 70.3 66.7 69.5 68.6 72.5 —









FORT MCMURRAY AREA

Table for Father Patrick Mercredi [Separate] Fort McMurray Gr 12 Enrollment: 170. Includes ESL, Special needs, Academic Performance (2011-2015), and Overall rating out of 10.

Table for Charles Spencer [Public] Grande Prairie Gr 12 Enrollment: 208. Includes ESL, Special needs, Academic Performance (2011-2015), and Overall rating out of 10.

Table for Spirit River [Public] Spirit River Gr 12 Enrollment: 55. Includes ESL, Special needs, Academic Performance (2011-2015), and Overall rating out of 10.

Table for Fort McMurray [Public] Fort McMurray Gr 12 Enrollment: 104. Includes ESL, Special needs, Academic Performance (2011-2015), and Overall rating out of 10.

Table for EW Pratt [Public] High Prairie Gr 12 Enrollment: 84. Includes ESL, Special needs, Academic Performance (2011-2015), and Overall rating out of 10.

Table for St. Andrew's [Separate] High Prairie Gr 12 Enrollment: 22. Includes ESL, Special needs, Academic Performance (2011-2015), and Overall rating out of 10.

Table for Frank Spragins [Public] Fort McMurray Gr 12 Enrollment: 156. Includes ESL, Special needs, Academic Performance (2011-2015), and Overall rating out of 10.

Table for Grande Prairie [Public] Grande Prairie Gr 12 Enrollment: 380. Includes ESL, Special needs, Academic Performance (2011-2015), and Overall rating out of 10.

Table for St. John Bosco [Separate] Grande Prairie Gr 12 Enrollment: 62. Includes ESL, Special needs, Academic Performance (2011-2015), and Overall rating out of 10.

Table for Holy Trinity [Separate] Fort McMurray Gr 12 Enrollment: 182. Includes ESL, Special needs, Academic Performance (2011-2015), and Overall rating out of 10.

Table for Hillside [Public] Valleyview Gr 12 Enrollment: 58. Includes ESL, Special needs, Academic Performance (2011-2015), and Overall rating out of 10.

Table for St. Joseph [Separate] Grande Prairie Gr 12 Enrollment: 215. Includes ESL, Special needs, Academic Performance (2011-2015), and Overall rating out of 10.

Table for Westwood [Public] Fort McMurray Gr 12 Enrollment: 259. Includes ESL, Special needs, Academic Performance (2011-2015), and Overall rating out of 10.

Table for Pease Wapiti Academy [Public] Grande Prairie Gr 12 Enrollment: 145. Includes ESL, Special needs, Academic Performance (2011-2015), and Overall rating out of 10.

Table for St. Mary's [Separate] Sexsmith Gr 12 Enrollment: 10. Includes ESL, Special needs, Academic Performance (2011-2015), and Overall rating out of 10.

GRANDE PRAIRIE AREA

Table for Beaverlodge [Public] Beaverlodge Gr 12 Enrollment: 165. Includes ESL, Special needs, Academic Performance (2011-2015), and Overall rating out of 10.

Table for Sexsmith [Public] Sexsmith Gr 12 Enrollment: 103. Includes ESL, Special needs, Academic Performance (2011-2015), and Overall rating out of 10.

HIGH LEVEL/FORT VERMILION AREA

Table for High Level [Public] High Level Gr 12 Enrollment: 53. Includes ESL, Special needs, Academic Performance (2011-2015), and Overall rating out of 10.





Foothills [Public] Okotoks Gr 12 Enrollment: 304
ESL (%): 3.8 Special needs (%): 14.7 Alt. French (%): 7.4
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 101/307 14/246
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 65.6 65.2 66.1 64.7 65.4

Cremona [Public] Cremona Gr 12 Enrollment: 18
ESL (%): n/a Special needs (%): 10.0 Alt. French (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 146/307 108/246
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 62.9 59.2 69.1 67.0 62.4

Sundre [Public] Sundre Gr 12 Enrollment: 59
ESL (%): n/a Special needs (%): 14.0 Alt. French (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 127/307 80/246
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 67.1 65.0 62.7 63.5 68.1

Holy Trinity Academy [Separate] Okotoks Gr 12 Enrollment: 248
ESL (%): 1.2 Special needs (%): 8.1 Alt. French (%): 4.5
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 32/307 14/246
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 69.0 69.2 70.8 n/a n/a n/a

Didsbury [Public] Didsbury Gr 12 Enrollment: 52
ESL (%): n/a Special needs (%): 17.5 Alt. French (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 32/307 43/246
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 63.4 65.6 66.6 68.7 68.5

PEACE RIVER AREA
Fairview [Public] Fairview Gr 12 Enrollment: 46
ESL (%): n/a Special needs (%): 11.9 Alt. French (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 211/307 165/246
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 65.5 57.4 65.4 66.1 60.0

Learning@HOME [Separate] Okotoks Gr 12 Enrollment: 156
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): n/a Alt. French (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 42/307 n/a
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark n/a 70.6 71.4 71.8 70.9 n/a

Innisfail [Public] Innisfail Gr 12 Enrollment: 87
ESL (%): 4.5 Special needs (%): 11.8 Alt. French (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 77/307 176/246
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 61.2 61.1 60.4 60.7 64.0

Georges P Vanier [Public] Donnelly Gr 12 Enrollment: 79
ESL (%): 5.6 Special needs (%): 20.1 Alt. French (%): 27.4
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 201/307 170/246
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 59.7 64.2 66.7 65.1 62.9

Oilfields [Public] Black Diamond Gr 12 Enrollment: 65
ESL (%): 4.6 Special needs (%): 15.7 Alt. French (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 201/307 170/246
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 64.8 64.6 63.5 60.1 63.0

Northstar [Public] Didsbury Gr 12 Enrollment: 55
ESL (%): n/a Special needs (%): 4.5 Alt. French (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 165/307 n/a
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 60.5 n/a n/a 69.5 72.6 n/a

Glenmary [Separate] Peace River Gr 12 Enrollment: 78
ESL (%): 3.1 Special needs (%): 22.0 Alt. French (%): 17.5
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 165/307 135/246
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 62.5 62.7 64.5 64.2 62.3

Strathcona-Tweedsmuir [Private] Okotoks Gr 12 Enrollment: 79
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 0.0 Alt. French (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 6/307 5/246
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 78.1 76.8 73.8 76.1 77.5

Olds [Public] Olds Gr 12 Enrollment: 131
ESL (%): 4.8 Special needs (%): 13.1 Alt. French (%): 3.5
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 11/307 36/246
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 71.8 72.9 70.4 71.1 71.3

Grimshaw [Public] Grimshaw Gr 12 Enrollment: 38
ESL (%): n/a Special needs (%): 9.7 Alt. French (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 218/307 226/246
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 55.0 58.6 59.2 60.3 60.7

OLDS/DIDSBURY AREA
Bowden Grandview [Public] Bowden Gr 12 Enrollment: 23
ESL (%): 5.2 Special needs (%): 10.4 Alt. French (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 154/307 158/246
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 62.6 65.1 61.9 65.6 63.4

Olds Koinonia [Public] Olds Gr 12 Enrollment: 19
ESL (%): 5.5 Special needs (%): 7.3 Alt. French (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 11/307 36/246
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 67.1 67.3 68.4 65.2 71.6

Peace River [Public] Peace River Gr 12 Enrollment: 80
ESL (%): n/a Special needs (%): 17.4 Alt. French (%): 7.8
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a Rank: 195/307 183/246
Academic Performance 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 Trend
Average exam mark 61.3 62.3 60.4 62.5 61.9













Wetaskiwin [Public] Wetaskiwin		Gr 12 Enrollment: 242				
ESL (%): 1.0	Special needs (%): 19.3			Alt. French (%): 0.0		
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a		2014-15		Last 5 Years		
		Rank: 106/307		120/246		
Academic Performance	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Trend
Average exam mark	63.8	66.7	66.2	66.9	68.0	▲
Percentage of exams failed	16.0	13.6	15.0	11.7	11.0	▲
School vs exam mark difference	4.6	2.6	3.7	3.9	2.7	—
Language Arts gender gap	F 1.9	M 1.0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Math gender gap	F 7.2	F 0.2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Courses taken per student	3.1	3.5	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Diploma completion rate	68.8	74.5	71.8	71.4	70.9	—
Delayed advancement rate	38.6	28.6	33.2	34.1	35.4	—
<b>Overall rating out of 10</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>▲</b>

# 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 305) according to their academic performance as measured by the Overall rating out of 10 (shown on the right hand side of the table) for the school year 2014/2015. Each school's five-year average ranking and Overall rating out of 10 are also listed. The higher the overall rating (out of 10), the higher the rank awarded to the school. Where schools tied in the overall rating, they were awarded the same rank. Where less than five years of data were available, "n/a" appears in the table.

Not all the province's high schools are included in the tables or the ranking. 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: 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---			School name	City	-Overall rating-	
2014/2015	Last 5 yrs	Trend			2014/2015	Last 5 yrs
1	1	—	Old Scona	Edmonton	10.0	10.0
1	1	—	Webber	Calgary	10.0	10.0
1	3	—	Rundle College	Calgary	10.0	9.9
4	4	—	West Island College	Calgary	9.8	9.6
4	n/a	n/a	Tempo	Edmonton	9.8	n/a
6	5	—	Strathcona-Tweedsmuir	Okotoks	9.2	9.1
7	8	—	Bearspaw Christian	Calgary	9.1	8.6
8	18	—	St. Timothy	Cochrane	8.9	8.0
9	6	—	Western Canada	Calgary	8.7	8.8
9	9	—	Westmount	Calgary	8.7	8.5
11	11	▲	Olds	Olds	8.6	8.3
11	36	—	Olds Koinonia	Olds	8.6	7.5
13	6	—	Sir Winston Churchill	Calgary	8.5	8.8
14	11	—	Archbishop MacDonald	Edmonton	8.4	8.3
14	14	—	Strathcona Christian	Sherwood Park	8.4	8.2
14	n/a	n/a	Alberta Fine Arts	Okotoks	8.4	n/a
14	n/a	n/a	E. H. Walter	Paradise Valley	8.4	n/a

---Rank---			School name	City	-Overall rating-	
2014/2015	Last 5 yrs	Trend			2014/2015	Last 5 yrs
14	n/a	n/a	Ste Marguerite d'Youville	St. Albert	8.4	n/a
19	51	—	Consort	Consort	8.3	7.2
19	n/a	n/a	St. Thomas Aquinas	Provost	8.3	n/a
21	10	—	Springbank	Calgary	8.2	8.4
21	16	—	Foundations for the Future (FFCA)	Calgary	8.2	8.1
21	n/a	n/a	Arden T. Litt Centre	Grassy Lake	8.2	n/a
24	11	—	Vauxhall	Vauxhall	8.1	8.3
24	20	—	Heritage Christian	Calgary	8.1	7.9
24	30	—	F G Miller	Elk Point	8.1	7.6
24	43	▲	Bishop Carroll	Calgary	8.1	7.4
28	16	—	William Aberhart	Calgary	8.0	8.1
28	25	—	Ardrossan	Ardrossan	8.0	7.8
28	92	▲	St. Paul	St. Paul	8.0	6.6
28	n/a	n/a	Our Lady of the Snows	Canmore	8.0	n/a
32	14	—	Holy Trinity Academy	Okotoks	7.9	8.2
32	20	—	Bawlf	Bawlf	7.9	7.9
32	20	—	Dr. E. P. Scarlett	Calgary	7.9	7.9

---Rank---					---Overall rating---					---Rank---					---Overall rating---	
2014/	Last				2014/	Last			2014/	Last				2014/	Last	
2015	5	Trend	School name	City	2015	5	Trend	School name	City	2015	5	Trend	School name	City	2015	5
32	25	—	W. R. Myers	Taber	7.9	7.8				86	150	▲	Willow Creek	Claresholm	6.9	5.9
32	43	▲	Didsbury	Didsbury	7.9	7.4				86	n/a	n/a	Calgary Islamic	Calgary	6.9	n/a
37	20	—	Beaumont	Beaumont	7.8	7.9				86	n/a	n/a	des Beaux-Lacs	Bonnyville	6.9	n/a
38	68	▲	Ernest Manning	Calgary	7.7	6.9				86	n/a	n/a	Living Waters	Spruce Grove	6.9	n/a
38	135	—	Holy Trinity Academy	Drayton Valley	7.7	6.1				86	n/a	n/a	Maurice-Lavallee	Edmonton	6.9	n/a
38	170	—	St. Mary's	Taber	7.7	5.6				86	n/a	n/a	Mother Margaret Mary	Edmonton	6.9	n/a
38	192	▲	Mallaig	Mallaig	7.7	5.2				86	n/a	n/a	St. Dominic	Rocky Mountain House	6.9	n/a
42	18	—	Calgary Christian	Calgary	7.6	8.0				101	51	—	Notre Dame Collegiate	High River	6.8	7.2
42	28	—	J H Picard	Edmonton	7.6	7.7				101	92	—	Foothills	Okotoks	6.8	6.6
42	28	—	Millwoods Christian	Edmonton	7.6	7.7				101	92	—	St. Gabriel the Archangel	Chestermere	6.8	6.6
42	36	—	Strathcona	Edmonton	7.6	7.5				101	100	—	Notre Dame	Calgary	6.8	6.5
42	43	—	Bev Facey	Sherwood Park	7.6	7.4				101	n/a	n/a	Foremost	Foremost	6.8	n/a
42	n/a	n/a	Airdrie Koinonia Christian	Airdrie	7.6	n/a				106	30	▼	National Sport	Calgary	6.7	7.6
42	n/a	n/a	Learning@HOME	Okotoks	7.6	n/a				106	36	—	Picture Butte	Picture Butte	6.7	7.5
49	25	—	Rundle College Academy	Calgary	7.5	7.8				106	63	—	Bow Valley	Cochrane	6.7	7.0
49	30	—	Edge	Calgary	7.5	7.6				106	63	—	St. Martin De Porres	Airdrie	6.7	7.0
49	30	—	Henry Wise Wood	Calgary	7.5	7.6				106	68	—	Central Alberta Christian	Lacombe	6.7	6.9
49	51	—	Magrath	Magrath	7.5	7.2				106	68	—	Redwater	Redwater	6.7	6.9
53	30	—	Centennial	Calgary	7.4	7.6				106	80	—	St. Francis Xavier	Edmonton	6.7	6.8
53	43	—	South Central	Oyen	7.4	7.4				106	92	—	Memorial	Stony Plain	6.7	6.6
53	57	—	Foothills Academy	Calgary	7.4	7.1				106	108	—	Leduc	Leduc	6.7	6.4
53	86	—	Crowsnest	Coleman	7.4	6.7				106	108	—	Rosemary	Rosemary	6.7	6.4
53	100	—	Hughenden	Hughenden	7.4	6.5				106	120	▲	Wetaskiwin	Wetaskiwin	6.7	6.3
53	100	▲	Tofield	Tofield	7.4	6.5				106	158	▲	La Crete	La Crete	6.7	5.8
53	n/a	n/a	Horizon MAP	Vauxhall	7.4	n/a				118	57	—	Livingstone	Lundbreck	6.6	7.1
60	20	—	Immanuel Christian	Lethbridge	7.3	7.9				118	68	—	Paul Kane	St. Albert	6.6	6.9
60	48	—	Queen Elizabeth	Calgary	7.3	7.3				118	80	—	Austin O'Brien	Edmonton	6.6	6.8
60	126	—	Matthew Halton	Pincher Creek	7.3	6.2				118	80	—	Three Hills	Three Hills	6.6	6.8
63	30	—	Christ The King	Leduc	7.2	7.6				118	86	—	Louis St. Laurent	Edmonton	6.6	6.7
63	43	—	Master's College	Calgary	7.2	7.4				118	92	—	Bishop Grandin	Calgary	6.6	6.6
63	48	—	Onoway	Onoway	7.2	7.3				118	92	—	Vimy Ridge	Edmonton	6.6	6.6
63	51	—	George McDougall	Airdrie	7.2	7.2				118	108	—	Chestermere	Calgary	6.6	6.4
63	57	—	Hunting Hills	Red Deer	7.2	7.1				118	n/a	n/a	New Sarepta	New Sarepta	6.6	n/a
63	63	—	Holy Cross	Strathmore	7.2	7.0				127	68	▼	Highwood	High River	6.5	6.9
63	63	—	McCoy	Medicine Hat	7.2	7.0				127	68	—	Morinville	Morinville	6.5	6.9
63	n/a	n/a	St. Jerome's	Vermilion	7.2	n/a				127	68	—	Senator Gershaw	Bow Island	6.5	6.9
63	n/a	n/a	St. Peter the Apostle	Spruce Grove	7.2	n/a				127	80	—	Sundre	Sundre	6.5	6.8
72	36	—	Archbishop Jordan	Sherwood Park	7.1	7.5				127	86	—	Parkview Adventist	Lacombe	6.5	6.7
72	36	—	St. Francis	Calgary	7.1	7.5				127	100	—	J. R. Robson	Vermilion	6.5	6.5
72	92	—	Vegreville	Vegreville	7.1	6.6				127	100	—	Rimbey	Rimbey	6.5	6.5
72	196	—	Delburne Centralized	Delburne	7.1	5.1				127	108	—	Crescent Heights	Calgary	6.5	6.4
72	n/a	n/a	Stirling	Stirling	7.1	n/a				127	120	▲	Central Memorial	Calgary	6.5	6.3
77	36	▼	Cochrane	Cochrane	7.0	7.5				127	120	—	Lord Beaverbrook	Calgary	6.5	6.3
77	36	▼	Harry Ainlay	Edmonton	7.0	7.5				127	126	—	St. Mary's	Vegreville	6.5	6.2
77	51	▼	John G Diefenbaker	Calgary	7.0	7.2				127	143	—	Two Hills	Two Hills	6.5	6.0
77	57	—	Bishop O'Byrne	Calgary	7.0	7.1				127	n/a	n/a	Alexandre-Taché	St. Albert	6.5	n/a
77	80	—	Spruce Grove	Spruce Grove	7.0	6.8				140	86	—	Jasper	Jasper	6.4	6.7
77	176	—	Innisfail	Innisfail	7.0	5.5				140	92	—	Holy Trinity	Edmonton	6.4	6.6
77	204	▲	Sexsmith	Sexsmith	7.0	4.9				140	100	—	Bowness	Calgary	6.4	6.5
77	n/a	n/a	Calgary Academy Collegiate	Calgary	7.0	n/a				140	135	—	Gerard Redmond	Hinton	6.4	6.1
77	n/a	n/a	Lillian Osborne	Edmonton	7.0	n/a				140	158	—	H. J. Cody	Sylvan Lake	6.4	5.8
86	48	—	St. Albert	St. Albert	6.9	7.3				140	192	—	Thorhild Central	Thorhild	6.4	5.2
86	51	—	Hugh Sutherland	Carstairs	6.9	7.2				146	68	—	Acme	Acme	6.3	6.9
86	57	—	Eagle Butte	Dunmore	6.9	7.1				146	68	—	Canmore Collegiate	Canmore	6.3	6.9
86	57	—	Kate Andrews	Coaldale	6.9	7.1				146	80	—	New Norway	New Norway	6.3	6.8
86	100	—	W. G. Murdoch	Crossfield	6.9	6.5				146	108	—	Cremona	Cremona	6.3	6.4
86	108	▲	Cold Lake	Cold Lake	6.9	6.4				146	126	—	Calgary Academy	Calgary	6.3	6.2
86	135	▲	J. T. Foster	Nanton	6.9	6.1				146	165	—	Eckville	Eckville	6.3	5.7
86	150	—	Notre Dame	Bonnyville	6.9	5.9				146	165	—	Richard F Staples	Westlock	6.3	5.7

---Rank---				---Overall rating---				---Rank---				---Overall rating---		
2014/	Last			2014/	Last			2014/	Last			2014/	Last	
2015	5	Trend	School name	2015	5	Trend	City	2015	5	Trend	School name	2015	5	
146	204	—	Thorsby	Thorsby	6.3	4.9		211	165	—	Fairview	Fairview	5.4	5.7
154	68	—	Assumption	Cold Lake	6.2	6.9		211	183	—	M. E. LaZerte	Edmonton	5.4	5.3
154	68	▼	County Central	Vulcan	6.2	6.9		211	213	▲	Harry Collinge	Hinton	5.4	4.7
154	126	—	Sturgeon	Namao	6.2	6.2		211	213	—	Pigeon Lake	Falun	5.4	4.7
154	135	—	Provost	Provost	6.2	6.1		211	n/a	n/a	Erle Rivers	Milk River	5.4	n/a
154	143	—	Central High Sedgewick	Sedgewick	6.2	6.0		211	n/a	n/a	Warner	Warner	5.4	n/a
154	143	—	Holy Redeemer	Edson	6.2	6.0		218	120	—	Bassano	Bassano	5.3	6.3
154	158	—	Bowden Grandview	Bowden	6.2	5.8		218	150	—	Lethbridge Collegiate	Lethbridge	5.3	5.9
161	120	—	Notre Dame	Red Deer	6.1	6.3		218	192	—	Bentley	Bentley	5.3	5.2
161	126	—	Archbishop Oscar Romero	Edmonton	6.1	6.2		218	202	—	Our Lady of Mount Pleasant	Camrose	5.3	5.0
161	126	—	John Maland	Devon	6.1	6.2		218	226	▲	Grimshaw	Grimshaw	5.3	4.2
161	143	—	Daysland	Daysland	6.1	6.0		218	n/a	n/a	Buck Mountain	Buck Lake	5.3	n/a
165	63	—	Coronation	Coronation	6.0	7.0		224	68	▼	Viking	Viking	5.2	6.9
165	100	—	Raymond	Raymond	6.0	6.5		224	86	▼	Coalhurst	Coalhurst	5.2	6.7
165	108	—	Bert Church	Airdrie	6.0	6.4		224	126	▼	Calmar	Calmar	5.2	6.2
165	108	▼	W P Wagner	Edmonton	6.0	6.4		224	135	—	Gus Wetter	Castor	5.2	6.1
165	135	—	Glenmary	Peace River	6.0	6.1		224	158	—	Banff	Banff	5.2	5.8
165	150	—	Salisbury	Sherwood Park	6.0	5.9		224	183	—	Edwin Parr	Athabasca	5.2	5.3
165	158	—	Strathmore	Strathmore	6.0	5.8		224	183	—	St. Anthony's	Drumheller	5.2	5.3
165	n/a	n/a	Northstar	Didsbury	6.0	n/a		224	217	—	Father Lacombe	Calgary	5.2	4.6
173	108	—	Catholic Central	Lethbridge	5.9	6.4		224	232	—	St. Andrew's	High Prairie	5.2	3.9
173	108	—	St. Joseph	Whitecourt	5.9	6.4		224	n/a	n/a	Robert Thirsk	Calgary	5.2	n/a
173	108	—	Westwood	Fort McMurray	5.9	6.4		224	n/a	n/a	Vista-Virtual	Barrhead	5.2	n/a
173	120	▼	Ross Sheppard	Edmonton	5.9	6.3		235	170	—	Mayerthorpe	Mayerthorpe	5.1	5.6
173	126	▼	Archbishop O'Leary	Edmonton	5.9	6.2		235	196	—	H. A. Kostash	Smoky Lake	5.1	5.1
173	135	—	Barrhead	Barrhead	5.9	6.1		235	204	—	Cardston	Cardston	5.1	4.9
173	170	▲	Frank Maddock	Drayton Valley	5.9	5.6		235	204	—	St. Joseph	Grande Prairie	5.1	4.9
173	180	▲	Chinook	Lethbridge	5.9	5.4		235	n/a	n/a	Breton	Breton	5.1	n/a
173	211	▲	Peace Wapiti Academy	Grande Prairie	5.9	4.8		240	135	—	St. Michael's	Pincher Creek	5.0	6.1
182	126	—	F. P. Walshe	Fort Macleod	5.8	6.2		240	165	—	St. Augustine	Ponoka	5.0	5.7
182	143	—	Parkland	Edson	5.8	6.0		240	204	—	Paul Rowe	Manning	5.0	4.9
182	150	—	Winston Churchill	Lethbridge	5.8	5.9		240	213	—	Hillside	Valleyview	5.0	4.7
182	176	▲	Fort Saskatchewan	Fort Saskatchewan	5.8	5.5		240	n/a	n/a	CBe - Learn	Calgary	5.0	n/a
182	196	—	Kitscoty	Kitscoty	5.8	5.1		245	150	▼	St. Mary's	Calgary	4.9	5.9
182	n/a	n/a	Marwayne Jubilee	Marwayne	5.8	n/a		245	228	▲	Bishop McNally	Calgary	4.9	4.1
182	n/a	n/a	Morrin	Morrin	5.8	n/a		245	n/a	n/a	Charles Spencer	Grande Prairie	4.9	n/a
189	108	—	St. Joseph's	Brooks	5.7	6.4		248	180	—	Prairie Christian	Three Hills	4.8	5.4
189	196	—	Bonnyville	Bonnyville	5.7	5.1		248	192	—	Wainwright	Wainwright	4.8	5.2
189	204	▲	J. C. Charyk Hanna	Hanna	5.7	4.9		248	217	—	Warburg	Warburg	4.8	4.6
189	n/a	n/a	Chinook Winds Adventist	Calgary	5.7	n/a		248	222	—	Caroline	Caroline	4.8	4.4
189	n/a	n/a	Holy Trinity	Fort McMurray	5.7	n/a		248	n/a	n/a	Forestburg	Forestburg	4.8	n/a
189	n/a	n/a	Learning Store on Whyte	Edmonton	5.7	n/a		248	n/a	n/a	Gabrielle-Roy	Edmonton	4.8	n/a
195	143	—	Medicine Hat	Medicine Hat	5.6	6.0		248	n/a	n/a	St. Mary	Westlock	4.8	n/a
195	150	—	Will Sinclair	Rocky Mountain House	5.6	5.9		255	183	▼	John Paul II	Fort Saskatchewan	4.7	5.3
195	183	—	Jasper Place	Edmonton	5.6	5.3		256	196	—	William E Hay	Stettler	4.6	5.1
195	183	—	Peace River	Peace River	5.6	5.3		256	222	—	Brooks	Brooks	4.6	4.4
195	204	▲	Lamont	Lamont	5.6	4.9		256	229	▲	J A Williams	Lac La Biche	4.6	4.0
195	n/a	n/a	Edmonton Islamic	Edmonton	5.6	n/a		259	176	▼	McNally	Edmonton	4.5	5.5
201	86	▼	Edmonton Christian	Edmonton	5.5	6.7		259	183	—	Lester B. Pearson	Calgary	4.5	5.3
201	150	—	Lacombe	Lacombe	5.5	5.9		259	229	—	David Thompson	Conдор	4.5	4.0
201	158	—	Father Patrick Mercredi	Fort McMurray	5.5	5.8		259	232	▲	Grande Prairie	Grande Prairie	4.5	3.9
201	170	—	Georges P Vanier	Donnelly	5.5	5.6		259	n/a	n/a	Hope Christian	Champion	4.5	n/a
201	170	—	Oilfields	Black Diamond	5.5	5.6		264	176	▼	Crescent Heights	Medicine Hat	4.4	5.5
201	180	—	Bellerose	St. Albert	5.5	5.4		265	202	—	Ponoka	Ponoka	4.3	5.0
201	183	—	Hilltop	Whitecourt	5.5	5.3		265	211	—	Victoria	Edmonton	4.3	4.8
201	183	—	Lindsay Thurber	Red Deer	5.5	5.3		265	217	—	Fort McMurray	Fort McMurray	4.3	4.6
201	n/a	n/a	Headway	Edmonton	5.5	n/a		268	165	—	Blessed Sacrament	Wainwright	4.2	5.7
201	n/a	n/a	Trochu Valley	Trochu	5.5	n/a		268	213	—	Spirit River	Spirit River	4.2	4.7
211	158	—	Camrose	Camrose	5.4	5.8		268	n/a	n/a	La Rose Sauvage	Calgary	4.2	n/a





# Appendix: Calculating the Overall rating out of 10

The *Overall rating out of 10* is intended to answer the question, “In general, how is the school doing, academically compared with 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 Course by course, the average diploma examination marks and failure rates for each school were standardized by calculating  $Z$ , which is defined by:

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

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

- 2 The *School vs exam mark difference* for each course was calculated using the raw data and then standardized as described in step 1 above.
- 3 The course-by-course standardized data were then aggregated to produce weighted average indicator values. The weighting used was the number of student course completions in each course at the school relative to the total number of student course completions at the school.
- 4 These weighted average results were then re-standardized.
- 5 The *Gender gap* indicators were calculated using the raw data and then standardized as described in step 1 above.
- 6 The *Courses taken per student*, *Diploma completion rate*, and *Delayed advancement rate* indicators were calculated using the raw data and then standardized as described in step 1 above.
- 7 The eight standardized indicator results were then combined to produce a weighted average summary standardized score for the school. The weightings used in these calculations were *Average exam mark*—20%, *Percentage of exams failed*—20%, *School vs exam mark*—10%, *English 30-1 gender gap*—5%, *Pure Math 30 gender gap*—5%, *Courses taken per student*—20%, *Diploma completion rate*—10%, and *Delayed advancement rate*—10%. In instances when fewer than two *Gender gap* indicators could be calculated, *Gender gap* results did not contribute to the *Overall rating*. In such instances, the *School vs exam mark difference* was weighted at 20%. Similarly, when the *Delayed advancement rate* could not be calculated, the *Diploma completion rate* was weighted at 20%.
- 8 This summary standardized score was re-standardized.

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

9 The maximum and minimum standardized scores were set at 2.2 and  $-3.29$  respectively. Scores equal to, or greater than, 2.2 received 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,  $-3.29$  received 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.

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

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

where *OR* is the resulting *Overall rating*,  $\mu$  is the average calculated according to the formula:

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

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

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

and StanScore is the standardized score calculated in (8) above and adjusted as required for minimum and maximum values as noted in (9) above. As noted in (9) above,  $OR_{min}$  equals zero,  $Z_{min}$  equals  $-3.29$ ; and  $Z_{max}$  equals 2.2.

11 Finally, the derived *Overall rating* is rounded to one place of the decimal 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 elementary and secondary schools in British Columbia, Alberta, and Ontario and on secondary schools in Quebec. He continues his research on school performance 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.

# 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](mailto: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](mailto:communications@fraserinstitute.org)
- ✎ via telephone: 604.714.4582

In Toronto, contact our media specialist:

- ✎ via telephone at 416.363.6575, ext. 238.

## Copyright

Copyright © 2016 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

July 2016

## 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](mailto: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