



Report Card on Alberta's High Schools 2023

Peter Cowley, Joel Emes and Max Shang

[COMPARESCHOOLRANKINGS.ORG](https://compareschoolrankings.org)



Report Card on Alberta's High Schools 2023

by Peter Cowley, Joel Emes, and Max Shang

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? / 31

Appendix: Calculating the *Overall rating out of 10* / 34

Contents / 2

About the authors / 36

Publishing information / 37

Supporting the Fraser Institute / 38

Purpose, funding, & independence / 38

About the Fraser Institute / 39

Editorial Board / 40

Introduction

The *Report Card on Alberta's High Schools 2023* (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.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 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 Max Shang at max.shang@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) difference between male and female students in the average value of their exam marks in English 30-1/2;
- (5) difference between male and female students in the average value of their exam marks in Mathematics 30-1/2;
- (6) 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.²

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

Research³ 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.”⁴ Further, “[t]he differences described by each indicator vary from school to school over a considerable range of values.”⁵

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*,⁶ 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 transition rates ($1 - \text{net unsuccessful transition rate}$) 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*

This indicator (in the tables *Courses taken per student*) measures the average number of diploma courses completed by those students registered in a school on

September 30th of the reported school year who are classified as having been in Grade 10 two years earlier. 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.

Please note: The method of calculation that Alberta Education uses to determine this participation rate has changed. Values for this indicator for the school year 2015/2016 and subsequent are not comparable with earlier values.

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 per-

formance (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 “statisti-

cally significant” to mean that, nine times out of 10, the results displayed represent a real change, that is, it is unlikely that the differences in the indicator values are simply random variation from year to year.

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 As of September 1, 2015, for calculating the final mark, the school-awarded mark counts for 70% and the diploma examination mark counts for 30%.
- 3 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).
- 4 Cowley and Easton, *Boys, Girls, and Grades*: page 7.
- 5 Cowley and Easton, *Boys, Girls, and Grades*: page 17.
- 6 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](#) 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						
B –	School Location						Gr 12 Enrollment: 54
							Affiliation
C –	ESL (%): 0.0	Special needs (%): 9.5		Alt. French (%): 0.0			
	Actual rating vs predicted based			2021-22	Last 5 Years		
D –	on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a		Rank: 128/197		73/164		
	Academic Performance	2016	2017	2018	2019	2022	Trend
E –	Average exam mark	67.2	64.8	68.6	64.9	62.9	—
F –	Percentage of exams failed	11.1	13.8	10.4	17.5	27.6	▼
G –	School vs exam mark difference	10.0	10.6	11.5	13.6	18.1	—
H –	Language Arts gender gap	F 1.2	F 2.0	F 2.6	F 0.7	n/a	n/a
I –	Math gender gap	M 11.5	F 19.0	F 7.5	F 14.7	n/a	n/a
J –	Courses taken per student	3.8	3.9	4.0	3.2	1.2	—
K –	Diploma completion rate	96.3	92.9	90.9	83.0	92.6	—
L –	Delayed advancement rate	2.5	10.0	11.0	18.3	10.6	▼
M –	Overall rating out of 10	7.3	6.5	7.0	5.3	5.5	▼

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. 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 (Left)—School name and location The school name and the city in which the school is located.

B (Right)—Affiliation and Gr 12 Enrollment The school's affiliation—public, separate, charter, or private and the number of regular day students enrolled in grade 12 in the fall of 2018. 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.

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 2018/2019 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 students at the school on all of the diploma examinations administered during the school year. 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 students at the school that were judged to be below the provincial standard.

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 and I—English 30 gender gap and Math 30 gender gap These statistics report the difference between male and female students in their average exam marks in English 30-1 or English 30-2 and in

Mathematics 30-1 or Mathematics 30-2. In both subject areas, the gender gaps are calculated using the most frequently written exam.

J—Courses taken per student This statistic reports the average number of diploma courses completed by those students registered in the school in the fall of the reported school year who are classified as having been in Grade 10 two years earlier.

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 eight academic performance indicators (*E through 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, 197 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 on-line learning centres, home-schooling centres, certain alternative schools, and adult education schools.

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, 2021/22		Gr 12 enrolment: 207				
ESL (%): 9.1	Special Needs (%): 12.8	Alt. French (%): 3.7				
Parents' avg income: \$ n/a						
Academic Performance	2016	2017	2018	2019	2022	Trend
Average exam mark	64.4	64.6	65.0	65.4	62.1	—
Percentage of exams failed	17.9	17.5	17.8	17.2	24.1	—
School vs exam mark difference	8.9	9.0	8.8	8.7	12.7	—
Language Arts gender gap	2.8	2.7	2.8	3.0	4.1	—
Math gender gap	4.9	5.2	4.3	5.1	5.1	—
Courses taken per student	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	1.6	—
Diploma completion rate	84.2	83.9	84.6	85.3	83.4	—
Delayed advancement rate	21.3	21.8	21.8	20.2	20.5	—
Overall rating out of 10	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	—

* These results reflect the average size of the gender gaps in 2021/22. The Language Arts gender gap favoured females at 81.2% of schools, males at 18.8% of schools, and was even at 0% of schools. The Math gender gap favoured females at 63.2% of schools, males at 35.9% of schools, and was even at 0.9% of schools.

Note 6

If you have questions about the *Report Card on Alberta's High Schools*, contact co-author Max Shang at max.shang@fraserinstitute.org.

List of cities and school districts

School city	Geographical area	School city	Geographical area
SchoolCity	AreaName	La Crete	High Level/Fort Vermilion
Airdrie	Airdrie	Lac La Biche	Athabasca/Smoky Lake
Ardrossan	Vegreville/Fort Saskatchewan	Lacombe	Lacombe/Ponoka
Athabasca	Athabasca/Smoky Lake	Leduc	Leduc
Barrhead	Barrhead/Westlock	Lethbridge	Lethbridge
Beaumont	Leduc	Magrath	Lethbridge
Beaverlodge	Grande Prairie	Mayerthorpe	Edson/Whitecourt
Bonnyville	St. Paul/Bonnyville	Medicine Hat	Taber/Medicine Hat
Brooks	Brooks	Morinville	Barrhead/Westlock
Calgary	Calgary	Namao	Barrhead/Westlock
Camrose	Camrose	Okotoks	Okotoks
Canmore	Banff	Olds	Olds/Didsbury
Cardston	Lethbridge	Onoway	St. Albert/Stony Plain
Carstairs	Acme	Peace River	Peace River
Champion	Picture Butte	Pincher Creek	Fort MacLeod
Chestermere	Strathmore	Ponoka	Lacombe/Ponoka
Claresholm	Picture Butte	Raymond	Lethbridge
Coaldale	Lethbridge	Red Deer	Red Deer
Coalhurst	Lethbridge	Rimbey	Lacombe/Ponoka
Cochrane	Cochrane/Bragg Creek	Rocky Mountain House	Rocky Mountain House
Cold Lake	St. Paul/Bonnyville	Sexsmith	Grande Prairie
Coleman	Picture Butte	Sherwood Park	Sherwood Park
Condor	Rocky Mountain House	Slave Lake	Athabasca/Smoky Lake
Crossfield	Airdrie	Spruce Grove	St. Albert/Stony Plain
Devon	Leduc	St. Albert	St. Albert/Stony Plain
Didsbury	Olds/Didsbury	St. Paul	St. Paul/Bonnyville
Drayton Valley	Wetaskiwin/Drayton Valley	Stettler	Stettler
Drumheller	Drumheller/Three Hills	Stony Plain	St. Albert/Stony Plain
Dunmore	Taber/Medicine Hat	Strathmore	Strathmore
Edmonton	Edmonton	Sundre	Olds/Didsbury
Edson	Edson/Whitecourt	Sylvan Lake	Rocky Mountain House
Evansburg	St. Albert/Stony Plain	Taber	Taber/Medicine Hat
Fort McMurray	Fort McMurray	Three Hills	Drumheller/Three Hills
Fort Saskatchewan	Vegreville/Fort Saskatchewan	Valleyview	Grande Prairie
Grande Cache	Jasper/Hinton	Vermilion	Wainwright/Vermilion
Grande Prairie	Grande Prairie	Viking	Wainwright/Vermilion
High Level	High Level/Fort Vermilion	Vulcan	High River
High Prairie	Grande Prairie	Wabasca	Athabasca/Smoky Lake
High River	High River	Wainwright	Wainwright/Vermilion
Hinton	Jasper/Hinton	Westlock	Barrhead/Westlock
Innisfail	Olds/Didsbury	Wetaskiwin	Wetaskiwin/Drayton Valley
Jasper	Jasper/Hinton	Whitecourt	Edson/Whitecourt

Index of geographical areas

Geographical area	Page
Acme	17
Airdrie	17
Banff	17
Calgary	18
Camrose	21
Drumheller/Three Hills	21
Edmonton	21
Edson/Whitecourt.	23
Fort MacLeod	23
Fort McMurray.	23
Grande Prairie	24
High Level/Fort Vermilion	24
High River	24
Jasper/Hinton	24
Lacombe/Ponoka	25
Leduc	25

Geographical area	Page
Lethbridge	25
Okotoks	26
Olds/Didsbury	26
Peace River.	26
Picture Butte.	27
Red Deer	27
Rocky Mountain House.	27
Sherwood Park	27
St. Albert/Stony Plain.	28
St. Paul/Bonnyville	28
Stettler	29
Strathmore.	29
Taber/Medicine Hat.	29
Vegreville/Fort Saskatchewan.	29
Wainwright/Vermilion	29
Wetaskiwin/Drayton Valley	29

Wetaskiwin		Public				
Wetaskiwin		Gr 12 enrolment: 190				
ESL (%): 1.7	Special needs (%): 14.7	French Imm (%): 0.0				
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a		Rank: 103/197		2021-22 Last 5 Years 108/164		
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2022	Trend
Average exam mark	67.7	65.1	69.1	68.1	64.7	—
Percentage of exams failed	12.3	15.0	11.9	11.8	15.5	—
School vs exam mark difference	3.4	3.0	3.0	3.1	6.5	—
Language Arts gender gap	M 1.2	F 1.1	F 4.4	F 1.4	M 2.5	—
Math gender gap	F 1.6	F 14.7	F 4.1	F 3.8	M 8.6	—
Courses taken per student	2.9	2.6	3.0	2.5	1.1	—
Diploma completion rate	68.7	67.7	64.9	68.2	70.5	—
Delayed advancement rate	37.4	39.1	44.6	44.3	36.2	—
Overall rating out of 10	6.2	5.3	5.9	5.6	6.0	—

Wetaskiwin Outreach		Public				
Wetaskiwin Outreach		Gr 12 enrolment: 24				
ESL (%): 0.0	Special needs (%): 8.1	French Imm (%): 0.0				
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a		Rank: 176/197		2021-22 Last 5 Years n/a/164		
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2022	Trend
Average exam mark	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	62.2	n/a
Percentage of exams failed	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	11.4	n/a
School vs exam mark difference	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	7.5	n/a
Language Arts 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
Courses taken per student	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.2	n/a
Diploma completion rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	29.2	n/a
Delayed advancement rate	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	92.5	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.7	n/a

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 197) 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 2021/2022. 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 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 10. Also excluded from the ratings and rankings are: online learning centres, home-schooling centres, certain alternative schools, and adult education schools.

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-	
2021/2022	Last 5 yrs	Trend			2021/2022	Last 5 yrs
1	1	▲	Webber	Calgary	10.0	10.0
1	n/a	n/a	Calgary French & International	Calgary	10.0	n/a
1	1	—	Old Scona	Edmonton	10.0	10.0
4	3	—	Rundle College	Calgary	9.7	9.9
5	8	—	Strathcona-Tweedsmuir	Okotoks	9.5	8.9
6	n/a	n/a	FFCA South	Calgary	9.3	n/a
7	17	▲	Edmonton Islamic	Edmonton	9.1	8.0
7	7	—	Millwoods Christian	Edmonton	9.1	9.0
9	5	—	FFCA	Calgary	8.9	9.1
10	5	—	Archbishop MacDonald	Edmonton	8.5	9.1
10	12	▲	Ernest Manning	Calgary	8.5	8.3
12	9	—	Westmount	Calgary	8.4	8.8
13	16	—	Lillian Osborne	Edmonton	8.3	8.1
13	10	—	Western Canada	Calgary	8.3	8.6
15	14	—	Strathcona	Edmonton	8.2	8.2
15	12	—	Sir Winston Churchill	Calgary	8.2	8.3
17	11	—	Springbank	Calgary	8.1	8.4
17	n/a	n/a	Coaldale	Coaldale	8.1	n/a
17	17	—	Dr. E. P. Scarlett	Calgary	8.1	8.0
17	4	—	West Island College	Calgary	8.1	9.2
21	34	—	Notre Dame	Calgary	8.0	7.3

---Rank---			School name	City	-Overall rating-	
2021/2022	Last 5 yrs	Trend			2021/2022	Last 5 yrs
21	36	—	St. Peter the Apostle	Spruce Grove	8.0	7.2
21	32	—	Henry Wise Wood	Calgary	8.0	7.4
24	56	—	Sexsmith	Sexsmith	7.9	6.6
24	n/a	n/a	Parkland Immanuel	Edmonton	7.9	n/a
24	36	—	Innisfail	Innisfail	7.9	7.2
24	14	—	William Aberhart	Calgary	7.9	8.2
28	17	—	Strathcona Christian	Sherwood Park	7.8	8.0
29	26	—	Bishop Carroll	Calgary	7.7	7.7
29	22	—	Calgary Christian	Calgary	7.7	7.8
31	26	—	Centennial	Calgary	7.6	7.7
31	34	—	St. Timothy	Cochrane	7.6	7.3
31	46	—	Spruce Grove	Spruce Grove	7.6	6.8
31	63	—	Calvin Christian	Coalhurst	7.6	6.5
35	22	—	St. Gabriel the Archangel	Chestermere	7.5	7.8
35	52	—	Memorial	Stony Plain	7.5	6.7
35	17	—	Holy Trinity Academy	Okotoks	7.5	8.0
38	26	—	Beaumont	Beaumont	7.4	7.7
38	46	—	St. Francis Xavier	Edmonton	7.4	6.8
40	117	—	Jasper	Jasper	7.3	5.5
40	26	—	Archbishop Jordan	Sherwood Park	7.3	7.7
40	n/a	n/a	St. Albert	St. Albert	7.3	n/a

---Rank---				---Overall rating---				---Rank---				---Overall rating---		
2021/	Last			2021/	Last			2021/	Last			2021/	Last	
2022	5	Trend	School name	2022	5	Trend	City	2022	5	Trend	School name	2022	5	
40	21	—	Olds	Olds	7.3	7.9		92	91	—	Bowness	Calgary	6.1	6.0
40	22	▼	Harry Ainlay	Edmonton	7.3	7.8		92	99	—	Lord Beaverbrook	Calgary	6.1	5.9
40	46	—	St. Mary's	Calgary	7.3	6.8		103	46	▼	Bishop O'Byrne	Calgary	6.0	6.8
46	46	—	St. Martin De Porres	Airdrie	7.2	6.8		103	n/a	n/a	Gateway Academy	Whitecourt	6.0	n/a
46	n/a	n/a	Westwood	Fort McMurray	7.2	n/a		103	91	—	Robert Thirsk	Calgary	6.0	6.0
48	36	—	John G Diefenbaker	Calgary	7.1	7.2		103	81	—	Bellerose	St. Albert	6.0	6.2
49	45	—	Ross Sheppard	Edmonton	7.0	6.9		103	108	—	Wetaskiwin	Wetaskiwin	6.0	5.8
50	108	▲	Peace Wapiti Academy	Grande Prairie	6.9	5.8		103	142	▲	Fort Saskatchewan	Fort Saskatchewan	6.0	5.0
50	30	—	Mother Margaret Mary	Edmonton	6.9	7.6		103	73	—	Jasper Place	Edmonton	6.0	6.3
50	31	▼	Ardrossan	Ardrossan	6.9	7.5		103	n/a	n/a	Maurice-Lavallee	Edmonton	6.0	n/a
50	36	—	Bev Facey	Sherwood Park	6.9	7.2		103	63	—	Holy Trinity	Edmonton	6.0	6.5
50	87	—	Sundre	Sundre	6.9	6.1		112	52	—	Rimbey	Rimbey	5.9	6.7
50	22	—	Rundle College Academy	Calgary	6.9	7.8		112	123	▲	Bert Church	Airdrie	5.9	5.3
50	99	—	Matthew Halton	Pincher Creek	6.9	5.9		112	52	—	Raymond	Raymond	5.9	6.7
50	41	▼	W. R. Myers	Taber	6.9	7.1		112	73	—	Austin O'Brien	Edmonton	5.9	6.3
58	91	—	Hilltop	Whitecourt	6.8	6.0		116	91	▼	Archbishop Oscar Romero	Edmonton	5.8	6.0
58	44	▼	Paul Kane	St. Albert	6.8	7.0		116	136	—	Glenmary	Peace River	5.8	5.1
58	130	—	Crescent Heights	Medicine Hat	6.8	5.2		116	n/a	n/a	W.H. Croxford	Airdrie	5.8	n/a
58	56	—	Crescent Heights	Calgary	6.8	6.6		116	136	▲	Lester B. Pearson	Calgary	5.8	5.1
62	n/a	n/a	All Saints	Calgary	6.7	n/a		120	117	—	Charles Spencer	Grande Prairie	5.7	5.5
62	56	—	Assumption	Cold Lake	6.7	6.6		120	116	—	Wainwright	Wainwright	5.7	5.6
62	81	—	Lacombe	Lacombe	6.7	6.2		120	81	▼	Notre Dame	Red Deer	5.7	6.2
62	36	—	Cochrane	Cochrane	6.7	7.2		120	63	▼	McCoy	Medicine Hat	5.7	6.5
62	73	▲	Louis St. Laurent	Edmonton	6.7	6.3		120	99	—	McNally	Edmonton	5.7	5.9
67	n/a	n/a	Morinville	Morinville	6.6	n/a		125	n/a	n/a	Holy Trinity	Fort McMurray	5.6	n/a
67	87	—	John Maland	Devon	6.6	6.1		125	73	—	Highwood	High River	5.6	6.3
67	32	▼	St. Francis	Calgary	6.6	7.4		127	99	—	Bow Valley	Cochrane	5.5	5.9
70	73	—	Cold Lake	Cold Lake	6.5	6.3		127	130	—	Lindsay Thurber	Red Deer	5.5	5.2
70	112	—	Will Sinclair	Rocky Mountain House	6.5	5.7		127	112	—	William E Hay	Stettler	5.5	5.7
72	87	—	Strathmore	Strathmore	6.4	6.1		127	91	—	George McDougall	Airdrie	5.5	6.0
72	n/a	n/a	Nelson Mandela	Calgary	6.4	n/a		127	73	▼	Magrath	Magrath	5.5	6.3
72	73	▲	Onoway	Onoway	6.4	6.3		127	108	—	Lethbridge Collegiate	Lethbridge	5.5	5.8
72	91	—	Notre Dame	Bonnyville	6.4	6.0		127	99	—	Bishop McNally	Calgary	5.5	5.9
72	99	—	David Thompson	Conдор	6.4	5.9		134	112	—	Sturgeon	Namao	5.4	5.7
72	99	—	Catholic Central	Lethbridge	6.4	5.9		134	108	—	M. E. LaZerte	Edmonton	5.4	5.8
72	52	—	Vimy Ridge	Edmonton	6.4	6.7		134	73	—	Queen Elizabeth	Calgary	5.4	6.3
79	n/a	n/a	St. André Bessette	Fort Saskatchewan	6.3	n/a		137	n/a	n/a	McTavish	Fort McMurray	5.3	n/a
79	91	—	Leduc	Leduc	6.3	6.0		137	n/a	n/a	Father Patrick Mercredi	Fort McMurray	5.3	n/a
79	69	—	J. R. Robson	Vermilion	6.3	6.4		137	122	—	Richard F Staples	Westlock	5.3	5.4
79	69	—	Canmore Collegiate	Canmore	6.3	6.4		137	69	▼	St. Paul	St. Paul	5.3	6.4
79	63	—	Eagle Butte	Dunmore	6.3	6.5		137	130	—	Crowsnest	Coleman	5.3	5.2
79	46	—	W P Wagner	Edmonton	6.3	6.8		137	117	—	Kate Andrews	Coaldale	5.3	5.5
85	145	—	Peace River	Peace River	6.2	4.6		137	146	▲	J Percy Page	Edmonton	5.3	4.4
85	n/a	n/a	Joane Cardinal-Schubert	Calgary	6.2	n/a		137	123	—	Father Lacombe	Calgary	5.3	5.3
85	63	—	Salisbury	Sherwood Park	6.2	6.5		145	99	—	Notre Dame Collegiate	High River	5.2	5.9
85	56	—	W. G. Murdoch	Crossfield	6.2	6.6		145	112	▼	Barrhead	Barrhead	5.2	5.7
85	130	▲	Cardston	Cardston	6.2	5.2		147	n/a	n/a	St. Joseph	Red Deer	5.1	n/a
85	69	—	Archbishop O'Leary	Edmonton	6.2	6.4		147	136	—	Edwin Parr	Athabasca	5.1	5.1
85	117	—	Central Memorial	Calgary	6.2	5.5		147	151	—	J A Williams	Lac La Biche	5.1	4.1
92	81	—	Mayerthorpe	Mayerthorpe	6.1	6.2		147	41	—	Christ The King	Leduc	5.1	7.1
92	n/a	n/a	St. Mary	Westlock	6.1	n/a		147	91	—	Chestermere	Calgary	5.1	6.0
92	130	▲	Ponoka	Ponoka	6.1	5.2		147	136	—	Victoria	Edmonton	5.1	5.1
92	81	—	H. J. Cody	Sylvan Lake	6.1	6.2		153	87	▼	Bishop Grandin	Calgary	5.0	6.1
92	63	▼	Hunting Hills	Red Deer	6.1	6.5		153	153	▲	Forest Lawn	Calgary	5.0	4.0
92	41	▼	Didsbury	Didsbury	6.1	7.1		155	136	—	Chinook	Lethbridge	4.9	5.1
92	56	—	Foothills	Okotoks	6.1	6.6		155	123	—	La Crete	La Crete	4.9	5.3
92	123	—	Medicine Hat	Medicine Hat	6.1	5.3		155	123	▼	Frank Maddock	Drayton Valley	4.9	5.3
92	56	—	Edmonton Christian	Edmonton	6.1	6.6		155	99	▼	Three Hills	Three Hills	4.9	5.9

---Rank---					-Overall rating-		---Rank---					-Overall rating-		
2021/	Last				2021/	Last	2021/	Last	2021/	Last	2021/	Last	2021/	Last
2022	5	Trend	School name	City	2022	5	2022	5	2022	5	2022	5	2022	5
159	150	—	Grande Prairie	Grande Prairie	4.8	4.2	176	n/a	n/a	Koinonia Christian	Red Deer	3.7	n/a	
159	146	—	Hillside	Valleyview	4.8	4.4	176	123	▼	Willow Creek	Claresholm	3.7	5.3	
159	n/a	n/a	St. John Paul II	Grande Prairie	4.8	n/a	181	154	—	High Level	High Level	3.6	3.9	
162	n/a	n/a	Gerard Redmond	Hinton	4.7	n/a	181	n/a	n/a	County Central	Vulcan	3.6	n/a	
162	154	—	James Fowler	Calgary	4.7	3.9	181	157	—	Winston Churchill	Lethbridge	3.6	3.8	
162	n/a	n/a	Calgary Islamic	Calgary	4.7	n/a	184	n/a	n/a	Viking	Viking	3.4	n/a	
165	130	—	Bonnyville	Bonnyville	4.6	5.2	185	158	▼	Northstar	Didsbury	2.9	3.7	
165	56	—	Hugh Sutherland	Carstairs	4.6	6.6	185	160	—	Eastglen	Edmonton	2.9	3.1	
165	154	—	Drumheller	Drumheller	4.6	3.9	187	n/a	n/a	HUB Okotoks	Okotoks	2.8	n/a	
168	146	—	Harry Collinge	Hinton	4.5	4.4	187	160	—	Grande Cache	Grande Cache	2.8	3.1	
169	144	—	Camrose	Camrose	4.4	4.8	189	163	—	E W Pratt	High Prairie	2.5	1.6	
170	143	—	Roland Michener	Slave Lake	4.2	4.9	190	n/a	n/a	Fort McMurray	Fort McMurray	1.9	n/a	
171	136	▼	Parkland	Edson	4.1	5.1	190	n/a	n/a	Grand Trunk	Evansburg	1.9	n/a	
172	151	—	Beaverlodge	Beaverlodge	4.0	4.1	192	162	▼	Queen Elizabeth	Edmonton	1.8	2.7	
172	146	▼	St. Joseph	Grande Prairie	4.0	4.4	193	n/a	n/a	St Isidore	Sherwood Park	1.5	n/a	
174	117	—	St. Joseph's	Brooks	3.9	5.5	193	164	—	Hope Christian	Champion	1.5	1.0	
175	159	—	Brooks	Brooks	3.8	3.6	195	123	▼	Calgary Academy	Calgary	1.1	5.3	
176	81	—	Edge	Calgary	3.7	6.2	196	n/a	n/a	Sunrise	Brooks	0.7	n/a	
176	n/a	n/a	Calgary Academy Collegiate	Calgary	3.7	n/a	197	n/a	n/a	Mistassiniy	Wabasca	0.0	n/a	
176	n/a	n/a	Wetaskiwin Outreach	Wetaskiwin	3.7	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, μ is the mean of the all-schools distribution of results, and σ 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 gender gap*—5%, *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*, 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 (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 a Senior Fellow and former Director of School Performance Studies at the Fraser Institute. He has a B.Comm. from the University of British Columbia (1974). 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 in 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.

Joel Emes

Joel Emes is President of Abacus Economics and a Fraser Institute Senior Fellow who rejoined the Institute after a stint as a senior advisor to British Columbia's provincial government. He previously served as a senior analyst, then as acting executive director, at the BC Progress Board. Prior to that, Joel was a senior research economist at the Fraser Institute where he initiated and led several flagship projects in the areas of tax freedom and government performance, spending, debt, and unfunded liabilities. Joel holds a B.A. and an M.A. in economics from Simon Fraser University.

Max Shang

Max Shang is an Economist at the Fraser Institute. Prior to joining the Institute, Max worked for the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations as a statistician and University of Guelph as senior research associate. His past research work has been published in leading peer-reviewed academic journals including *Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics* and *Computational Statistics*. During his Ph.D. study, Max developed two more efficient statistical methods for calculating insurance premium. He holds a Ph.D. in Food, Agricultural and Resource Economics from the University of Guelph.

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® DC, the most recent version, is available free of charge from Adobe Systems Inc. at <<http://get.adobe.com/reader/>>. Readers who have trouble viewing or printing our PDF files using applications from other manufacturers (e.g., Apple's Preview) should use Reader® or Acrobat®.

Ordering publications

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

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

Media

For media enquiries, please contact our Communications Department:

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

Copyright

Copyright ©2024 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

2024

Typesetting

Nick Murphy

Cover design

Peng Wei

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. Robert Barro

Prof. Jean-Pierre Centi

Prof. John Chant

Prof. Bev Dahlby

Prof. Erwin Diewert

Prof. Stephen Easton

Prof. J.C. Herbert Emery

Prof. Jack L. Granatstein

Prof. Herbert G. Grubel

Prof. James Gwartney

Dr. Jerry Jordan

Prof. Ross McKittrick

Prof. Michael Parkin

Prof. Friedrich Schneider

Prof. Lawrence B. Smith

Mr. Vito Tanzi

Past members

Prof. Armen Alchian*

Prof. Michael Bliss*

Prof. James M. Buchanan*†

Prof. Friedrich A. Hayek*†

Prof. H.G. Johnson*

Prof. Ronald W. Jones*

Prof. F.G. Pennance*

Prof. George Stigler*†

Sir Alan Walters*

Prof. Edwin G. West*

* deceased; † Nobel Laureate