

Studies in Education Policy



March 2013

Report Card on Ontario's Secondary Schools 2013

by Peter Cowley and Stephen Easton



Contents

Introduction / 3

Key academic indicators of school performance / 5

Other indicators of school performance / 8

Notes / 10

Detailed school reports / 11

How does your school stack up? / 60

Appendix: Calculating the *Overall rating out of 10* / 67

About the authors / 69

Publishing information / 70

Supporting the Fraser Institute / 71

Purpose, funding, & independence / 72

About the Fraser Institute / 73

Editorial Advisory Board / 74

Introduction

The *Report Card on Ontario's Secondary Schools 2013* (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, it alerts parents to those nearby schools that appear to have more effective academic programs. Parents can also determine whether schools of interest are improving over time. By first studying the *Report Card*, parents will be better prepared to ask relevant questions when they visit schools under consideration and speak with the staff.

Of course, the choice of a school should not be made solely on the basis of a single source of information. Web sites maintained by Ontario's Education Quality and Accountability Office (EQAO),¹ the provincial ministry of education, and local school boards may also provide useful information.² Parents who already have a child enrolled at the school provide another point of view.

Naturally, a sound academic program should be complemented by effective programs in areas of school activity not measured by the *Report Card*. Nevertheless, the *Report Card* provides a detailed

picture of each school that is not easily available elsewhere.

The Report Card facilitates school improvement

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

However, the *Report Card* offers more than just incentive. It includes a variety of indicators, each of which reports results for an aspect of school performance that may be improved. School administrators who are dedicated to their students' academic success accept the *Report Card* as another source of opportunities for improvement.

Some schools do better than others

To improve a school, one must believe that improvement is achievable. This *Report Card*, like other report cards from the Fraser Institute, 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 dictate the degree of academic success that students can enjoy in school—some schools do better than others. This finding confirms the results of research carried out in other countries.³ Indeed, it will come as no great surprise to experienced parents

and educators that the data consistently suggest that what goes on in the schools makes a difference to academic results and that some schools make a greater 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 schools having 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 techniques used in schools where students are successful, less effective schools may find ways to improve.

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

You can contribute to the 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.

Key academic indicators of school performance

The foundation of the *Report Card* is an overall rating of each school's academic performance. We base our *Overall rating out of 10* on the school's performance on six indicators, all of which are derived from province-wide tests of literacy and mathematics skills that are administered by the province's Education Quality and Accountability Office (EQAO).⁴ They are:

- (1) the average level of achievement on the grade-9 EQAO assessment in academic mathematics;
- (2) the average level of achievement on the grade-9 EQAO assessment in applied mathematics;
- (3) the percentage of these grade-9 EQAO assessments in mathematics that did not meet the provincial standard;
- (4) the percentage of Ontario Secondary School Literacy Tests (OSSLT) that were not successfully completed;
- (5) the difference between male and female students in their average levels of achievement on the grade-9 EQAO assessment in academic mathematics; and,
- (6) the difference between male and female students attempting the OSSLT for the first time in their rate of successful completion of the test.

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

Indicators of effective teaching

Average results on grade-9 mathematics tests

Fundamental to the mission of secondary schools is ensuring that students are equipped with sound skills in literacy and mathematics. Differences among students in abilities, motivation, and work habits will inevitably have an impact upon the final results. There are, however, recognizable differences from school to school within a district in the average results on both of these tests. There is also variation within schools in the average results obtained on these tests. Such differences in outcomes cannot be explained simply by the individual and family characteristics of the school's students. We believe that teaching makes a difference to student outcomes and it therefore seems reasonable to include the average levels of achievement in these critical subject areas as indicators of effective teaching.

The indicators in mathematics—in the tables, *Average level Gr 9 Math (Acad)* and *Average level Gr 9 Math (Apld)*—show the average level of proficiency achieved by the school's students on the uniform assessments by the EQAO at the grade-9 level. Generally, each grade-9 student will write only one of the two tests, depending on the mathematics program—academic or applied—in which he or she is enrolled.

The EQAO converts the raw score on each test into a level of achievement from 1 to 4. Achievement at Levels 1 and 2 suggest that the student has not yet met the provincial standard. Level 3 is considered the provincial standard and Level 4 represents achievement well above the expected level. Achievement at Level 3 or 4 suggests that students are prepared for work at the next grade.

In order to calculate the average level achieved by the students at a school on each test, a numerical value was given to each level of achievement. Thus, Level 1 was given a value of 1 for purposes of determining the average; Level 2, a value of 2; Level 3, a value of 3; and Level 4, a value of 4. A value of 0 was given in those cases where a student completed the test but did not demonstrate sufficient understanding to be assigned achievement Level 1.

Percentage of OSSLTs successfully completed

In most cases, students must pass the Ontario Secondary School Literacy Test (OSSLT) in order to graduate. It is first written in grade 10. Students who do not pass the test in grade 10 may write the test again in subsequent school years. The OSSLT indicators report the success rate on the OSSLT by students who have not previously attempted the test—in the tables *OSSLT passed (%)—FTE*—and students who have unsuccessfully attempted the test in the past—in the tables *OSSLT passed (%)—PE*.

Since results on the OSSLT are expressed by the EQAO as simply successful or unsuccessful, the indicators of success rate are not used in the calculation of the *Overall rating*. Instead, the full weight assigned to the OSSLT results is given to the OSSLT fail rate described below.

Percentage of grade-9 mathematics and OSSLT tests below standard

Presented in the tables as *Tests below standard (%)*, this indicator combines the results of all the OSSLT and grade-9 mathematics tests written by the students at the school. However, for the purposes of the calculation of the *Overall rating*, the percentage of tests below standard for these two test series are calculated separately.

For each school, this indicator reports the combined rate of failure on the grade-9 math tests and the OSSLT. It was derived by dividing the total number of all the above tests that provided enough information to enable the calculation of a score but did not meet the provincial standard by the total number of such tests written by the students at the school.

Since literacy and mathematical skills are critical to students' further intellectual and personal development, students should, at the minimum, demonstrate that they meet the accepted standard of performance for their grade in these subject areas. Schools have the responsibility of ensuring that their students are adequately prepared to do so.

How well do the teachers take student differences into account? The Gender gap indicators

The *Gender gap* indicators—in the tables *Gender gap (level) Math* and *Gender gap (% passed)—OSSLT*—use the result in grade-9 academic mathematics and the OSSLT result for “first-time-eligible” (FTE) students to determine how successful the school has been in narrowing the achievement gap between male and female students in literacy and mathematics.⁵ These indicators are determined, for each subject area, by calculating the absolute value of the difference between male and female students in their average level of achievement (in mathematics) or success rate (in the OSSLT). The more successful sex is reported along with the difference in the detailed tables.

Undoubtedly, some personal and family characteristics, left unmitigated, can have a deleterious effect on a student's academic development. The *Report Cards* provide evidence that successful teachers overcome such impediments. By comparing the results of male and female students in two skills areas—literacy and mathematics—in which one group or the other has enjoyed a historical advantage, we are able to gauge the extent to which schools provide effective teaching to all of their students.

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, homework, and class participation to rate a student, we have combined all the indicators to produce an overall rating. The overall rating of school performance answers the question, “In general, how is the school doing academically compared to the other schools in the Report Card?”

To derive this rating, the results for each of the six 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 sharing certain statistical properties. Standardized values can readily be combined and compared. The standardized data were then weighted and combined to produce an overall standardized score. Finally, this score was converted into an overall rating out of 10. It is from this *Overall rating out of 10* that the school's provincial rank is determined.

For schools in which there were fewer than 15 test results for boys or for girls, no values for the *Gender gap* indicators can be provided. In these cases the *Overall rating out of 10* is derived using the remaining indicators. (See Appendix 1 for an explanation of the calculation of the *Overall rating out of 10*.)

Other indicators of school performance

The *Report Card* includes other indicators that, while they are not used to derive the *Overall rating out of 10*, add more information about the school's effectiveness.

The *Tests not written* indicator

Schools that administer the assessments provided by the Education Quality and Accountability Office (EQAO) are expected to ensure that all their students write the tests. Higher participation rates provide the benefit of objective assessment of learning to more students and parents. They also provide a more accurate reflection of the level of achievement at the school. A reader can have more confidence that the test results are a true reflection of the school's average achievement level if all, or almost all, of its students write the tests.

The participation rate indicator—in the tables *Gr 9 Tests not written (%)*—was determined by first summing, for both of the grade-9 math tests, the total number of students for whom no test data were submitted or who were exempt from testing. This result was then divided by the total number of these tests that could have been completed had all students fully participated.

The principal of a school at which a relatively large percentage of students did not complete the tests should be able to provide good reasons for the students' failure to do so and a well-developed plan to increase participation in future test sittings.

As the OSSLT is a compulsory component of Ontario's graduation program and must be successfully completed by all students prior to graduation, it is unnecessary to consider it in the calculation of this indicator.

The *Trend* indicator

Is the school improving academically? The *Report Card* provides five years of data for most schools. Unlike a snapshot of one year's results, this historical record provides evidence of change (or lack thereof) over time. To detect trends in the performance indicators, we developed the *Trends* indicator. This indicator uses statistical analysis to identify those dimensions of school performance in which there has likely been real change rather than a fluctuation in results caused by random occurrences. 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 are available, a trend is indicated only in those circumstances where five years of data are available and where the trend is statistically significant. For this indicator, we have defined the term "statistically significant" to mean that, nine times out of 10, the trend that is noted is real; that is, it did not happen just by chance.

The socioeconomic indicator

When they design their lesson plans and deliver the curriculum, educators can and should take into account the abilities, interests, and backgrounds of their students. By doing so, educators can overcome disadvantages that their students may have. The socioeconomic indicator enables us to identify schools that are successful despite adverse conditions faced by their students at home. Similarly, it identifies schools where students with a relatively positive home

situation appear not to be reaching their presumed potential.

The socioeconomic indicator was derived as follows. First, using enrolment data from the Ministry of Education sorted by postal code and 2006 census data⁶ provided by Statistics Canada, we determined the average level of parental income from wages and salaries and from self-employment. We then used regression analysis to determine the relationship between parental income and variations in school performance as measured by the *Overall rating out of 10*. The analysis determined that, on average, when a school had more parents with higher incomes, the *Overall rating* at the school was likely to be higher.

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

For example, during the 2011/2012 school year, School A, a public secondary school in Toronto, achieved an *Overall rating* of 8.3 and yet, when the parental income of the student body was taken into account, the school was expected to achieve a rating of only about 5.3. The difference of 3.0 is reported in the tables. On the other hand, the actual *Overall rating* of School B, another Toronto public secondary school, was 4.7, although its predicted rating was 6.2. The reported difference for School B is -1.5. This measurement suggests that School A is more successful than School B in enabling all of its students to

reach their potential.

This measure of the effect of the socioeconomic background of a school's student body is presented with two important notes of caution. First, less than 25% of the variation among Ontario secondary schools in the overall rating is associated with the level of parental employment income. Clearly, many other factors—including good teaching, counselling, and school administration—contribute to the effectiveness of schools. Second, the statistical measures used describe past relationships between a socioeconomic characteristic and a measure of school effectiveness. These relationships may not remain static. The more effectively the school enables all of its students to succeed, the weaker will be the relationship between the home characteristics of its students and their academic success. Thus, this socioeconomic indicator should not be used as an excuse or rationale for poor school performance. The effective school will produce good results, regardless of the family background of its students.

The student characteristics indicators

For each public school, the *Report Card* notes the percentage of its students who are enrolled in ESL programs or who have certain identified special needs. As was noted in the Introduction, it is sometimes useful to compare a school's results to those of similar schools. These two indicators, along with the average parental employment income, can be used to identify schools with similar student-body characteristics.

Notes

- 1 The Education Quality and Accountability Office (EQAO) is an arm's-length agency of the provincial government. It provides parents, teachers, and the public with information about student achievement. For more information, see the EQAO's web site at <http://www.eqao.com/>.
- 2 See, for instance, the EQAO's web site at <http://www.eqao.com/>, the Ministry of Education's web site at <http://www.edu.gov.on.ca>, or the web site of the Toronto Catholic District School Board at <http://www.tcdsb.org/>.
- 3 See, for instance, Michael Rutter et al., *Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children* (Harvard University Press, 1979) and Peter Mortimore et al., *School Matters: The Junior Years* (Open Books, 1988).
- 4 The EQAO's test results, student enrollment data, and school information used or reported in this publication were provided by the Ontario Ministry of Education. The results or views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and are not those of the Ontario Ministry of Education.
- 5 For a discussion of gender-based differentials in academic achievement, see Peter Cowley and Stephen Easton, *Boys, Girls, and Grades: Academic Gender Balance in British Columbia's Secondary Schools*. Public Policy Sources 22 (Fraser Institute, 1999).
- 6 A Dissemination Area (DA) is a small geographic area comprising one or more neighbouring blocks, and having a population of 400 to 700 persons. The Dissemination Area is the smallest standard geographic area for which all census data are disseminated. All of Canada is divided into Dissemination Areas.

Detailed school reports

Use the sample table and the explanation of each line below to help you interpret the detailed results for individual schools. Families choosing a school for their children should seek to confirm the *Report Card*'s findings by visiting the school and interviewing teachers, school administrators, and other parents. More information about the schools may be found at <http://ontario.compareschoolrankings.org>. More information regarding test results at individual schools can be found on the Education Quality and Accountability Office (EQAO) web site at <http://www.eqao.com> and on the web sites of local school districts and schools. Of course, a sound academic program should be complemented by effective programs in areas of school activity not measured by the *Report Card*.

Important note

Private schools are not required to administer the grade-9 EQAO tests. Since the *Report Card* is based, in part, on results achieved on these tests, only those private schools that chose to administer the EQAO tests could be included.

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 – GEOGRAPHIC AREA							
B –	School name [Affiliation] City			OSSLT count: 437			
C –	ESL (%): 2.1			Special needs (%): 16.7			
D –	Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$96,900: -0.8			Rank: 396/725		Last 5 Years 422/691	
	Academic Performance	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Trend
E –	Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad)	2.5	2.8	2.7	2.5	2.6	—
F –	Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Apld)	1.7	2.0	2.2	1.2	2.4	—
G –	OSSLT passed (%)-FTE	85.8	87.9	86.5	84.8	86.1	—
H –	OSSLT passed (%)-PE	46.5	51.7	47.2	58.7	63.6	▲
I –	Tests below standard (%)	30.6	23.8	24.8	30.6	24.9	—
J –	Gender gap (level)-Math	E	F 0.1	M 0.1	E	E	—
K –	Gender gap OSSLT	F 6.6	F 9.8	F 8.0	F 2.5	F 11.5	—
L –	Gr 9 tests not written (%)	1.0	0.3	1.5	1.4	1.6	▼
M –	Overall rating out of 10	5.6	6.4	5.9	4.9	6.0	—

A — The schools are grouped into geographical areas. To find a school's results, find its location in the "List of cities and geographical areas" and note its geographical area. Find the geographical area in the "Index of geographical areas" and note the page on which its results begin. Within each geographical area, the schools are listed in

alphabetical order.

B (left) — The school name, its affiliation—public, Catholic, or private—and the city in which the school is located.

B (right) — The number of students at the school

who were eligible to write the OSSLT.

C — These statistics report the percentage of the students at the school, who are eligible to write the OSSLT, who are enrolled in ESL programs, and the percentage who have an identified special need. Use this statistic to identify schools at which the students share some personal characteristics.

D (left) — This statistic compares the school's actual *Overall rating out of 10* with the rating that is predicted by the average parental employment income in each school's family. A positive difference suggests that the school is effective in enabling its students to succeed regardless of their family's characteristics.

D (right) — The school's overall academic rank in the province for 2011/2012 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 and F — The average level achieved by the students on the grade-9 academic (Acad) and applied (Appl) mathematics tests. The EQAO assigns a level of achievement to each completed test. Achievement at Levels 1 and 2 suggest that the student has not yet met the provincial standard. Level 3 is considered the provincial standard and Level 4 represents achievement well above the expected level. Thus, achievement at Level 3 or 4 suggests that students are well prepared for work at the next grade. In order to calculate the average level, a numerical value was given to each level of achievement. Thus, Level 1 was given a value of 1 for purposes of determining the average; Level 2, a value of 2; Level 3, a value of 3; and Level 4, a value of 4. In those cases where a student completed the test but did not demonstrate sufficient understanding to be assigned achievement Level 1, the test was given a value of 0.

G & H — The percentage of eligible OSSLT writers who successfully completed the test, either on their first attempt (FTE) or on a subsequent attempt (PE).

I — The percentage of all the completed tests written by students at the school that were judged to be either unsuccessful (OSSLT) or below Level 3 (grade-9 math tests). A low percentage of *Tests below standard (%)* indicates that the school is successful in ensuring that most of its students are meeting or exceeding the provincial standard of performance.

J and K — The difference (in average level of achievement) between girls and boys in the grade-9 academic mathematics test and the OSSLT (FTE students). Where the difference favours the girls, the value is preceded by an F. Where boys are favoured, the value is preceded by an M. An E means that there is no difference between the girls and the boys on this measure. Smaller differences indicate that the school is doing a good job for all its students.

L — The percentage of the grade-9 mathematics tests that could have been completed by the school's students but which were not assigned an overall score. The percentage, *Gr 9 Tests not written (%)*, takes into account the total number of students for whom no test data were submitted or who were exempt from testing.

Important note: Schools that administer these tests are expected to ensure that all their students participate. For this reason, you should take note of the *Tests not written* percentage when you consider each school's results in the *Report Card*. The principal of a school with a high *Tests not written* percentage should be able to provide good reasons for the students' failure to complete the tests.

M — The *Overall rating out of 10* takes into account the indicators described in E through K above to answer the question, "In general, how is the school doing academically compared to other schools in the report card?"

Important note: 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 out of 10*, it must improve more rapidly than the average. If it improves, but at

a rate less than the average, it will show a decline in its rating.

N — An upward-pointing arrow at the end of an indicator row means that the school is probably improving on that indicator. A downward-pointing arrow means that the school is probably getting worse. The researchers had to be at least 90% sure that the changes were not just random before indicating a trend. A dash indicates that there is no significant change. Where insufficient data were available, “n/a” appears in the column. Note that for the two *Gender gap* indicators and *Tests below standard* a downward trend in the data will lead to an upward-pointing arrow in the trend column. For example, a decreasing *Tests below standard (%)* indicates improvement and so an upward-pointing arrow is displayed.

Other notes

Note 1

Not all the province’s secondary schools are included in the tables or the ranking. In order to be included, schools must have had, in the school year 2011/2012, at least 15 students who wrote either of the two versions of the grade-9 EQAO mathematics test and at least 15 “first-time-eligible” (FTE) or “previously eligible” (PE) writers of the Ontario Secondary School Literacy Test. Private schools and federally funded schools operated by First Nations are not required to administer the grade-9 mathematics tests. Since the results of these tests form the basis for this *Report Card*, only those schools that administer them could be included. Finally, also excluded are schools that did not generate a sufficiently large set of student data to enable the calculation of an *Overall rating out of 10*. **The exclusion of a school from the *Report Card* is not a judgement of the school’s effectiveness.**

Note 2

The EQAO’s test results, student enrollment data,

and school information used or reported in this publication were provided by the Ontario Ministry of Education. The results or views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and are not those of the Ontario Ministry of Education.

Note 3

In accordance with its regulations regarding the privacy of personal information, where the results in a test involved fewer than 15 students, the EQAO 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

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

Note 6

You can compare a school’s results with these all-schools average results in the table below.

Average values for all schools 2011/2012						OSSLT count: 277	
ESL (%):	7.2					Special Needs (%):	23.4
Parents’ avg income:	\$ 74,700						
Academic Performance	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Trend	
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad)	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.8	2.8	▲	
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Apld)	2.1	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.3	▲	
OSSLT passed (%)-FTE	81.3	83.0	82.3	81.5	80.6	—	
OSSLT passed (%)-PE	54.5	57.4	54.6	52.5	51.5	—	
Tests below standard (%)	29.6	28.3	26.9	26.6	26.4	▲	
Gender gap (level)-Math*	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	—	
Gender gap (% passed)-OSSLT*	8.1	6.6	7.9	7.7	8.6	—	
Gr 9 tests not written (%)	2.7	2.5	2.2	2.0	2.0	▲	
Overall rating out of 10	6.2	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	n/a	

* These results reflect the average size of the gender gaps in 2011/2012. The Gr 10 OSSLT gender gap favoured females at 90.8% of schools and males at 9.2% of schools. The Gr 9 Math gender gap favoured males at 45.9% of schools, females at 22.2% of schools, and was even at 31.9% of schools.

List of cities and geographical areas

City	Geographical area	City	Geographical area
Acton	Halton Area	Courtice	Kawartha Pine Ridge Area
Ajax	Durham Area	Deep River	Renfrew County Area
Alexandria	Upper Canada Area	Delhi	Grand Erie Area
Alliston	Simcoe County Area	Desbarats	Algoma Area
Almonte	Upper Canada Area	Dorchester	Thames Valley Area
Amherstburg	Greater Essex Area	Douglas	Renfrew County Area
Ancaster	Hamilton-Wentworth Area	Dresden	Lambton Kent Area
Angus	Simcoe County Area	Dryden	Kenora Area
Arnprior	Renfrew County Area	Dundas	Hamilton-Wentworth Area
Arva	Thames Valley Area	Dunnville	Grand Erie Area
Athens	Upper Canada Area	Dunrobin	Ottawa
Atikokan	Kenora Area	Elgin	Upper Canada Area
Aurora	York Area	Elliot Lake	Algoma Area
Avonmore	Upper Canada Area	Elmira	Waterloo Area
Aylmer	Thames Valley Area	Elmvale	Simcoe County Area
Baden	Waterloo Area	Embrun	Upper Canada Area
Bancroft	Hastings-Limestone Area	Englehart	Ontario North East Area
Barrie	Barrie	Erin	Upper Grand Area
Barry's Bay	Renfrew County Area	Espanola	Rainbow Area
Beamsville	Niagara Area	Essex	Greater Essex Area
Belle River	Greater Essex Area	Exeter	Avon Maitland Area
Belleville	Hastings-Limestone Area	Fenelon Falls	Trillium Lakelands Area
Blackstock	Durham Area	Fergus	Upper Grand Area
Blenheim	Lambton Kent Area	Flesherton	Bluewater Area
Blind River	Algoma Area	Fonthill	Niagara Area
Bolton	Peel Area	Forest	Lambton Kent Area
Bowmanville	Kawartha Pine Ridge Area	Fort Erie	Niagara Area
Bracebridge	Trillium Lakelands Area	Fort Frances	Kenora Area
Bradford	Simcoe County Area	Gananoque	Upper Canada Area
Brampton	Peel Area	Georgetown	Halton Area
Brantford	Brantford	Geraldton	Superior-Greenstone Area
Brighton	Kawartha Pine Ridge Area	Glencoe	Thames Valley Area
Brockville	Upper Canada Area	Gloucester	Ottawa
Brunssum	Overseas	Goderich	Avon Maitland Area
Burlington	Halton Area	Gravenhurst	Trillium Lakelands Area
Caledon	Peel Area	Grimsby	Niagara Area
Caledon East	Peel Area	Guelph	Upper Grand Area
Caledonia	Grand Erie Area	Hagersville	Grand Erie Area
Cambridge	Waterloo Area	Haliburton	Trillium Lakelands Area
Campbellford	Kawartha Pine Ridge Area	Hamilton	Hamilton-Wentworth Area
Cannington	Durham Area	Hammond	Upper Canada Area
Carleton Place	Upper Canada Area	Hanmer	Rainbow Area
Casselman	Upper Canada Area	Hanover	Bluewater Area
Cayuga	Grand Erie Area	Harrow	Greater Essex Area
Chatham	Lambton Kent Area	Hawkesbury	Upper Canada Area
Chelmsford	Rainbow Area	Hearst	Ontario North East Area
Chesley	Bluewater Area	Huntsville	Trillium Lakelands Area
Chesterville	Upper Canada Area	Ingersoll	Thames Valley Area
Clinton	Avon Maitland Area	Ingleside	Upper Canada Area
Cobourg	Kawartha Pine Ridge Area	Innisfil	Simcoe County Area
Cochrane	Ontario North East Area	Iroquois	Upper Canada Area
Collingwood	Simcoe County Area	Iroquois Falls	Ontario North East Area
Cornwall	Upper Canada Area	Kanata	Ottawa

List of cities and geographical areas

City	Geographical area	City	Geographical area
Kapuskasing	Ontario North East Area	Parry Sound	Near North Area
Kemptville	Upper Canada Area	Pembroke	Renfrew County Area
Kenora	Kenora Area	Penetanguishene	Simcoe County Area
Keswick	York Area	Perth	Upper Canada Area
Kincardine	Bluewater Area	Petawawa	Renfrew County Area
King City	York Area	Peterborough	Kawartha Pine Ridge Area
Kingston	Kingston	Petrolia	Lambton Kent Area
Kingsville	Greater Essex Area	Pickering	Durham Area
Kirkland Lake	Ontario North East Area	Picton	Hastings-Limestone Area
Kitchener	Kitchener	Plantagenet	Upper Canada Area
Lakefield	Kawartha Pine Ridge Area	Port Colborne	Niagara Area
Langton	Grand Erie Area	Port Dover	Grand Erie Area
LaSalle	Greater Essex Area	Port Elgin	Bluewater Area
Leamington	Greater Essex Area	Port Hope	Kawartha Pine Ridge Area
Lindsay	Kawartha Pine Ridge Area	Port Perry	Durham Area
Lion's Head	Bluewater Area	Prescott	Upper Canada Area
Listowel	Avon Maitland Area	Rainy River	Kenora Area
Lively	Rainbow Area	Red Lake	Kenora Area
London	London	Red Rock	Lakehead Area
Madoc	Hastings-Limestone Area	Renfrew	Renfrew County Area
Manotick	Ottawa	Richmond	Ottawa
Maple	York Area	Richmond Hill	York Area
Marathon	Superior-Greenstone Area	Ridgetown	Lambton Kent Area
Markham	York Area	Ridgeway	Niagara Area
M'Chigeeng	Rainbow Area	Rockland	Upper Canada Area
Meaford	Bluewater Area	Russell	Upper Canada Area
Metcalfe	Ottawa	Sarnia	Lambton Kent Area
Midland	Simcoe County Area	Sault Ste. Marie	Algoma Area
Milton	Halton Area	Sharbot Lake	Hastings-Limestone Area
Mississauga	Mississauga	Shelburne	Upper Grand Area
Mitchell	Avon Maitland Area	Simcoe	Grand Erie Area
Moosonee	Ontario North East Area	Sioux Lookout	Kenora Area
Mount Forest	Upper Grand Area	Smiths Falls	Upper Canada Area
Napanee	Hastings-Limestone Area	Smithville	Niagara Area
Nepean	Ottawa	South Porcupine	Ontario North East Area
New Liskeard	Ontario North East Area	South River	Near North Area
Newcastle	Kawartha Pine Ridge Area	St Catharines	St Catharines
Newmarket	York Area	St Marys	Avon Maitland Area
Niagara Falls	Niagara Area	St Thomas	Thames Valley Area
North Bay	Near North Area	Stayner	Simcoe County Area
Norwood	Kawartha Pine Ridge Area	Stittsville	Ottawa
Oakville	Halton Area	Stoney Creek	Hamilton-Wentworth Area
Odessa	Hastings-Limestone Area	Stouffville	York Area
Orangeville	Upper Grand Area	Stratford	Avon Maitland Area
Orillia	Simcoe County Area	Strathroy	Thames Valley Area
Orléans	Ottawa	Sturgeon Falls	Near North Area
Oshawa	Durham Area	Sudbury	Rainbow Area
Ottawa	Ottawa	Sutton West	York Area
Owen Sound	Bluewater Area	Sydenham	Hastings-Limestone Area
Pain Court	Lambton Kent Area	Tecumseh	Greater Essex Area
Palmerston	Upper Grand Area	Thornhill	York Area
Paris	Grand Erie Area	Thorold	Niagara Area
Parkhill	Thames Valley Area	Thunder Bay	Lakehead Area

List of cities and geographical areas

City	Geographical area
Tilbury	Lambton Kent Area
Tillsonburg	Thames Valley Area
Timmins	Ontario North East Area
Toronto	Toronto
Tottenham	Simcoe County Area
Trenton	Hastings-Limestone Area
Unionville	York Area
Uxbridge	Durham Area
Val Caron	Rainbow Area
Vankleek Hill	Upper Canada Area
Walkerton	Bluewater Area
Wallaceburg	Lambton Kent Area
Waterdown	Hamilton-Wentworth Area

City	Geographical area
Waterford	Grand Erie Area
Waterloo	Waterloo Area
Welland	Niagara Area
West Lorne	Thames Valley Area
Whitby	Durham Area
Warton	Bluewater Area
Wikwemikong	Rainbow Area
Williamstown	Upper Canada Area
Windsor	Greater Essex Area
Wingham	Avon Maitland Area
Woodbridge	York Area
Woodstock	Thames Valley Area

Index of geographical areas

Geographical area	Page
Algoma Area	51
Avon Maitland Area	33
Barrie	51
Bluewater Area	52
Brantford	33
Durham Area	18
Grand Erie Area	34
Greater Essex Area	34
Halton Area	19
Hamilton-Wentworth Area	36
Hastings-Limestone Area	44
Kawartha Pine Ridge Area	52
Kenora Area	54
Kingston	45
Kitchener	37
Lakehead Area	54
Lambton Kent Area	37
London	38
Mississauga	20

Geographical area	Page
Near North Area	55
Niagara Area	39
Ontario North East Area	55
Ottawa	45
Overseas	59
Peel Area	22
Rainbow Area	56
Renfrew County Area	48
Simcoe County Area	57
St Catharines	40
Superior-Greenstone Area	58
Thames Valley Area	41
Toronto	24
Trillium Lakelands Area	58
Upper Canada Area	48
Upper Grand Area	42
Waterloo Area	43
York Area	30

Table for Monsignor Paul Dwyer [Catholic] Oshawa. OSSLT count: 334. Includes ESL (%), Special needs (%), and Academic Performance metrics for 2008-2012.

Table for Port Perry [Public] Port Perry. OSSLT count: 279. Includes ESL (%), Special needs (%), and Academic Performance metrics for 2008-2012.

HALTON AREA

Table for Abbey Park [Public] Oakville. OSSLT count: 323. Includes ESL (%), Special needs (%), and Academic Performance metrics for 2008-2012.

Table for Notre Dame [Catholic] Ajax. OSSLT count: 468. Includes ESL (%), Special needs (%), and Academic Performance metrics for 2008-2012.

Table for R S McLaughlin [Public] Oshawa. OSSLT count: 292. Includes ESL (%), Special needs (%), and Academic Performance metrics for 2008-2012.

Table for Acton [Public] Acton. OSSLT count: 153. Includes ESL (%), Special needs (%), and Academic Performance metrics for 2008-2012.

Table for O'Neill [Public] Oshawa. OSSLT count: 313. Includes ESL (%), Special needs (%), and Academic Performance metrics for 2008-2012.

Table for Saint-Charles-Garnier [Catholic] Whitby. OSSLT count: 93. Includes ESL (%), Special needs (%), and Academic Performance metrics for 2008-2012.

Table for Aldershot [Public] Burlington. OSSLT count: 122. Includes ESL (%), Special needs (%), and Academic Performance metrics for 2008-2012.

Table for Oshawa Central [Public] Oshawa. OSSLT count: 151. Includes ESL (%), Special needs (%), and Academic Performance metrics for 2008-2012.

Table for Sinclair [Public] Whitby. OSSLT count: 494. Includes ESL (%), Special needs (%), and Academic Performance metrics for 2008-2012.

Table for Assumption [Catholic] Burlington. OSSLT count: 250. Includes ESL (%), Special needs (%), and Academic Performance metrics for 2008-2012.

Table for Pickering [Public] Ajax. OSSLT count: 572. Includes ESL (%), Special needs (%), and Academic Performance metrics for 2008-2012.

Table for St Mary [Catholic] Pickering. OSSLT count: 437. Includes ESL (%), Special needs (%), and Academic Performance metrics for 2008-2012.

Table for Bishop Paul Francis Reding [Catholic] Milton. OSSLT count: 446. Includes ESL (%), Special needs (%), and Academic Performance metrics for 2008-2012.

Table for Pine Ridge [Public] Pickering. OSSLT count: 407. Includes ESL (%), Special needs (%), and Academic Performance metrics for 2008-2012.

Table for Uxbridge [Public] Uxbridge. OSSLT count: 383. Includes ESL (%), Special needs (%), and Academic Performance metrics for 2008-2012.

Table for Burlington Central [Public] Burlington. OSSLT count: 204. Includes ESL (%), Special needs (%), and Academic Performance metrics for 2008-2012.

Ascension of Our Lord [Catholic] Mississauga OSSLT count: 242
ESL (%): 23.6
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$46,400: 0.8
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.2 2.5 2.8 2.7 2.8 ▲
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Apld) 1.6 2.0 1.9 2.2 2.3 ▲
OSSLT passed (%)-FTE 72.7 78.1 77.4 79.9 78.1 ▲
OSSLT passed (%)-PE 52.4 42.4 60.0 70.6 72.7 ▲
Tests below standard (%) 46.3 36.8 31.4 29.3 28.8 ▲
Gender gap (level)-Math M 0.1 M 0.2 F 0.2 M 0.2 E —
Gender gap OSSLT F 7.7 F 0.8 F 3.7 F 1.4 M 7.3 —
Gr 9 tests not written (%) 3.6 0.6 0.0 0.0 0.5 —
Overall rating out of 10 3.5 4.6 5.2 5.6 5.9 ▲

Gordon Graydon Memorial [Public] Mississauga OSSLT count: 327
ESL (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$77,900: 2.2
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 3.1 3.1 3.2 3.1 3.3 —
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Apld) 2.7 2.6 1.7 2.3 2.0 —
OSSLT passed (%)-FTE 96.8 89.4 95.2 92.7 96.1 —
OSSLT passed (%)-PE 31.9 25.0 20.5 30.3 18.9 —
Tests below standard (%) 16.5 15.7 12.8 13.5 11.3 ▲
Gender gap (level)-Math M 0.2 E M 0.2 E E —
Gender gap OSSLT F 3.7 F 10.9 M 0.7 M 5.2 F 3.1 —
Gr 9 tests not written (%) 2.0 1.2 0.4 0.4 1.3 —
Overall rating out of 10 8.4 7.6 8.0 7.9 8.4 —

Lorne Park [Public] Mississauga OSSLT count: 286
ESL (%): n/a
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$163,000: -0.6
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.9 3.0 2.9 3.0 3.1 —
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Apld) 2.5 2.2 n/a 2.6 2.4 n/a
OSSLT passed (%)-FTE 97.2 96.7 92.5 97.3 95.1 —
OSSLT passed (%)-PE 85.2 95.2 80.0 70.8 n/a n/a
Tests below standard (%) 10.4 10.7 12.6 8.4 8.6 —
Gender gap (level)-Math M 0.1 M 0.1 F 0.2 E E —
Gender gap OSSLT F 5.0 M 0.5 F 7.7 F 5.5 F 2.2 —
Gr 9 tests not written (%) 0.3 1.0 0.8 0.0 0.0 —
Overall rating out of 10 8.7 8.3 7.3 8.5 8.4 —

Cawthra Park [Public] Mississauga OSSLT count: 356
ESL (%): 0.6
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$87,900: 1.5
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.9 2.9 3.0 3.0 3.0 ▲
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Apld) 2.0 2.4 2.2 2.6 2.5 —
OSSLT passed (%)-FTE 96.7 96.0 95.2 95.5 93.1 —
OSSLT passed (%)-PE 94.1 75.0 70.8 77.3 61.9 —
Tests below standard (%) 12.5 13.9 12.7 9.8 11.9 —
Gender gap (level)-Math M 0.1 M 0.3 E E F 0.1 —
Gender gap OSSLT F 4.6 F 0.7 F 3.5 F 1.9 F 5.2 —
Gr 9 tests not written (%) 2.1 0.3 0.0 0.2 0.9 —
Overall rating out of 10 8.4 7.7 7.9 8.3 8.0 —

Iona [Catholic] Mississauga OSSLT count: 307
ESL (%): n/a
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$100,500: 0.7
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.7 2.8 2.9 2.9 3.0 ▲
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Apld) 2.3 2.2 2.5 2.5 2.4 —
OSSLT passed (%)-FTE 87.4 86.7 86.0 88.0 88.4 —
OSSLT passed (%)-PE n/a 66.7 58.3 63.2 n/a n/a
Tests below standard (%) 21.6 23.7 17.7 14.3 14.2 ▲
Gender gap (level)-Math M 0.1 E E E M 0.1 —
Gender gap OSSLT F 5.2 F 9.7 F 6.7 F 7.1 F 6.1 —
Gr 9 tests not written (%) 1.7 1.8 1.3 0.6 0.8 —
Overall rating out of 10 7.0 6.5 7.0 7.6 7.6 ▲

Loyola [Catholic] Mississauga OSSLT count: 320
ESL (%): 13.4
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$96,500: 0.8
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.8 2.7 2.7 3.0 3.1 —
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Apld) 2.1 2.0 2.2 2.2 2.5 —
OSSLT passed (%)-FTE 88.2 89.0 90.1 85.2 87.3 —
OSSLT passed (%)-PE 64.9 70.5 65.5 52.9 70.3 —
Tests below standard (%) 23.1 24.9 22.3 19.8 16.0 —
Gender gap (level)-Math F 0.1 E F 0.1 E M 0.1 —
Gender gap OSSLT F 4.8 F 3.5 F 2.2 F 8.2 F 0.6 —
Gr 9 tests not written (%) 2.3 1.0 0.4 1.8 1.0 —
Overall rating out of 10 7.0 6.5 6.5 6.9 7.6 —

Clarkson [Public] Mississauga OSSLT count: 282
ESL (%): 10.6
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$80,600: 0.6
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.7 2.7 2.9 2.9 3.0 ▲
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Apld) 2.2 2.2 1.9 2.1 2.5 —
OSSLT passed (%)-FTE 79.8 87.1 83.3 87.4 83.4 —
OSSLT passed (%)-PE 47.2 47.7 59.6 66.7 59.1 ▲
Tests below standard (%) 32.4 27.3 23.9 24.0 19.3 ▲
Gender gap (level)-Math F 0.1 M 0.1 M 0.2 M 0.2 F 0.1 —
Gender gap OSSLT F 2.4 F 4.5 F 8.9 F 9.7 F 14.9 ▼
Gr 9 tests not written (%) 2.9 1.4 1.6 0.0 0.5 —
Overall rating out of 10 6.1 6.2 6.2 6.5 6.8 ▲

ISNA [Private] Mississauga OSSLT count: 47
ESL (%): n/a
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$ n/a: n/a
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) n/a n/a n/a n/a 2.9 n/a
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Apld) n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a
OSSLT passed (%)-FTE n/a n/a n/a n/a 91.3 n/a
OSSLT passed (%)-PE n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a
Tests below standard (%) n/a n/a n/a n/a 10.1 n/a
Gender gap (level)-Math M 0.1 E E M 0.1 n/a n/a
Gender gap OSSLT n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a
Gr 9 tests not written (%) n/a n/a n/a n/a 19.5 n/a
Overall rating out of 10 n/a n/a n/a n/a 7.7 n/a

Meadowvale [Public] Mississauga OSSLT count: 429
ESL (%): 5.8
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$83,200: 0.3
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.6 2.6 2.8 2.9 2.8 —
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Apld) 2.3 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.7 —
OSSLT passed (%)-FTE 89.7 90.2 86.6 86.2 81.9 ▼
OSSLT passed (%)-PE 61.8 49.3 59.2 61.5 62.9 —
Tests below standard (%) 24.9 22.6 23.4 19.0 22.4 —
Gender gap (level)-Math F 0.1 E M 0.1 M 0.1 M 0.1 —
Gender gap OSSLT F 7.8 F 3.9 F 1.9 F 3.6 F 10.6 —
Gr 9 tests not written (%) 2.1 1.4 0.8 1.9 1.8 —
Overall rating out of 10 6.6 6.7 6.6 7.2 6.6 —

Erdale [Public] Mississauga OSSLT count: 377
ESL (%): 23.3
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$98,100: -0.8
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.7 2.8 2.9 2.8 2.9 —
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Apld) 2.4 2.0 2.4 2.3 2.5 —
OSSLT passed (%)-FTE 88.1 89.3 86.4 85.2 75.2 —
OSSLT passed (%)-PE 69.1 66.7 42.6 53.6 58.7 —
Tests below standard (%) 22.6 22.3 24.0 26.9 25.8 ▼
Gender gap (level)-Math M 0.1 E E E M 0.2 —
Gender gap OSSLT F 5.4 F 3.8 F 5.9 F 3.4 F 0.1 —
Gr 9 tests not written (%) 0.9 1.3 1.6 1.1 0.9 —
Overall rating out of 10 7.2 6.8 6.5 6.3 6.0 ▼

John Cabot [Catholic] Mississauga OSSLT count: 270
ESL (%): 11.9
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$62,500: 2.0
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.8 2.7 3.0 3.1 3.1 —
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Apld) 2.2 1.9 2.3 2.4 2.4 —
OSSLT passed (%)-FTE 86.6 89.8 82.8 88.7 86.2 —
OSSLT passed (%)-PE 57.9 63.9 45.2 55.6 56.3 —
Tests below standard (%) 23.7 27.3 22.8 16.9 15.5 —
Gender gap (level)-Math M 0.1 E M 0.1 F 0.1 E —
Gender gap OSSLT F 8.0 F 5.9 F 7.1 F 1.8 F 5.5 —
Gr 9 tests not written (%) 0.4 1.2 1.2 1.3 1.2 ▼
Overall rating out of 10 6.9 6.4 6.6 7.7 7.6 ▲

Mississauga [Public] Mississauga OSSLT count: 526
ESL (%): 8.6
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$74,300: 1.4
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.8 2.8 2.9 2.9 3.1 —
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Apld) 2.1 2.3 2.1 2.6 2.6 —
OSSLT passed (%)-FTE 84.8 88.4 78.0 85.8 85.8 —
OSSLT passed (%)-PE 54.9 58.8 52.3 53.3 51.6 —
Tests below standard (%) 23.4 22.4 27.0 21.6 18.4 —
Gender gap (level)-Math M 0.1 M 0.1 M 0.1 E E —
Gender gap OSSLT F 5.3 F 2.7 F 11.8 F 12.1 F 2.5 —
Gr 9 tests not written (%) 0.3 0.7 0.8 0.2 1.2 —
Overall rating out of 10 7.0 6.7 5.6 6.8 7.4 —

Father Michael Goetz [Catholic] Mississauga OSSLT count: 552
ESL (%): 17.8
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$52,900: 1.8
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.7 2.8 3.0 2.9 2.9 —
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Apld) 1.9 2.1 2.3 2.4 2.6 ▲
OSSLT passed (%)-FTE 84.3 84.4 84.9 84.7 85.9 —
OSSLT passed (%)-PE 63.8 76.1 51.2 57.8 57.5 —
Tests below standard (%) 28.7 26.5 24.4 22.0 20.0 —
Gender gap (level)-Math M 0.1 M 0.2 M 0.1 E M 0.1 —
Gender gap OSSLT F 3.3 F 7.8 F 7.5 F 7.1 F 2.3 —
Gr 9 tests not written (%) 2.8 4.6 3.2 0.5 0.0 —
Overall rating out of 10 6.5 6.3 6.5 6.9 7.1 ▲

John Fraser [Public] Mississauga OSSLT count: 423
ESL (%): 14.4
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$87,800: 1.3
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 3.1 3.1 3.2 3.1 3.0 ▼
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Apld) 3.2 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.5 ▼
OSSLT passed (%)-FTE 90.8 95.8 90.6 90.9 89.5 —
OSSLT passed (%)-PE 71.1 64.1 62.5 74.6 78.8 —
Tests below standard (%) 9.8 13.8 13.2 12.4 14.9 ▼
Gender gap (level)-Math M 0.1 M 0.1 M 0.1 E M 0.1 —
Gender gap OSSLT F 3.3 F 7.2 F 6.1 F 0.9 F 6.0 —
Gr 9 tests not written (%) 0.0 0.7 0.3 0.7 1.1 ▼
Overall rating out of 10 9.2 8.4 8.0 8.2 7.8 ▼

Our Lady of Mount Carmel [Catholic] Mississauga OSSLT count: 562
ESL (%): 8.5
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$87,400: 1.1
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.8 2.9 2.9 3.0 3.0 —
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Apld) 2.5 2.5 2.4 2.5 2.5 —
OSSLT passed (%)-FTE 91.6 90.4 89.0 92.1 91.3 —
OSSLT passed (%)-PE 52.4 65.4 62.1 55.8 61.9 —
Tests below standard (%) 17.7 17.4 17.7 15.1 15.4 —
Gender gap (level)-Math E E E M 0.1 M 0.1 ▼
Gender gap OSSLT F 4.8 F 14.2 F 4.7 F 6.1 F 6.3 —
Gr 9 tests not written (%) 0.7 0.9 0.9 2.1 1.0 —
Overall rating out of 10 7.9 7.3 7.2 7.7 7.6 —

Glenforest [Public] Mississauga OSSLT count: 465
ESL (%): 24.7
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$61,000: 2.1
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 3.1 3.1 3.1 3.2 3.2 —
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Apld) 2.2 2.2 2.3 2.5 2.1 —
OSSLT passed (%)-FTE 92.4 88.5 91.3 86.7 91.0 —
OSSLT passed (%)-PE 57.9 62.0 56.5 86.9 45.3 —
Tests below standard (%) 18.8 18.1 17.7 15.6 17.8 —
Gender gap (level)-Math M 0.2 M 0.2 E M 0.1 M 0.1 —
Gender gap OSSLT F 7.4 F 0.4 F 5.5 F 1.4 F 4.3 —
Gr 9 tests not written (%) 1.5 0.5 0.8 1.1 0.3 —
Overall rating out of 10 8.0 7.6 7.6 7.9 7.7 —

Lincoln M Alexander [Public] Mississauga OSSLT count: 528
ESL (%): 29.2
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$44,100: -0.6
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.8 2.8 2.8 2.6 2.8 —
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Apld) 2.4 2.1 2.0 1.7 2.1 ▼
OSSLT passed (%)-FTE 64.6 64.8 63.5 64.0 66.7 —
OSSLT passed (%)-PE 35.4 36.9 31.4 36.6 42.4 —
Tests below standard (%) 41.7 43.6 46.8 49.0 40.3 —
Gender gap (level)-Math M 0.1 M 0.3 M 0.1 F 0.1 M 0.1 —
Gender gap OSSLT F 7.5 F 9.3 E F 24.6 F 6.0 —
Gr 9 tests not written (%) 12.0 8.5 5.5 4.5 4.4 —
Overall rating out of 10 4.6 3.8 3.8 3.0 4.4 —

Philip Pocock [Catholic] Mississauga OSSLT count: 445
ESL (%): 23.8
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$67,700: 1.2
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.8 2.9 2.9 3.0 3.1 —
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Apld) 2.5 2.3 2.4 2.4 2.7 —
OSSLT passed (%)-FTE 89.8 88.2 86.0 85.9 81.6 ▼
OSSLT passed (%)-PE 56.7 63.9 56.0 53.9 47.8 —
Tests below standard (%) 20.3 20.6 22.3 21.1 20.4 —
Gender gap (level)-Math M 0.2 E E M 0.2 F 0.1 —
Gender gap OSSLT F 5.9 F 5.6 F 16.0 F 5.9 F 8.1 —
Gr 9 tests not written (%) 2.7 2.5 0.7 0.9 2.0 —
Overall rating out of 10 7.4 7.2 6.6 7.0 7.0 —

Lawrence Park [Public] Toronto OSSLT count: 308
ESL (%): 0.6
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$255,000: -3.7
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Overall rating out of 10 9.3 8.1 7.9 8.1 8.4

Malvern [Public] Toronto OSSLT count: 274
ESL (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$136,500: 0.2
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Overall rating out of 10 8.3 8.2 8.1 7.9 8.3

Monarch Park [Public] Toronto OSSLT count: 348
ESL (%): 31.6
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$64,900: 0.2
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Overall rating out of 10 3.7 5.0 5.4 6.7 5.9

Leaside [Public] Toronto OSSLT count: 265
ESL (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$169,700: -1.0
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Overall rating out of 10 9.1 8.6 8.0 8.2 8.3

Marc Garneau [Public] Toronto OSSLT count: 761
ESL (%): 26.1
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$31,000: 0.8
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Overall rating out of 10 5.1 4.9 5.4 4.9 5.4

Monseigneur-de-Charbonnel [Catholic] Toronto OSSLT count: 95
ESL (%): 14.7
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$53,300: 1.4
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Overall rating out of 10 8.6 5.9 7.2 6.8 6.7

Lester B Pearson [Public] Toronto OSSLT count: 530
ESL (%): 7.2
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$48,400: 0.9
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Overall rating out of 10 4.9 5.7 5.8 6.1 6.1

Marshall McLuhan [Catholic] Toronto OSSLT count: 334
ESL (%): 19.8
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$66,400: 0.9
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Overall rating out of 10 5.6 6.6 5.6 6.1 6.7

Monsignor Percy Johnson [Catholic] Toronto OSSLT count: 360
ESL (%): 8.1
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$45,900: 0.0
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Overall rating out of 10 3.1 4.6 3.9 4.5 5.1

Loretto [Catholic] Toronto OSSLT count: 121
ESL (%): n/a
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$47,700: -1.6
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Overall rating out of 10 3.4 4.0 4.4 3.3 3.5

Martingrove [Public] Toronto OSSLT count: 344
ESL (%): 9.6
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$86,400: 0.5
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Overall rating out of 10 7.4 7.6 6.4 7.2 6.9

Neil McNeil [Catholic] Toronto OSSLT count: 221
ESL (%): 17.6
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$63,800: 2.4
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Overall rating out of 10 8.6 8.2 8.3 8.9 8.1

Loretto Abbey [Catholic] Toronto OSSLT count: 255
ESL (%): 20.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$91,100: 0.7
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Overall rating out of 10 6.9 7.8 7.5 7.8 7.3

Mary Ward [Catholic] Toronto OSSLT count: 302
ESL (%): 12.6
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$52,700: 2.6
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Overall rating out of 10 7.3 8.4 8.1 8.1 7.9

Nelson A Boylen [Public] Toronto OSSLT count: 128
ESL (%): 21.9
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$35,400: -4.7
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Overall rating out of 10 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0

Madonna [Catholic] Toronto OSSLT count: 188
ESL (%): 45.2
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$42,800: 1.6
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Overall rating out of 10 4.2 4.2 3.7 4.5 6.6

Michael Power/St Joseph [Catholic] Toronto OSSLT count: 630
ESL (%): 5.7
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$91,500: 0.3
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Overall rating out of 10 8.5 7.8 8.0 7.4 6.9

Newtonbrook [Public] Toronto OSSLT count: 415
ESL (%): 34.9
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$48,900: 0.4
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Overall rating out of 10 5.5 6.3 5.3 6.0 5.6

J Brennan [Catholic] Windsor OSSLT count: 220
ESL (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$63,700: 2.0
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.9 2.9 3.0 2.9 2.9

Kingsville [Public] Kingsville OSSLT count: 169
ESL (%): n/a
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$71,800: 2.1
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.7 2.8 2.9 2.9 3.0

St Joseph's [Catholic] Windsor OSSLT count: 344
ESL (%): 2.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$66,300: 0.4
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.7 2.7 3.0 2.7 2.7

General Amherst [Public] Amherstburg OSSLT count: 210
ESL (%): 0.5
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$100,700: -0.2
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.8 2.8 3.0 2.8 2.9

Leamington [Public] Leamington OSSLT count: 341
ESL (%): 5.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$65,000: 1.4
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.9 2.8 2.9 3.0 3.1

St Thomas of Villanova [Catholic] LaSalle OSSLT count: 330
ESL (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$98,100: -0.1
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.7 2.6 3.1 3.0 2.9

Harrow [Public] Harrow OSSLT count: 65
ESL (%): n/a
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$89,200: -0.9
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.7 2.5 2.7 2.8 3.0

l'Essor [Catholic] Tecumseh OSSLT count: 171
ESL (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$85,700: -0.1
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.8 2.6 2.9 2.6 2.9

Vincent Massey [Public] Windsor OSSLT count: 441
ESL (%): n/a
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$85,300: 1.3
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.9 3.0 2.9 3.1 3.1

Holy Names [Catholic] Windsor OSSLT count: 406
ESL (%): 1.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$91,400: 0.6
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.7 2.7 2.9 2.8 2.9

Riverside [Public] Windsor OSSLT count: 236
ESL (%): n/a
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$64,100: -0.5
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.8 2.8 2.7 2.8 2.8

W F Herman [Public] Windsor OSSLT count: 231
ESL (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$52,800: 0.1
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.5 2.5 2.8 2.7 2.8

Hon W C Kennedy [Public] Windsor OSSLT count: 269
ESL (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$52,600: -0.7
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.6 2.7 2.6 2.5 2.3

Sandwich [Public] LaSalle OSSLT count: 283
ESL (%): 1.4
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$97,800: -0.4
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.9 2.9 3.0 2.9 2.9

Walkerville [Public] Windsor OSSLT count: 272
ESL (%): 0.0
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$64,700: 1.6
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.4 2.4 2.7 2.8 2.9

John L Forster [Public] Windsor OSSLT count: 251
ESL (%): 59.4
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$36,800: -4.4
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.6 2.3 2.5 2.7 2.5

St Anne [Catholic] Tecumseh OSSLT count: 409
ESL (%): 0.2
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$100,800: 0.9
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) 2.9 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0

Western [Public] Amherstburg OSSLT count: 74
ESL (%): n/a
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$79,700: -3.0
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad) n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a

Sir Winston Churchill [Public] Hamilton OSSLT count: 379

Westmount [Public] Hamilton OSSLT count: 333

Kitchener Waterloo [Public] Kitchener OSSLT count: 337

St Jean de Brebeuf [Catholic] Hamilton OSSLT count: 489

KITCHENER Cameron Heights [Public] Kitchener OSSLT count: 519

Resurrection [Catholic] Kitchener OSSLT count: 412

St Mary's [Catholic] Hamilton OSSLT count: 291

Eastwood [Public] Kitchener OSSLT count: 557

St Mary's [Catholic] Kitchener OSSLT count: 667

St Thomas More [Catholic] Hamilton OSSLT count: 563

Forest Heights [Public] Kitchener OSSLT count: 532

LAMBTON KENT AREA Alexander Mackenzie [Public] Sarnia OSSLT count: 172

Waterdown [Public] Waterdown OSSLT count: 310

Grand River [Public] Kitchener OSSLT count: 466

Blenheim [Public] Blenheim OSSLT count: 130

Westdale [Public] Hamilton OSSLT count: 501

Huron Heights [Public] Kitchener OSSLT count: 340

Chatham-Kent [Public] Chatham OSSLT count: 334

Mother Teresa [Catholic] Nepean OSSLT count: 286
ESL (%): 7.0
Special needs (%): 16.8
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$97,400: 1.5
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend

Rideau [Public] Ottawa OSSLT count: 297
ESL (%): 63.3
Special needs (%): 22.6
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$39,100: -4.0
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend

South Carleton [Public] Richmond OSSLT count: 388
ESL (%): 0.8
Special needs (%): 24.2
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$114,000: -0.1
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend

Nepean [Public] Ottawa OSSLT count: 303
ESL (%): 5.0
Special needs (%): 19.1
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$108,100: 1.3
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend

Ridgmont [Public] Ottawa OSSLT count: 302
ESL (%): 39.4
Special needs (%): 15.2
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$49,600: -1.4
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend

St Francis Xavier [Catholic] Gloucester OSSLT count: 273
ESL (%): 0.0
Special needs (%): 21.6
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$97,100: 0.3
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend

Notre Dame [Catholic] Ottawa OSSLT count: 191
ESL (%): 17.8
Special needs (%): 22.5
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$60,400: -0.2
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend

Sacred Heart [Catholic] Stittsville OSSLT count: 322
ESL (%): 0.0
Special needs (%): 23.9
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$114,900: -0.3
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend

St Joseph [Catholic] Nepean OSSLT count: 192
ESL (%): n/a
Special needs (%): n/a
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$133,700: 0.2
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend

Osgoode Township [Public] Metcalfe OSSLT count: 195
ESL (%): 0.5
Special needs (%): 28.7
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$95,500: 0.1
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend

Samuel-Genest [Catholic] Ottawa OSSLT count: 256
ESL (%): 14.5
Special needs (%): 27.3
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$61,500: 1.4
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend

St Mark [Catholic] Manotick OSSLT count: 213
ESL (%): 0.0
Special needs (%): 24.9
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$124,600: -0.5
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend

Ottawa Technical Learning Centre [Public] Ottawa OSSLT count: 122
ESL (%): n/a
Special needs (%): n/a
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$65,800: -4.5
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend

Sir Robert Borden [Public] Nepean OSSLT count: 257
ESL (%): 6.2
Special needs (%): 24.9
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$101,400: 0.6
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend

St Matthew [Catholic] Orléans OSSLT count: 254
ESL (%): 0.0
Special needs (%): 27.2
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$100,200: 0.1
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend

Pierre-Savard [Catholic] Nepean OSSLT count: 110
ESL (%): 0.0
Special needs (%): 13.6
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$119,700: -2.3
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend

Sir Wilfrid Laurier [Public] Orléans OSSLT count: 307
ESL (%): 5.5
Special needs (%): 17.9
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$103,700: 0.3
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend

St Patrick's [Catholic] Ottawa OSSLT count: 363
ESL (%): 13.5
Special needs (%): 18.7
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$57,400: -1.3
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend

Westgate [Public] Thunder Bay OSSLT count: 281
ESL (%): 0.4 Special needs (%): 26.3
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$73,300: -1.3
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend

Northern [Public] Sturgeon Falls OSSLT count: 69
ESL (%): n/a Special needs (%): n/a
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$50,400: -3.4
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend

Cochrane [Public] Cochrane OSSLT count: 58
ESL (%): n/a Special needs (%): n/a
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$97,900: -5.6
Academic Performance 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 Trend

NEAR NORTH AREA
Algonquin [Catholic] North Bay OSSLT count: 172
ESL (%): 0.6 Special needs (%): 38.4
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$69,200: -0.4

Parry Sound [Public] Parry Sound OSSLT count: 291
ESL (%): 0.3 Special needs (%): 32.6
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$52,500: -0.6

Englehart [Public] Englehart OSSLT count: 46
ESL (%): n/a Special needs (%): n/a
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$56,500: 0.8

Almaguin Highlands [Public] South River OSSLT count: 202
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 37.6
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$56,200: -2.4

St Joseph-Scollard Hall [Catholic] North Bay OSSLT count: 279
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 37.6
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$68,200: 0.5

Hearst [Catholic] Hearst OSSLT count: 75
ESL (%): n/a Special needs (%): n/a
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$44,300: 2.2

Chippewa [Public] North Bay OSSLT count: 98
ESL (%): n/a Special needs (%): n/a
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$64,200: -0.7

West Ferris [Public] North Bay OSSLT count: 192
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 27.1
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$55,200: -1.4

Iroquois Falls [Public] Iroquois Falls OSSLT count: 92
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 31.5
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$53,400: -0.6

Franco-Cité [Catholic] Sturgeon Falls OSSLT count: 67
ESL (%): n/a Special needs (%): n/a
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$54,700: 0.5

Widdifield [Public] North Bay OSSLT count: 260
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 27.7
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$82,100: -0.6

Kapusking [Public] Kapusking OSSLT count: 38
ESL (%): n/a Special needs (%): n/a
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$72,700: -4.1

L'Odysée [Public] North Bay OSSLT count: 18
ESL (%): n/a Special needs (%): n/a
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$66,100: -0.4

ONTARIO NORTH EAST AREA
Cit  des Jeunes [Catholic] Kapusking OSSLT count: 73
ESL (%): n/a Special needs (%): n/a
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$69,500: 0.0

Kirkland Lake District [Public] Kirkland Lake OSSLT count: 176
ESL (%): 0.0 Special needs (%): 36.4
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$64,900: -1.4

Overseas

OVERSEAS

ARNORTH International [Private] Brunssum		OSSLT count: 17				
ESL (%):	n/a	Special needs (%):		n/a		
Actual rating vs predicted based on parents' avg. inc. of \$	n/a: n/a	Rank:	178/725	2011-12	Last 5 Years	
					n/a	
Academic Performance	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Trend
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Acad)	n/a	2.5	n/a	n/a	2.7	n/a
Avg. level Gr 9 Math (Appld)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
OSSLT passed (%)-FTE	n/a	93.8	n/a	n/a	100.0	n/a
OSSLT passed (%)-PE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Tests below standard (%)	n/a	14.0	n/a	n/a	14.3	n/a
Gender gap (level)-Math	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Gender gap OSSLT	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Gr 9 tests not written (%)	n/a	0.0	n/a	n/a	0.0	n/a
Overall rating out of 10	n/a	6.9	n/a	n/a	7.2	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 719) according to their academic performance as measured by the Overall rating out of 10 (shown on the right side of the table) for the school year 2011/2012. 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 fewer than five years of data were available, "n/a" appears in the table.

Not all the province's secondary schools are included in the tables or the ranking. In order to be included, schools must have had, in the school year 2011/2012, at least 15 students who wrote either of the two versions of the grade-9 EQAO math test and at least 15 first-time-eligible or previ-

ously eligible writers of the Ontario Secondary School Literacy Test. Private schools, including federally funded schools operated by the First Nations, are not required to administer the grade-9 EQAO tests. Since the results of these tests are a necessary component of this Report Card, only those private schools that both administered the EQAO tests and allowed the publication of their results could be included.

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	
2011/ Last 5	2012 years			2011/ Last 5	2012 years
1	1	London Central	London	9.6	9.5
2	6	Cardinal Carter Academy for the Arts	Toronto	9.5	9.0
3	5	Colonel By	Gloucester	9.2	9.1
3	161	St Joseph's	Renfrew	9.2	7.2
5	4	Bayview	Richmond Hill	9.1	9.2
5	13	Richmond Hill	Richmond Hill	9.1	8.7
5	45	Holy Name of Mary	Brampton	9.1	8.1
8	2	Pierre Elliott Trudeau	Markham	9.0	9.3
8	2	St Michael	Kemptville	9.0	9.3
8	8	St Robert	Thornhill	9.0	8.9
8	10	St Therese of Lisieux	Richmond Hill	9.0	8.8
8	10	West Carleton	Dunrobin	9.0	8.8
13	8	Oakville Trafalgar	Oakville	8.9	8.9
14	6	Unionville	Unionville	8.8	9.0
14	10	North Toronto	Toronto	8.8	8.8
16	13	St Augustine	Markham	8.7	8.7
16	17	Etobicoke School of the Arts	Toronto	8.7	8.6
16	17	St Aloysius Gonzaga	Mississauga	8.7	8.6

Rank		School name	City	Overall rating	
2011/ Last 5	2012 years			2011/ Last 5	2012 years
16	23	Ursula Franklin	Toronto	8.7	8.4
16	32	Nelson	Burlington	8.7	8.3
16	n/a	St Michael's Choir (Sr)	Toronto	8.7	n/a
22	13	Bur Oak	Markham	8.6	8.7
22	17	Earl of March	Kanata	8.6	8.6
22	n/a	Bill Crothers	Unionville	8.6	n/a
25	17	Abbey Park	Oakville	8.5	8.6
25	23	Nepean	Ottawa	8.5	8.4
25	35	William Lyon Mackenzie	Toronto	8.5	8.2
25	57	St Marcellinus	Mississauga	8.5	8.0
25	108	De La Salle	Ottawa	8.5	7.5
25	141	Jeanne-Lajoie	Pembroke	8.5	7.3
25	161	North Grenville	Kemptville	8.5	7.2
32	23	Iroquois Ridge	Oakville	8.4	8.4
32	23	Lawrence Park	Toronto	8.4	8.4
32	35	Lorne Park	Mississauga	8.4	8.2
32	35	Middlefield	Markham	8.4	8.2
32	45	Gordon Graydon Memorial	Mississauga	8.4	8.1

Rank		School name	City	Overall rating		Rank		School name	City	Overall rating	
2011/ Last 5	2012 years			2011/ Last 5	2012 years	2011/ Last 5	2012 years			2011/ Last 5	2012 years
32	70	R H King	Toronto	8.4	7.8	94	57	Bluevale	Waterloo	7.8	8.0
32	161	St Mary's	Brockville	8.4	7.2	94	70	Newmarket	Newmarket	7.8	7.8
39	17	Lisgar	Ottawa	8.3	8.6	94	89	Br André	Markham	7.8	7.6
39	23	Leaside	Toronto	8.3	8.4	94	89	Cardinal Carter	Aurora	7.8	7.6
39	23	Stratford Central	Stratford	8.3	8.4	94	89	Lester B Pearson	Burlington	7.8	7.6
39	35	Malvern	Toronto	8.3	8.2	94	89	Notre Dame	Burlington	7.8	7.6
39	57	Westmount	Thornhill	8.3	8.0	94	89	St Anne	Tecumseh	7.8	7.6
39	70	Mother Teresa	Nepean	8.3	7.8	94	89	St Peter's	Peterborough	7.8	7.6
39	81	Don Mills	Toronto	8.3	7.7	94	89	Westmount	Hamilton	7.8	7.6
39	89	St Francis Xavier	Mississauga	8.3	7.6	94	125	St Pius X	Ottawa	7.8	7.4
47	22	Guelph	Guelph	8.2	8.5	94	125	St Thomas Aquinas	Oakville	7.8	7.4
47	23	John McCrae	Nepean	8.2	8.4	94	141	Burlington Central	Burlington	7.8	7.3
47	23	St Joseph	Nepean	8.2	8.4	94	141	King City	King City	7.8	7.3
47	35	Thomas A Blakelock	Oakville	8.2	8.2	94	141	Stephen Lewis	Mississauga	7.8	7.3
47	45	Gisèle-Lalonde	Orléans	8.2	8.1	94	161	Milton	Milton	7.8	7.2
47	57	Regiopolis/Notre-Dame	Kingston	8.2	8.0	94	202	Peninsula Shores District	Warton	7.8	7.0
47	57	Sacred Heart	Newmarket	8.2	8.0	111	70	Glenforest	Mississauga	7.7	7.8
47	70	Forest Hill	Toronto	8.2	7.8	111	81	Holy Trinity	Kanata	7.7	7.7
47	108	Rosedale Heights School of the Arts	Toronto	8.2	7.5	111	81	St Elizabeth	Thornhill	7.7	7.7
47	161	Delphi Secondary Alternative	Toronto	8.2	7.2	111	89	Father John Redmond	Toronto	7.7	7.6
47	202	Étienne-Brûlé	Toronto	8.2	7.0	111	89	Holy Trinity	Oakville	7.7	7.6
58	23	Neil McNeil	Toronto	8.1	8.4	111	108	Port Credit	Mississauga	7.7	7.5
58	35	Garneau	Gloucester	8.1	8.2	111	108	Vincent Massey	Windsor	7.7	7.5
58	45	St Ignatius of Loyola	Oakville	8.1	8.1	111	182	Pain Court	Pain Court	7.7	7.1
58	57	Aurora	Aurora	8.1	8.0	111	244	F J Brennan	Windsor	7.7	6.8
58	70	Bishop Allen	Toronto	8.1	7.8	111	n/a	ISNA	Mississauga	7.7	n/a
58	108	Bishop Macdonell	Guelph	8.1	7.5	121	70	Sir Robert Borden	Nepean	7.6	7.8
58	125	Kingsville	Kingsville	8.1	7.4	121	81	Christ the King	Georgetown	7.6	7.7
58	n/a	Bruce Peninsula District	Lion's Head	8.1	n/a	121	81	Sinclair	Whitby	7.6	7.7
58	n/a	Corpus Christi	Burlington	8.1	n/a	121	89	Northern	Sarnia	7.6	7.6
67	35	Centennial	Guelph	8.0	8.2	121	108	Embrun	Embrun	7.6	7.5
67	35	Humberside	Toronto	8.0	8.2	121	108	Our Lady of Mount Carmel	Mississauga	7.6	7.5
67	45	Cawthra Park	Mississauga	8.0	8.1	121	125	de Casselman	Casselman	7.6	7.4
67	45	Elmira	Elmira	8.0	8.1	121	125	Eden	St Catharines	7.6	7.4
67	45	Langstaff	Richmond Hill	8.0	8.1	121	125	Kingston	Kingston	7.6	7.4
67	45	Richview	Toronto	8.0	8.1	121	141	St Christopher	Sarnia	7.6	7.3
67	89	White Oaks	Oakville	8.0	7.6	121	182	Emily Carr	Woodbridge	7.6	7.1
67	422	Le Sommet	Hawkesbury	8.0	5.8	121	182	Iona	Mississauga	7.6	7.1
67	n/a	Longfields Davidson Heights	Nepean	8.0	n/a	121	202	John Cabot	Mississauga	7.6	7.0
76	32	Thornhill	Thornhill	7.9	8.3	121	202	Uxbridge	Uxbridge	7.6	7.0
76	35	Belle River	Belle River	7.9	8.2	121	226	Loyola	Mississauga	7.6	6.9
76	35	Earl Haig	Toronto	7.9	8.2	121	244	South Huron	Exeter	7.6	6.8
76	57	Markham	Markham	7.9	8.0	121	327	St Edmund Campion	Brampton	7.6	6.4
76	57	Mary Ward	Toronto	7.9	8.0	138	45	Marymount	Sudbury	7.5	8.1
76	66	Agincourt	Toronto	7.9	7.9	138	45	Richmond Green	Richmond Hill	7.5	8.1
76	66	Markville	Markham	7.9	7.9	138	45	Sir John A Macdonald	Waterloo	7.5	8.1
76	66	St Joseph's	Cornwall	7.9	7.9	138	81	Brockville	Brockville	7.5	7.7
76	70	Oakridge	London	7.9	7.8	138	125	Jean Vanier	Collingwood	7.5	7.4
76	89	Dr Norman Bethune	Toronto	7.9	7.6	138	161	Northern	Toronto	7.5	7.2
76	89	The Woodlands	Mississauga	7.9	7.6	138	182	Cobourg District CI West	Cobourg	7.5	7.1
76	125	John F Ross	Guelph	7.9	7.4	138	182	Milliken Mills	Unionville	7.5	7.1
76	141	Bishop Paul Francis Reding	Milton	7.9	7.3	138	226	Father Michael McGivney	Markham	7.5	6.9
76	141	Charlottenburgh and Lancaster	Williamstown	7.9	7.3	138	286	Bracebridge and Muskoka Lakes	Bracebridge	7.5	6.6
76	141	St Ignatius	Thunder Bay	7.9	7.3	148	66	Notre Dame	Toronto	7.4	7.9
76	226	Vankleek Hill	Vankleek Hill	7.9	6.9	148	70	Mayfield	Caledon	7.4	7.8
76	244	Victoria Park	Toronto	7.9	6.8	148	141	La Citadelle	Cornwall	7.4	7.3
76	492	Mère-Teresa	Hamilton	7.9	5.4	148	141	Sir William Mulock	Newmarket	7.4	7.3
94	32	John Fraser	Mississauga	7.8	8.3	148	141	St Joseph's	Toronto	7.4	7.3

Rank		School name	City	Overall rating		Rank		School name	City	Overall rating	
2011/ Last 5	2012 years			2011/ Last 5	2012 years	2011/ Last 5	2012 years			2011/ Last 5	2012 years
148	161	Parkside	Dundas	7.4	7.2	193	312	St Patrick's	Sarnia	7.1	6.5
148	182	Blessed Trinity	Grimmsby	7.4	7.1	193	422	Lambton Kent	Dresden	7.1	5.8
148	264	Mississauga	Mississauga	7.4	6.7	193	n/a	St Francis Xavier	Gloucester	7.1	n/a
148	264	Moira	Belleville	7.4	6.7	214	13	Père-René-de-Galinée	Cambridge	7.0	8.7
148	264	St John's	Brantford	7.4	6.7	214	108	Cardinal Newman	Stoney Creek	7.0	7.5
148	264	The Humberview	Bolton	7.4	6.7	214	125	Vaughan	Thornhill	7.0	7.4
148	286	Etobicoke	Toronto	7.4	6.6	214	141	Banting Memorial	Alliston	7.0	7.3
148	286	Gravenhurst	Gravenhurst	7.4	6.6	214	141	Rick Hansen	Mississauga	7.0	7.3
148	481	Bloor	Toronto	7.4	5.5	214	141	Samuel-Genest	Ottawa	7.0	7.3
148	n/a	Cardinal Ambrozic	Brampton	7.4	n/a	214	161	Bayside	Belleville	7.0	7.2
148	n/a	Jean Vanier	Aurora	7.4	n/a	214	182	Waterloo-Oxford	Baden	7.0	7.1
164	70	A B Lucas	London	7.3	7.8	214	202	Philip Pocock	Mississauga	7.0	7.0
164	89	Canterbury	Ottawa	7.3	7.6	214	202	St Mary's	Hamilton	7.0	7.0
164	89	South Carleton	Richmond	7.3	7.6	214	202	St Matthew	Orléans	7.0	7.0
164	89	W A Porter	Toronto	7.3	7.6	214	286	West Hill	Owen Sound	7.0	6.6
164	108	Loretto Abbey	Toronto	7.3	7.5	214	327	North Park	Brampton	7.0	6.4
164	108	Waterdown	Waterdown	7.3	7.5	214	327	Senator O'Connor	Toronto	7.0	6.4
164	125	Assumption	Burlington	7.3	7.4	214	375	Chatham-Kent	Chatham	7.0	6.1
164	161	Sir Frederick Banting	London	7.3	7.2	214	468	La Salle	Kingston	7.0	5.6
164	182	Elliot Lake	Elliot Lake	7.3	7.1	214	n/a	St Maximilian Kolbe	Aurora	7.0	n/a
164	202	Donald A. Wilson	Whitby	7.3	7.0	214	n/a	St. Michael	Bolton	7.0	n/a
164	226	Riverdale	Toronto	7.3	6.9	232	81	Michael Power/St Joseph	Toronto	6.9	7.7
164	226	Sir Wilfrid Laurier	Orléans	7.3	6.9	232	141	Thornlea	Thornhill	6.9	7.3
164	387	L'Héritage	Cornwall	7.3	6.0	232	161	Central Elgin	St Thomas	6.9	7.2
164	468	Walkerville	Windsor	7.3	5.6	232	161	Nicholson	Belleville	6.9	7.2
178	57	All Saints	Kanata	7.2	8.0	232	182	Martingrove	Toronto	6.9	7.1
178	89	St Peter	Orléans	7.2	7.6	232	182	Our Lady of Lourdes	Guelph	6.9	7.1
178	89	Waterloo	Waterloo	7.2	7.6	232	202	Cameron Heights	Kitchener	6.9	7.0
178	108	Hearst	Hearst	7.2	7.5	232	202	Renaissance	Aurora	6.9	7.0
178	108	St Benedict	Sudbury	7.2	7.5	232	202	Resurrection	Kitchener	6.9	7.0
178	108	St Thomas Aquinas	London	7.2	7.5	232	202	Sir John A Macdonald	Toronto	6.9	7.0
178	125	Lockerby	Sudbury	7.2	7.4	232	202	Sir Winston Churchill	St Catharines	6.9	7.0
178	141	Stephen Lewis	Thornhill	7.2	7.3	232	226	Holy Cross	Kingston	6.9	6.9
178	161	St Mark	Manotick	7.2	7.2	232	244	Alexander MacKenzie	Richmond Hill	6.9	6.8
178	226	Norwell	Palmerston	7.2	6.9	232	264	Father Leo J Austin	Whitby	6.9	6.7
178	244	Georgetown	Georgetown	7.2	6.8	232	264	Huntsville	Huntsville	6.9	6.7
178	244	Holy Names	Windsor	7.2	6.8	232	264	North Park	Brantford	6.9	6.7
178	327	Saint Michael	Niagara Falls	7.2	6.4	232	264	Osgoode Township	Metcalfe	6.9	6.7
178	344	St Francis Xavier	Hammond	7.2	6.3	232	286	Atikokan	Atikokan	6.9	6.6
178	n/a	AFNORTH International	Brunssum	7.2	n/a	232	286	Hammarskjold	Thunder Bay	6.9	6.6
193	45	Chesley	Chesley	7.1	8.1	232	312	Central Huron	Clinton	6.9	6.5
193	70	Louis-Riel	Gloucester	7.1	7.8	232	312	Holy Trinity	Courtice	6.9	6.5
193	108	Aldershot	Burlington	7.1	7.5	232	344	Albert Campbell	Toronto	6.9	6.3
193	108	Leamington	Leamington	7.1	7.5	232	492	Nouvelle-Alliance	Barrie	6.9	5.4
193	108	Sacred Heart	Stittsville	7.1	7.5	232	518	Penetanguishene	Penetanguishene	6.9	5.2
193	125	Medway	Arva	7.1	7.4	256	125	Merivale	Nepean	6.8	7.4
193	141	St. Joan of Arc	Mississauga	7.1	7.3	256	125	Saint Paul	Niagara Falls	6.8	7.4
193	161	A.Y. Jackson	Kanata	7.1	7.2	256	141	E L Crossley	Fonthill	6.8	7.3
193	161	Cartwright	Blackstock	7.1	7.2	256	161	Lindsay	Lindsay	6.8	7.2
193	161	Harbord	Toronto	7.1	7.2	256	161	St Marys	St Marys	6.8	7.2
193	182	Port Perry	Port Perry	7.1	7.1	256	161	Streetsville	Mississauga	6.8	7.2
193	202	Glengarry	Alexandria	7.1	7.0	256	182	Highland	Dundas	6.8	7.1
193	202	St Joseph	Mississauga	7.1	7.0	256	182	Preston	Cambridge	6.8	7.1
193	202	St Thomas Aquinas	Kenora	7.1	7.0	256	182	Westdale	Hamilton	6.8	7.1
193	226	Franco-Ouest	Nepean	7.1	6.9	256	202	Sir Oliver Mowat	Toronto	6.8	7.0
193	264	Father Michael Goetz	Mississauga	7.1	6.7	256	226	Bell	Nepean	6.8	6.9
193	286	E C Drury	Milton	7.1	6.6	256	244	Orangeville	Orangeville	6.8	6.8
193	312	All Saints	Whitby	7.1	6.5	256	244	St Paul	Trenton	6.8	6.8

Rank		School name	City	Overall rating		Rank		School name	City	Overall rating	
2011/ Last 5	2012 years			2011/ Last 5	2012 years	2011/ Last 5	2012 years			2011/ Last 5	2012 years
256	286	Father Bressani	Woodbridge	6.8	6.6	313	450	E.J.Lajeunesse	Windsor	6.5	5.7
256	327	Clarkson	Mississauga	6.8	6.4	313	450	St Thomas Aquinas	Brampton	6.5	5.7
256	387	Collingwood	Collingwood	6.8	6.0	313	450	Woodstock	Woodstock	6.5	5.7
256	492	Stephen Leacock	Toronto	6.8	5.4	313	572	W C Eaket	Blind River	6.5	4.8
273	125	I E Weldon	Lindsay	6.7	7.4	331	108	Sandwich	LaSalle	6.4	7.5
273	125	Lo-Ellen Park	Sudbury	6.7	7.4	331	244	Jean Vanier	Toronto	6.4	6.8
273	182	Holy Trinity	Simcoe	6.7	7.1	331	244	Stouffville District	Stouffville	6.4	6.8
273	182	St Thomas of Villanova	LaSalle	6.7	7.1	331	312	Southwood	Cambridge	6.4	6.5
273	202	Ancaster	Ancaster	6.7	7.0	331	327	Notre Dame	Welland	6.4	6.4
273	202	Monseigneur-de-Charbonnel	Toronto	6.7	7.0	331	327	St Jean de Brebeuf	Woodbridge	6.4	6.4
273	202	St Mary	Cobourg	6.7	7.0	331	344	Ursuline (The Pines)	Chatham	6.4	6.3
273	226	A N Myer	Niagara Falls	6.7	6.9	331	361	Westlane	Niagara Falls	6.4	6.2
273	244	General Amherst	Amherstburg	6.7	6.8	331	375	St Patrick	Thunder Bay	6.4	6.1
273	264	O'Neill	Oshawa	6.7	6.7	331	387	Ernestown	Odessa	6.4	6.0
273	264	Rideau	Elgin	6.7	6.7	331	406	St Augustine	Brampton	6.4	5.9
273	286	Sainte-Famille	Mississauga	6.7	6.6	331	422	Chaminade	Toronto	6.4	5.8
273	286	Turner Fenton	Brampton	6.7	6.6	331	450	Fletcher's Meadow	Brampton	6.4	5.7
273	327	St David	Waterloo	6.7	6.4	331	481	Innisdale	Barrie	6.4	5.5
273	344	Woburn	Toronto	6.7	6.3	331	518	Cobourg District CI East	Cobourg	6.4	5.2
273	375	Marshall McLuhan	Toronto	6.7	6.1	346	141	St Michael	Stratford	6.3	7.3
273	387	Cardinal Newman	Toronto	6.7	6.0	346	182	Mother Teresa	London	6.3	7.1
273	450	Governor Simcoe	St Catharines	6.7	5.7	346	202	Jeunes sans frontières	Brampton	6.3	7.0
291	161	Frontenac	Kingston	6.6	7.2	346	202	l'Essor	Tecumseh	6.3	7.0
291	161	St Anne's	Clinton	6.6	7.2	346	226	Glebe	Ottawa	6.3	6.9
291	182	Huron Heights	Kitchener	6.6	7.1	346	244	Centennial	Belleville	6.3	6.8
291	226	St Francis	St Catharines	6.6	6.9	346	264	Eastview	Barrie	6.3	6.7
291	244	Hillcrest	Ottawa	6.6	6.8	346	286	Centre Wellington	Fergus	6.3	6.6
291	244	Saugeen	Port Elgin	6.6	6.8	346	286	St. Thomas Aquinas	Russell	6.3	6.6
291	244	Strathroy District	Strathroy	6.6	6.8	346	312	Hawkesbury	Hawkesbury	6.3	6.5
291	264	Meadowvale	Mississauga	6.6	6.7	346	312	St Joseph-Scollard Hall	North Bay	6.3	6.5
291	264	Mitchell	Mitchell	6.6	6.7	346	327	Dr John M Denison	Newmarket	6.3	6.4
291	264	Orchard Park	Stoney Creek	6.6	6.7	346	344	Lord Dorchester	Dorchester	6.3	6.3
291	286	Northview Heights	Toronto	6.6	6.6	346	344	St Jean de Brebeuf	Hamilton	6.3	6.3
291	344	Applewood Heights	Mississauga	6.6	6.3	346	375	Wexford Collegiate School for the Arts	Toronto	6.3	6.1
291	344	Assumption	Brantford	6.6	6.3	346	387	Brampton Centennial	Brampton	6.3	6.0
291	344	South Lincoln	Smithville	6.6	6.3	362	161	Listowel	Listowel	6.2	7.2
291	361	St Mary's	Owen Sound	6.6	6.2	362	244	MacKenzie	Deep River	6.2	6.8
291	361	St Mary's	Sault Ste. Marie	6.6	6.2	362	264	St Martin	Mississauga	6.2	6.7
291	375	Woodbridge	Woodbridge	6.6	6.1	362	312	Parkside	St Thomas	6.2	6.5
291	387	L'Amoreaux	Toronto	6.6	6.0	362	327	Centre Dufferin	Shelburne	6.2	6.4
291	387	St Marguerite d'Youville	Brampton	6.6	6.0	362	327	Notre Dame	Carleton Place	6.2	6.4
291	406	Jacob Hespeler	Cambridge	6.6	5.9	362	344	Blenheim	Blenheim	6.2	6.3
291	468	Pope John Paul II	Toronto	6.6	5.6	362	361	Holy Cross	Strathroy	6.2	6.2
291	587	Madonna	Toronto	6.6	4.6	362	361	St Joseph's	Windsor	6.2	6.2
313	182	Arnprior	Arnprior	6.5	7.1	362	387	Francis Libermann	Toronto	6.2	6.0
313	182	Lambton Central	Petrolia	6.5	7.1	362	387	Robert F Hall	Caledon East	6.2	6.0
313	226	Bradford	Bradford	6.5	6.9	362	406	Englehart	Englehart	6.2	5.9
313	226	St John	Perth	6.5	6.9	362	406	Therault	Timmins	6.2	5.9
313	244	Holy Trinity	Cornwall	6.5	6.8	362	422	Notre Dame	Ajax	6.2	5.8
313	264	Acton	Acton	6.5	6.7	362	422	St Paul	Mississauga	6.2	5.8
313	264	Marathon	Marathon	6.5	6.7	362	450	Loyalist	Kingston	6.2	5.7
313	312	Robert Bateman	Burlington	6.5	6.5	378	81	St Theresa	Belleville	6.1	7.7
313	344	Cairine Wilson	Ottawa	6.5	6.3	378	264	St Mary's	Woodstock	6.1	6.7
313	375	Cardinal Leger	Brampton	6.5	6.1	378	286	Renfrew	Renfrew	6.1	6.6
313	387	St Paul	Ottawa	6.5	6.0	378	286	Thousand Islands	Brockville	6.1	6.6
313	406	Pickering	Ajax	6.5	5.9	378	344	Courtice	Courtice	6.1	6.3
313	406	R S Mclaughlin	Oshawa	6.5	5.9	378	344	Grand River	Kitchener	6.1	6.3
313	422	Clarke	Newcastle	6.5	5.8	378	361	Bayridge	Kingston	6.1	6.2

Rank		School name	City	Overall rating		Rank		School name	City	Overall rating	
2011/ Last 5	2012 years			2011/ Last 5	2012 years	2011/ Last 5	2012 years			2011/ Last 5	2012 years
378	361	St Thomas More	Hamilton	6.1	6.2	442	264	Bishop Tonnos	Ancaster	5.7	6.7
378	375	Delhi	Delhi	6.1	6.1	442	312	St James	Guelph	5.7	6.5
378	422	Adam Scott	Peterborough	6.1	5.8	442	327	Holy Cross	Peterborough	5.7	6.4
378	422	West Park	St Catharines	6.1	5.8	442	327	Ingersoll District	Ingersoll	5.7	6.4
378	450	Lakeshore	Port Colborne	6.1	5.7	442	327	Our Lady of the Lake	Keswick	5.7	6.4
378	450	Lester B Pearson	Toronto	6.1	5.7	442	375	Patrick Fogarty	Orillia	5.7	6.1
378	450	Notre Dame	Brampton	6.1	5.7	442	375	Prince Edward	Picton	5.7	6.1
378	518	Ajax	Ajax	6.1	5.2	442	387	Laura Secord	St Catharines	5.7	6.0
378	531	Bowmanville	Bowmanville	6.1	5.1	442	387	St Joseph's	Barrie	5.7	6.0
378	619	St Patrick	Toronto	6.1	4.0	442	406	Fellowes	Pembroke	5.7	5.9
378	n/a	St. Roch	Brampton	6.1	n/a	442	422	Simcoe	Simcoe	5.7	5.8
396	202	Kincardine	Kincardine	6.0	7.0	442	422	Wellington Heights	Mount Forest	5.7	5.8
396	244	Barrie North	Barrie	6.0	6.8	442	450	Port Hope	Port Hope	5.7	5.7
396	264	Bishop Ryan	Hamilton	6.0	6.7	442	468	Glencoe	Glencoe	5.7	5.6
396	286	Erindale	Mississauga	6.0	6.6	442	468	St Stephen's	Bowmanville	5.7	5.6
396	286	Holy Cross	St Catharines	6.0	6.6	442	468	Widdifield	North Bay	5.7	5.6
396	286	Sacred Heart	Walkerton	6.0	6.6	442	481	Denis Morris	St Catharines	5.7	5.5
396	312	Orillia	Orillia	6.0	6.5	442	502	Elmvale	Elmvale	5.7	5.3
396	327	Maple	Maple	6.0	6.4	442	518	Pine Ridge	Pickering	5.7	5.2
396	344	Peterborough	Peterborough	6.0	6.3	442	531	Lester B Pearson	Gloucester	5.7	5.1
396	375	Gloucester	Gloucester	6.0	6.1	442	531	St Joan of Arc	Barrie	5.7	5.1
396	375	St Mary's	Kitchener	6.0	6.1	442	563	Sarnia	Sarnia	5.7	4.9
396	387	Sandalwood Heights	Brampton	6.0	6.0	442	572	Assumption	Windsor	5.7	4.8
396	387	St Josephs Morrow Park	Toronto	6.0	6.0	466	202	L'Escale	Rockland	5.6	7.0
396	406	Holy Cross	Woodbridge	6.0	5.9	466	226	Franco-Cité	Ottawa	5.6	6.9
396	422	St Mary	Pickering	6.0	5.8	466	226	Rockland	Rockland	5.6	6.9
396	n/a	Georges-P-Vanier	Hamilton	6.0	n/a	466	286	Sainte-Marie	New Liskeard	5.6	6.6
396	n/a	Marc-Garneau	Trenton	6.0	n/a	466	344	Harrow	Harrow	5.6	6.3
413	226	Haliburton Highland	Haliburton	5.9	6.9	466	361	Dr G W Williams	Aurora	5.6	6.2
413	286	Carleton Place	Carleton Place	5.9	6.6	466	406	Galt	Cambridge	5.6	5.9
413	286	Cité des Jeunes	Kapuskasing	5.9	6.6	466	406	Sir Winston Churchill	Thunder Bay	5.6	5.9
413	312	Crestwood	Peterborough	5.9	6.5	466	422	Almonte	Almonte	5.6	5.8
413	327	Saunders	London	5.9	6.4	466	422	St Joan of Arc	Maple	5.6	5.8
413	361	Holy Trinity	Bradford	5.9	6.2	466	450	Newtonbrook	Toronto	5.6	5.7
413	387	Timiskaming District	New Liskeard	5.9	6.0	466	502	Centre Hastings	Madoc	5.6	5.3
413	406	St Charles	Sudbury	5.9	5.9	466	502	Wallaceburg	Wallaceburg	5.6	5.3
413	422	Franco-Cité	Sturgeon Falls	5.9	5.8	466	596	Le Caron	Penetanguishene	5.6	4.4
413	468	Bishop Smith	Pembroke	5.9	5.6	480	141	North Middlesex	Parkhill	5.5	7.3
413	502	Gabriel-Dumont	London	5.9	5.3	480	244	Erin	Erin	5.5	6.8
413	502	Monarch Park	Toronto	5.9	5.3	480	264	Essex	Essex	5.5	6.7
413	548	Ascension of Our Lord	Mississauga	5.9	5.0	480	286	Fenelon Falls	Fenelon Falls	5.5	6.6
413	n/a	Philopateer Christian College	Mississauga	5.9	n/a	480	286	M M Robinson	Burlington	5.5	6.6
427	286	Anderson	Whitby	5.8	6.6	480	361	Madawaska Valley	Barry's Bay	5.5	6.2
427	286	Thomas A Stewart	Peterborough	5.8	6.6	480	387	Algonquin	North Bay	5.5	6.0
427	312	Grimsby	Grimsby	5.8	6.5	480	406	Tagwi	Avonmore	5.5	5.9
427	327	Sydenham	Sydenham	5.8	6.4	480	422	Archbishop Denis O'Connor	Ajax	5.5	5.8
427	361	Westside	Orangeville	5.8	6.2	480	468	Monsignor Doyle	Cambridge	5.5	5.6
427	387	Central Algoma	Desbarats	5.8	6.0	480	481	Regina Mundi	London	5.5	5.5
427	406	London South	London	5.8	5.9	480	502	Monsignor Paul Dwyer	Oshawa	5.5	5.3
427	422	Brookfield	Ottawa	5.8	5.8	480	502	St Basil	Sault Ste. Marie	5.5	5.3
427	450	Brantford	Brantford	5.8	5.7	480	642	Roland Michener	South Porcupine	5.5	3.7
427	450	St Benedict	Cambridge	5.8	5.7	480	n/a	Maxwell Heights	Oshawa	5.5	n/a
427	468	Silverthorn	Toronto	5.8	5.6	495	344	F E Madill	Wingham	5.4	6.3
427	481	Heart Lake	Brampton	5.8	5.5	495	361	Catholic Central	London	5.4	6.2
427	481	Huron Heights	Newmarket	5.8	5.5	495	361	St Joseph's	St Thomas	5.4	6.2
427	518	Beamsville	Beamsville	5.8	5.2	495	387	John Diefenbaker	Hanover	5.4	6.0
427	592	J Clarke Richardson	Ajax	5.8	4.5	495	422	College français	Toronto	5.4	5.8
442	226	Immaculata	Ottawa	5.7	6.9	495	422	Kitchener Waterloo	Kitchener	5.4	5.8

Rank		School name	City	Overall rating		Rank		School name	City	Overall rating	
2011/ Last 5	2012 years			2011/ Last 5	2012 years	2011/ Last 5	2012 years			2011/ Last 5	2012 years
495	422	Paris	Paris	5.4	5.8	557	422	Dryden	Dryden	4.9	5.8
495	450	Dunbarton	Pickering	5.4	5.7	557	450	Fort Frances	Fort Frances	4.9	5.7
495	450	Notre Dame	Ottawa	5.4	5.7	557	481	White Pines	Sault Ste. Marie	4.9	5.5
495	481	St Clair	Sarnia	5.4	5.5	557	502	Clarington Central	Bowmanville	4.9	5.3
495	492	St Dominic	Bracebridge	5.4	5.4	557	518	Cardinal Carter	Leamington	4.9	5.2
495	518	Perth and District	Perth	5.4	5.2	557	548	Bramalea	Brampton	4.9	5.0
495	518	Tilbury	Tilbury	5.4	5.2	557	572	Trenton	Trenton	4.9	4.8
495	531	Marc Garneau	Toronto	5.4	5.1	557	572	Waterford	Waterford	4.9	4.8
495	548	Thorold	Thorold	5.4	5.0	557	580	Nantyr Shores	Innisfil	4.9	4.7
495	548	W F Herman	Windsor	5.4	5.0	568	450	Huron Park	Woodstock	4.8	5.7
495	563	l'Odyssee	North Bay	5.4	4.9	568	468	Red Lake	Red Lake	4.8	5.6
495	580	Valley Heights	Langton	5.4	4.7	568	531	Quinte	Belleville	4.8	5.1
513	422	Twin Lakes	Orillia	5.3	5.8	568	548	Brock	Cannington	4.8	5.0
513	468	General Panet	Petawawa	5.3	5.6	568	563	Confederation	Val Caron	4.8	4.9
513	481	Georgian Bay	Meaford	5.3	5.5	568	563	Sir Wilfrid Laurier	London	4.8	4.9
513	492	Barrie Central	Barrie	5.3	5.4	568	592	Cedarbrae	Toronto	4.8	4.5
513	492	St Basil The Great	Toronto	5.3	5.4	568	596	Monseigneur-Bruyère	London	4.8	4.4
513	531	Sir Wilfrid Laurier	Toronto	5.3	5.1	568	605	Oakwood	Toronto	4.8	4.3
513	580	Monsignor John Pereyma	Oshawa	5.3	4.7	568	642	Hagersville	Hagersville	4.8	3.7
513	619	Catholic Central	Windsor	5.3	4.0	578	422	Westgate	Thunder Bay	4.7	5.8
513	n/a	Pierre-Savard	Nepean	5.3	n/a	578	468	Iroquois Falls	Iroquois Falls	4.7	5.6
522	312	Béatrice-Desloges	Orléans	5.2	6.5	578	518	Forest Heights	Kitchener	4.7	5.2
522	406	Korah	Sault Ste. Marie	5.2	5.9	578	531	Jarvis	Toronto	4.7	5.1
522	406	Saltfleet	Stoney Creek	5.2	5.9	578	531	McKinnon Park	Caledonia	4.7	5.1
522	422	Park Street	Orillia	5.2	5.8	578	548	Parry Sound	Parry Sound	4.7	5.0
522	422	Saint-Charles-Garnier	Whitby	5.2	5.8	578	580	Dante Alighieri	Toronto	4.7	4.7
522	450	Riverside	Windsor	5.2	5.7	578	626	Kenner	Peterborough	4.7	3.9
522	492	St Thomas Aquinas	Tottenham	5.2	5.4	578	635	East York	Toronto	4.7	3.8
522	518	Manitoulin	M'Chigeeng	5.2	5.2	578	649	O'Gorman	Timmins	4.7	3.5
522	548	Parkdale	Toronto	5.2	5.0	578	n/a	Saint-François-Xavier	Sarnia	4.7	n/a
522	548	Port Colborne	Port Colborne	5.2	5.0	589	502	Owen Sound	Owen Sound	4.6	5.3
522	548	St Thomas Aquinas	Lindsay	5.2	5.0	589	531	Cayuga	Cayuga	4.6	5.1
522	605	Thistleton	Toronto	5.2	4.3	589	531	Hon W C Kennedy	Windsor	4.6	5.1
522	657	Fort Erie	Fort Erie	5.2	3.3	589	548	Central Peel	Brampton	4.6	5.0
522	n/a	David Suzuki	Brampton	5.2	n/a	589	572	Sharbot Lake	Sharbot Lake	4.6	4.8
522	n/a	Glendale	Tillsonburg	5.2	n/a	589	587	Smiths Falls District	Smiths Falls	4.6	4.6
522	n/a	Louise Arbour	Brampton	5.2	n/a	589	635	West Humber	Toronto	4.6	3.8
522	n/a	Superior CVI	Thunder Bay	5.2	n/a	589	n/a	Roméo Dallaire	Barrie	4.6	n/a
539	312	Seaway	Iroquois	5.1	6.5	597	361	Le Relais	Alexandria	4.5	6.2
539	422	Bear Creek	Barrie	5.1	5.8	597	387	Russel High	Russell	4.5	6.0
539	422	East Northumberland	Brighton	5.1	5.8	597	502	Bishop Alexander Carter	Hanmer	4.5	5.3
539	492	Espanola	Espanola	5.1	5.4	597	502	Collège Notre-Dame	Sudbury	4.5	5.3
539	502	Centennial	Welland	5.1	5.3	597	502	Henry Street	Whitby	4.5	5.3
539	531	Harold M. Brathwaite	Brampton	5.1	5.1	597	563	South Grenville	Prescott	4.5	4.9
539	531	Napanee	Napanee	5.1	5.1	597	563	Vaughan Road	Toronto	4.5	4.9
539	548	Plantagenet	Plantagenet	5.1	5.0	597	587	Jean-Vanier	Welland	4.5	4.6
539	610	Monsignor Percy Johnson	Toronto	5.1	4.2	597	596	St Peter's	Barrie	4.5	4.4
539	626	St Mary's	Toronto	5.1	3.9	597	626	Norwood District	Norwood	4.5	3.9
539	n/a	Nottawasaga Pines	Angus	5.1	n/a	597	635	St Lawrence	Cornwall	4.5	3.8
539	n/a	Superior Heights	Sault Ste. Marie	5.1	n/a	597	649	Macdonald-Cartier	Sudbury	4.5	3.5
551	375	Chippewa	North Bay	5.0	6.1	597	671	Central Commerce	Toronto	4.5	2.7
551	422	Sherwood	Hamilton	5.0	5.8	610	502	College Avenue	Woodstock	4.4	5.3
551	481	Eastdale	Oshawa	5.0	5.5	610	531	Stayner	Stayner	4.4	5.1
551	492	North Dundas	Chesterville	5.0	5.4	610	563	St Theresa's	Midland	4.4	4.9
551	531	Ridgeway-Crystal Beach	Ridgeway	5.0	5.1	610	580	Birchmount Park	Toronto	4.4	4.7
551	654	Emery	Toronto	5.0	3.4	610	580	Chinguacousy	Brampton	4.4	4.7
557	286	Stratford Northwestern	Stratford	4.9	6.6	610	605	Thomas L Kennedy	Mississauga	4.4	4.3
557	344	Brebeuf	Toronto	4.9	6.3	610	626	Lincoln M Alexander	Mississauga	4.4	3.9

Rank		School name	City	Overall rating		Rank		School name	City	Overall rating	
2011/ Last 5	2012 years			2011/ Last 5	2012 years	2011/ Last 5	2012 years			2011/ Last 5	2012 years
617	481	East Elgin	Aylmer	4.3	5.5	671	614	Lakefield	Lakefield	3.3	4.1
617	502	Cathedral	Hamilton	4.3	5.3	671	619	Beaver Brae	Kenora	3.3	4.0
617	563	Westminster	London	4.3	4.9	671	662	Western	Toronto	3.3	3.2
617	592	Pauline Johnson	Brantford	4.3	4.5	675	492	Opeongo	Douglas	3.2	5.4
617	614	Kirkland Lake District	Kirkland Lake	4.3	4.1	675	587	Sudbury	Sudbury	3.2	4.6
617	619	York Memorial	Toronto	4.3	4.0	675	679	Queen Elizabeth	Sioux Lookout	3.2	2.3
617	626	Danforth	Toronto	4.3	3.9	675	686	Western	Amherstburg	3.2	0.6
624	548	Grey Highlands	Flesherton	4.2	5.0	679	665	North Albion	Toronto	3.1	3.1
624	572	Ridgetown	Ridgetown	4.2	4.8	679	n/a	Cornwall	Cornwall	3.1	n/a
624	572	Woodroffe	Ottawa	4.2	4.8	679	n/a	Rothwell-Osnabruk	Ingleside	3.1	n/a
624	592	St Patrick's	Ottawa	4.2	4.5	682	596	Hill Park	Hamilton	3.0	4.4
628	406	Rainy River	Rainy River	4.1	5.9	682	626	Almaguin Highlands	South River	3.0	3.9
628	422	Goderich District	Goderich	4.1	5.8	682	649	Nipigon Red Rock	Red Rock	3.0	3.5
628	518	Athens	Athens	4.1	5.2	682	657	Lakeshore	Toronto	3.0	3.3
628	548	Eastwood	Kitchener	4.1	5.0	682	681	C W Jefferys	Toronto	3.0	2.0
628	619	Dunnville	Dunnville	4.1	4.0	687	619	George S Henry	Toronto	2.9	4.0
628	635	John McGregor	Chatham	4.1	3.8	687	642	G L Roberts	Oshawa	2.9	3.7
628	649	Runnymede	Toronto	4.1	3.5	687	657	Delta	Hamilton	2.9	3.3
628	654	Scarlett Heights Entrepreneurial	Toronto	4.1	3.4	687	662	Sir Winston Churchill	Hamilton	2.9	3.2
636	518	Sir Allan MacNab	Hamilton	4.0	5.2	691	642	Weston	Toronto	2.8	3.7
636	548	Deslauriers	Nepean	4.0	5.0	692	596	Sacré-Coeur	Sudbury	2.7	4.4
636	605	West Ferris	North Bay	4.0	4.3	692	642	Midland	Midland	2.7	3.7
636	665	George Harvey	Toronto	4.0	3.1	694	649	Sutton	Sutton West	2.6	3.5
636	670	Father Henry Carr	Toronto	4.0	2.8	694	657	Stamford Collegiate	Niagara Falls	2.6	3.3
641	596	Gananoque	Gananoque	3.9	4.4	696	680	Westview Centennial	Toronto	2.5	2.1
641	610	Barton	Hamilton	3.9	4.2	696	n/a	John Polanyi	Toronto	2.5	n/a
641	610	Winston Churchill	Toronto	3.9	4.2	696	n/a	Wasse-Abin Wikwemikong	Wikwemikong	2.5	n/a
641	614	Glendale	Hamilton	3.9	4.1	699	669	Kipling	Toronto	2.4	2.9
645	502	Walkerton	Walkerton	3.8	5.3	700	635	Champlain	Chelmsford	2.3	3.8
645	531	Blessed Mother Teresa	Toronto	3.8	5.1	701	673	Central	Toronto	2.2	2.6
645	563	Lively	Lively	3.8	4.9	701	673	St Catharines	St Catharines	2.2	2.6
645	605	Ridgemont	Ottawa	3.8	4.3	703	678	Chelmsford Valley District	Chelmsford	2.0	2.4
645	614	James Cardinal McGuigan	Toronto	3.8	4.1	704	626	Geraldton	Geraldton	1.9	3.9
645	673	Eastdale	Welland	3.8	2.6	704	673	Sir John A Macdonald	Hamilton	1.9	2.6
651	244	Marie-Rivier	Kingston	3.7	6.8	704	682	Kapuskasing	Kapuskasing	1.9	1.8
651	468	North Lambton	Forest	3.7	5.6	707	662	Northern	Sturgeon Falls	1.8	3.2
651	518	John Paul II	London	3.7	5.2	708	673	Don Bosco	Toronto	1.7	2.6
651	531	Oshawa Central	Oshawa	3.7	5.1	708	684	College Heights	Guelph	1.7	0.9
651	572	Glenview Park	Cambridge	3.7	4.8	710	648	l'Horizon	Val Caron	1.6	3.6
651	580	H B Beal	London	3.7	4.7	710	683	Downsview	Toronto	1.6	1.0
651	587	Port Dover	Port Dover	3.7	4.6	712	n/a	Ottawa Technical Learning Centre	Ottawa	1.3	n/a
651	596	Keswick	Keswick	3.7	4.4	713	657	Cochrane	Cochrane	1.2	3.3
651	596	West Elgin	West Lorne	3.7	4.4	714	665	Rideau	Ottawa	0.9	3.1
651	626	West Hill	Toronto	3.7	3.9	714	n/a	Renaissance	Timmins	0.9	n/a
651	635	David and Mary Thomson	Toronto	3.7	3.8	716	668	John L Forster	Windsor	0.4	3.0
662	531	North Hastings	Bancroft	3.6	5.1	716	686	Eastern Commerce	Toronto	0.4	0.6
662	596	Lasalle	Sudbury	3.6	4.4	718	685	Alexander Mackenzie	Sarnia	0.1	0.8
662	610	Timmins	Timmins	3.6	4.2	719	671	Queen Elizabeth	Kingston	0.0	2.7
662	626	Clarke Road	London	3.6	3.9	719	688	Bendale	Toronto	0.0	0.0
666	548	Campbellford	Campbellford	3.5	5.0	719	688	Nelson A Boylen	Toronto	0.0	0.0
666	635	Arthur Voaden	St Thomas	3.5	3.8	719	688	North Peel	Brampton	0.0	0.0
666	642	Loretto	Toronto	3.5	3.7	719	688	Sir Robert L Borden	Toronto	0.0	0.0
666	654	Bishop Marrocco/Thomas Merton	Toronto	3.5	3.4	719	n/a	NIL Academy	Toronto	0.0	n/a
670	619	Montcalm	London	3.4	4.0	719	n/a	Northern Lights	Moosonee	0.0	n/a
671	614	Archbishop Romero	Toronto	3.3	4.1						

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 others in the report card?” The following is a simplified description of the procedure used to convert the data received from the Ministry of Education into the *Overall rating out of 10*.

- 1 The results for English and French language examinations are separately subjected to the following procedures.
- 2 The *Average levels* achieved on each of the two grade-9 mathematics tests, the two OSSLT results (FTE and PE), and the indicators of failure on the four test sittings 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.

- 3 The standardized data for results data were then aggregated. The weighting used was the number of student writers of each test relative to the total number of student test writers in the relevant subject area.
- 4 Similarly, the standardized data for the indicators of failure were aggregated using the same method of weighting.
- 5 The *Gender gap* values for the grade-9 mathematics test and the OSSLT were each calculated by determining the absolute value of the difference in the level of achievement (or success rate in the case of the OSSLT) of male students and female students at the school. The results for each subject were then standardized.
- 6 The four standardized indicator results created in steps 3, 4, and 5 were then combined to produce a weighted, average, summary standardized score for the school. The weightings used in these calculations were: combined results indicator—45%; Combined fail rate indicator—45%; Gender gap measures—5% each. For schools where there were fewer than two gender gap results, the weightings for the missing gender gap indicators were assigned to the combined fail rate indicator.
- 7 This summary standardized score was re-standardized.

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

- 8 The allowable maximum and minimum standardized scores were set at 2.0 and -3.29 respectively. Scores

equal to, or greater than, 2.0 receive an overall rating of 10. This cut-off was chosen because it allows more than one school in a given year to be awarded 10 out of 10. Scores of equal to, or less than, -3.29 receive the lowest overall rating of 0. Schools with scores below -3.29 are likely to be outliers, a statistical term used to denote members of a population that appear to have characteristics substantially different from the rest of the population. We chose, therefore, to set the minimum score so as to disregard such extreme differences.

Note that, beginning with the 2010 edition, the maximum standardized score is set at 2.2, rather than 2.0 as in previous Report Cards. This change has been made to bring the Report Card on Ontario's Secondary Schools in line with editions produced in other provinces. The effect of this change is to reduce the frequency of schools achieving an overall score of 10.

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

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

where OR is the resulting *Overall rating out of 10*, μ is the average calculated according to the formula:

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

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

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

and *StanScore* is the standardized score calculated in (6) above and adjusted as required for minimum and maximum values as noted in (7) above. As noted in (7) above, OR_{\min} equals zero, Z_{\min} equals -3.29; and Z_{\max} equals 2.0.

- 10 Finally, the derived *Overall rating out of 10* 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 out of 10*, it must improve more than the average. If it improves, but at a rate less than the average, it will show a decline in its rating.

About the authors

Peter Cowley

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

Stephen T. Easton

Stephen T. Easton is a professor of Economics at Simon Fraser University and a Senior Scholar at the Fraser Institute. He received his A.B. from Oberlin College and his Ph.D. from the University of Chicago. Recent works published by the Fraser Institute include *Privatizing Prisons* (editor, 1998), *The Costs of Crime: Who Pays and How Much? 1998 Update* (with Paul Brantingham, 1998), and *Rating Global Economic Freedom* (editor, 1992). A co-author of *A Secondary Schools Report Card for British Columbia* (1998), *Boys, Girls, and Grades: Academic Gender Balance in British Columbia's Secondary Schools* (1999) and the *Report Card on Aboriginal Education in British Columbia* (2004), he has continued to co-author the *Report Cards* of British Columbia, Alberta, New Brunswick and, most recently, Ontario. Other publications about education include "Do We Have a Problem Yet? Women and Men in Higher Education," in David Laidler (ed.), *Renovating the Ivory Tower: Canadian Universities and the Knowledge Economy* (Toronto: C.D. Howe Institute, 2002), pp. 60–79; "Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose" in Stephen B. Lawton, Rodney Reed, and Fons van Wieringen, *Restructuring Public Schooling* (Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1997) and *Education in Canada: An Analysis of Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Schooling* (Vancouver: the Fraser Institute, 1988). His editorials have been carried by the *Vancouver Sun*, the *Globe and Mail*, the *National Post*, the *Ottawa Citizen*, the *Stirling chain* and many other newspapers around the country.

Publishing information

Distribution

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

Ordering publications

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

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

Media

For media enquiries, please contact our Communications Department:

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

Copyright

Copyright © 2013 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

March 2013

Editing

Lindsey Thomas Martin

Typesetting

Nick Murphy

Cover design

Bill Ray

Images for cover

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

Supporting the Fraser Institute

To learn how to support the Fraser Institute, please contact

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

Lifetime patrons

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

Sonja Bata

Serge Darkazanli

Fred Mannix

Charles Barlow

John Dobson

Con Riley

Ev Berg

Raymond Heung

Catherine Windels

Art Grunder

Bill Korol

Jim Chaplin

Bill Mackness

Purpose, funding, & independence

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

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

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

The opinions expressed by the authors are those

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

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

About the Fraser Institute

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

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

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

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

Peer review—validating the accuracy of our research

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

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

update includes substantive or material changes in the methodology.

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

Editorial Advisory 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