The information in this report provides an overview of results from the June 2010 Communications 12 Provincial Exam. The information is based on the 4,563 students who wrote the June Provincial Exam.

### Provincial Averages
- School Mark – 65%
- Exam Mark – 64%
- Final Mark* – 66%

*Final marks are produced in each instance in which a student has both a valid school percentage and an exam percentage for any session in the selected period. 60% of the final mark is based on the school mark and 40% is based on the exam mark. School marks and final marks for those students who were re-writing are excluded.

### Written Response Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Organizer</th>
<th>Maximum Possible Score</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Mean Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informational Text</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Letter</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Design</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition*</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>13.97</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Students were asked to respond to one of two possible Composition questions.

Differences often exist between school and exam marks. School assessment measures curricular performance over time, whereas exams evaluate those curricular areas best measured in a final testing situation. Some students perform better on exams, others in the classroom. Thus, some differences between school and exam marks may be expected.
Comments from the Markers

Below are topic areas and skills in which students seemed to be well prepared (strengths) and those in which students needed improvement (weaknesses) according to the examination markers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Organizer</th>
<th>Areas of Strength</th>
<th>Areas of Weakness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Informational Text** | • Stronger responses used a good topic sentence.  
  • Students were able to use good quotations for support.  
  • Students generally stayed on topic.  
  • Good use of transitions between paragraphs.  
  • Students brought in prior knowledge which added to their responses (e.g. personal connections to the environment and conservation). | • Many students overused quotations – directly copying from the text.  
  • Weaker responses were simply a summary of the passage and did not address the topic.  
  • There was poor integration of quotations.  
  • Weaker responses lacked logical inference and had weak topic sentences.  
  • There were many errors in sentence structure (e.g. fragments, run-ons, comma splices, idiomatic errors, punctuation and spelling).  
  • Lower level responses were often very short and therefore underdeveloped.  
  • Mid-ranged responses often listed the information without any inference. |
| **Visual Design** | • Students produced original titles for their products.  
  • Students clearly understood the task.  
  • Stronger visual designs demonstrated effective organization.  
  • Many students made good use of the page – product had good balance.  
  • Many students made good use of parallel structure and emphasis.  
  • Many students utilized the “5 W’s strategy” in order to ensure all important details were included. | • Some students wrote information in full sentences, creating text heavy visual products.  
  • Many responses were missing visuals.  
  • Many lower level responses missed key information.  
  • Students were not descriptive with their visuals (e.g. a student drew a box and wrote the word “park” but not “teens running in the park”).  
  • There were many problems with spelling.  
  • Some students added irrelevant or useless information.  
  • Some students did not use entire page for visual design. |
| **Business Letter** | • Majority of students understood the letter format.  
  • Many students were able to transfer information from prompt to the body of their letter.  
  • Most letters had appropriate tone.  
  • Many students used the information from the Visual Design section to enhance their letter response.  
  • Stronger responses were multi-paragraphed. | • Many letters had weak introductions – students immediately addressed the task.  
  • Many letters were missing the date, course of action, and/or the closing.  
  • There were several one paragraph responses and many letters lacked signatures.  
  • Some confusion about the task was apparent.  
  • Many students copied the information
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Higher level responses had strong closings and engaging discussions of their skills and aptitude for the position.</th>
<th>There was appropriate diction.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There was appropriate diction.</td>
<td>Many errors in sentence structure (e.g. fragments, run-ons, comma splices, usage, spelling, punctuation) and very colloquial responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most students attempted an essay structure.</td>
<td>Some students had single paragraph responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Many good narratives and creative responses.</td>
<td>Weaker responses had an appropriate introduction, but the rest of the response was off topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper level responses used complex sentences and could incorporate dialogue effectively.</td>
<td>Lower level responses tended to list ideas, which were not appropriately developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weaker responses also attempted dialogue and narrative structure.</td>
<td>Very little use of figurative language and many clichés were used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall, students had strong paragraph development.</td>
<td>Many students struggled with poor mechanics, spelling and Standard English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students were aware of audience – tone and language was generally appropriate.</td>
<td>The markers felt that the overall difficulty level of the exam was appropriate. The examination adequately represented the Examination Specifications in terms of topic weightings and cognitive levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>