Communications 12
Report to Schools January 2012

The information in this report provides an overview of results from the January 2012 Communications 12 Provincial Exam. The information is based on the 2,009 students who wrote the January Provincial Exam.

**Provincial Averages**

School Mark – 66%

Exam Mark – 64%

Final Mark* – 67%

*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.

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.

### 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>6.52</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Design</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Letter</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition*</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Students were asked to respond to one of two possible Composition questions.*
## 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** | • Upper level responses were insightful and well-organized, balancing specific references to the article with relevant personal details.  
• Generally, responses were organized with adequate use of transitions and relevant examples.  
• Comprehension of the task was demonstrated. | • Many students did not make specific reference to the article.  
• Many responses contained personal experiences.  
• There are continued issues with responses that do not demonstrate the English skills required to succeed.  
• Students writing the e-exam relied heavily on cutting and pasting from the text with no integration of these quotations, or balancing this with their own writing. |
| **Visual Design** | • Upper level responses demonstrated a clear understanding of the task and the important elements of visual design.  
• Upper level responses included a strong sense of creativity, especially in using rhetorical questions.  
• Upper level responses had an “encouraging” tone. | • Lower level responses revealed a misreading of the task; some students did not address the task or only addressed a portion of the task.  
• Student failed to provide a variety of visuals and responses became dense with text. |
| **Business Letter** | • Students who wrote strong letters showed creative problem solving and used details in a sophisticated way. | • Students are still writing single paragraph business letters.  
• Lower level responses tended to use a more colloquial, inappropriate, or threatening tone.  
• Lower level responses did not provide a clear concluding statement or course of action.  
• Letters are still appearing poorly formatted, in particular missing the date and one or both addresses. |
| **Composition** | • Upper level responses were engaging and well written. Students referenced good examples to support their ideas.  
• The narrative responses and personal stories shared were engaging.  
• Upper level responses had a clear purpose, theme, thesis, and were organized and developed accordingly.  
• Strong vocabulary and diction was noted in upper level responses. | • Lower level responses were typically simplistic, unoriginal, unimaginative, and repetitive.  
• There are continual paragraphing issues, such as single paragraph responses and one sentence paragraphs.  
• Lower level responses contained frequent and basic errors in syntax, mechanics, and diction. |
Note from Markers

If students choose to write the e-exam, it is recommended that they practice and familiarize themselves with sample e-exams before the exam session.

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.