The information in this report provides an overview of results from the January 2012 English 12 Provincial Exam. The information is based on the 15,936 students who wrote the January Provincial Exam.

**Provincial Averages**

- School Mark – 73%
- Exam Mark – 68%
- Final Mark* – 72%

*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>Stand Alone</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis of Texts</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>15.58</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>15.78</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**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>
| **Stand Alone**      | • Upper level responses contained superior integration of quotations and use of transition words and phrases.  
                          • Examples used by students covered the majority of the text and were discussed in depth.  
                          • Students could relate to both the topic and the article and were able to respond to the question effectively.  
                          • There were many succinct, upper level responses. | • Some students failed to respond to the question appropriately. Many students wrote a more personal response rather than a literary analysis.  
                          • Many responses contained an over-reliance upon quotations, making it difficult to decipher the student’s own thoughts.  
                          • Weak to mid-range responses tended to summarize the article.  
                          • Some students misread the article.  
                          • Weaker responses were unable to differentiate between irony and sarcasm.  
                          • There were numerous spelling and usage errors. |
| **Synthesis of Texts** | • Students clearly understood the question and most students referred to both pieces.  
                              • Some upper level responses addressed the internal struggle of the narrator in the prose piece and in so doing were able to define, differentiate, and offer insight.  
                              • There were few misreads of the text. | • Many responses consisted of plot summaries and only superficial attempts at synthesis.  
                              • Many responses were not balanced in terms of discussing both pieces.  
                              • Many clearly competent writers only referred to one of the texts in their discussion and subsequently earned failing scores.  
                              • Some responses did not address the question.  
                              • There were numerous spelling and usage errors.  
                              • Some weaker responses were too casual and colloquial in tone. |
| **Composition**       | • The accessible topic allowed most students to succeed.  
                              • Most students used multi-paragraph structure.  
                              • Succinct responses tended to get higher marks, and many upper level responses effectively utilized figurative language and evocative writing.  
                              • There were many engaging narrative responses. | • Many weak to mid-range responses consisted of a list of experiences without development.  
                              • Several responses contained inappropriate language and/or subject matter.  
                              • Overly colloquial language was a detriment, as were “stream of consciousness” responses and attempts to coin new words.  
                              • Overall, responses displayed weak mechanics. |

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.