The information in this report provides an overview of results from the January 2014 Communications 12 Provincial Exam. The information is based on the 2,098 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>6.97</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Design</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Letter</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>13.52</td>
<td>56%</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>
| Informational Text   | • Strong responses used proper essay structure and included direct quotations from the article to support their opinions.  
                        • Some students were able to combine personal experiences and expand upon appropriate support from article. | • Some students did not read the footnotes that defined certain terms and showed confusion over some terms used throughout the text.  
                        • Weaker responses often copied the text directly and without analysis; some being entirely personal opinion with no reference to the text itself. |
| Visual Design        | • Strong responses included all the significant information in the text and included the 5 W’s (Who, What, When, Where, Why).  
                        • Many students were able to connect with the topic, and provided an appropriate response. | • Many students still struggled with incorporating visuals into their responses and often failed to describe images within their design.  
                        • Many weak responses relied too heavily on text.  
                        • Weaker responses often did not offer a balanced visual layout or make use of the whole page. |
| Business Letter      | • Most students used proper business letter format.  
                        • Most students showed a clear understanding of what constitutes a professional application letter and were able to connect the job-related aspects of the scenario in the letter. | • Some students did not include date and contact information on the application letter.  
                        • Weak responses were often underdeveloped and used only one paragraph.  
                        • Weaker responses opted for a more informal tone than required for an application letter, with some even indicating a threatening tone towards the reader. |
| Composition          | • Strong responses had well developed ideas that were often well supported and included specific details. | • Weak responses tended to be seriously underdeveloped, vague, and repetitive.  
                        • Weaker responses often had serious issues with basic language conventions. |