

# English 12

## Report to Schools May 2015

The information in this report provides an overview of results from the May 2015 **English 12** Provincial Exam. The information is based on the **2853** students who wrote the May Provincial Exam.

### Average Provincial Exam Mark – 68%

Curriculum Organizer	Maximum Possible Score	Mean Score*	Mean Percentage
Stand Alone	12.0	6.56	55%
Synthesis of Texts	24.0	11.48	48%
Composition	24.0	13.78	57%
Multiple Choice	23.0	13.57	59%

\*The raw score or mean average will not necessarily equal the final reported percentage, as all exams go through an equating process to ensure that the level of difficulty is the same session to session.

### 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.

Curriculum Organizer	Areas of Strength	Areas of Weakness
Stand Alone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good integration of quotations and incorporation of implicit and explicit references</li> <li>• Many students attempted to create thesis statements and/or use ‘hooks’ to draw the reader into the response</li> <li>• Responses generally mentioned the title and author of the text in the opening sentences</li> <li>• Most responses demonstrated understanding of the text</li> <li>• Many responses correctly identified literary devices used in the text and discussed them in relation to the topic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overuse of quotations resulted in a lack of students’ own words</li> <li>• Weak language skills and a lack of proofreading resulted in lower scores</li> <li>• A number of students gave first-person responses that did not match the purpose of the question</li> <li>• Some students struggled with the location specificity of the text, either demonstrating no understanding of the context or adding distracting personal narratives</li> <li>• Responses confused the ‘speaker’ with the ‘reader’ and referred to the female author by male or plural pronouns</li> </ul>

<b>Synthesis of Texts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responses were generally on-topic and creative</li> <li>• Strong use of quotations</li> <li>• Many responses had clear introductions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many responses demonstrated little English language proficiency</li> <li>• Many responses relied heavily on plot summary rather than synthesis; some were narrative</li> <li>• Many students confused the first and second texts and did not write about the correct passages</li> </ul>
<b>Composition</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong expository essays made references to literature and other texts students had read</li> <li>• Expository compositions were well-organized, original, and thoughtful</li> <li>• Narrative compositions used dialogue and imagery well, writing about passions and experiences with honesty and insight</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many responses were compromised by a lack of editing, resulting in language errors throughout</li> <li>• Some responses appeared to be memorized completely, as they barely connected to the topic and fell apart after a strong start</li> </ul>

*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.*