Communications 12
Report to Schools June 2015

The information in this report provides an overview of results from the June 2015 Communications 12 Provincial Exam. The information is based on the 4641 students who wrote the June Provincial Exam.

**Provincial Averages**

School Mark – 65%
Exam Mark – 63%
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.

**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>6.7</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Design</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Letter</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>56.0%</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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informational Text</td>
<td>• Topic sentences were strong and focused on the question</td>
<td>• Some responses lapsed into personal narratives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good use of direct quotations and examples from the text</td>
<td>• Tendency for weaker responses to recopy significant portions of the text rather than integrate relevant quotations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strong responses were well-organized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Design</td>
<td>• Many responses used strong and relevant titles and had a sense of balance</td>
<td>• Weaker responses missed key details, lacked description of visuals, and used boxes for emphasis only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strong responses referenced the subtopics given in the scenario</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Letter</td>
<td>• Stronger responses met the purpose of the task and offered a clear letter format, multiple paragraphs, key details, a specific course of action, and an appropriate tone</td>
<td>• Some responses did not use proper business letter format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Some responses failed to identify significant and/or relevant details necessary to answer this exam question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Weaker responses had no closing, specific course of action, or dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>• Strong narrative responses used descriptive vocabulary</td>
<td>• Tendency to leave this question incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Upper-level responses demonstrated paragraph structure, transitions, and overall organization</td>
<td>• Weaker responses did not adhere to essay writing conventions, including length, multiple paragraphs, and correct use of Standard English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.