The information in this report provides an overview of results from the January 2016 Communications 12 Provincial Exam. The information is based on the 2384 students who wrote the January Provincial Exam.

**Provincial Averages**

- School Mark – 67%
- 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.

**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>6.21</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Design</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Letter</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
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** | • Topic sentences were focused on the question discussed in a well-organized manner.  
• Good integration of direct quotes/examples from the article.  
• Response question and text was accessible to the majority of students. | • Issues with deficiency in language conventions.  
• Tendency to plagiarize and recopy significant portions of the text (including e-exam students cutting/pasting).  
• Some students lapsed into personal responses. |
| **Visual Design**     | • Stronger responses utilized relevant titles.  
• Visual design products had a stronger sense of balance. | • Weaker responses missed key details (5 W’s).  
• Issues with students not describing their visuals and using the box for emphasis only.  
• “Text heavy” responses. |
| **Business Letter**    | • Stronger responses were able to meet the expectations and purpose of the task and offer some creative insight beyond a simple literal answer.  
• Letters offered responses in a clear letter format, more than one paragraph, included key details, a specific course of action and appropriate tone. | • Lack of proper business letter format.  
• Some responses didn’t meet the purpose of the task and failed to identify significant and/or relevant details necessary to answer the exam question. |
| **Composition**       | • Stronger responses had well developed paragraphs with smooth transitions and attempted to use descriptive vocabulary, dialogue, and/or humour. | • Weaker responses did not adhere to conventions of writing an essay – multi-paragraph, appropriate length, correct use of Standard English. |

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.