The information in this report provides an overview of results from the January 2019 Communications 12 Provincial Exam. The information is based on the 3096 students who wrote the January Provincial Exam.

**Provincial Averages**

School Mark – 66%

Exam Mark – 58%

Final Mark* – 62%

*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**

| Curriculum Organizer   | Maximum Possible Score | Mean Score | Mean Percentage |
|------------------------|------------------------|------------|----------------|---------------|
| Informational Text     | 12.0                   | 6.45       | 53%            |
| Visual Design          | 12.0                   | 6.46       | 53%            |
| Business Letter        | 9.0                    | 3.45       | 38%            |
| Composition            | 24.0                   | 13.44      | 56%            |

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 strong and addressed the task.  
• Strong integration of quotations and paraphrased examples to support ideas.  
• Proper structured paragraphs.  
• Question and text was accessible by majority of students. | • Continued issues with the use of Standard English.  
• Weaker papers offered a summation of the text or a personal response.  
• Weaker papers were too short and not developed enough to pass.  
• Some students simply copied directly from the passage and failed to offer any analysis. |
| **Visual Design**     | • Topic and task was accessible.  
• Stronger papers displayed effective layout, visuals, appropriate titles and sub-headings.  
• Stronger papers referenced the sub-topics in the scenario. | • Weaker responses failed to include visuals.  
• Weaker responses missed key details (5 Ws)  
• Weaker responses were very “text heavy” and lapsed into writing a paragraph response. |
| **Business Letter**    | • The letter was straightforward; very few mis-reads of the task.  
• Stronger papers offered responses in a clear format, more than one paragraph, included key details, a specific course of action and appropriate tone. | • Weaker letters were poorly formatted and lacked an adequate business letter format.  
• Weaker letters were short and failed to provide a closing with contact information and a request for action.  
• Many students relied on colloquial phrasing and conventions of language were weak. |
| **Composition**       | • Both topics were fair and accessible.  
• Upper level papers attempted to use descriptive vocabulary and attempt narrative compositions.  
• Upper level papers were thoughtful and had well developed paragraphs with smooth transitions. | • Weaker papers showed deficiencies in the use of conventions.  
• Weaker papers offered simplistic and formulaic responses.  
• Weaker papers failed to adhere to the 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.