

**English 12: Written Responses
Item-Level Response Report (Provincial Level)**

British Columbia

All Schools

June/2009

Provincial English 12 Item-Level Response Reports include data for all BC students in Grade 12 who wrote the exam in June 2009 (about 27,145 students). Both public and independent schools are included. The English 12 June 2009 (Written Responses) provincial Item-Level Response Report displays the proportion of students in each scoring category. All students were required to answer all three Items,

Form	Content Area	Item #	Number(%) of Respondents	Number (%) Scores of 0 (both markers)	Number (%) Scores of 1 (both markers)	Number (%) Scores of 1&2 or 2&2	Number (%) Scores of 2&3 or 3&3	Number (%) Scores of 3&4 or 4&4	Number (%) Scores of 4&5 or 5&5	Number (%) Scores of 5&6 or 6&6
A	Stand Alone Text	1	27145 (100%)	1080 (4%)	1072 (4%)	4417 (16%)	5107 (19%)	8901 (33%)	4842 (18%)	1726 (6%)
A	Analysis of Synthesis Texts	2	27145 (100%)	468 (2%)	320 (1%)	2579 (10%)	4618 (17%)	11074 (41%)	6060 (22%)	2026 (8%)
A	Composition	3	27145 (100%)	276 (1%)	109 (0%)	1283 (5%)	3355 (12%)	13276 (49%)	6926 (26%)	1920 (7%)

Note: Two markers scored each response and the score the student receives is the sum of the score from marker 1 plus the score from marker 2. Each of the 7 data categories in the table indicates how to associate results to the written response scoring rubric document attached below. For instance, "Scores of 1&2 or 2&2" should be interpreted as being marked either '1' by one marker and '2' by the second marker, or '2' by both markers.

Score Description
Grade 12 English written response scoring rubric (click here)

General Comments - Grade 12 English Written Responses

1. Stand-Alone Text

Areas of Strength

- Recognition of literary devices and the integration of quotations were evident in strong responses.
- Upper level responses were able to make connections between the poem and universal themes, showing real insight.
- Stronger responses used personification as a basis for a thorough discussion.
- Upper level responses provided a fully developed analysis.

Areas of Weakness

- Some students did not seem to have read the footnotes which provided important information.
- Some responses attempted to address the question but were often underdeveloped.
- Some responses were on a personal level, using first person as if they knew the poet.
- Weaker responses would concentrate on one line in the poem and as a result the response was a complete misinterpretation.
- Weaker responses resorted to summarizing the poem when they did not understand it.
- Weaker responses were sometimes personal narratives.

2. Analysis of Synthesis Texts

Areas of Strength

- Many responses demonstrated true synthesis; students wrestled with the complexities of the topic and came up with many original ideas.
- Many students took a strong stance in reaction to the question, and used evidence from both pieces to support their ideas.
- Strong response provided good character assessment.
- Upper level responses provided a sophisticated weighing of issues, understanding that there did not exist a simple right or wrong answer.
- Upper level responses drew logical substantiated conclusion.

Areas of Weakness

- Many responses relied on lengthy quotations with little discussion.
- Many students responded rather informally.
- There were many personal responses which were not appropriate to the question or task.
- Some students adopted a persona (mother, author, and son); the task is meant to be a literary essay.
- Some responses were merely a summary of the two pieces.

3. Composition

Areas of Strength

- Strong expository and narrative responses; the narratives were, by and large, more compelling to read.
- Good use of prior knowledge.
- Responses had a sense of purpose.
- Content was appropriate.
- Some upper level responses were succinct.
- Some upper level responses had an effective narrow focus and provided a more insightful analysis of the subject.

Areas of Weakness

- There were many single-paragraph responses; some students clearly had trouble structuring an essay.
- A number of responses consisted merely of several loosely connected anecdotes, rather than a single, unified essay.
- Some expository essays were vague and underdeveloped. They often relied on generalizations rather than concrete examples.