

Vocational Qualifications (QCF, NVQ, NQF)

Text Processing (Business Professional)

Level 2 Audio Transcription - **06976**

OCR Report to Centres 2015 - 2016

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This report on the examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this report.

© OCR 2016

CONTENTS

Vocational Qualifications (QCF, NVQ, NQF)

Level 2 Audio Transcription - **06976**

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
Level 2 Audio Transcription – 06976	4
Overview	4
General Comments	4
Comments on Individual Units	4
Sector Update.....	5

Level 2 Audio Transcription – 06976

Overview

Many candidates produced work to a good standard with the majority completing the examination.

Most of the candidates completed all the documents to a reasonable standard of accuracy but poor proofreading led to many uncorrected typographical errors. All documents were well presented. The changes from double line spacing to single line spacing and the items for emphasis were generally well done.

General Comments

The performance of candidates who completed this examination was consistent with previous years.

Comments on Individual Units

Autumn 2015

Document 1: This document was usually well displayed. The letterhead template was occasionally altered by candidates. (Marking Criteria 4H) Only a few candidates omitted the date. (MC 2.1) A few candidates omitted “Mr” in the address. (MC 2.1) The heading was occasionally entered in closed capitals instead of initial capitals and underlined. (MC 4J) Some candidates only printed one extra copy instead of the two copies required. (MC 2.2) This may be because they did not put the word “file” on the destination details which is acceptable but could be the reason for the omitted copy.

Document 2: This document was well presented. The numbered paragraphs posed some problems as they were sentences and therefore required initial capitals and a full stop at the end. (MC 1.7 and 1.2) Some candidates failed to leave a clear line space between the numbered paragraphs. (MC 4B) The words “overnight” and “worthwhile” were sometimes keyed-in as two words. (MC 1.2)

Document 3: This document was mostly well presented. Some candidates did not produce the table in double line spacing. (MC 4C) On the table the presentation of all entries in the first column in block capitals is not acceptable. (MC 4J) Occasionally, when candidates chose to use gridlines, an empty row followed the headings. (MC 4L) The word “overnight” was sometimes keyed-in as two words. (MC 1.2) The vertical space of at least 75 mm was generally well done with only a few candidates failing to carry out the instruction. (MC 4E) When the document went onto two pages some candidates failed to number the second page. (MC 2.3)

Spring 2016

Document 1: This document was usually well displayed. Only a few candidates omitted the date. (Marking Criteria 2.1) A few candidates omitted “Mr” in the address. (MC 2.1) The heading was occasionally entered in closed capitals instead of initial capitals and underlined. (MC 4J) Some candidates only printed one extra copy instead of the two copies required. (MC 2.2) This may be because they did not put the word “file” on the destination details which is acceptable but could be the reason for the omitted copy.

Document 2: This document was generally well done. The numbered items posed some problems as they were not full sentences. These were accepted with or without initial capitals and a full stop at the end. (MC 1.2)

Document 3: This document was mostly well presented. A few candidates did not produce the table in double line spacing. (MC 4C) On the table the presentation of all entries in the first column in block capitals is not acceptable. (MC 4J) Occasionally, when candidates chose to use gridlines an empty row followed the headings. (MC 4L) The vertical space of at least 60 mm was generally well done with only a few candidates failing to carry out the instruction. (MC 4E) When the document went onto two pages some candidates failed to number the second page. (MC 2.3)

Level 2 Summer 2016

Document 1: This document was usually well displayed. Only a few candidates omitted the date. (Marking Criteria 2.1) A few candidates omitted “Mr” in the address. (MC 2.1) The heading was occasionally entered in closed capitals instead of initial capitals and underlined. (MC 4J) Some candidates only printed one extra copy instead of the two copies required. (MC 2.2) This may be because they did not put the word “file” on the destination details which is acceptable but could be the reason for the omitted copy.

Document 2: This document was generally well done. Some candidates inserted All Staff in the wrong position. The word “free” was sometimes keyed-in as “three”. (MC 2.1) The numbered items were generally very well presented.

Document 3: This document was mostly well presented. A few candidates did not produce the table in double line spacing. (MC 4C) On the table the presentation of all entries in the first column in block capitals is not acceptable. (MC 4J) When candidates decided to use decimal points in the entries of money they did not always align the decimal point. (MC 4Q) The vertical space of at least 75 mm was generally well done with only a few candidates failing to carry out the instruction. (MC 4E) When the document went onto two pages some candidates failed to number the second page. (MC 2.3) Many candidates keyed-in “pool” as “pull”. (MC2.1)

Sector Update

This qualification is being withdrawn after the Autumn 2017 series. No replacement qualification is being made available.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Skills and Employment

Telephone: 02476 851509

Fax: 02476 421944

Email: vocational.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2016

