

Level 2 Business Presentations – 06977 Autumn 2009

General

Almost all candidates completed the four documents.

Most candidates produced the correct documents in the specified formats.

The majority of penalties were incurred through typographical errors and through errors in the column chart.

Document 1

Display of this document was generally good. Specified fonts and sizes were mostly used, although there were several instances of inconsistent sizes across the slides (MC 2.3) and some candidates confused serif with sans serif (MC 2.3). A few candidates neglected to display the heading in italic (MC 2.3) or right aligned (MC 4F). In a few instances the company name was omitted (MC 2.1) or not printed in the same default font as the candidate details and date (MC 2.3). Occasionally the centre number or date was omitted from the footer (MC 2.3). Several candidates used the American style of date eg 12.20.07 (MC 2.1). In a few instances the headings were superimposed on the logo (MC 1.6).

In Slide 3 there were a few instances of *<Type Title Here>* appearing in the chart (MC 2.2). There were also instances of the text not aligned consistently across the boxes (MC 4I). A few candidates did not follow capitalisation for job titles (treated as proper nouns MC 1.7).

In the Outline View candidates frequently left inconsistent line spacing between items (MC 4I). In some instances an extra bullet appeared at the end of the bulleted items, caused by a hard return (MC 2.1). There were several instances of the Outline View not being printed (MC 2.2).

Document 2

This document was generally well executed with most candidates carrying out the required amendments, although the most common error was failure to change the bullet style (MC 2.3). A few candidates printed the unamended slides (MC 2.2). Several candidates used the wrong format for audience notes and omitted the single sheet printout of Slide 3 (MC 2.2). In Slide 2 a few candidates inserted the sub-bullets in the wrong position (MC 3.1), or neglected to use serif font as instructed (MC 2.3). In Slide 3 several candidates failed to amend the text in the boxes (MC 2.1) *Vice Chairman* was accepted as a subordinate, or in the position of a co-worker without the link lines, as some systems would not allow it to be formatted as a linked co-worker at the first level.

Document 3

This document was mostly carried out to a high standard, with good chart presentation, apart from shading issues (see below). A few candidates printed each slide separately on a full page (MC 2.2).

In Slide 5 a few candidates omitted the legend (MC 2.3). Several candidates did not follow capitalisation as shown (MC 4J). Some candidates printing in black and white did not show differentiation between the columns and it was not possible to see which dialogue box colour/shade codes related to which columns unless each column was separately labelled (MC 2.2). Some candidates only keyed the word *NUMBERS* in the dialogue box (MC2.2). The axis labels were frequently omitted (MC2.2) or transposed (MC3.2).

In Slide 6 a few candidates neglected to import a clipart picture (MC 2.3).

Document 4

Many candidates produced accurate work, although some incurred heavy penalties through typographical errors and additional, omitted or substituted words (MC 1.1 and 2.1). There were several instances of the slide order not being changed (MC 2.3) and of the note headings not being emboldened (MC 4D).

The most common typographical and spelling errors were *form* instead of *from*, *supplies* for *suppliers*, *attend* for *attended* and *work* for *walk*.