![OCR - Recognising Achievement logo]

Chief Examiner's
Group Report
Confidential

**OCR Level 2 Business Presentations - 06977
Autumn 2010**

General Report and Review of Paper

Please note that extra time for candidates is no longer allowed, unless (in exceptional circumstances) by arrangement with OCR. A copy of such authority must accompany the relevant submission sheet.

Some software may format items automatically. Centres and candidates should be aware of this and amend the formatting as necessary to meet the assessment criteria specified in this unit.

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.

Analysis

Document 1: Display of this document was generally good. Specified fonts and sizes were mostly used, although there were some instances of inconsistent sizes of headings 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 bold (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 5.10.10 (MC 2.1). In a few instances the headings were superimposed on the logo (MC 1.6).

In Slide 1 there were a few instances of *<Type Title Here>* appearing in the chart (MC 2.2). There were instances of subordinates wrongly displayed as assistants (MC2.3) and of 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 Slide 2, first bullet, candidates frequently failed to key *Office* with an initial capital (MC1.7).

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). In some instances the date, although correct on the whole page slides, was automatically displayed in American style in Outline View (MC 4L). There were several instances of the Outline View not being printed and a few where the Outline View had been printed but not the whole page slides (MC 2.2).

Frequent spelling and typographical errors in this document were *Office* for *Officer, Personal* for *Personnel, Manger* for *Manager.*

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 1 (MC 2.2). In some instances the date, although correct on the whole page slides, was automatically displayed in American style (MC 4L). 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). A frequent misspelling was *Picadily* for *Piccadilly*. In Slide 1 several candidates failed to amend the text in the boxes (MC 2.1) and there were instances of S*ue Strelley* being added as an assistant or subordinate instead of a co-worker (MC 2.3).

Document 3: Many candidates carried out this document to a high standard, with most candidates producing the pie chart correctly for Slide 5. A few candidates printed each slide separately on a full page (MC 2.2).

In Slide 5 there were a few instances of a column chart being used instead of a pie chart. A few candidates omitted the legend (MC 2.3). Several candidates did not follow capitalisation as shown (MC 4J).   Some candidates added superfluous headings such as *Number* and *Claim Type* to the chart (MC 2.1). The only heading that should have appeared on Slide 5 was *Claims*, in the same position and formatting as the other slide headings.

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 *from* for *of* in Slide 1, *check* for *cheque*, *remainders* for *reminders*, *currant* for *current* and *royalty* for *loyalty*(MC1.1 and 2.1). *Personnel Manager* was frequently keyed without initial capitals (MC1.7).