

## Business Presentations (Level 2) – 06977 Autumn 2011

### **General:**

Centres should ensure that the revised unit specifications are used in future. This document can be found in the *Units* section of the Text Processing pages on the OCR website: [http://www.ocr.org.uk/qualifications/type/qcf/text\\_pro/bp\\_l2\\_cert/documents/](http://www.ocr.org.uk/qualifications/type/qcf/text_pro/bp_l2_cert/documents/).

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.

### **Document 1:**

Display of this document was generally good. Specified fonts and sizes were mostly used, although there were frequent 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 italic (MC 2.3) or centred (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 4.22.11 (MC 2.1). In a few instances the headings were superimposed on the logo (MC 1.6).

In Slide 4 there were a few instances of <Type Title Here> appearing in the chart (MC 2.2). There were instances 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) and there were occasional misspellings of names. The alternative spelling of Adviser/Advisor was frequently inconsistent across all documents (MC 4K).

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 *opportunités* for *opportunities*, *saving* for *savings*, *event* for *events* and omission of the question mark.

### **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 number of 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 4 (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). In Slide 4 several candidates failed to amend the text in the boxes (MC 2.1).

### **Document 3:**

Many candidates carried out this document to a high standard, with most candidates producing the line 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 the data list being printed instead of the line chart (MC 2.2). Many candidates omitted the axis labels (MC 2.3). Some candidates added superfluous headings to the chart (MC 2.1). The only heading that should have appeared on Slide 5 was *EVENT TARGETS*, in the same position and formatting as the other slide headings. The most frequent typographical errors were *Janury* for *January*, *Febuary* for *February* and *events* for *event*.

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

### **Document 4:**

Some candidates produced accurate work, although many 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) or being omitted (MC 2.1). Several candidates did not leave a clear line space after the note headings (MC 4B). Due to lack of clarity in layout, allowance was made for differing paragraphs in slides 3, 4 and 5.

The most common errors were substituted or omitted words and typographical and spelling errors such as *opportunites* for *opportunities*, *changed* for *charged*, *loose* for *lose*, *of* for *or*, *personnel* for *personal*, *out* for *our*, *trails* for *trials*, *advice* for *advise*, and *high life* for *highlight*