

## **Medical Word Processing Level 2 – 06996**

### **Summer 2009**

The standard of work submitted was good with most candidates coping well with the demands of the new scheme and the medical terminology in this paper. Some candidates are changing the font style and size of the recalled text in the OCR supplied files which should not be changed unless specifically instructed to do so.

#### ***Document 1:***

The majority of candidates numbered the pages and removed the page number from the first page, but in removing this they also removed the header text which should appear on every page (Marking Criterion 2.3). For those that displayed the header on every page there was occasionally a difference in the header text on different pages with errors appearing on the second and subsequent pages. The left and top margin were adjusted as instructed, but many candidates failed to maintain the top margin measurement on pages 2 and 3, probably due to superfluous hard returns at the top of the page (MC 4T). A number of candidates copied the paragraph rather than the sentence as instructed and a few moved the sentence instead of copying (MC 3.5). The font style and size of the recalled text must not be changed; candidates who modified this were penalised (MC 2.3). In papers from some centres the font size, margin and indent measurements were slightly outside the tolerances allowed and candidates should be advised not to apply any scaling or 'adjusting to fit' as this can affect the measurements thereby incurring faults. The search and replace, move and change in linespacing were generally well executed. Some candidates incurred a fault for inconsistent spacing following the subheadings, particularly after the TREATMENT subheading (MC 4I) and a few indented the heading CAUSES with the indent paragraph, although this was not included within the bracket (MC 4U). The word 'perineal' was occasionally keyed as 'perennial' and 'prostate' as 'prostrate'.

#### ***Document 2:***

The insertion and manipulation of the picture was not always done correctly. The correct picture was usually inserted; however, this should be positioned below the heading to the right of the first paragraph and some candidates incorrectly aligned this with the heading (MC 2.3). The new paragraph 'Most Staphylococcus infections...' should have been positioned below the picture as shown on the draft and not wrapped to the left of the picture (MC 2.3). A few candidates were slightly out with the width measurement; maintaining aspect ratio was not required providing the width was correct (MC 2.3). 'Staphylococcus' was frequently misspelt (MC 1.1) or keyed without an initial capital (MC 1.7). The sort was well done; the last two items 'septicaemia' and 'septic arthritis' were accepted in any order as some medical dictionaries present these in a different order to the computer sort. A few candidates failed to print the document in landscape (MC 4H). The vertical transposition was well done (MC 3.1) and most candidates performed a word count which should have been 159 – additional text such as 'word count' is not penalised, but these words should not be included in the actual word count (MC 2.3). The automatic filename and path were usually inserted, although some had saved with a different filename or added additional text such as their initials to the filename (MC 2.3). The display of a file extension is not essential.

**Document 3:**

The presentation of the table must be exactly as shown on the draft with the column widths adjusted to display the items on one line and the sub-divided column headings wrapped as shown. The heading PATIENT DETAILS should span the sub-divided columns requiring the cells to be merged but some candidates had split this heading aligning PATIENT above APPOINTMENT and DETAILS above RADIOGRAPHIC (MC 2.3). Many candidates continue to present the table without a clear line space after each of the column headings and/or after the section headings (MC 4B) and some are not aligning data to the left (MC 4P).

Occasionally the table extended into the left margin resulting in an irregular left margin with the text above and below (MC 4A). A few candidates started the table after the second paragraph of recalled text and then typed the final paragraph again incurring several errors for duplicated text (MC 2.1). The table modifications were generally well done but the APPOINTMENT TIME column was not always sorted correctly with several displaying this in descending rather than ascending order (MC 3.4). Times were accepted consistently displayed with a colon separator and am/pm displayed with or without a preceding space ie 9.00 am or 9.00am. Common errors included 'lumbar' keyed as 'lumber', 'pyelogram' as 'pyelo gram', 'Rosenberg' as 'Rosenburg' and 'Bensusan' as 'Bensuson'.

**Document 4:**

The majority of candidates recalled the supplied letterhead template, although some incurred a fault for making alterations to the letterhead such as changing alignment, font style/size or removing emphasis (MC 4H). Many candidates failed to change the font size and style of the recalled phrases to Trebuchet MS 11 (MC 2.3). A few candidates failed to date the letter (MC 2.1). Some candidates failed to follow the display of drug names as shown on the draft - proprietary drug names 'Plaquenil', 'Salazopyrin', 'Humira' should be displayed with initial caps (MC 1.7 per word) and generic drug names 'methotrexate' and 'leflunomide' should be displayed without an initial capital (MC 4J). Common errors included '6.1' as G.1', 'CRP' as 'CPR', 'metatarsophalangeal' as 'metacarpophalangeal' and various spellings of 'pruritis'. In the third paragraph a few candidates missed a line of text by jumping from the word 'joints' on one line to 'joints' on the next line – careful proofreading would identify this omission. Occasionally faults were incurred in the production of extra copies, destination and routing with some candidates producing only one copy or handwriting destination details and a few failed to key 'cc' or an alternative (MC 2.3).