

Vocational Qualifications (QCF, NVQ, NQF)

Text Processing (Business Professional)

Level 1 Business Presentation - **06968**

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 1 Business Presentation - **06968**

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
Level 1 Business Presentation - 06968	4
Overview	4
General Comments	4
Comments on Individual Units	4
Sector Update.....	5

Level 1 Business Presentation - 06968

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

On Business Presentations Level 1, Document 1 candidates used the wrong slide for Slide 1, ie using a title slide instead of a bulleted slide. On the master slide the date, centre number and slide number were sometimes omitted. Occasionally the date was in the American format.

On Document 2 the bullets were not demoted as instructed and sometimes the bullet symbol was deleted. There was inconsistent spacing on the outline view printout.

On Document 3 some candidates failed to insert the Clip Art image and also produced the wrong printout usually printing one slide per page.

On Document 4 the headings on the Speaker's Notes were not emphasised in bold as instructed and some candidates failed to follow the capitalisation.

Comments on Individual Units

Autumn 2015

Document 1: This document was well done although a few candidates used the wrong slide for Slide 1, ie a title slide instead of a bulleted slide. On the master slide "Today's Date" and the Slide Number were sometimes omitted. (Marking Criteria 2.3) The date was sometimes rendered in the American format. (MC 2.1)

Document 2: Occasionally the bullet was not demoted and sometimes the bullet symbol was deleted. (MC 2.3, 1.2) There was inconsistent spacing on the outline view. (MC 4I) The date was sometimes rendered in the American format. (MC 2.1)

Document 3: This document was very well done. Some candidates failed to insert the Clip Art image. (MC 2.3)

Document 4: Incorrectly keying-in text caused most errors in this document. (MC 1.1, 1.2) Some candidates did not emphasise the headings in bold as instructed. (MC 4D) The capitalisation of the headings on the Speaker's Notes was not consistently followed by some candidates. (MC 4J)

Spring 2016

Document 1: This document was well done although a few candidates used the wrong slide for Slide 1 ie a title slide instead of a bulleted slide. On the master slide "Today's Date" the Centre Number and the Slide Number were sometimes omitted. (Marking Criteria 2.3) The date was sometimes rendered in the American format. (MC 2.1) Some candidates failed to follow the capitalisation for the headings and within the slide. (MC 4J)

OCR Report to Centres – August 2016

Document 2: Occasionally the bullets were not demoted as instructed and sometimes the bullet symbol was deleted. (MC 2.3, 1.2) There was inconsistent spacing on the outline view. (MC 4I) The date was sometimes rendered in the American format. (MC 2.1)

Document 3: This document was very well done. Some candidates failed to insert the Clip Art image. (MC 2.3) Some candidates produced the wrong printout usually printing one slide per page. (2.2)

Document 4: Incorrectly keying-in text caused most errors in this document. (MC 1.1, 1.2) A small minority of candidates did not emphasise the headings in bold as instructed. (MC 4D) The capitalisation of the headings on the Speaker's Notes was not consistently followed by some candidates. (MC 4J)

Summer 2016

Document 1: This document was well done although a few candidates used the wrong slide for Slide 1 ie a title slide instead of a bulleted slide. On the master slide "Today's Date", the Centre Number and the Slide Number were sometimes omitted. (Marking Criteria 2.3) The date was sometimes rendered in the American format. (MC 2.1) Some candidates failed to follow the capitalisation for the headings and within the slide. (MC 4J) Some candidates mixed the spelling of Adviser/Advisor – either was acceptable but must be consistent on the slide and throughout the presentation. (MC 4K)

Document 2: Occasionally the bullets were not demoted as instructed and sometimes the bullet symbol was deleted. (MC 2.3, 1.2) There was inconsistent spacing on the outline view. (MC 4I) Stephen was sometimes rendered as Stephan. (MC 1.2)

Document 3: This document was very well done. Some candidates failed to insert the Clip Art image. (MC 2.3) Sometimes candidates keyed-in Client Care Team as client care team (MC 1.7) Some candidates produced the wrong printout usually printing one slide per page. (2.2)

Document 4: Incorrectly keying-in text caused most errors in this document. (MC 1.1, 1.2) On Slide 4 some candidates keyed-in Client Care Team as client care team". (MC 1.7) A small minority of candidates did not emphasise the headings in bold as instructed. (MC 4D)

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

