OCR

Oxford Cambridge and RSA

Cambridge National

Creative iMedia

Unit **J807:** Level 1/2 Cambridge National Award in Creative iMedia

Unit **J817:** Level 1/2 Cambridge National Certificate in Creative iMedia

Unit **J827:** Level 1/2 Cambridge National Diploma in Creative iMedia

OCR Report for Centres for June 2014

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.

CONTENTS

Cambridge National Award in Creative iMedia J807

Cambridge National Certificate in Creative iMedia J817

Cambridge National Diploma in Creative iMedia J827

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

J807, J817, J827: Cambridge Nationals Creative iMedia

General Comments:

Overall, this qualification has seen a very successful first year and the content has been found to be both engaging and accessible by centres and their learners. Some clarification of the expectations and approach to assessment is still needed, which is not unexpected for a new qualification. On a positive note, a good number of centres have submitted some excellent work that is a good match for the qualification structure, marking criteria and assessment practice. Entries were made for every unit in this series although some were more popular than others.

Candidates did not always demonstrate a high level of skill in creating their final outcomes, even though they achieved high marks overall. This is a result of the structure to the marking grids, which has a spread of marks for the creative process to investigate, plan, produce and review their work. In this respect many candidates were able to achieve strong marks across the process through the unit in order to support a high overall mark.

A number of key areas were found to be problematic and do not appear to be well understood. These are identified below:

- The qualification features a summative assessment philosophy and evidence should not be based on coursework activities. Learners should be taught the unit content prior to them completing the OCR assignment independently
- Centres must use the OCR model assignments for assessment purposes. Some permitted changes are allowed but these are restricted as detailed in the teacher guidance section of the model assignment.
- Feedback on how to improve the work cannot be provided to candidates once entered for assessment. The only guidance that can be given for the model assignment is a clarification of what is required by the brief/scenario.
- The re-use of assignments and evidence created from older cognate qualifications such as OCR Nationals in ICT is not suitable. This approach must be avoided.

In terms of the approach to evidence generation, a number of areas would benefit from being addressed. These are more general issues that apply to all units:

- With any investigation or exploration for Task 1 the referencing of sources must be included. This is so that it is clear what is the candidates own interpretation and understanding, which is what counts towards the award of marks.
- Evidence of the processes completed to create the final product for any unit should not be just implied. The use of appropriate tools and techniques should be evidenced clearly to support the marks, especially for the higher mark bands.

In terms of the administration of the qualification in this series, a number of issues were experienced. It is hoped that these issues will be resolved in future series since they can cause difficulties with processing candidate results in good time:

- The URS (Unit Recording Sheet) was not always used or supplied with the candidate work. This is an important document for the moderator to see the mark breakdown across the strands and should be included with all entry routes ie repository, postal or visiting.
- The CCS160 (Centre Authentication Statement) and a copy of the MS1 should also be supplied to the moderator with the candidate work.

- A significant number of late entries were made together with changes to marks once the moderator had started to review the work. Final marks should be entered by the dates shown in the specification.
- The full mark range should be used. It was recognised that some centres appeared to cap the lower mark at 36 whereas there was a wide range of submissions, some of which justified the mark and others that were significantly weaker. As a moderation outcome, any scaling that is applied because of this has the potential to disadvantage some candidates and centres are required to record accurate marks in the first instance.

In addition to some problem areas, it was found that many centres demonstrated good practice as follows:

- Detailed comments, justifications and signposting in the comment section of the URS. This generally makes the moderation process easier and it becomes more straightforward for the moderator to support the marks once some explanation and signposting has been provided.
- Supplying the final product in its intended digital format(s), whether on disc or memory stick. Note that paper printouts for digital media outcomes rarely confirm suitable file properties and filenames have been used.
- An independent approach to evidence generation by candidates where they choose their own formats and style of evidence. This is a much more appropriate structure and the use of prescriptive workbooks and templates should certainly be avoided in this qualification.
- The interpretation of client requirements is found in all units and this was carefully considered by some candidates. This is the opportunity for candidates to evidence their own personal ideas on what is required by the brief and how they could approach it. Note that merely re-iterating the brief would not provide any interpretation.

Teacher's application of the marking criteria has again been found to be generous in some parts of the marking criteria. These include the initial research and investigations for LO1 together with parts of the planning for LO2 (in particular the identification of assets and resources along with how they are to be used). The use of tools and techniques to create the product for LO3 is also implied in many cases whereas this needs to be clear in the candidate's evidence. The reviews for LO4 have again been quite accurately marked.

A notice to centres has been issued for the Cambridge Nationals in Creative iMedia. Following its successful first year of delivery a review identified a series of minor typographical amendments to the content of the specification. These amendments provide greater clarity and a revised version of the specification and final version of the notice will be available on the OCR website.

Some amendments have been made to the marking criteria grids to ensure they are consistent and must be applied when internally assessing candidate work from September 2014. Details of these are included in this report for each individual unit in the next section.

R081 Pre-production Skills

This is the second series for this qualification but already there are improvements in the quality of answers from the first series in January.

There is a good level of knowledge about what pre-production documents are and what they contain. However the understanding of why these documents are used is still weak and this is where marks have again been lost. This indicated that candidates have been taught how to create these documents within specific projects without the understanding of why they are being used at that stage. This was clearly evident in the responses for question 9 where the review of an existing document was assessed.

This paper is vocationally focussed and so is based on a single context that runs throughout the entirety of the paper. Thus some questions within the paper require the candidates to demonstrate clearly that they can apply their knowledge **specifically** to the context given to gain full marks on the question. Candidates will not be credited fully where they do not refer to the context. It is this aspect of the paper where candidates struggled and it is advised that centres take note of this issue.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No. 1

a – This question asked for the purpose of a script, not its content. This resulted in some candidates losing marks.

b i – A less demanding question that was answered well.

b ii – This question required candidates to apply their knowledge of storyboards to the context of an animated video. As a result the lack of application of context led to the candidates dropping marks on this question.

Question No. 2

a This was a simple question which had a mark scheme that is clearly listed in a number of different units from the specification. However this question was poorly answered indicating that work plans and production schedules are not being addressed correctly at this moment.

b This question was based on the same work plans and production schedule theme and as a result of the apparent lack of teaching of this topic marks were lost on this question.

Work plans and production schedules are a part of the specification and as such questions may be asked of this topic in future series. Centres are advised to take note of this.

Question No. 3

a In this question candidates were asked to describe the steps that would be taken to allow the logos to be included in the game. The asking of permission was a common answer but is not enough as asking for permission is not enough for their use - permission must be first obtained. As a result full marks were not common in this answer

b This question asked about the effects of target audience age and income on the choice of logos. This was based within the context of the game. Too many answers were generic with no relationship to the context being made, ie teenagers.

Question No. 4

a

i A less complex question that was generally well answered

ii A less complex question that was generally well answered

b

i A less complex question that was generally well answered. However a number of candidates referred to the software, not the final file type.

ii This question was poorly answered showing candidates lack of knowledge of how to name files appropriately. This question did not ask for the importance of version control but asked for the candidate to apply their knowledge to the scenario and create a suitable name to save the reviewed file.

iii A less complex question that was generally well answered.

Question No. 5

a As mentioned this paper is vocationally based with a context and as a result this question was poorly answered. Too many answers were generic 'Internet' 'google' 'search engine' which were too vague resulting in no marks.

b Full marks were not common in this question, as whilst primary research techniques such as surveys or questionnaires were mentioned , they were not linked to the context consistently for full marks to be awarded.

Question No. 6

This question required candidates to select five suitable images, justify their choice and place them in the structure of a mood board. The drawing of the images was not required. This question was generally well done with three main weaknesses being seen. 1) Candidates only listed the images which missed the mood board structure context 2) More than five images were selected 3) Justifications were descriptions of the images not reasons for their inclusion.

Question No. 7

a A less complex question but the knowledge of relevant file types was mixed.

b This question asked the candidates to relate the final file choice to the scenario of the games being played on multiple mobile platforms. This was poorly answered with candidates not linking to the scenario and only providing generic answers.

Question No. 8

Candidates were asked to create a storyboard for the scenes between two levels of a game. A number of candidates drew the game itself which did not answer the question. Creating a storyboard is not just about drawing scenes but is also about the technical aspects such as camera angles, lighting and timings. It is the consistent use of these technical aspects that were required to access the higher marks.

Question No. 9

This question was about the strengths and weakness of a mind map and its suitability for its audience and purpose. This question was not well answered. This again indicated the lack of understanding of the purpose of a pre-production document, in this case a mind map. To gain the highest marks the candidates needed to demonstrate who the mind map was aimed at and so its purpose, together with its strengths and weaknesses. This was not well done. Many candidates gave generic answers about the purpose of a mind map and focussed on the content of the game and how the game can be improved, not the mind map. This again demonstrated where candidates spend their time in other units creating pre-production documents without the understanding of why and who they are creating the documents for.

R082

Specific comments relating to this unit:
- How the purpose and audience influence the design should not be just a media analysis of existing products.
- Assets need to be identified in the planning and not just listed in the evidence of creating the digital graphic. How and where they are to be used is also important to support the higher marks and few candidates included this.
- Many candidates successfully evidenced their skills from R081in the form of detailed visualisation diagrams.
- The properties of digital graphics were not investigated very thoroughly, sometimes only considering bitmap and vector formats. In particular, this should include the pixel count and dpi resolution for print and web use. This is fundamental to the unit if candidates are to evidence their understanding and create digital graphics that are fit for purpose in a vocational context.
- Legal issues (typically copyright) were identified and where this was considered in an applied context for the work being created, the higher performance descriptor was accessible
- A significant number of portfolios included the final graphic in a relatively low quality print format. Sometimes this was only from a monochrome laser printer. In general this type of product evidence struggles to support the marks at high band 1 or above.
- The final graphic in its intended format is a very important piece of evidence that should always be provided. Merely inserting screen captures into a write up is not a good substitute for this. This is a key point for any unit submission.
- Many graphic outcomes were not to suitable pixel dimensions and resolutions for print purposes at the size of a DVD cover. The work was often creative but lacked the technical qualities to ensure it was fit for purpose.
- The use of tools and techniques frequently lacked any evidence – this cannot be implied from the final graphic
- Reviews tended to be very good often supporting higher marks in band 2 and 3.

Specification issues for clarification:
- As part of LO2, candidates should identify the assets needed but the marking criteria require them to also understand their potential use to achieve the higher marks.
- As part of LO2, candidates should identify the resources needed but the marking criteria require an understanding of their purpose for the higher marks. The unit content refers to using version control in LO3. The marking grid refers to using file and folder names and structures. For clarification, the use of file and folder names that includes version control is recommended to fully address this.

OCR Report to Centres – June 2014

R083

Specific comments relating to this unit:
- Work plans that address the character creation in a vocational context should be produced rather than a work plan for the evidence generation for the entire unit.
- The final character in its intended format is a very important piece of evidence that should always be provided. Merely inserting screen captures into a write up or attaching a low quality paper based print is not a good substitute for this.
- Different views of the character should be included in order to access the higher mark bands eg front view, side view and/or a facial close up. This ensures the level of demand in this unit is comparable with other units (this requirement will be seen in the tasks for the new model assignment released in Autumn 2014).

Specification issues for clarification:
- As part of LO2, candidates should identify the assets needed but the marking criteria require them to also understand their potential use to achieve the higher marks.
- As part of LO2, candidates should identify the resources needed but the marking criteria require an understanding of their purpose for the higher marks. The marking criteria refers to a test plan that covers functionality, identifying tests, expected and actual outcomes plus any re-tests. For clarification, this should be covered in the teaching content when creating test plans and is generic across any unit.
- The marking criteria requires effects adding to the character and this should be included in the teaching content.
- The unit content refers to using version control in LO3. The marking grid refers to using file and folder names and structures. For clarification, the use of file and folder names that includes version control is recommended to fully address this.

R084

Specific comments relating to this unit:
- This unit is proving to be very popular and some very creative comics are being produced.
- Choice of software used varies from word processing, desktop publishing, presentation and dedicated comic book creation applications. It should be noted that a series of PowerPoint slides is not a good choice of software to create a comic strip or comic book in this unit.
- In mark band 2 and 3, both a script and storyline is required. A number of candidates had a storyline but no separate script. It can be accepted that evidence of the script is merged with the storyboard where it is sufficiently detailed and clear. This should be identified in the URS comments if this approach is used to justify the marks given.
- A range of assignments were used in this series, not all of which were clearly within the scope of permitted modification to the OCR model assignments. Note that a free choice or a range of options is not considered a suitable scenario for any assignment.

Specification issues for clarification:
The marking criteria grid has been amended for LO1: *Understanding comic strips and their creation*.
Part of Mark Band 3 has been amended as follows:
- Describes software that can be used to create a comic strip, accurately describing a range of tools that can be used and explains how these relate to the layout and features of the pages.
 The marking criteria grid has been amended for LO3: *Be able to produce a multipage comic strip*.
 Part of Mark Bands 2 and 3 have been amended as follows:
- Mark Band 2 – Integrates the script with the visual storyline to produce a mostly coherent comic strip, which mostly follows the plan.
- Mark Band 3 – Integrates the script with the visual storyline to produce a fully coherent comic strip, which closely follows the plan.
- As part of LO2, candidates should identify the assets needed but the marking criteria require them to also understand their potential use to achieve the higher marks.
- As part of LO2, candidates should identify the resources needed but the marking criteria require an understanding of their purpose for the higher marks.
- Content refers to source and store assets but marking criteria requires them to use appropriate methods. For clarification the 'appropriate methods' refers to version control, properties and file formats.
- The unit content refers to using version control in LO3. The marking grid refers to using file and folder names and structures. For clarification, the use of file and folder names that includes version control is recommended to fully address this.

R085

Specific comments relating to this unit:
- Some candidates did not evidence the use of a master page and template to define the styles, fonts and colour schemes as would be expected to create consistency across the website.
- The house style for the website can be identified as part of the planning, either in the interpretation of client requirements or by annotation of the visualisation diagram. This is being clarified in the specification amendments.
- The software application used to create the website should be clear in the evidence presented (this comment applies to most units). This is to ensure its selection is appropriate in a vocational context.
- Colour schemes were found to be quite varied. Bold primary colour schemes are not ideal and can limit the marks in the LO3 descriptor for a basic masterpage in mark band 1 unless its use can be justified.

Specification issues for clarification:
- As part of LO2, candidates should identify the assets needed but the marking criteria require them to also understand their potential use to achieve the higher marks. The unit content refers to using version control in LO3. The marking grid refers to using file and folder names and structures. For clarification, the use of file and folder names that includes version control is recommended to fully address this.

R086

Specific comments relating to this unit:

- A number of entries were based on older qualifications including OCR Nationals in IT and QCF Creative iMedia. The use of coursework approaches and prescriptive writing frames is not suitable for this new qualification. Where the OCR model assignment was used on the 'Superfizz' brief, some excellent outcomes were created that were found to fully meet the requirements of the client in a vocational context. It was reassuring to see this standard of work that supported very high overall marks.
- The final animation in its intended format should always be provided. Both .gif and .swf were popular choices which worked well.

Specification issues for clarification:

- The marking criteria requires candidates to consider the advantages and disadvantages of different animation types, which needs to be part of the exploration in LO1
- Sourcing and storage of assets should include using appropriate methods, as required by the marking criteria. In terms of the unit content, this refers to file formats, file names and properties
- As part of LO2, candidates should identify the assets needed but the marking criteria require them to also understand their potential use to achieve the higher marks.
- The marking criteria suggests a storyboard is required that includes resources (eg computer, equipment and software). These would normally be listed separately and this would be recommended as a more practical approach to evidencing the criteria. Marks should still be given where the storyboard and identification of resources are separate.
- The marking criteria refers to a test plan that covers functionality, identifying tests, expected and actual outcomes plus any re-tests. For clarification, this should be covered in the teaching content when creating test plans and is generic across any unit.
- The unit content refers to using version control in LO3. The marking grid refers to using file and folder names and structures. For clarification, the use of file and folder names that includes version control is recommended to fully address this.

R087

Specific comments relating to this unit:

- The investigation and consideration of design principles was relatively weak in a number of submissions.
- Evidence of the processes completed to create and repurpose the assets were often very brief in order to support the marks given. In general, this cannot be just implied in the final work.
- The final product that has been exported in its intended format should always be provided. This format should be generic and not require the use of any specialist software applications. Merely inserting screen captures into a write up is not a good substitute for this since it does not confirm that any user navigation and interactivity has been included.

Specification issues for clarification:

- The marking criteria refers to a test plan that covers functionality, identifying tests, expected and actual outcomes plus any re-tests. For clarification, this should be covered in the teaching content when creating test plans and is generic across any unit.
- The marking criteria requires the final product to be saved in a suitable format that retains interactivity, the knowledge of these should be a result of the teaching content from LO1
- The unit content refers to using version control in LO3. The marking grid refers to using file and folder names and structures. For clarification, the use of file and folder names that includes version control is recommended to fully address this.

R088

Specific comments relating to this unit:
- Lists of equipment and resources tended to be brief with little justification in relation to identified success criteria. In general, the success criteria could be determined from the interpretation of the client requirements.
- The final audio file in its intended format was always supplied for this unit. In general the audio products were good and combined a range of sounds and effects.

Specification issues for clarification:
- The unit content refers to using version control in LO3. The marking grid refers to using file and folder names and structures. For clarification, the use of file and folder names that includes version control is recommended to fully address this.

R089

Specific comments relating to this unit:
- Group working is allowed in the qualification and this unit lends itself to this better than most others. Where this approach is used, the individual contribution must be clearly evidenced and marks can only be awarded for what the individual candidate has done. Witness statements can assist this evidencing of contribution (see guidance in the specification on how to provide this effectively).
- A large number of submissions were created individually by candidates and this enables them full access to the available marks. Credit could be given for the use of camera techniques and video editing using this approach, whereas it could be diluted when working with others.
- The final video exported in a viewable format is required and not just Windows movie maker .mswmm files since these do not have the video embedded.

Specification issues for clarification:
The marking criteria grid has been amended for LO1: *Understand the uses and properties of digital video*
Part of Mark Bands 2 and 3 have been amended as follows:
- Mark Band 2 – Produces a summary of the uses and properties of digital video, identifying a range of sectors in which digital video is used which demonstrates a sound understanding.
- Mark Band 3 – Describes accurately different video file formats and the properties of digital video.

The marking criteria grid has been amended for LO3: *Be able to create a digital video sequence.*
Part of Mark Bands 1, 2 and 3 have been amended as follows:
- 'Saves and exports the digital video sequence (occasionally/mostly/consistently) using a format which is ………'
  The word video has been changed from sound.

- The unit content refers to using version control in LO3. The marking grid refers to using file and folder names and structures. For clarification, the use of file and folder names that includes version control is recommended to fully address this.

R090

Specific comments relating to this unit:

- The knowledge and understanding of exposure settings was not well evidenced and yet this is an important part of this dedicated unit on digital photography. Note that more in depth learning is required over and above a general knowledge of taking pictures using a smartphone so that the level of demand is commensurate with other units.
- Investigation into cameras, techniques and composition using web sources often lacked appropriate referencing and it was not always clear what was the candidate's own work. This comment applies to any investigation and research activities.

Specification issues for clarification:
The marking criteria grid has been amended for LO2: *Be able to plan a photo-shoot.*

- In Mark Band 2, mark point 11 has been omitted. The mark range is confirmed as 7 to 11 marks.

R091

Specific comments relating to this unit:
- The final game proposal in its intended format is a very important piece of evidence that should always be provided. Merely inserting the content of this into an overall unit write up is not a good substitute for this. The proposal should be a document or other file that would be used to present the game concept to a client.

Specification issues for clarification:
- The review of the game proposal requires references to game components, narrative and game play across the three mark bands.

R091

R092

Specific comments relating to this unit:

- The final playable game in its intended format should always be provided. A series of screen captures showing the game environment and game play does not provide any suitable evidence of this.
- The investigation and research using web sources often lacked appropriate referencing and it was not always clear what was the candidate's own work. This is an important area for any unit.

Specification issues for clarification:
The marking criteria grid has been amended for LO1: *Understand game creation hardware, software and peripherals*
Part of Mark Band 3 has been amended to remove the word limited, as follows:

- Produces a summary of the capabilities and limitations of a range of 2D and 3D software used for digital game creation which demonstrates thorough understanding.
- The marking criteria make reference to how much support the candidate needs. For clarification, this can only refer to the brief/scenario for the game and all other work must be produced independently by the candidate without support or guidance.
- For clarification, the contextualisation of the key aspects of game creation is required by the marking criteria and this should be included as part of the teaching content.
- The marking criteria refers to a test plan that covers functionality, identifying tests, expected and actual outcomes plus any re-tests. For clarification, this should be covered in the teaching content when creating test plans and is generic across any unit.
- Planning the structure of the game is required by the marking criteria.
- The unit content refers to using version control in LO3. The marking grid refers to using file and folder names and structures. For clarification, the use of file and folder names that includes version control is recommended to fully address this.

Summary
This has been a very successful first year for the qualification. It is recognised that some centres are still adapting their approach to this new qualification. The following key points are emphasised:

- Prescriptive workbooks and writing frames are not permitted in this qualification. Centres must ensure that all work is authentic to each candidate.
- Sources of information must be referenced so that it is clear what is the candidate's own personal interpretation, analysis, annotation or summary.
- Feedback cannot be given on how to improve the work to gain a higher grade/mark.
- The final work in its intended format should always be provided as evidence. Merely including screen captures into a write up is not a good alternative since this restricts the moderator's ability to check the properties, format, overall quality and fitness for purpose.
- Synoptic links to R082 have been seen to assist the evidence of pre-production techniques such as work plans, visualisation diagrams and consideration of a target audience.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning
Telephone: 01223 553998
Facsimile: 01223 552627
Email: general.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

PART OF THE
CAMBRIDGE ASSESSMENT
GROUP

LLOYD'S REGISTER QUALITY ASSURANCE · ISO9001

UKAS
MANAGEMENT
SYSTEMS
001