# 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 January 2018

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

# R081 Pre-production Skills

**General Comments:**

A sound level of knowledge was again seen this series about the specification in general. The trend towards less generic answers was continued highlighting a better application of knowledge in places to the context that the paper has been set in. Having said this, marks are still being lost due to the context not being fully applied. Candidates should be helped in developing their ability to read the context and then apply their knowledge to that context. The context used is never one that candidates could not relate too and so exam practice of answering questions related to a specific context needs to be increased to help candidates develop their ability to answer questions fully.

The understanding of the purpose of some of the pre-production documents is still lacking despite this being mentioned in previous reports at the end of each examination series. The ability to justify the selection of one pre-production document over another for a given context is still weak. Considering that there are only five documents in the specification this is concerning.

In a number of cases marking of the design based question was hampered due to candidates using equipment that does allow the images to be seen. Candidates must ensure that they only use a black pen or HB pencil when taking the examination.

**Comments on Individual Questions:**

**Question No.**

1a   This question was generally well answered. However, the question asks for items and there were, once again, too many answers that could not be classified as items. Candidates should also ensure that they read the questions fully as a number of responses were seen where 'text' was given. This was not acceptable as it is too vague to be an item. A number of responses were also seen referring to video and audio which were not acceptable in this context as the question referred to physical mood board.

1b   This was well answered for one mark, with the second expansion mark often omitted. Many responses seen were too vague with phrases such as 'to generate ideas' being used. This is not specific enough an answer as this could refer to a spider diagram, one of the other pre-production documents in the specification. This highlighted again the lack of understanding of the reasons for why specific documents are used.

1c   This question saw a mixed set of responses, mainly due to candidates not reading the command word in the question correctly. The question required candidates to describe how the physical mood board could be converted into a digital version, i.e. how to use a piece of hardware to do this.

2a   This answer demonstrated a full range of marks being awarded with candidates generally showing a good understanding the different aspects of a work plan.

2b   The responses seen to this question generally showed a weakness in the understanding of the concept of workflow in workplans. Whilst many candidates gained one mark for providing an example from the work plan, the awarding of higher targeted expansion marks was limited. The concept of workflow is an area of weakness that should be addressed for future series.

3        This question saw a mixed set of responses, mainly due to candidates not reading the command word in the question correctly. The question asked for a description of health and safety issues, not an explanation of an issue and how it could be resolved. This is what was seen from a large number of candidates. A number of responses were also seen where candidates used 'classroom rules' as their answers which were not suitable for the context of a professional company. Hence marks were again lost on this question.

4ai      This question was targeted at a low level of knowledge and was generally well answered. However, there were many vague answers provided i.e. tablet - does this refer to a drawing tablet or a tablet computer. This was not credited.

4aii     This question was targeted at a low level of knowledge and was generally well answered. However, there were many responses that identified software that centres may use to complete coursework but are not appropriate for the professional based context of the examination scenario. A number of responses were also seen where candidates provided two examples of one type of software.

4b       This was well answered for one mark, with the second expansion mark often omitted. This highlighted again the lack of understanding of the reasons for why specific documents are used. Too many responses seen were generic, possibly referring to a number of other documents and not to the use of a storyboard in this context.

5a       This question was targeted at a low level of knowledge and saw a range of responses. A large number of responses seen used a 'default' of Data Protection Act and the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act. This highlighted a general weakness in the understanding of the legislation that is involved in the creative media sector and candidates did not apply it correctly to the context.

5b       This question was targeted towards the higher end of knowledge and understanding and saw a wide range of marks being awarded, with a tendency towards the lower numbers being given. Many responses referred to copyright and not to intellectual property rights highlighting again a lack of the understanding of the legislation that is involved in the creative media sector.

6        This question was targeted at a low level of knowledge and was generally well answered. However, there were many answers that again showed a lack of understanding of the different file formats that are appropriate for the context.

7        Compared to earlier examination series the creation of the wrong document was again not seen as often, which is a positive movement. However, marks were often lost by candidates where it was not clear that the response was a comic cover rather than a DVD cover or poster. This shows again that candidates still need to apply their work more fully to the context provided.

         At the top end of the mark scheme some of the visualisations produced were of the highest quality.

8ai      This question was targeted at a low level of knowledge and was generally well answered.

8aii     This question was targeted at a low level of knowledge and was generally well answered.

8aiii    this question was targeted at a low level of knowledge and was generally well answered.

8b    this question was targeted towards the higher end of knowledge and understanding and saw a wide range of marks being awarded. The responses once again highlighted lack of understanding of the use of pre-production documents in a context. Many responses seen showed a lack of knowledge and understanding of what is included on a script referring to information that would instead be included on a storyboard.

9    The responses seen for this question were, in the main, better than in earlier series. Some responses seen referred to the correct audience for the document rather than the audience of the product. This increased the possibility of the highest marks being awarded. However, the lack of explanation of how the improvements suggested by the candidates can aid the document audience restricted some of the marks that were awarded.

# R082 – R092

**General Comments:**

The structure to the work submitted in this January series has shown a few changes and potential trends, the reasons for which are not yet entirely clear. This has been seen across both the mandatory unit R082 together with some of the optional units R083 to R092. There are two main areas for comment here. Firstly, the concept of the summative assessment, which is a regular comment in the series reports although on this occasion, there is an increasing area of concern. The requirement of the summative assessment is that candidates complete the final assignment independently following a structured programme of learning. This is expected to take in the region of 10 hours but it is apparent that a good number of submissions would have taken substantially longer, sometimes with portfolios that include over 100 pages of evidence. A second area for comment is the concern about what additional guidance is being provided to candidates. This has been apparent because of patterns seen in the structure to submissions that is significantly outside the scope of the tasks in the OCR model assignment(s). As an example, a significant number of submissions from multiple centres have a very similar structure to the work, which appears to be a close match to the OCR exemplar material. Their use as a 'model answer' is a concern that has been raised in previous the feedback reports. However, the correct use of the exemplar material is to assist teachers in how to apply the marking criteria to a piece of work and yet it is becoming a template for what content to include so that mark band 3 can be achieved. This is fundamentally wrong and it would not be appropriate for candidates to use the exemplar as a reference in this way. Centres should not be using the exemplars to guide candidates on what to include and such practice can discourage the awarding body from making exemplar material available in future.

An important area to note here is that formative, prescriptive approaches and/or guided coursework does not meet the requirements of assessment in this qualification, which is a growing concern. A popular feature of the qualification is that the external assessment currently comprises 25% for the Certificate in the Cambridge Nationals Creative iMedia, which is supported on the basis that some rigour is maintained in the coursework/moderated units. Such rigour must be continuously applied throughout the sequence of processes from the centre's assessment through to awarding body standardisation, moderation and awarding to ensure the validity and reliability of the results.

Adaptations to model assignments have introduced a minority of problems in this series. What is important is that any change to the scenario maintains the breadth and scope of the intended final work. One example here would be an amendment to the digital photography unit that only required a few images on a very narrow theme. In effect, this limited the settings that could be used for a very limited range of composition ie with a single subject. Another example for digital graphics would be to require just a print or web graphic, rather than the two versions which are a feature of every OCR model assignment.

It was apparent that Unit Recording Sheets are sometimes completed for only those candidates in the sample requested by OCR. This is not generally considered to be good practice since the comments and justifications should be made at the time of the assessment, not retrospectively. In a small number of cases, comments were more generic and hence not providing any additional clarification for the moderator. However, on a more positive note it was good to see the majority of entries with clear signposting to the evidence and explanations of what evidence was available to meet the marking criteria. This is good practice that would be strongly encouraged.

Note that delivery guide and lesson elements cannot be used as evidence. These are teaching resources and play no part in the summative assessment, the concepts of which do not always appear to be well understood. Candidates should be responding to the tasks in the assignment once the summative assessment phase is being completed.

In this series a higher proportion of unit entries deviated from the rules regarding order of merit to the extent that they became invalid. The consequence here is that the work must then be returned to the centre for remarking. The most common reason is the lack of internal standardisation by the centre where there is more than one teacher/assessor. In situations where centres have more than one teacher it is essential that a rigorous internal standardisation process is followed to ensure there is an agreement of marks that are submitted to OCR.

Where centres have migrated from the Cambridge Nationals in ICT, it is clear that there is a learning curve in terms of the combined technical and creative aspects of the Creative iMedia qualification. Here, it can be thought of as a hybrid qualification that combines creative media content with the technical requirements that ensure the work is fit for purpose. One or the other of these aspects is not always well done and yet overlooked when attempting to apply the marking criteria.

Administration: Consistent with previous series, a significant number of clerical errors continue to be seen. One of the reasons for this is the use of centre devised spreadsheets to record the marks, which are then transferred to the URS for submission to the moderator. However, the moderator can then only use the URS information so a transcription error from the spreadsheet to URS introduces problems. As with any series, centres are asked to double check the marks entered on Interchange so that they are consistent with the URS and any/all other internal records. If a postal entry (/02) option is used, the inclusion of a printout of any internal spreadsheet may assist the moderator and reduce the administrative burden of correcting what appear to be clerical errors.

**Comments on Individual Units**

**R082**

- On a positive note, many portfolios were credited with very high marks for LO1 with some very lengthy and detailed evidence although it is the quality and not quantity that is expected by the marking criteria and assessment philosophy. Comments were received from centres to say they approached the mandatory unit R082 in the same way as that from the Cambridge Nationals in ICT. However, an important point to make here is that the task duration of up to 2 hours is recommended for this evidence in LO1 ie to produce a 'summary' as required by the marking criteria. Taking an unsuitable lengthy approach to this Learning Outcome can easily be generously marked by centres that give more marks for the quantity of evidence rather than the quality of a summary.

- A growing concern in LO1 is the format and content of the evidence, which is the same as the exemplar material on the OCR website. This practice must not be followed. The use of the OCR exemplar is to show how the marking criteria can be applied, not how candidates should be structuring their evidence. On occasions, centres are giving marks at the top of MB3 for work which is the same style as the exemplar but with more detail. This is not appropriate since additional detail would not meet the requirements of the marking criteria. Using the structure of the exemplar, the indicative best fit band is the highest that could be achieved and a different approach would be needed that is more consistent with the descriptors in the marking criteria.

- In LO2, the planning often included some good examples of the candidate's personal interpretation of the brief as opposed to just restating the content of the assignment scenario. This is important to support the mark in the first strand of LO2. The use of knowledge, skills and understanding from other units in the specification was often omitted, limiting the marks in the first strand to MB2.

- The technical compatibility of the assets was typically overlooked for the first strand of LO3, restricting the marks to MB2.

- The complexity of the final graphics for LO3 was quite varied, especially when using the Gloustol Film festival brief. This made it more difficult to support MB3 in several submissions and some final graphics were relatively simplistic, hence the best fit closer to MB2. As a poster, both landscape and portrait orientations were produced, which is open to the creative interpretation by the candidate. What is important though is that the poster properties are to the correct pixel dimensions and dpi for an A3 print product (ie not A4 or what would only be web resolution). In general, a number of centres are not assessing the final work correctly since they are omitting to check the properties of the final graphics to ensure they are fit for purpose (comments should be added to the URS for this).

- A cautionary comment here for LO3 is that the unit requires the use of image editing software and that desktop publishing approaches using standard paper sizes is not a good match for the intention of the unit in this media based qualification.

- In LO4, the submissions where marks could be supported were found where the reviews made relevant comments on the final graphic outcomes rather than summarising key points of the process to create them. This meets the descriptors in the marking criteria and hence more appropriate for the unit.

**R084**

- The research completed for LO1 must be summarised and put into the candidates own words to support any marks. Extensive pages of information sourced from the web may be relevant but does not demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of comics in terms of the origin, history and characters, which would potentially limit the marks to MB1. Where this information is not put in the candidate's own words, the centre's marks were found to be quite generous but this can also introduce more serious problems and assessors must maintain diligence about the source and authenticity of any evidence.

- In general, the final comics have a tendency to be generously marked and this requires some re-adjustment of the centre's marking. The marking criteria are looking for a coherent storyline and focal points, which are not always well done. One example would be the repetitive use of very similar visual scenes with just different captions, which does is not consistent with the requirements for MB3. A general comment would be that some correction to the marks is often needed in LO3 since a significant number were quite generous.

- The size of speech boxes can affect the readability of the final comic. If these are too small, the fitness for purpose can be compromised and the more effective comics are evidenced when the overall visual storytelling is clear for the reader at the intended print size.

- Watermarks from limited edition versions of comic creation software is not considered to be a limiting factor in the application of the marking criteria

### R085

- A popular change to the OCR model assignment is to change the theme of the website. One comment here is that it should still be defined by the client (or teacher acting in the role) so that it does not become a free choice on the part of the candidate. In order to maintain the vocational nature of the qualification and assignments, candidates should always be working to specific client needs. Where the eco-fest theme has been amended by centres, it has been good to see the alternatives continue to provide suitable range of website content.

- For LO1, the investigation into other websites tends to be very good although some focussed more on the homepage content and features rather than the website as a whole.

- In LO3, the correct display of assets was slightly problematic in some submissions due to the way in which the authoring software manages these at the publication stage. Fortunately, some of these were included in a visiting moderation and hence the issues with the display were resolved at the time of moderation. Many final websites were aesthetically very good, demonstrating some good design skills in addition to the use of the web authoring software.

### R087

- Another popular unit although often completed using Microsoft PowerPoint. A good proportion also created an interactive website to meet the unit outcomes (which is more consistent with the media context of the qualification).

- The investigation for LO1 should always focus on multimedia products and not platforms to access the higher mark bands.

- The creation and re-purposing of assets for the first strand of LO3 was often not well done and lacked any significant evidence. As an example, a HD video could be sourced and re-purposed into a lower resolution (and shorter duration) for use in the interactive multimedia product. Where this repurposing is completed by the candidate, evidence must be included to support the marks in the first strand of LO3 (too often this is only implied and therefore cannot be supported by the moderation).

- What is important in LO3 is that the final product works as an interactive product for a user and not just be a PowerPoint for a presentation purposes.

### R090

- Characteristically, this does not have a high number of entries compared to some other units but it does tend to be given high marks. This does not mean it is an easier unit and it is important to recognise that the level of demand is similar to all other units in the qualification.

- In LO1, candidates tend to provide detailed research into camera specifications, features, rules of composition and photography but sometimes struggle with putting this into their own words to demonstrate their own understanding. As a consequence, centre marking

can often be generous and credit cannot be given for this. Referencing of sources is also problematic, which can again introduce more serious problems.

- In LO3, there tends to be issues with both strands of the marking criteria to the extent that the centre's marks are becoming quite generous. In the first strand, the selection and use of a range of features and settings cannot be just implied in the final photographs and this must be explicit to access the higher mark bands. Where most photographs are taken with a smartphone, this could only be accepted in meeting the criteria for MB1. For the second strand, the photographs must meet the brief and not be just a collection of their best images. Where the photographs are only inserted into a PowerPoint file (sometimes with annotated comments) this is not a suitable medium to meet the client brief and therefore more consistent with MB1. The stronger submissions included the final photographs as image files that could be used by a client in a vocational context, which would be recommended with all submissions. Note that relatively small prints on a page do not enable the moderator to adequately assess the image quality. It is quite clear that for LO3, many photographs demonstrate some excellent visual compositions. However, the achievement of the marking criteria cannot always be implied in these and additional evidence is required to justify the higher mark bands

**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

Cambridge Assessment