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 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.

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

1   General Comments

A good level of knowledge about what certain pre-production documents are and what they contain was again demonstrated this series. However, the understanding of why these documents are used and who the target audience is for these documents is still weak. This was clearly evident in the responses for question 8 where the review of an existing document was assessed.

This series did contain less generic answers than previous ones, highlighting a better application of knowledge to the vocational context. However, there was a lack knowledge shown about some of the more technical aspects of the specification. There was also an increase in the number of responses that did not link to the questions, where candidates did not read the question fully and identify the correct pre-production document.

2   Comments on Individual Questions

Question No.

1ai.
Generally, a well-answered question.

1aii
This question was generally well answered. However, a number of candidates included answers that were not items on the visualisation diagram but descriptions of processes that would take place.

1b.
This question saw too many responses where general statements were made and the vocational context of visualisation diagram was omitted. This, together with a lack of expansion on why the document is suited, saw full marks not being awarded as often as one might have expected.

Question 2 was designed to assess the candidate's ability to select an appropriate document, explain why it should be used and then identify what software should be used to create it. Hence the marks awarded for 2ii and 2iii were dependant on 2i being correct.

2i.
There was a mixture of documents chosen by the candidates. However, a number of candidates did not read the question properly and responded with a file type rather than a pre-production document.

2ii
This answer had to relate to the document identified in 2i. This question was generally well answered when related to the document from 2i. However, a number of responses were seen that did not relate to the document from 2i indicating a lack of understanding of the use and purpose of these documents.

2iii
This question saw mixed responses with the software chosen not always being appropriate to the document identified in 2i.

3a
Too many of the responses for this question described the constraints of the Act rather than identifying the Act correctly.

3bi
This was generally well answered with full marks being awarded on a consistent level.

3bii
This question saw a variety of responses with the expansion of the implication being weakly explained.

4a
There was a mixture of responses to this question indicating that this section of the specification is not being taught as well as others. The use of primary sources in the research phase of pre-production is an important part of the process.

4b
As with 4a this question saw a mixture of responses with a large number of candidates mixing primary and secondary sources up.

4c
This question saw a mixture of responses with some excellent context based answers being explained. However, a significant number of responses were also seen where it was not the grouping of the audience that was explained.

5
This question assessed both the ability to create a mood board and to apply it to the context correctly. A wide variety of answers were seen on this question with the main reasons for not awarding marks being poor justifications and lack of appropriate layout. Where these were done correctly some excellent answers were seen. However, an issue that raises concern is that a large number of responses were seen where the incorrect document was created. A number of storyboards were seen where no marks were awarded.

6
This question assessed both the ability to create a mind map and to apply it to the context of a homepage. Whilst the creation of a mind map was generally well done the context was not applied consistently. Too many mind maps were seen where the content was clearly about a website or the healthy eating campaign itself and marks were restricted for this approach. A large number of responses were also seen where the incorrect document was produced, i.e. the main part a visualisation diagram of the webpage. Centres are advised to ensure that candidates are taught to read the questions correctly.

7a
This question saw mixed responses from candidates indicating that the technical knowledge of the devices used to create the pre-production documents is an area of the specification that needs to be addressed.

7b.
A range of marks were awarded across this question with some candidates showing a good understanding of the software required. However, marks were lost due to a lack of understanding of the software used to create the documents/items rather than view them, especially regarding the downloadable sheets. A large number of candidates were also too vague in the responses and simply reworded the question in their response – not a practice that is to be encouraged.

7c
The level of understanding shown in the responses for this question was disappointing. Too many candidates were not clear about why a contingency is used often stating reasons about not working quickly enough.

8
The responses for this question again showed that candidates do not understand why documents are used and who they are aimed at. Whilst the strengths, weaknesses and improvements are generally being explained well the lack of relating these to the context as well as the correct audience (the author of the final downloadable sheet) restricts the number of top end marks that can be awarded.

OCR Report to Centres – June 2016

R082 – R092

1   General Comments

Some stability and consolidation is now starting to be seen in the Creative iMedia qualification following this June series. This has resulted in a broad range of work that spans the full mark range across all the optional units. At the top end, a number of creative and high quality outcomes have been produced. Where this is achieved within the 10-12 hours of time available for the final assessment, this demonstrates good practice and is very commendable. In cases where the time made available for the final assignment is closer to the full 30 GLH (guided learning hours) and delivered as a coursework based approach, the evidence tends to be unsuitable for the award of the unit. This continues to be a concern within the Cambridge Nationals qualification.

On several occasions, moderators had to contact centres for missing work and evidence. There are two main reasons for this. Firstly, the final product outcome in many submissions was not supplied for evidence purposes even though this is quite fundamental to support the marks in Learning Outcome (LO) 3. The second reason is because of incorrect file naming when uploading work to the Repository. It is important to realise that filenames must be unique across the entire cohort of submissions in the repository, otherwise the work of one candidate could be overwritten by the work of another if the same filename is used. The workaround has been to send the work on DVD or memory stick to the moderator but, for future submissions, a more careful check on the use of unique file names for each candidate is needed.

Over the short history of the qualification, there has been three common problem areas with a fairly equal balance between them. These three areas are over guidance, the copying and pasting of information from web sources (without referencing) and the incorrect use of OCR model assignments. Note that over guidance includes the provision and use of templates and writing frames. The balance between these has changed in the June 2016 series where moderators have seen a lower number of issues with the incorrect use of model assignments. In the Cambridge Nationals, it is a mandatory requirement that the OCR model assignments are used even though the scenario can be amended. The important restriction here is that the amended scenario must not offer a lower level of demand in what is required for evidence purposes. This is a positive step forward although with any modified assignments, centres should always provide a complete copy of the revised assignment that was used. Looking ahead, it is now hoped that a similar improvement will be seen regarding the remaining two problem areas.

In the research and investigations for LO1, many submissions are still not being correctly referenced. Even if they are referenced, the copying and pasting of information from web sources does not evidence any understanding of the content. In these cases, no marks can be supported for what has been submitted. The centre's own assessment needs to select appropriate marks for this or, in reality, reject the evidence before submission in order to fully comply with JCQ regulations. However, it was noted that in some isolated submissions the Unit Recording Sheet (URS) and teacher's annotations stated that the evidence had only been copied and therefore no marks could be given, which at least demonstrates an understanding of assessment. For information, OCR has produced a guide to generating evidence in the Cambridge Nationals qualifications. This can be found at:

http://www.ocr.org.uk/Images/284791-guide-to-generating-evidence.pdf

The URS was not always completed correctly across units. Some didn't have any candidate names, some had no candidate numbers and, at times, the annotations were identical across several candidates with no real relevance to the content of the candidate work. Clerical errors were also frequent and often incorrectly added up on the URS prior to entering the marks on the MS1. These errors increase the administrative burden of correction and it is hoped that they will reduce in future series. The labelling and organisation of electronic evidence is another area that could be improved in places. Where version control and suitable filenames are used, this can simplify the structure to the evidence and provide evidence for some of the marks in LO3.

As with previous series reports, it must be emphasised that the final work in its intended format should be supplied with any unit. This is what would be delivered to a client in a vocational or commercial context and therefore a primary form of evidence to support the marks in any and all of the units. It is unfortunate and unexpected that this continues to be missing in a significant number of entries, especially with the postal entry option.

2   Comments on Individual Units

Unit R082

The vast majority of entries used one of the OCR model assignments. Whereas the original assignment to create a DVD cover continues to be the most popular, the *Timechaser* game advertisement appears to be very engaging. The quality of the outcomes varies, even at the top of the mark range. The fitness for purpose continues to be a frequent problem, with final graphics having insufficient pixels for use as a print product. The underpinning knowledge and understanding for this should be developed in LO1 and is part of the marking criteria although as seen in previous series, this aspect continues to be overlooked in a large proportion of entries. Web versions of the graphic are not always included with the evidence, especially with just the paper based submissions. This makes it difficult for the moderator to fully support the marks. Final work is still often being submitted only in print form. In some cases, centres had to be contacted for the work in order for the moderator to be able to support the marks.

Unit R083

A common problem for this unit is that the research needs references for any sources used and it must be clear what is the candidate's own knowledge of 2D and 3D characters for evidencing LO1.

A number of submissions were limited by a relatively simplistic character development. One comment here would be that this should not be seen as an easy unit and the level of demand is comparable as any other unit. The expectations and requirements of LO3 varies across the moderated units and here, the marking criteria are looking for a range of tools, techniques and effects to create the character. This can be evidenced in screenshots to an extent although a series of final exported images for the character should also be included. The knowledge and understanding of pixel dimensions and resolution from R082 could also be applied to this unit to ensure the character is fit for purpose to meet the brief.

Unit R084

For this unit on creating a comic, some very strong submissions were seen at the top end of the mark range. It continues to be one of the strongest units although it is sometimes difficult to see how the portfolio of evidence could have been produced within the 10-12 hours that is available for the final assignment. In a good number of entries, candidates had researched the origins and history of comics, the results of which had been put into their own words which is an important part of any unit. The comics varied quite substantially in quality, effectiveness and coherence. Even though a wide variety of comic software had been used, this was not always a limiting factor in the support for the marks given.

Unit R085

The unit on creating a multipage website has again been typically completed very well. The structure and process of web authoring tended to be well presented and the final websites a good match for the OCR 'Eco-fest' assignment brief. As seen with previous series, there are no major concerns with this unit which is characteristically well done.

Unit R086

More centres are now submitting digital animations that are created in software applications with relatively few stop motion approaches (which are not a good match for the criteria or unit). As with R085, the process through the unit has been evidenced in a straightforward way and supportive of some high marks where the final animation is in a suitable format.

Unit R087

The most popular approach to this unit continues to be based around PowerPoint but too many final products were closer to a presentation than an interactive multimedia product. Navigation and page display should apply some concepts of design principles that were investigated for LO1. This tended to be a relatively weak area and few candidates were able to access the top end of the mark range. An alternative approach for this unit would be an interactive multimedia product in the form of a website but this has not been a very popular choice of format.

Unit R088

It is interesting to see that in this unit on digital sound, the final products were not always as strong when compared to R089 (digital video) or even some other units. The process through tis unit is similar to both R088 and R089 which is why they are a barred combination. The recording of candidates own sounds is poorly evidenced in some submissions (if included at all) and the audio volume level can be highly inconsistent, making some products not fit for purpose. Where an audio product is assembled using sounds sourced from the internet only, then some parts of the marking criteria cannot be achieved and Mark Band 3 becomes inaccessible in LO3. In order for this unit to be completed as successfully as most others, there would need to be some improvement in the evidence of recording sounds together with a final product that combines a range of sounds into an effective track that meets the brief using more consistent audio volume levels.

Unit R089

This unit on digital video was typically supported by some very good final video products. These often demonstrated some creativity along with a wide range of camera shots and editing techniques. Where this didn't work quite so well is in those submissions that omitted any digital video footage and instead used a combination of still photos that were edited into an audio-visual product. Traditionally, digital video is often completed by groups within media qualifications but in the Cambridge Nationals, candidates can only be given marks for their own contribution to the marking criteria (and not just the overarching learning outcome). Therefore, it is their own skills in using the video camera to record footage using a range of shots that supports the marks. Although group working is not disallowed in the qualification, it is not necessarily a good approach and it is essential that the individual contribution is explicitly clear. Unfortunately, this was not always the case.

Unit R090

When completing this unit on digital photography, centres should emphasise that there is an assignment brief with a specific scenario and theme that needs to be addressed in the photographs taken. Consequently, a general portfolio of photographs, even if quite good, may

not meet the brief or support the higher mark bands. As an example, a series of macro shots of flowers might be visually appealing but would not be appropriate for the OCR model assignment. It is noticed in this series that authenticity can be a problem. Any final photographs must be a result of summative assessment and not just a collection of their best photos that were taken on a holiday over the last two years. This continues to be an issue as seen in previous series. The photographic composition tends to be good but consideration of using features and settings of the digital camera is the weaker area to support the higher mark bands. As a technical media qualification, both aspects are embedded into the unit so selecting an appropriate exposure mode (with associated settings) together with a creative composition are required. The level of demand in this unit is no less than any other and in a number of cases, the assessment of this unit needs to be more rigorous.

Unit R091

For this unit the research into a range of games and gaming consoles development was not evidenced very successfully. For any unit, the research must be summarised using the candidate's own words to gain any marks. In some submissions, the unit was completed very well and here there was a clear proposal document that was supplied as a separate/standalone piece of evidence. This style of document included all of the required game elements and could be given to a client in a vocational context. Where the unit was not done so well, candidates had not expanded significantly on the ideas developed in LO2 such that the evidence for LO3 was actually very limited.

Unit R092

A substantial number of submissions included highly playable and effective games, with some high marks being supported. This included some complex *Mowve* games with choices of lawn mower. One comment would be that these must be supported by evidence of the process through LO1, LO2 and LO4. It is important to realise that evidence of meeting all the marking criteria cannot be implied by having a good final product. To some extent, evidence of creating interactions between the game components can be clear in the final game but a select number of screenshots from the development should also be included. It is hoped that this will be addressed by centres in future.

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