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 2017

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

OCR Report to Centres – June 2017

R081 Pre-production Skills

General Comments:

The level of technical knowledge expected at this stage in the qualifications life was not seen. This builds on what was noted in the January session this year. 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 session. Considering that there are only five documents in the specification this is concerning trend. This signifies that the direct teaching of this unit is still taking a less prominent position to the coursework units. The application of the pre-production documents in the coursework units is needed but should be underpinned by a thorough understanding of the technical aspects, which can only be done in suitable depth through the direct teaching of this unit

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 that, marks are still being lost due to the context not being fully applied. Candidates should be helped in developing their ability to understand the contexts in papers and then apply their knowledge to those contexts. The context assessed will never be one that candidates can not relate to 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.

In a number of cases marking of the design based questions 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.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question 1a
This question was generally well answered. However, the question asks for *items*, and there were 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 for two reasons, as it is too vague to be an *item* and in the context of this question would not be accepted as it could refer to annotations which were excluded in the question.

Question 1b
This was well answered for one mark, with the expansion of who/what the explanation would be used for being omitted in most cases.

Question 1c
This was well answered for one mark, with the expansion of who the visualisation diagram would be viewed by omitted in most cases. Where attempts had been made these were generic in content referring to "people" and not linking to the context.

Question 2a
The wording of the question referred to the expression of new ideas in a meeting being captured so leading to the use of a mind map to capture these ideas. Too many answers referred to the use of a mood board or a file type, which indicates that the understanding of the use and purpose of the various pre-production documents is still not clear.

Question 2b
This answer was generally well answered where marks could be awarded. If 2a was incorrect then 2b by its linked nature would be incorrect. Candidates responded with either generic mind map items or items that could be included based on the context of the question. Both avenues are acceptable.

Question 3ai
This question saw a mixed response with concept of time being misunderstood by some with responses referring to "small teams". Marks were also lost for referring to "two months" or "ten months". These were too vague, what needed two months? What was the "ten months" referring to? Candidates who gained the full marks were accurate in their answers referring to such aspects as "planning needed to be completed in 2 months". This again highlighted the lack of exam technique used by candidates.

Question 3aii
This was mixed in its responses as well, with candidates not selecting the correct design requirements such as including a video, soundtrack or narration. The selection of including four eras was incorrect as that is not a design requirement.

Question 3aii
The creation of a work plan saw a wide variety of responses, which supports the work seen in other aspects of the Creative iMedia specification where work plans must be produced. This is one aspect that could easily be rectified by candidates and centres resulting in higher marks. Within the brief provided the timescales and tasks were clearly signposted.

Question 4
This question was answered incorrectly in most cases. The question referred to the legislation that would affect the workers in the context of the development of the multimedia content. Most of answers referred to "copyright". This was incorrect as it does not affect the workers and in the context of the scenario is incorrect as the content of the rides would be created by the production team. The responses seen indicate a possible narrowness of teaching regarding the legislation relevant to the specification or a poor understanding on the part of the candidates. These are points that should be addressed by centres.

Question 5a
The context of this question referred to the multimedia sections that would be viewed through the VR goggles of the riders, not to the accessibility to the ride itself. Many candidates did not pick up on this context and so their answers were incorrect. Correct answers referred to "hearing issues so subtitles would be needed on the videos seen" or "some riders may have epilepsy so flashing images shouldn't be used".

Question 5b
In most cases candidates gained at least one mark for referring to a correct piece of hardware. However, the expansion marks were not awarded as consistently as hoped where the description of how they could be used was not as clear as it should be. Many candidates referred to mobile phones as being a suitable piece of hardware. At this moment in time mobile phones/smart phones are not widely available enough with suitable capability to carry out this task. This was seen as a "fishing" answer by candidates showing no understanding of their current capability. In future sessions and contexts new technologies will possibly be acceptable as long as they are relevant.

Question 5c
This question asked for the "most suitable" software and the use of image editing software is not correct as it is not the most suitable. This indicates that there is use of certain software for most tasks in the coursework units, even where it is not the most suitable. As a result, candidates' understanding is being hampered and best practice is not being seen.

Question 5d
Responses seen for this question generally ranged from either being clear about what a secondary source is or having no understanding whatsoever. This highlights an area where understanding is weak and should be addressed before future sessions.

Question 6
Compared to earlier examination sessions the creation of the wrong document was not seen as often, which is a positive movement. The mind maps seen varied in their quality and complexity as was expected. The complexity of the mind map produced was dependent upon the candidates' grasp of the context; with the highest marks being credited to those candidates developing mind maps that fully met the criteria of capturing and editing images in the theme park.

Question 7a
Generally the storyboards produced were of a suitable quality for the specification. However, marks were limited due to a lack of technical aspects such as timings, camera angles, camera movements, sound effects etc being shown. This shows a lack of coverage of the technical aspects when teaching R081 and other units in the specification. A small number of candidates just drew a series of images that were not linked to the context of what the storyboard was about and so gained no marks.

Question 7b
Generally, well answered.

Question 8
Generally, well answered.

Question 9
This question was poorly answered with candidates consistently referring to virtual reality goggles or VR cameras such as the Samsung 360 VR.   The specification refers to *virtual cameras* used in animation and game software, where a view point is "filmed" from the position where a camera would be in the "real" world. This question highlighted an aspect of the specification for R081 that is not being covered as fully as it should. Centres are advised to ensure that this is addressed for future sessions.

Question 10
This question was not as well answered as in previous sessions. The responses seen did not focus on the use and purpose of the mood board as well as previously. This indicates that candidates are not clear about the use of mood boards and who they are for and why they are used. Whilst the strengths and weaknesses were on the whole generally identified, the understanding of the purpose of them was lacking, together with a lack of application of their use to the correct audience.

R082 – R092

General Comments:

The overall performance of candidates has been quite good in the moderated coursework units although some variation continues to be present, partly due to differences in the approaches used to create the final products. These are discussed in more detail later in this report under Section 2: *Comments on individual units.* In terms of administration, some reassuring examples of good practice were seen in a high number of entries. In these examples, the candidate portfolios were well organised and structured with a covering URS that was fully completed. The paper based portfolios were then supported by either a DVD or memory stick with the final products from LO3. Where modified assignments were used, a printed copy was typically supplied with the administrative paperwork. Compared to previous series, fewer problems with unique file naming were seen when centres chose the entry option for the OCR repository, which is a practical alternative to postal submissions. Where centres had opted for a visit, these tended to be efficient and well organised in nearly all cases.

Not all the entries were free of administrative problems and some clerical errors were found by the moderation team in a large proportion of the units entered. This is where the marks on the URS add up to a different total to what is entered with OCR Interchange. In these cases, the moderator is required to submit a clerical error notice and amendment form, which requires additional procedures and adds a delay to the timely moderation and processing of entries. It appears that in some cases, the URS form is not being used as the master assessment record and yet it is the primary tool that forms part of the audit trail for assessment. If centres are using alternative records such as spreadsheets then more checks need to be made to ensure the marks are transferred correctly.

A concern for the moderation team has been the notification by centres to say they have been informed that only paper based evidence is needed for postal entries using the /02 entry option. It needs to be emphasised that this is incorrect. For the moderator to support the best marks in LO3, the final product in its intended digital format will always be needed. Any information to the contrary would be wrong since several parts of the marking descriptors cannot be successfully evidenced without the final product. Some examples would be the navigation through a functional website and the properties of a digital graphic to ensure they meet the assignment brief. This issue has been seen to a greater or lesser degree in each series and the omission of the main product outcome is a concern since moderators can only make their judgements on what evidence is supplied.

The storage of work by centres highlighted some additional concerns including the unavailability of candidate memory sticks due to them being at home and links to web based locations, e.g. for Wix or Weebly websites and Moodle sites, neither of which are good options. Note that the final products should be packaged up and supplied in full to the external moderator. This ensures that the products are effectively 'locked' for the assessment and moderation processes to be completed in a secure environment.

The annotations by teachers on the candidate work should be limited to how the evidence meets the marking criteria. In some entries, the annotations were more like feedback on how to improve the work, which would not be appropriate for the summative assessment philosophy. In a similar way, templates and writing frames should not be used and yet these continue to underpin a significant proportion of portfolios that were seen. Referencing of information that is sourced from the web continues to be a challenge. For this, candidates must clearly show what information was sourced and where from. The straight copying and pasting of information does not demonstrate any knowledge or understanding and candidates need to put this into their own words to gain any credit in the marks.

In terms of the assignments, most of entries were based on one of the OCR model assignments that are available from the OCR website. In a minority of cases, these had some changes made but generally within the scope of permitted changes. Where this became problematic is in situations such as allowing candidates to choose their own scenario or removing the requirement for both print and web versions of the digital graphics with specific dimensions. These amendments would be outside the scope of the permitted changes. For this and other issues relating to the structure and content of evidence, the OCR Guide to Generating Evidence can be downloaded from the OCR website and this would be recommended reading for future series.

Some of the common issues for candidates were:
a) The connection between the assignment tasks and what is needed to meet the marking criteria. The recommendation here would be that candidates are given both the assignment and marking criteria so that they can check for themselves if they have evidence to meet the criteria. Note that a teacher cannot detail exactly what to do in order to improve the work.
b) How to evidence using knowledge, skills and understanding from other units in the qualification. For this, the content of R082 pre-production is the most common approach such as the use of mood boards, mind maps and/or categorisation of the target audience. An example where this does not work effectively would be the use of a visualisation diagram in R082 or a storyboard for R089 since these are already part of the unit content.
c) An approach to evidence generation that relies heavily on using PowerPoint. Although it is a perfectly acceptable format, in some cases there is a tendency to limit the evidence to a single slide, whereas multiple slides would be needed to achieve the higher mark bands. A slide based structure is almost self-limiting here in a similar way to writing frames that have fixed size boxes, although these would also be unsuitable for different reasons.
d) Peer assessment for the review, which is not part of the marking criteria. For LO4 the candidates should be commenting for themselves what worked and what didn't in the final products. This is different to a summary of the processes completed through the unit and a check of the marking criteria is always a good approach when ready to complete this final task in a unit.
e) Identifying and using success factors when these are not part of the unit or marking criteria. Although these can provide a framework, they can also be self-limiting since a review is more than just whether a product meets any identified success criteria. It is recognised that these are popular within IT qualifications but there are very few units in Creative iMedia that include these in the marking criteria.

Comments on Individual Units

Unit R082:
The structure to the evidence is consistent with previous series in more general terms and the common issues continue to be seen. Some examples would be:
a) Image properties not being included in the investigation for LO1. Here the difference in the image properties for both print and web use should be included since these underpin the two different types of graphics that are created in LO3.
b) An image analysis of existing products is not a good match for the marking criteria in LO1. The descriptors in the marking criteria do not require this although it would be a useful activity as a learning exercise but not part of the assessment tasks.
c) How the purpose and audience influence the design and layout is rarely being evidenced for LO1. Once again, the identification of an audience for an existing product does not address this effectively.

d) Work plans are often for how to complete the unit rather than how to create a digital graphic in LO2. The duration of the work plan should also be around the recommended 10-12 hours for the final assignment.

e) Use of assets and purpose of resources is not always well evidenced for LO2. For the higher mark bands, this needs to be more than a list; but reassuringly, a higher number of candidates are now including this in their evidence.

f) Legislation is often included as generic information rather than being applied to the assignment scenario. The higher performing candidates contextualised this quite well.

g) Lack of evidence of using tools and techniques to create the graphic in LO3. A screen shot of a layer stack can show this to an extent but must be reproduced at a suitable size for it to be read easily by the moderator.

h) Final graphics that are not the correct dimensions for print or resolution for web in LO3. Centres need to take this into consideration when deciding on a mark in LO3. All too often, this is being overlooked and marks given for just the visual appeal/layout or techniques used.

i) Reviews that summarise the creation process rather than considering the effectiveness of the final graphic.

However, the quality and complexity of the final graphics continues to improve and many demonstrate some very creative ideas and outcomes. The best submissions are where this is combined with appropriate technical properties to ensure the graphics are fit for purpose.

Unit R083:
One approach was seen that was based on using sketched characters from LO2 that are 'coloured in'. This can limit the marks in LO3 since few tools/techniques were then used in the production process.

Unit R084:
The marking criteria requires some investigation into comics, their origins and history. One of the problematic areas in this unit is that the sourcing of information is not being referenced correctly in LO1. It is important that any information must be summarised into the candidate's own words to support any marks. The investigations by the higher marked candidates often include extensive pages of information on existing comic storylines. This can be interesting but not required by the marking criteria in LO1.The final comic was often supplied as a paper based printout. As for any unit, a digital/electronic version would be needed by a client for distribution and this is what should be supplied for external moderation. This would also then assist the support for marks in LO3 for saving/exporting the comic in suitable formats. A final comment would be that some comics were supplied as a single page, not multi page and this is being overlooked in the centre's marking. In these cases, a high mark for LO3 would not be suitable since a multi-page comic is required across all three mark bands in LO3.

Unit R085:
This unit continues to be popular and tends to be quite well done. In LO1 candidates should be reviewing [entire] websites and not just the home page of published sites to fully address the marking criteria. Otherwise the investigations for LO1 are typically quite good but sources of information should again be referenced for internet connection methods. The reference to house style is not always being planned and implemented in LO2 and LO3. This often needs to be more explicit rather than just implied in the final website. Wix and Weebly were used in a number of submissions but these are not a good choice since they limit the marks that can be supported in LO3 (there are issues with satisfactorily evidencing the marking criteria in the creation strand). Note that websites must be *supplied* and not just passed on to the moderator as a link to a web location – which makes the use of online template websites such as Weebly and Wix problematic for this qualification.

Unit R087:
The two approaches that continue to be the most popular are to create either a website, or a PowerPoint product. The website option would be more consistent with the creative media nature of the qualification although high marks can be achieved using either approach. Whatever system is used to create the product, the stronger submissions are built on detailed investigations into design principles for LO1 that are then applied to the product for LO3. The effectiveness of the GUI (graphical user interface) varies quite significantly. Some are very good but a significant number of PowerPoint approaches were seen to be quite weak. The important aspect here is that when using PowerPoint, these must be produced as a user driven interactive product and not have the look and feel of a presentation e.g. with animated effects for content being displayed using successive mouse clicks.

Unit R090:
This unit is focussed on capturing high quality photographs rather than any extensive editing into media products. As with some other units, the initial investigation must include references for sources of information. The rules of composition would be a good example here in LO1. Planning tends to be appropriate for the photoshoot but quite brief in places. Where resources to be used were only listed, it was unfortunate that there was some detail on the computer system – but only a comment that a 'camera' was needed. Some further detail on this fundamental resource for the unit would be highly recommended. For the creation strand in LO3, the features and settings used cannot be implied in the photos. This is a common weakness in the unit and more consideration of how to evidence this should be included if aiming for the higher mark bands. Smart phones were used at times, although in many cases, these were also supported by the use of a dedicated digital camera. Note that the use of smart phones on their own would only be suitable for the bottom mark band since they do not have any appropriate settings that can be used and hence not an effective substitute for a digital camera. A final comment in this unit is that the better submissions always include the final photographs as digital images within a folder. Their insertion into a PowerPoint file is not a good approach, especially where this includes annotations on the images. This would not be used by a client in a vocational context and therefore does not meet the marking criteria in the second strand of LO3. Having said that, it is clear that a few centres have delivered the unit very effectively such that candidates have produced some creative and skilled photography, with good composition and presentation. These submissions were reassuring to see and a great match for the intention of the unit to develop some solid photographic skills.

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