**OCR**

Oxford Cambridge and RSA

# Cambridge Technicals Level 3

# Digital Media

**05843-05846 & 05875**

**Unit 2 Pre-production and Planning**

# OCR Report to Centres June 2018

**About this Examiner Report to Centres**

This report on the 2018 Summer assessments aims to highlight:

- areas where students were more successful

- main areas where students may need additional support and some reflection

- points of advice 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.

The report also includes links and brief information on:

- A reminder of our **post-results services** including **reviews of results**

- Link to **grade boundaries**

- **Further support that you can expect from OCR**, such as our CPD programme

**Reviews of results**

If any of your students' results are not as expected you may wish to consider one of our Reviews of results services. For full information about the options available visit the OCR website. If University places are at stake you may wish to consider priority service 2 reviews of marking which have an earlier deadline to ensure your reviews are processed in time for university applications: http://www.ocr.org.uk/administration/stage-5-post-results-services/enquiries-about-results/service-2-priority-service-2-2a-2b/

**Grade boundaries**

Grade boundaries for this, and all other assessments, can be found on OCR website

**Further support from OCR**



Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear exam feedback directly from a senior assessors or drop in to an online Q&A session.

https://www.cpdhub.ocr.org.uk

# CONTENTS

**Cambridge Technicals Level 3**
**Digital Media**
**(05843-05846 & 05875)**

## OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

**Content**                                                                                          **Page**

# Unit 2 Pre-production and Planning

1.     General Comments:

Centres had made use of the resources provided by OCR to support the teaching and learning of Unit 2 for candidates. Candidates were mostly clear about the requirements of the unit, understanding that they were working to a brief, and were prepared in the main for the vocational case study-based nature of the exam. In this session candidates were not always able to produce pre-production documents to the standard seen in previous sessions. Answers varied in degree of length of responses, and again the majority of candidates did not require extra answer sheets as found in Unit 1.

2.     Comments on Individual Questions:

Section A:

1a) This question required candidates to evidence that they had understood the client requirements given to PK Online by the University of Breswick before the team began planning the website. Most candidates were fully able to give answers in relation to requirements for the website allowing them to successfully address the question.

1b) This question tested candidates' understanding of Shaista's job role as the designer and the impact that one of the requirements they had discussed in 1a) would have on her specifically. Candidates needed to have a full understanding of what her job role would entail in order to gain the marks for this question. Successful answers understood that she would be responsible for house style design and, for example, that this would be vital if the website was to bring the University 'into the 21st Century'.

2. This question again required candidates to use their knowledge and understanding of the different job roles in pre-production and of working in teams. In the Insert, it was outlined that Daniel would take a lead in project management and coordination of the jobs the team members would complete.  Candidates needed to be able to explain the problems Daniel might have in terms of project management such as team members falling behind with work.  Some candidates referred to factors that would not have an impact on project management, such as copyright, which prevented them from addressing the focus of the question.  Centres are encouraged to further explore the requirements of specific job roles as part of the planning process.

3a) This tested candidates' knowledge of legal issues and most candidates had clearly been well prepared in this area in being able to cite potential issues such as data protection, libel and discrimination, which were directly related to the intended target audience of students for the website. The most successful answers linked directly to the brief and why issues such as data protection were important.

3b) Most candidates were able to give a correct answer for how to resolve issues cited in 3a). Very few misinterpreted this question and most were able to link responses to the brief, such as gaining students' permission to use images and names on the website.

4a) This question required candidates to demonstrate understanding about project management tools. Candidates had to identify two tools that Daniel could use and explain why they would be suitable. The best answers referenced specific software, such as OpenProject and Zoho, and why these would be useful in relation to the brief. Some candidates gained marks by citing tools such as production schedules. Where candidates gave answers such as mindmaps and moodboards they were unable to meet the requirements of the question.

4b) Where candidates had not correctly identified a project management tool they could not gain marks for this question. Most candidates were able to give a correct answer for a drawback of the tool either in relation to the brief or from personal experience, which was pleasing to see.

5. This question tested candidates' knowledge of research techniques, asking for an evaluation of one primary research method against another in relation to which would be the most effective to gain feedback on initial ideas. Candidates giving creative answers of methods to gain feedback, such as targeted Survey Monkey links with a competition compared to focus groups, were the most successful. Some candidates identified primary research methods that did not meet the requirements of the question, such as textual analysis of other websites. It was pleasing to note, however, that candidates rarely confused primary and secondary methods.

6. This question was worth nine marks and asked candidates to provide three examples of creative content that could be featured on the website based on the brief and explain why these would be suitable to engage the audience. Candidates needed to use the brief and generate creative content ideas, a core synoptic skill, and apply the skills outlined in the specification. The most successful answers engaged with the brief, and examples of creative content included video testimonials that could be shared around different groups of students. Suggestions such as 'adding a search bar' or 'title' to the website did not allow candidates to address the requirements of the question.

Section B.

7. This required candidates to draw a sitemap that could be used to help Ed plan the infrastructure of the website. Good responses demonstrated clear understanding of the layout and purpose of a sitemap and organised the pages and links of the website, successfully justifying choices with clear annotations. Some candidates lacked familiarity with sitemaps, producing visualisation diagrams instead. It is recommended that centres ensure candidates have the opportunity to practice creating a range of pre-production documents before the exam even if they are not making the products for coursework unit options.

8. This required candidates to draw a wireframe for the home page of the website. Good responses demonstrated clear understanding by candidates of the layout conventions of websites and the specific features that separate wireframes from visualisation diagrams, such as the use of placeholders. Where candidates were not prepared to specifically draw a wireframe and instead drew a visualisation diagram they were unable to meet the requirements of the question. Successful answers were clear wireframes that included annotations to explain candidate responses.

9. It was pleasing to see that some centres had prepared candidates well in understanding both the content and strengths of using a SWOT analysis and many candidates were able to provide justification of using a SWOT with clear strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats in relation to the specific brief and team members' job roles.  The final question on the paper requires learners to evaluate planning documents and pre-production methods and unfortunately, candidates were not always able to discuss the limitations of using a SWOT analysis as part of the planning and pre-production process for producing a website. The best responses discussed why documents such as wireframes, sitemaps and productions schedules were also needed.