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 2017

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 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, centres are reminded that this is a vocational paper where the context is a key part of the examination. A negative development seen this series, however, was a lack knowledge shown about some of the more technical aspects of the specification, especially with regard to the hardware and software that is used in media production. 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.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No.

1ai. This question was generally well answered. However, there was a large number of responses that did not link to the context of an audio video advertisement.

1aii. This question was generally answered well again. However, there were a number of responses that were too vague. A storyboard is constructed using images/pictures and so answers that stated this without expanding upon what the images were i.e. image of scene, picture of characters was considered too vague and not worthy of credit.

1b. Whilst being generally well answered there were a large number of responses again not related to context. Answers such as 'used in a play' and 'used for a film' illustrate this point. R081 is a vocational paper where the application of context is important.

2ai This was well answered.

2aii. This question was aimed towards the top end of the ability range. This question sought to test the candidates' knowledge of why certain research techniques gain more detailed information than others. Too many responses were seen that just reworded the question without explaining why the information was more detailed and how it could be used within the context of the paper scenario.

2b This question saw a wide range of answers with too many not being linked to the context and so full marks were not awarded as often as expected.

3. This question was generally well answered indicating a good understanding of the rules surrounding intellectual property. There were, however, a large number of candidates who confused this with copyright.

4a. This question once again saw responses across the whole range of marks available. This series saw less responses than previous series where the candidates did not create the correct document. The highest mark was not awarded as often as expected due to the images not being correctly selected to match the context of a fashion magazine.

4bi. Whilst being generally well answered, there were a large number of candidates who were either too vague in their answers or did not answer within the context of the paper.

4bii This was generally well answered.

5a. This design question, as usual, provided a range of responses covering the full mark range. However there were a large number of candidates who produced some excellent visualisation diagrams but gained very few marks for not reading the question correctly. Too many answers were magazine covers rather than the contents page. Centres are advised to encourage the candidates to read the questions posed carefully. The highest marks were not allocated as often as possible due to the quality of annotations being weak.

5b. The specification for this unit requires candidates to be aware of the hardware that can be used to create pre-production documentation. The very large number of responses that were seen where candidates gave pieces of software as their answer was concerning, indicating that this is an area of weakness when the unit is being taught.

6. To gain full marks candidates had to answer within the context of a photo-shoot. Too often answers were too vague and so marks were not awarded. Answers such as 'lights are too bright' are not relevant to the context.

7. This was a low level question requiring straight recall from the unit specification. However, the marks awarded were not as consistently high as expected.

8. The responses seen for this answer were better that in earlier series indicating that more time is being spent on this aspect of the specification. The responses seen were much more evaluative in their wording rather than descriptive allowing the middle mark band to be accessed more consistently The correct target audience is still not being referred to as often as expected. However, there were less responses seen that referred to the wrong target audience for the document.

R082 – R092

General Comments:

The January 2017 series has further demonstrated a number of improvements to the structure of evidence as initially seen in the November series.

Some common issues were still seen although these were not as widespread as previous series. Examples include the incorrect file naming in the repository (/01) entries and the omission of the final products in their intended format for evidence purposes. On the basis that the final product is the primary outcome from the assignment, it continues to be unclear why this fundamental piece of evidence is sometimes not supplied to the moderator. For the repository file naming, centres should refer to the OCR guidance on the use of unique file names such as by using the candidate number as part of each file uploaded.

The correlation between the evidence submitted and the requirements of the marking criteria have again shown some slight improvement. However, a more significant number of entries were seen where internal standardisation had not been carried out effectively. This becomes apparent when there are two or more teachers/assessors within the same unit and their marking is slightly different. This can introduce problems with the rank order of candidates and either a broad moderation outcome or remark becomes necessary. This emphasises the importance of internal standardisation across an appropriate range of candidates and marks.

Comments on Individual Units:

Unit R082
Apart from a minority of entries, the common weaknesses in this unit continue to be in the exploration of graphics for LO1, the use and purpose of assets/resources in LO2 and the technical compatibility of assets for LO3.

LO1: For the exploration of graphics, most approaches tend to include a detailed media analysis of existing products but this is not a requirement of the marking criteria in this qualification. How the purpose and audience influence the design and layout should also be a forward looking activity but it has been seen that this is not being done in the majority of entries. A fundamental part of the initial exploration for LO1 is the suitability for different uses and this should include some consideration of pixel dimensions and dpi resolution for both print and web use. Although a comparison of bitmap/raster and vector graphics contributes to this, the image properties are more fundamental to the unit and this knowledge needs to be applied in LO3.

LO2: Across all three mark bands, some understanding of the use of assets and purpose of resources should be evidenced. In many entries, this is shown only as a list of items, which would not fit the descriptors any higher than mark band 1.

LO3: The first strand of this requires some preparation of assets and consideration of the technical compatibility. It has been seen that a good number of candidates are including some evidence of preparing/repurposing the assets although there are very few that refer to the technical compatibility which would be needed for anything higher than mid mark band 2. What is required for this is some consideration of the number of pixels in the image asset and how large it would be printed on the final graphic. For example, if an asset downloaded from the internet is only 300 pixels wide then as part of a print product, it could not be much larger than one inch wide (i.e. using 300dpi). Stretching this to fill the full width of a DVD cover (or similar large print product) can only produce a low quality final graphic and yet this is typically overlooked.

Otherwise, the use of the OCR model assignments is generally very good and where changes are made, these are nearly always within the permitted modifications as stated in the teacher guidance section. The *Timechaser* and *Gloustol* briefs have been popular alternatives to the *Energy Matters* DVD assignment brief this series.

Unit R083

The choice of software is an important consideration for this unit. Popular choices are image editing software such as Adobe Photoshop or even Windows Paint. Some approaches have developed 3D characters but as with any unit, it is important that the final character/product is submitted in a file format that is approved for submission, so that it can be viewed by the moderator.

Unit R085

As seen with previous series, there continues to be a clear structure and process through the assignment and unit. The stronger submissions have included a good range of evidence for the website creation process, i.e. using the tools and techniques of the authoring software. One comment would again be that the finished website needs to be sent to the moderator for evidence purposes and this cannot just be published live on the Internet. The use of online web builder applications was again problematic in this respect.

Unit R087

We have seen two different approaches, one using PowerPoint and one using a website as the interactive multimedia product. Given the creative media nature of the qualification, the website approach is considered appropriate although the marking criteria can be applied to any approach and software application. When using PowerPoint, the better submissions created a true user driven interactive product as opposed to a final product that is more of a slideshow that requires mouse clicks to display the content.

Unit R089

There are two main areas that differentiate the stronger entries from others in this unit. It is important to note that evidence of the video footage recording by each candidate is needed to support any marks in the first strand of LO3. This has become problematic for two reasons. Firstly, group working approaches either have not provided sufficient opportunity for each candidate to evidence a wide range of shots or alternatively, this contribution is not evidenced or clear for the moderator. The second issue seen in this series is that a significant number of entries are continuing to use still images that are then edited into a video product. To fully meet the marking criteria, video footage must be recorded and edited. The unit is not just about creating a slideshow in video editing software which has been characteristic of the weaker submissions.

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

UKAS
MANAGEMENT
SYSTEMS
001