

Cambridge National

Creative iMedia

Level 1/2 Cambridge National Award in Creative iMedia **J807**

Level 1/2 Cambridge National Certificate in Creative iMedia **J817**

Level 1/2 Cambridge National Diploma in Creative iMedia **J827**

OCR Report for Centres for November 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.

© OCR 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

Content	Page
Moderated Units	4

Moderated Units

General Comments:

The November series provides an opportunity for resubmissions in addition to units that were completed after the June marks entry deadline. Under these circumstances it is important that the URS are annotated to confirm the work is a resubmission and be updated with the most recent marks. Where there is a discrepancy, the moderator is required to process the entries using the clerical error procedure so that marks can be amended. The prevalence of clerical errors is again a concern and this introduces a delay in the moderation and processing of entries. Given that deadlines are very short for the November series, this can be problematic. As with any series, centres are encouraged to double check the marks entered on Interchange so that they are consistent with the URS sent to the moderator.

Some centres are using the entry codes incorrectly and this is an issue that needs to be addressed. Note here that entry option /01 is for repository entries and /02 is for postal entries. In the January and June series, there is also the /03 option that is for visiting moderation. Centres are encouraged to select the correct entry option for their intended format of submission. As an example, it is not appropriate to make /01 entries and then submit by post.

In nearly all cases, the OCR model assignments were used for the final summative assessment. This is a requirement of the qualification and it is good to see that this is being adhered to. Very few amendments were made to the scenarios and in general, the assignment tasks maintained, which is good practice.

The URS (Unit Recording Sheets) provide an opportunity for centre assessors to justify the mark given and/or signpost to where the evidence can be found. Some centres demonstrate good practice here but others include comments that do not provide additional assistance to the moderator. As an example, a number of comments were very lengthy but do little more than make statements along the same lines as the marking criteria descriptors. This unfortunately doesn't provide any justification of marks or signposting to where the evidence can be found. As with the candidate's own evidence, sometimes it is the quality of the centre's URS comments rather than the quantity that should be the primary aim.

The structure and organisation of candidate portfolios has been slightly more problematic than usual. It is possible that this is a result of entries being resubmissions whereby additional evidence has been produced but not organised into a coherent creative flow through the assignment and learning outcomes. Although it is recognised that portfolios of evidence can be more fragmented than usual in these circumstances, the file naming and folder structure should still be considered as a whole so that the moderation process is able to locate the required evidence efficiently. This is another area where the signposting of evidence on the URS comments is helpful.

One form of evidence that is rarely used is that of screen recordings using video capture applications but one good example was seen this series. This type of evidence can be quite lengthy even though potentially an excellent format. What is important is that the video evidence is relevant and appropriate to the marking criteria, without excessive fillers or blank periods. What would assist the moderator is an index of key scenes and where they occur in the timeline. This could be added as a separate document or potentially included in the URS comment fields.

A number of unit submissions had little evidence of the creation tools and techniques that were used eg in R082 and R085. In the situation whereby these are resubmissions it would be unrealistic to create these since the final product is already finished. The aim with any assignment work would be for candidates to create and collate their evidence as they work

through the assignment tasks. In terms of suitable forms of evidence, one additional comment for the entries this series is 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.

For future reference, moderation feedback reports are a valuable source of information for centre assessors but the content and guidance given is not always being acted on. It is hoped that these feedback reports are circulated to the relevant personnel so that improvements to centre based assessment and marking can be made.

2. Comments on Individual Units

R082

- The better submissions demonstrated a combination of creativity and complexity in the layout. More notably, these could be seen in the *Glouster* film festival poster or *Timechaser* game advertisement.
- A number of submissions were quite simplistic in their content and the complexity of the final graphics was difficult to support in MB3 at times even when supported by advanced tools.
- A number of final graphics were not to correct image properties and sizes. Note that the use of an A4 template is not a good starting point and this unit is about using image editing software, not desktop publishing. When aiming for the higher mark bands, the fitness for purpose in meeting the assignment brief is an important part of the criteria ie with suitable image properties and formats. The stronger submissions generally considered this quite carefully.

R084

- Some final comics were created in Photoshop, which is a good approach and introduces transferable skills that are appropriate to industry working practices. However, this can mean that the final products are perhaps not as visually appealing as those created in dedicated applications such as Comic Life although it is recognised that the skills required may be at a higher level. Whatever software is used, the marking criteria are still based around the coherence of the comic in its purpose of telling a story.
- A script and storyline is needed to fully support LO2, prior to the comic creation in LO3. This was not always included and in general, marks can only be supported for what is clearly evidenced as opposed to being implied in the final product.

R085

- A number of the submissions were poorly structured and with a lack of organising the evidence files submitted. Here, the final website (.html) files that are included in the same folder as images, videos, research, planning and review documents makes it difficult for the moderator to unpick the evidence and locate what is needed.
- A number of final websites were found to be not loading the images correctly. In one submission, a URS comment stated that it was not the candidate's fault but this lacks clarity. Note that the marking criteria in R085 (LO3 – MB3) begins with a requirement for '*Creating logical and well-structured folder structures which are consistently used appropriately*'. This refers to the way that assets are managed within the web authoring software so that relative links are created for the images and not absolute links, since this would otherwise result in broken links once the published site is used on a different computer system. For clarification, this part of the criteria does not relate to the organisation of files submitted – that is covered by the last descriptor in LO3, which is '*Consistently saves electronic files using file and folder names and structures which are consistent and appropriate*.'

R092

- A number of the final games were not adequately tested and lacked the functionality required for the higher mark bands. In general, the approaches to testing were not well done and the philosophy of testing should be to try and 'break' the game rather than apply basic checks such as making sure the player object moves. The playability and functionality of the game is an important factor when deciding the marks in LO3.
- On a positive note, it was good to see some evidence of the tools and techniques in the game creation processes, which is often quite limited in this unit.

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

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2017

