Common Issues with Unit 23

See also the **FAQ** on
http://community.ocr.org.uk/community/ocr_nationals_in_ict/home

GENERAL: A question often posed by centres relates to the possible collaboration of candidates on this unit. It should be clear from the outset that ALL work included in a portfolio as evidence for this unit must be that of the individual candidate submitting it. Whilst it is entirely acceptable for a centre to allow groups of students to collaborate in the shooting of suitable video footage, as this process is NOT assessed in the unit, it is important to understand that ALL the work done to edit this video content must be done on an individual basis.

Assessment Objective 1:

- Candidates are expected to review video *clips*. Suitable clips might include film trailers, advertisements and music videos. These should include sufficient effects to enable them to provide useful information to candidates – a single unedited video recording is not appropriate. Reviewing the plot of a feature film does not meet the requirements of this AO.

- Although the aims of the video clips do not have to be identified at Pass level, it is recommended that some time should be spent looking at this aspect with all candidates, as they will have to identify an aim for their own product in order to pass AO2.

- When considering good and not-so-good features, candidates should consider techniques and effects as well as content.

Assessment Objective 2

- Whilst stills can form an important part of the final clip, it is important to plan the inclusion of at least one clip of video, in order to meet the requirements of AO3.

- Content of the storyboard is amplified in the Knowledge, Skills and Understanding section of the Unit Specification:

    - content

    - timeline

    - text (eg, titles and credits)

    - images/animations

    - sound

    - video

    - transitions

    - special effects

- At Distinction level the structure and detail included in the plan should be sufficient to enable a third party to create the product, as intended, in the absence of the designer.

- There is no requirement for candidates to shoot their own source video footage, although many centres do allow their candidates to do this. Alternative methods, which are equally acceptable, include allowing candidates to work in groups to shoot the source footage; allowing candidates each to shoot some footage then to share this with other members of the group and providing candidates with a library of footage from which to select source material.

- If candidates are to shoot original video/still footage then their storyboards should show the footage required. If a library of source footage is provided then this needs to be browsed beforehand so that candidates know what they can include in their storyboards.

Assessment Objective 3

- The electronic file of the final video clip can form a significant part of the evidence.

- All candidates need to show use of specific skills, as listed in the grading grid. Screenshots and/or witness statements accompanying the electronic file might be used to evidence this. The file on its own is unlikely to show clearly the software features used.

- The extent to which the video clip works as intended can be assessed by comparing the final clip with the storyboard.

- There is actually no differentiation on the soundtrack, as at Distinction the grading grid simply gives the alternative of soundtrack or narration.

- Quality and appropriateness is a significant factor in assessment of this AO.

Assessment Objective 4

- No screenshot evidence is required to evidence testing level, but the electronic file of the completed sound clip should back up any claims on test plans.

- Reference should be made to the examples listed in the Knowledge, understanding and skills section of the Unit specification:

    - suitable content

    - whether correct message conveyed

    - suitable time allocation for each component

    - runs for the correct length of time

    - suitable effects/transitions

    - suitable file format

- Testing one element (eg effects) four times constitutes one test and does not meet the requirement to perform four tests.

- Even at Pass level there must be at least one area for improvement identified. This does not need to be an error. Peer evaluation can be useful for giving candidates ideas for improvement but candidates **must** make their own comments before credit can be given.

- For Merit/Distinction there must be clear evidence that improvement(s) have been made. This might be through annotated screenshots, 'before' and 'after' video files with an explanation, or by a tutor witness statement.