

CAMBRIDGE NATIONALS

Moderators' report



CREATIVE iMEDIA

J807, J817, J827

R082-R092 Summer 2019 series

Version 1

Contents

Introduction	4
General overview	5
Unit R082 General overview	7
Comments by LO	8
LO1 – Understand the purpose and properties of digital graphics	8
LO2 – Be able to plan the creation of a digital graphic	9
LO3 – Be able to create a digital graphic	10
LO4 – Be able to review a digital graphic	10
Unit R083 General overview	12
Comments by LO	12
LO1 – Understand the properties and uses of 2D and 3D digital characters	12
LO2 – Be able to plan original 2D and 3D digital characters	13
LO3 – Be able to create 2D and 3D digital characters	13
LO4 – Be able to review 2D and 3D digital characters	13
Unit R084 General overview	14
Comments by LO	14
LO1 – Understand comic strips and their creation	14
LO2 – Be able to plan a multipage comic strip	15
LO3 – Be able to produce a multipage comic strip	16
LO4 – Be able to review a multipage comic strip	16
Unit R085 General overview	17
Comments by LO	18
LO1 – Understand the properties and features of multipage websites	18
LO2 – Be able to plan a multipage website	18
LO3 – Be able to create multipage websites using multimedia components	19
LO4 – Be able to review a multipage website	20
Unit R086 General overview	21
Comments by LO	21
LO1 – Understand the purposes and features of animation	21
LO2 – Be able to plan a digital animation	22
LO3 – Be able to create a digital animation	22
LO4 – Be able to review a digital animation	22
Unit R087 General overview	23
Comments by LO	24
LO1 – Understand the uses and properties of interactive multimedia products	24

LO2 – Be able to plan interactive multimedia products.....	24
LO3 – Be able to create interactive multimedia products.....	25
LO4 – Be able to review interactive multimedia products	25
Unit R088 General overview	26
Comments by LO	26
LO1 – Understand the uses and properties of digital sound	26
LO2 – Be able to plan a digital sound sequence	27
LO3 – Be able to create a digital sound sequence	27
LO4 – Be able to review a digital sound sequence.....	27
Unit R089 General overview	28
Comments by LO	29
LO1 – Understand the uses and properties of digital video	29
LO2 – Be able to plan a digital video sequence	29
LO3 – Be able to create a digital video sequence	29
LO4 – Be able to review a digital video sequence.....	30
Unit R090 General overview	31
Comments by LO	32
LO1 – Understand the features and settings of digital photographic equipment	32
O2 – Be able to plan a photo shoot.....	32
LO3 – Be able to take and display digital photographs.....	33
LO4 – Be able to review digital photographs.....	33
Unit R091 General overview	34
Comments by LO	35
LO1 – Understand digital game types and platforms.....	35
LO2 – Be able to plan a digital game concept.....	35
LO3 – Be able to design a digital game proposal	35
LO4 – Be able to review a digital game proposal	35
Unit R092 General overview	36
Comments by LO	37
LO1 – Understand game creation hardware, software and peripherals	37
LO2 – Be able to plan the creation of a digital game	37
LO3 – Be able to create a digital game	37
LO4 – Be able to review the creation of a digital game	37


Introduction

Our Moderators' reports are produced to offer constructive feedback on centres' assessment of moderated work, based on what has been observed by our moderation team. These reports include a general commentary of accuracy of internal assessment judgements; identify good practice in relation to evidence collation and presentation and comments on the quality of centre assessment decisions against individual Learning Objectives. This report also highlights areas where requirements have been misinterpreted and provides guidance to centre assessors on requirements for accessing higher mark bands. Where appropriate, the report will also signpost to other sources of information that centre assessors will find helpful.

OCR completes moderation of centre-assessed work in order to quality assure the internal assessment judgements made by assessors within a centre. Where OCR cannot confirm the centre's marks, we may adjust them in order to align them to the national standard. Any adjustments to centre marks are detailed on the Moderation Adjustments report, which can be downloaded from Interchange when results are issued. Centres should also refer to their individual centre report provided after moderation has been completed. In combination, these centre-specific documents and this overall report should help to support centres' internal assessment and moderation practice for future series.



Would you prefer a Word version?



Did you know that you can save this pdf as a Word file using Acrobat Professional?

Simply click on **File > Save As Other . . .** and select **Microsoft Word**

(If you have opened this PDF in your browser you will need to save it first. Simply right click anywhere on the page and select **Save as . . .** to save the PDF. Then open the PDF in Acrobat Professional.)

If you do not have access to Acrobat Professional there are a number of **free** applications available that will also convert PDF to Word (search for *pdf to word converter*).



We value your feedback

We'd like to know your view on the resources we produce. By clicking on the icon above you will help us to ensure that our resources work for you.

General overview

The qualification has demonstrated significant growth over the last year with some engaging units and content that spans both ICT and media concepts. A wide range of submissions were seen that covered the full range of marks within the different units. Some highly creative and visually appealing products were produced by some candidates and at the other end of the scale, some very brief and incomplete submissions. It is believed that some incomplete submissions were only entered to permit a re-submission in the November 2019 series since the June series was the last opportunity to submit work using the legacy model assignments.

It was interesting to see a significant number of entries that used the new set assignments. These were introduced in February 2019 and replace the older legacy assignments. It is worthwhile clarifying that the new set assignments cannot be modified in either the scenario or associated tasks, whereas the legacy assignments permitted some changes.

An unusually high number of submissions were accompanied by problems with the administration. These include:

- Not supplying all portfolios requested in the sample.
- Missing URS (Unit Recording Sheets) with the breakdown of marks that were given by each LO (Learning Outcome).
- Clerical errors, whereby the total marks on the URS add up to a different total to that entered on OCR Interchange.
- Not including the final product in its intended digital file format (this is required for all units).
- Encrypted memory sticks with a separate password (often making it more difficult to connect the work with the correct password).
- CD/DVD sessions that are not 'closed' to enable them to be read on a different computer system.
- Final products and/or portfolios of evidence that are stored on a publicly available website.
- Late submission of work, well after the marks entry deadline.
- Lost work, which was not reported to OCR using the online form for special consideration.


A high number of submissions were found to have issues with the rank order, which leads to an invalid order of merit (IoM) when moderating the work. This typically arises where there are multiple teachers/assessors with insufficient processes for internal standardisation. It is not possible to complete the moderation process with an invalid order of merit and a significant number of units with large cohorts had to be returned for a remark. Perhaps more concerning is that this did not always result in the required improvement to the rank order, suggesting some misunderstanding of the marking criteria and/or standardisation processes.

Key point call out

The URS (Unit Recording Sheet) provides centres with an opportunity to support the marks given. There are two main reasons why this is needed:

- 1) Portfolios of evidence are slightly fragmented without a clear structure or sequence to the process through the unit. In these cases, signposting to where the evidence can be found is very helpful.
- 2) Situations whereby the evidence of meeting the marking criteria is not explicit and some justification and/or explanation is beneficial.

For any unit, the final work in its intended digital file format should be supplied. There are some possible exceptions, which would be for R091 – Designing a Game Concept since the game proposal could be a separate printed document, as if it were to be posted to a game development company.

	<p>Misconception</p>	<p>That a unit can be evidenced using a paper based portfolio of evidence. As a media based qualification, this approach is not practical and is unable to show the final product effectively. This is particularly found in a digital video, sound sequence, interactive product, website, animation, game and the digital graphics in both formats for R082. The underlying philosophy in this qualification that the product is the main outcome from the assignment and hence a fundamental piece of evidence to support the marking criteria. It is also what would be supplied to a client in a vocational context.</p>
---	-----------------------------	---

In general, centres are requested to check for clerical errors at the time of submitting marks to OCR. Once the sample request email has been received, the entire sample of work should be collated with accompanying URS and final products in their intended digital formats. This should then be posted to the given OCR moderator address within three days. If any work is missing or lost, it should be notified to OCR via the online form using Interchange. Witness statements are not a substitute for lost coursework. If there are any reasons why the sample cannot be sent within three days, this should also be notified to OCR who may grant an extension in special cases.

To confirm the validity and authenticity of the assessment, some restrictions are in place for this qualification to make sure it complies with JCQ Regulations. Firstly, the assignment must be completed as a summative assessment whereby candidates are given the opportunity to apply what they have learned. This is a different concept to 'teaching to the assignment' which can result in over guidance. The use of templates should be avoided other than those provided by OCR although it is recognised that Level 1 cohorts can '*work with [limited] guidance*', since this is covered by the performance descriptors for Level 1 Pass level. These are found in the specification under section 3.4 although there are restrictions on the amount of guidance such that candidates still apply their learning in their assignment work. On a cautionary note, the equivalent Level 2 pass performance descriptor under bullet six is that candidates '*work independently*'. Therefore, centres should be cautious about providing a Level 2 cohort with any form of template, workbook or writing frame on which to base their evidence for the assignment.

In terms of authenticity, there are numerous references in the specification and assignments to clarify what is expected to avoid plagiarism. The way to accomplish this is to make sure that candidates always include references for any and all sources of information. The importance of this cannot be stressed highly enough. In order to gain any credit, this must then be put into their own words as a summary and/or conclusion that effectively demonstrates their knowledge and understanding.

One of the best ways to accomplish this was seen in several submissions and clearly not an isolated example. The candidate included text copied from a website page, with a url (web address) and underneath, a paragraph of the candidates own words that began "*From this my understanding is.....*"

Unit R082 General overview

This mandatory unit is based around the creation of digital graphics. Examples would be DVD or game covers, printed advertisements, magazine/book covers and posters. The majority of entries used one of the legacy model assignments which were:

- DVD cover for 'Energy Matters'
- Magazine advertisement for Timechaser
- Poster for a Glouster international film festival

Some entries were also seen for the three new set assignments, which have now replaced the legacy assignments:

- Vinyl record sleeve
- Book cover
- Magazine advertisement on local photography

The most popular choices of software application were Adobe Photoshop, Fireworks and Serif DrawPlus. A minority of submissions also used the GIMP (open source software). Some choices were not ideal on the basis that they are desktop publishing applications and not image editing software, one example being Microsoft Publisher. This is not disallowed but tends to limit to support for marks in mark band 1.

The assignment should be completed within approximately 10 hours and be a summative activity following the teaching of the unit content from the specification, which is around 20 hours. Candidates must respond to the assignment tasks using their own initiative and be allowed to apply what they have learned. The credit of marks must be directly linked to specific evidence in the portfolio of work. Marks are generally supported for what evidence is provided.

Key point call out


The final graphics in their intended digital file formats should always be included for moderation purposes, which is what would be supplied to a client in a vocational context. This is so that the moderation can confirm the image properties (i.e. pixel dimensions and dpi resolution) are correct and that they meet the client brief.


Most successful topic/question/set texts

- Summarising the use of graphics in a range of different purposes (LO1)
- Creating a work plan (LO2)
- Creating visualisation diagrams (LO2)
- Creating the digital graphic (LO3)
- Identifying areas for improvement (LO4)

Least successful topic/question/set texts

- Describing how the purpose and target audience influence the design and layout (LO1)
- Discussing legislation in a commercial context (LO2)
- Ensuring the technical compatibility of assets (LO3)
- Reviewing the final graphics in terms of what worked and what didn't (LO4)

	Misconception	<p>Two common misconceptions are found in the concept of this unit. Firstly, that digital graphics is only for images that are displayed on a display screen, which is not correct since many printed graphics were created using a computer and image editing software. The second misconception is that resolution is defined as 720p, 1080p or full HD, which is incorrect, since that only refers to video resolution and not printed/still images and graphics relevant to this unit.</p>
---	----------------------	--

	OCR support	<p>Marking guidance document for this unit was published in December 2018 and is available for secure download from OCR Interchange. Note that this is for teacher use only and must not be shared with candidates.</p>
---	--------------------	---

Comments by LO

LO1 – Understand the purpose and properties of digital graphics


The investigation into digital graphics should be based on the types of graphic products that could be created in this unit. A number of submissions included examples such as signage and icons, which are not good choices since they do not have the complexity of image construction with a combination of images and text.

A popular approach was seen whereby candidates inserted five examples of a digital graphic and commented on the purpose, design and layout. This is not such a good match for the marking criteria which is to summarise how and why digital graphics are used in order to evidence an understanding of the purpose.

The identification of file types was often very thorough. Many of these included comments on the characteristics of the file types including where they could be used. One comment here is that marking criteria is only looking for an identification of the file types that are relevant to digital graphics in the first strand. The additional commentary on the characteristics can contribute to the second strand of the marking criteria that refers to image properties and their suitability, e.g. for print and web use.

One of the fundamentally important aspects of the unit is the image properties which includes pixel dimensions and DPI resolution. This knowledge is established in LO1, considered in the planning for LO2 and applied in the creation of the graphics for LO3. In a significant number of submissions, the underpinning knowledge was not suitably established in LO1, leading to problems with the image resolution in LO3 when the graphics were actually created in both formats. A minority of submissions made some excellent comments and references to the properties of a graphic for print use in comparison to the difference that would be needed for web use. It is clear that a growing number of centres are now including this concept and philosophy in the teaching of the unit, which is good practice.

The final part of the marking criteria in LO1 is based on how the purpose and target audience influences the design and layout of digital graphics. This was rarely done very well although it is clear that a number of centres have now grasped this concept effectively. The use and reference to the OCR marking guidance can offer some clarification on what is expected for this part of the marking criteria.

	<p>Misconception</p>	<p>That LO1 can be evidenced in the form of a media analysis, whereby a range of existing graphics are annotated with comments on their design and layout. This is not a good match for the requirements of the marking criteria when aiming for the higher mark bands.</p>
---	-----------------------------	---

LO2 – Be able to plan the creation of a digital graphic


An excellent example of how to interpret the brief was found in the submissions from one centre in particular. Here, the interpretation of the brief was in the form of an email to the NuComputerGames client, explaining what they want to do for them. The content of this email identified what file formats were to be used and why, together with what they would put on the graphic with supporting reasons. This is recognised as an excellent approach for a vocational qualification which has not been seen before in this unit.

Many centres and candidates evidenced the use of knowledge, skills and understanding in the form of mood boards and mind maps from R081. Quite a number of other submissions were given marks in mark band 3 even when this was missing which was not appropriate.

Visualisation diagrams tend to be very good especially when hand drawn. Many of these were quite detailed and supported by a range of annotations to explain the content. Work plans were quite varied whereby some were quite detailed with a Gantt chart to accompany the list of activities. Other approaches were more of a table of activities without a visual indication of the sequence which tended to be more appropriate in mark band 2.

Across nearly all submissions candidates identified a range of assets and in many cases a wide range that could be used in the digital graphics. What was not done as well is identifying the potential use of those assets. Some guidance on how to do this can be seen in the OCR marking guidance. In a similar way resources were often identified but often with little commentary on the purpose. A point to note here is that the potential use of assets and the purpose of resources is a requirement across all three mark bands.

Legislation is an area that was not done consistently well in this unit. Many candidates commented on a range of different legal issues but these were not applied to the assets that were to be used in their intended digital graphic. In all of the OCR assignments there is a statement that the final product is to be used in a commercial context and this must be taken into account. This is the part that was often missing and reference to the assets being used in an educational project is not a good alternative if aiming for the higher mark band. A large proportion of entries included background information on legal issues such as Copyright, trademarks, intellectual property and its duration after the author's death. This is slightly outside the scope of the unit. Although it is not necessary to source background information on these legal issues, if it is done it must also be referenced in a similar way to the evidence for LO1.

	<p>AfL</p>	<p>The evidence of clearly using knowledge, skills and understanding from other units in the qualification can readily be achieved in the form of mind maps and mood boards from R081. Other opportunities would include the detailed categorisation of a target audience and potentially highly detailed work plans with contingencies, milestones and a complex structure of tasks and activities. If R081 has not yet been delivered then opportunities for co-teaching the use of mind maps and mood boards would work well alongside the delivery of R082 digital graphics.</p>
---	-------------------	--


LO3 – Be able to create a digital graphic

There are two strands to the marking criteria in this unit/learning outcome. For the first strand, assets must be sourced, created and prepared for use. In nearly all submissions, the sourcing of assets was clear in one form or another although the creation and preparation evidence was often under-developed. The final part of the marking criteria in the first strand is to make sure the technical compatibility of assets, which in general was missing except in a minority of entries, some of which were resubmissions. Note that some evidence of ensuring the technical compatibility of assets is essential for marks to be supported in mark band 3.

For the second strand, a wide range of graphics were produced. Many of them demonstrated some creativity and impressive visual appeal for a Level 2 qualification. At the other end of the scale, a number of complex, but sometimes not very effective, graphics were created. As a qualification with a strong media focus, this was often appropriate to the descriptor in the lower mark band. The DVD cover and Timechaser brief tended to produce stronger graphics outcomes compared to the Glouster film festival scenario. The use of advanced tools was often well evidenced but the actual digital graphics were not always complex and effective to fully support mark band 3.

Image properties were sometimes overlooked in the centre's assessment and application of the marking criteria. This is an important part of the unit to make sure that the final graphics are fit for purpose.


File and folder organisation tended to be well evidenced in the form of screenshots. The most relevant part of this is the organisation of the assets and the final graphics as opposed to the structure of the assignment work from LO1 through to LO4.

	Misconception	<p>There is a misconception that the use of tools and techniques can be implied in the final graphic. However, this is not the case since it is often not clear whether standard tools were used, or advanced tools, if aiming for the higher mark band. Many submissions included suitable evidence but in a minority the number of screenshots was quite excessive and unnecessary. The marking criteria only requires a range of advanced tools which is generally accepted as three or more. If that range of advanced tools are evidenced in a handful of screenshots that can be sufficient to meet the higher mark band (as long as the effectiveness and image properties are also suitable).</p>
---	----------------------	---

LO4 – Be able to review a digital graphic

There are two parts to the marking criteria for the final review. The first part tended not to be done well in a large number of submissions, which is the candidate's own review of the final graphics in terms of what worked and what didn't. On the other hand, the second part is about areas for improvement, which was typically much more appropriate to meet in the marking criteria even though often quite brief.

Note that peer assessment is not part of the unit or assignment and should be avoided. It is for candidates to decide for themselves what worked and what didn't in the final graphic. It is unfortunate that a significant number of submissions included peer assessment as an alternative to the candidate's own review with the result that there was limited support for the centre's marks.

	Misconception	<p>There is a misconception that a detailed and lengthy review or summary of the process through the unit contributes to the marking criteria. A closer inspection of the marking criteria is recommended here since it is about reviewing the final product in terms of what worked and what didn't. Therefore, a critical commentary in the candidate's own words is what is needed to support the marks. Some candidates did this very well but were often credited highly alongside other candidates where they only commented on the process. This led to some inconsistency in the support for marks, risking an invalid order of merit.</p>
---	----------------------	--

Unit R083 General overview

Two very different approaches were seen in this unit, even within the same centre's submissions. One of which is very good and the other does not meet the intention of the unit.

a) the approach that does work is where candidates create their own original character from scratch, often basing this on a scan of a visualisation diagram that is edited, coloured in and enhanced using a software application.


b) the other approach which was seen quite a lot is whereby candidates copy an existing character such as from the Internet and only make some edits in terms of colour changes and cropping. By creating a new character using this approach, it tends to limit the credit for marks in mark band 1 for the first strand of LO3.

The most popular software choices for this unit built on skills from R082, digital graphics. Here, the use of Adobe Photoshop and sometimes Illustrator were the stronger examples. For 3D, Blender has been the most popular choice.

Although this is not one of the most popular units, it was clear that some outstanding character designs were produced by one centre in particular. The engagement with the unit was tremendous and some very high marks supported.

Key point call out

The digital character should be original as opposed to an edited version of a character that already exists if aiming for the higher mark bands. The character should also be submitted as a digital file with the portfolio evidence for moderation.

	<p>OCR support</p>	<p>A marking guidance document is available for this unit, which can be downloaded from OCR Interchange. Note that this is for teacher reference only and not to be shared with candidates.</p>
---	---------------------------	---

Comments by LO

LO1 – Understand the properties and uses of 2D and 3D digital characters

Candidates tended to complete the investigation with some extensive research into digital characters. This often included a range of characters in the stronger submissions, from superheroes through to games and manga comics, which is good practice rather than focussing on one area. What is essential in this unit like many others is referencing of any sources. This is of particular relevance to the information on characters and their characteristics.

The stronger submissions for the investigation of software types typically included both 2D and 3D software applications to cover the requirement for complex types as required for mark band 3.

LO2 – Be able to plan original 2D and 3D digital characters

The interpretation of the brief was not always expanded on very effectively for the higher mark bands. In a similar way the target audience was not always done well and in general a large number of submissions only summarised the content from the scenario in the assignment brief. This would be an area for development in future.

Many candidates identified a wide range of assets but with a limited commentary on their potential use. Hence this tended to meet the mark band 2 descriptor at best and rarely addressing mark band 3 effectively.

Many work plans were also mostly capable of producing the intended character (MB2) but few had sufficient detail to be supported in mark band 3.

A number of centres claimed the use of knowledge and skills from R081 in the form of the work plan. However, a work plan is included in the teaching content for R083 and therefore cannot be credited as clearly being from a different unit. A more conventional approach would be to include mind maps and mood boards that are based on digital characters.

Visualisation diagrams were one of the stronger pieces of evidence in the planning especially where hand drawn and annotated with extra information. On occasions the visualisation diagrams were used as the basis for the final character by scanning and editing in a software application, which is a technique used within the sector.

Legislation was not always well done. This again lacked the application of being in a commercial context to meet the higher mark bands.

An unexpected number of submissions would often omit any evidence of a test plan with functional testing that is required by the marking criteria. This is an area for development in future.

LO3 – Be able to create 2D and 3D digital characters

There was some excellent use of Adobe Illustrator to create a 2D character in a good proportion of submissions, whereas few candidates attempted the creation of a 3D character.

Not all submissions included the actual character that was exported in a digital file format this limited the support for marks in the second strand of LO3. Some of the strongest submissions included multiple file formats and resolutions, one of which was a PNG file with a transparent background. This would be very effective and useful for the client when they wanted to use a character in their own materials.

LO4 – Be able to review 2D and 3D digital characters

As with a number of other units, the first part of the review was not always done well. Many candidates summarised the process through the unit and what they did to complete the assignment, whereas the comments on the final character often tend to be quite brief. This is not a good match for the requirements of the marking criteria (reference to the OCR marking guidance would be recommended).

On the other hand, the areas for improvement in the character were stronger in their approach and more relevant to the marking criteria.

Unit R084 General overview

Most candidates attempted the legacy model assignment with very few submitting work based on the new set assignment.



Within the qualification as a whole, this is considered to be one of the more creative units with an emphasis on storytelling as opposed to technical skills. It should be noted that the marking criteria in LO3 omits any reference to the use of tools and techniques but this is replaced by the coherence of the storytelling in the comic with clear focal points.

This unit can potentially be submitted as paper based portfolio although the stronger submissions still included digital files many of which add a print resolution version together with a web/display quality resolution. As with any unit, the actual digital files for the final product should still be included if aiming for the higher mark bands so that some evidence of saving and exporting the product is clearly included.

One important aspect of this particular unit is that a multipage comic is created but not all submissions covered this requirement.

Key point call out

The final comics should always be included as digital files if aiming for the higher levels of achievement.

	AfL	Coherence of storytelling with the panel sequence should be emphasised in the teaching of this unit, which has a stronger emphasis than the technical skills.
	OCR support	A marking guidance document is available for this unit, which can be downloaded from OCR Interchange. Note that this is for teacher reference only and not to be shared with candidates.

Comments by LO

LO1 – Understand comic strips and their creation

The referencing of sources continues to be an issue in this unit when completing the initial research. A summary of the origins and history of comics is certainly needed in this first strand although the information should always be put into the candidate's own words to demonstrate their understanding, which is what supports the marks. When sourcing information such as from books or the Internet, it must be clear where the information came from to avoid any plagiarism concerns. Note that if information is only sourced and not rephrased, it would not support any marks for the candidate's own knowledge and understanding.

When describing the software that can be used to create comics the important aspect here is that it refers to a range of tools that can be used and how it relates to the layout and features of the pages, which is different from the features and computer requirements of the software application.

LO2 – Be able to plan a multipage comic strip

The interpretation of the client brief was often under-developed in this unit. A typical approach would be to summarise some key points from the brief but not expand on it significantly to meet the higher mark bands.

The first strand of the planning criteria requires a script and storyline across all three mark bands. A large number of submissions omitted a separate storyline and only included an outline script, hence not supporting the higher mark band. As a development process for a comic book the initial storyline should be drafted as an outline before producing a more detailed script, which is then reviewed before creating a storyboard that is part of the second strand of the planning criteria. Note that there is a sequence of steps here to fully address the planning requirements. The use of knowledge, skills and understanding from other units in the specification can again be evidenced in the form of mind maps and mood boards. If creating their own image based assets another opportunity exists to use some knowledge and skills some R082, which was seen in some submissions.

In general, nearly all submissions included some form of storyboard in the second strand of the planning criteria. Not all of these were fully detailed to be supported in mark band 3 on the basis that this should include characters, storyline, panel layout, communication, focal points and locations.

Many submissions tended to use assets based on 'Bitstrips' type characters. This can be a slightly restrictive approach especially where the characters are more consistent full or half length and limiting the opportunities for establishing focal points.

Resources should not be limited to just computer equipment and many submissions had opportunities for further development here. The software applications that will be used to modify any image based assets together with creating the comic itself should also be discussed in terms of their purpose especially if aiming for the higher mark band.

Legislation tended not to be done that well, often including generic information on Copyright, trademarks and intellectual property. The marking criteria is looking for legislation in relation to the use of assets in multipage comic strips. Hence this should also be in an applied context for this unit like all others.

LO3 – Be able to produce a multipage comic strip


For the first strand, candidates are required to source and store a wide range of assets together with preparing the page layout. This was not well evidenced in a large proportion of submissions. Many of these had been given with high marks but it cannot be implied just by having the final comic.

The creation of the comic for the second strand would need to establish some key focal points for the story, and then integrate the story with the visual panels to create a coherent comic strip. A good proportion of the stronger submissions achieved this successfully.

Although a number of submissions only included a printed paper based comic, this does not address the final two sections of the marking criteria in LO3. The strongest submissions included a high quality PDF for print purposes together with a low quality version typically as a JPG for web or display purposes, both of which were submitted as evidence for moderation. This then also provides evidence of the last part of the marking criteria which was to save electronic files using file and folder names and structures. One of the most important parts of this is the final product and assets as opposed to any evidence of the process through the unit in LO1, LO2, LO3 and LO4.

Key point call out

For the purposes of clarification, a coherent comic strip is one that has a clear story for the reader. If the reader of the comic is slightly unclear about the story once they reach the end and it may not be appropriate in the higher mark band.

	<p>Misconception</p>	<p>That evidence of tools and techniques in the production contributes to the marks in LO3.</p>
---	-----------------------------	---

LO4 – Be able to review a multipage comic strip

For the review, where six marks available in this unit, tended to be done quite well with some relevant comments on the story and the image based assets in the panels. Some candidates still review the process through the unit which is not a good match for the marking criteria, but in general this was not such a significant problem in this unit. The areas for improvement were also done quite well.

Unit R085 General overview

This unit on website development continues to be one of the more popular units this series. The majority of submissions were based on the legacy model assignment for the 'ecofest' brief but a minority used one of the new set assignments. By far the most popular for these was the travel blogger scenario which appears to have been quite an engaging brief for those candidates who used it.

Even though online site builders are popular within industry solutions these do not work so well for the purposes of this qualification and assessment. The reasons being that the work is not stored securely online with too many sharing opportunities which would contravene JCQ Regulations. Without having the work stored securely it also becomes more problematic in case of any post series review where it must be clear that no changes could have been made in between the original assessment, moderation and subsequent review at a later time. Where this is not possible to guarantee, it becomes an unsuitable medium. At the time of writing, the most common approaches are to use either Adobe Dreamweaver or Serif WebPlus, the latter of which is starting to fall behind current trends in web technologies such that some features do not display correctly. A minority of submissions used Microsoft Expression and a review of suitable software options is being planned to support this unit.

Key point call out


It is recognised that the software options are becoming more limited with current trends on the sector, which is likely to introduce some challenges in the short term. Centres would be encouraged to periodically review the options available.


Most successful topic/question/set texts

- The finished website products tended to be generally strong.

Least successful topic/question/set texts

- The final review which tended to be relatively brief for the higher number of marks available in this unit.

	<p>Misconception</p>	<p>That websites can be published to the Internet for moderation purposes. This is not a sufficiently secure hosting medium and all work for moderation must be submitted to OCR and/or the moderator directly. The repository entry option must be used to store all the work and not have links to external (unsecure) web locations.</p>
---	-----------------------------	---

	<p>OCR support</p>	<p>A marking guidance document is available for this unit, which can be downloaded from OCR Interchange. Note that this is for teacher reference only and not to be shared with candidates.</p>
---	---------------------------	---

Comments by LO

LO1 – Understand the properties and features of multipage websites

A common approach was to review a range of websites but this is not always a good match for the marking criteria. A key point here is that the marking criteria is looking for the purpose and component features of websites which are more extensive than just the homepage. The intention of this first part is that candidates start to identify a range of features so that they can pick some relevant ones to include on the website that they will plan and create later in this unit. One additional comment would be that the marking criteria is looking for an understanding, so a description of features is not the strongest approach if aiming for the higher mark band.

The second part of this first learning outcome is about devices used to access web pages. In general, this was well done and typically included detailed descriptions of the devices.

On the other hand, the final part of this first learning outcome is about Internet connection methods and yet this generally was not as well done. The main reason is that the marking criteria is looking for an understanding of connection methods as opposed to a description which would be more relevant to knowledge-based criterion. Hence only the strongest submissions achieved this effectively by comparing and contrasting using examples, as opposed to describing the options available.

LO2 – Be able to plan a multipage website

The planning is covered by two strands of the marking criteria. The first strand begins with the interpretation of the brief, which tended to be slightly limited where candidates primarily just restated key elements from the assignment scenario. The second part considers the target audience, which was often brief but a slightly better expansion of the scenario.

The use of knowledge and skills from other units in the specification can again be covered by the inclusion of mind maps and mood boards but potentially the resizing of image based assets for use on the website it also contribute. Note that a work plan doesn't contribute to this part because it's already included in the teaching content of the unit.

The work plan is one good example of the applied nature that is expected in this unit. For example a common approach by many candidates was to list activities based on the sequence of tasks in the assignment. The test plan is listed in LO2 which is where the activity is included in the work plan. When creating a website a developer would create the site and then use a test plan at the end but few candidates included testing as an activity at the end of LO3, which is where it would be needed in a vocational context.

Planning techniques were varied across the submissions. Some were detailed and complex while others were quite sparse. The minimum expectations would be a site map and visualisation diagrams for the range of pages to be created i.e. the page content and the navigation in between. Consideration of house style is required across mark bands 2 and 3. This was also quite thin in terms of evidence. Some of the strongest submissions annotated the visualisation diagrams whereas others included a paragraph of text describing fonts and colours to be used.

The second strand of the planning requires consideration of assets, resources, a test plan and legislation. In general terms, a wide range of assets were identified but often with limited evidence of

their potential use. In a similar way the purpose of resources that includes the software application to create the website was also under-developed.

Test plans also varied in their suitability to meet the higher mark bands and descriptors. The stronger submissions correctly tested the functionality of the website whereas less suitable approaches would have tests that relate to the client brief and the content which is not the same as functionality. It was reassuring to see that some candidates used the new OCR templates for test plan with no major issues.

Legislation again often included some generic information but not always applied effectively to the use of assets in creating a website in a commercial context.

LO3 – Be able to create multipage websites using multimedia components

A large number of submissions tended to only include the final website as the evidence for LO3 which is not the best approach in aiming for the higher mark band. This is because several aspects of the marking criteria cannot be adequately implied as having been completed to a high level without explicit evidence. For example, the use of *logical and well-structured folders within the web authoring software* which is different from saving the finished website HTML as the last criteria in the marking in the strand.

The sourcing and importing of assets using appropriate methods also lacked any significant evidence. This is included so that images are managed effectively by the authoring software so that they are not lost when publishing the final website and viewed on a different computer system. Unfortunately, several submissions were still seen where the image based content was only displayed with a blank box and a red cross in the top left hand corner. This occurs when the links to the image source are not managed correctly.

The use of a master page was also not typically done well. Many candidates claimed to have used a master page to establish the colours and fonts across the website although at times it was clear that these still varied on different pages. Hence the portfolios should always include clear evidence of creating and applying the master page if aiming for the higher mark band.

The use of advanced techniques can often be seen by viewing the finished website. For example, this included location maps and/or rich media. Where this is not obvious some more explicit evidence within the write up for the unit would be recommended. However, one of the more important parts of the marking criteria is to combine components effectively and producing a clean coherent working navigation system when creating the website. It is accepted that this can be evidenced in the final product to a significant extent. Saving and publishing the website was generally done very well in the HTML files provided although a minority of submissions did not include the digital files for the published website and relied only on screen captures. This is not a good alternative for anything above mark band one. In a similar way a link to an online website is also not suitable.

LO4 – Be able to review a multipage website

This unit has 12 marks for the review and as a result the expectations are higher in the unit compared to others which have only 6 marks. The reason is that a website is considered to be a larger product i.e. with multiple pages, content and user driven navigation in between with a wider range of features and navigation. Since there is more to comment on and apply the marking criteria there is a higher number of marks available. If aiming for the higher mark band comments on each page of the website would be expected and marks were often generous.


In a similar way the areas for improvement could also be applied to each of the pages or the development of extra pages to make a more comprehensive website to meet the brief.

Unit R086 General overview

The majority of submissions for this unit used the legacy model assignment on Superfizz. As seen in recent submissions over the last 2 years some excellent animations are created using Serif DrawPlus, which is potentially more popular because of its simpler user interface. The other main option is Adobe Flash, which is still popular with many centres. It is recognised that some online software applications are becoming available for animation work. In general, these can be used as long as it is possible to download the finished animation and submit for moderation, which is different from the use of online website builders.

Although not limited to this animation unit, several examples of good practice were found in the investigation and research. This is where candidates included a section of text from a website, placed in quotation marks with a superscript which is indexed at the bottom of the page. This is very impressive and commendable given Creative iMedia is a Level 1/2 qualification.

<i>Most successful topic/question/set texts</i>	<i>Least successful topic/question/set texts</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The final animations, which often demonstrated some creative interpretation of the brief 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completing the test plan at different stages of the production

	OCR support	A marking guidance document is available for this unit, which can be downloaded from OCR Interchange. Note that this is for teacher reference only and not to be shared with candidates.
---	--------------------	--

Comments by LO

LO1 – Understand the purposes and features of animation

A popular approach to the investigation was to select a range of animation products and comment on how they were produced. This is fine but for the higher mark bands it is important to focus this on the purposes and uses in order to demonstrate a thorough understanding of animations as opposed to a description.

The requirement to describe a wide range of animation types and techniques tended to be done very well. What was not always included is the advantages and disadvantages of each which is required for the higher mark band.

LO2 – Be able to plan a digital animation

The interpretation of the brief needs to be more than a summary of the key points from the assignment scenario to be supported higher than mark band 1. Like many other units the use of knowledge skills and understanding from other units in the specification was typically evidenced in the form of mind maps and mood boards.

The final part of the marking criteria for the first strand is based on the suitability of file formats in respect of digital animation. On occasions this tended to be generic information about file formats and what they were used for.

For the second strand of the marking criteria storyboards tended to be quite detailed and effective. Assets and resources were typically identified separately and appropriate to the intended product.

Legislation most often included generic information but in a number of submissions, was found to have an excellent commercial context.

LO3 – Be able to create a digital animation

LO3 has two strands to the marking criteria. The first strand only requires candidates to source and store a wide range of assets, which is worth up to 9 marks. This should not be just implied in the final animation if aiming for the higher mark band (there are no 'easy' marks as such across any unit in the qualification). Evidence of storing them using appropriate methods could include resizing the assets for use in the animation stage size, but this was rarely well done across the submissions.

The test plan is part of LO3 in this unit and again looks to test the functionality. On occasions this was more about meeting the client brief or the content, rather than the functionality. Only a few candidates achieved this descriptor in mark band 3.

The use of functions within the animation software to enhance and animated movement to some extent can be seen in the final product. One example here being shape and motion tweens. Where this is not obvious candidates should be encouraged to provide more explicit evidence, e.g. using a series of selected screenshots.

The use of the test plan in production tended not to be done well and where included was more of a final testing approach. This would meet mark band 2 but note that mark band 3 requires the testing to be carried out at regular intervals during production. Very few candidates evidenced this.

The final part of LO3 is about the saving of electronic files for the animation, which tended to be done well although some submissions submitted the final animation relying on only screenshots which is not a good approach for anything above mark band one.

LO4 – Be able to review a digital animation

The review in this unit has 9 marks available instead of the normal 6. So, it is expected that a review proportionate to the number of marks available is produced to achieve the highest mark band. As with any unit the content of the review must be for the final product in terms of what worked and what did not while referencing back to the brief. Hence this should include the visual content and effective story or message within the animation. Areas for improvement tended to be done well but not always supported by a justification to fully support the highest mark band.

Unit R087 General overview

Most candidates completed the legacy model assignment for this unit which is on the days out theme park scenario.

A higher proportion than normal completed this unit using PowerPoint where in previous series a popular choice was also a website as an interactive media product. PowerPoint is acceptable for the unit but the important part is that the final product looks and feels like an interactive multimedia product rather than a presentation. This requires a level of skill in using the software by the candidate in order to achieve mark band 3. A key element of that is user driven navigation that is non-linear, avoiding superfluous range of animated transitions and disabling the space bar and mouse click to advance to the next slide.

Key point call out


Interactive multimedia can be created as a website or PowerPoint product in this unit. If using PowerPoint, it is important that the final outcome appears and functions like an interactive multimedia product and not a presentation, which requires a careful and considered approach that applies effective design principles.

Most successful topic/question/set texts

- Investigation of multimedia products for LO1
- Planning the multimedia product for LO2.

Least successful topic/question/set texts

- Preparation and repurposing of assets for the first strand of LO3. Navigation and display features of a PowerPoint based product.
- The final review for LO4, which must be sufficiently detailed to fully support the 12 marks available.

	<p>OCR support</p>	<p>A marking guidance document is available for this unit, which can be downloaded from OCR Interchange. Note that this is for teacher reference only and not to be shared with candidates.</p>
---	---------------------------	---

Comments by LO

LO1 – Understand the uses and properties of interactive multimedia products

The investigation requires a review of a range of products with the purpose and where used. This tended to be done well although the final part is the identification of design principles which was often omitted. However, design principles are a core concept of the unit which needs to be planned and implemented in LO2 and LO3 if aiming for the higher mark bands. The investigation into a wide range of hardware software and peripherals was quite thorough even though the detail descriptions of the hardware was slightly excessive at times and beyond what was required to fully support the marking criteria. As with some other units it is about the quality of the evidence and not the quantity keeping in mind that a concise summary in the candidate's own words can be better at demonstrating an understanding rather than a lengthy description which may only meet the middle mark band.

The limitations caused by connections, bandwidth and data transfer speeds when accessing interactive multimedia products tended not to show a thorough understanding. Although quite descriptive in the nature of the evidence this should not be just a description of the connections but understanding of the limitations. Hence an applied context with examples would be a better approach.

Finally, for the investigation in LO1 the identification of file formats for different platforms was typically done well. This would always need to focus on a multimedia context keeping in mind the hardware platform it will be used on, rather than generic information on a wide range of file formats for digital media.

LO2 – Be able to plan interactive multimedia products

The interpretation of the brief and consideration of the target audience was generally done quite well together with some use of knowledge and skills from R081 in the form of mind maps and mood boards. One other good opportunity for other use of knowledge and skills also comes from R082 in the repurposing of images for use in the multimedia product but this was quite rare given that many images are high resolution and yet a display screen for a multimedia product is a considerably lower resolution. There are several opportunities here to improve the performance and user experience by having a responsive multimedia product that has assets optimised for use.

The other aspect of the first strand is the work plan. This tended to be appropriate for the development although as with any of the unit the activities for LO1 investigation do not need to be included when working in a vocational context.

The second strand of the planning criteria requires evidence of using complex planning techniques, consideration of design principles on the use of assets and resources. The main area that was under-developed is an application of design principles especially where there was minimal consideration of this in the investigation for LO1.

Visualisation diagrams tended to be very good; typically hand drawn and covering each slide or page of the multimedia product.

Test plans were sometimes very lengthy but did not restrict the tests to the functionality which is what supports the marking criteria. Once again a clear and concise quality of evidence is better than a lengthy quantity which has not such a good match for the marking criteria.

Legislation often referred to an educational context rather than the commercial context as required by the assignment brief. Few candidates met the descriptor in mark band 3 for this aspect.

LO3 – Be able to create interactive multimedia products

There are two strands to the marking criteria in LO3. The first strand tended to be implied to a large extent just by having a final product. This is not a good approach and some explicit evidence of sourcing, creating and especially repurposing the assets is needed if aiming for the higher mark bands. Sourcing assets typically comes from the Internet in the form of images and video. Creating assets was often in the form of a logo that was created by the candidates. Repurposing of assets was occasionally evidenced in the form of resizing still images or trimming a video clip to a shorter length. Without any specific evidence of repurposing assets this generally restricts the candidates' achievements to within mark band 2.

Preparing the structure for the interactive multimedia product was not evidenced particularly well and again should not be just implied in the final product.

For the second strand a large part of the marking criteria can be evidenced in the final product. An important comment here is that the product must be supplied in a digital file format and not just shown as a series of screenshots. The nature of the product is suitable for this particular unit and strand because of the requirement to include a range of asset types with a clear and coherent navigation system in order to create a working interactive multimedia product. Saving exporting in a suitable file format is also part of the criteria which is also evidenced in the final product file. Note that when using PowerPoint a standard.pptx file will qualify as saving but not exporting as a different format. However, this was achieved whereby candidates exported as a.ppsx show file to cover this part of the criteria.

The saving of electronic files and folders is more important to be based on the product and the organisation of the assets that we used to create it rather than the entire unit portfolio evidence from LO1 through to LO4.

LO4 – Be able to review interactive multimedia products

This unit has a 12 mark review and as a result the expectations are higher than a unit which has only 6 marks for this final strand. The reason is that a multimedia outcome is considered to be a larger product i.e. with multiple pages/slides, content and user driven navigation. With a wider range of features and navigation to comment on, and to apply the marking criteria, this is the reason for the higher number of marks available. If aiming for the higher mark band comments on each page of the multimedia product would be expected and many submissions tended to be generous in the marks given.

In a similar way the areas for improvement could also be applied to each of the pages/slides or the development of extra pages to make a more comprehensive product to meet the brief.

Unit R088 General overview

This was found to be a more popular unit than previously seen and most candidates responded to the 'grass and glass' assignment brief which is the legacy model assignment. It was good to see this was often done very well and it is believed that the unit is underrated in terms of its engagement and content.

In nearly all cases the software used for this unit was audacity. What is important is that the sound sequences are exported into a generic file format that can be listened to rather than the.aup files which are of limited use.

Key point call out


An important part of this unit is the recording of audio for the first strand of LO3, which cannot be replaced by software applications that convert text to speech.


Most successful topic/question/set texts

- The final digital sound sequences that were typically an excellent match for the assignment brief

Least successful topic/question/set texts

- Evidence of recording sounds for the first strand of LO3

	Misconception	That text to speech conversion software approaches are an equivalent to recording audio directly with a microphone and associated equipment
---	----------------------	---

	OCR support	A marking guidance document is available for this unit, which can be downloaded from OCR Interchange. Note that this is for teacher reference only and not to be shared with candidates.
---	--------------------	--

Comments by LO

LO1 – Understand the uses and properties of digital sound

Many candidates investigated a range of examples of digital sound but didn't always link these to the use, properties and sectors where they were used in order to evidence their understanding for the higher mark band.

Evidence of different audio file formats tended to be good. It was reassuring to see a higher proportion of candidates discussing the environmental considerations and limitations relating to audio recording in this series, which has often been overlooked.

LO2 – Be able to plan a digital sound sequence

The interpretation of the brief was often done quite well and expanded on the content of the assignment scenario with some realistic ideas combining a voiceover with music and sound effects.

The strongest submissions had a separate work plan with the activities for LO2, LO3 and LO4 to create the sound sequence. In addition to some planning for the content of the sequence, the complexity was often high and determined by the range of sound effects, music, voiceovers and associated script.

Legislation once again tended to be slightly generic with limited references to the commercial context that is required by any of the assignments.

The use of knowledge and skills from other units in the specification was not quite as strong, partly because mind maps are suitable but mood boards, being more of a visual tool, don't have such a strong link to this sound unit.

LO3 – Be able to create a digital sound sequence

LO3 has two strands to the marking criteria. The first strand is about recording and sourcing sounds. An issue seen in a high proportion of submissions is that candidates had written a script but not recorded it themselves. Instead they had used a text to speech converter using an online website resource, but this is not an alternative to recording sound for this strand, limiting the marks to mark band 1. Note that the recording of sound is a fundamental aspect of the first strand in LO3.

Importing a range of assets into the software was generally good and to an extent this could be heard in the final sound sequence. The evidence of using sound editing, mixing and enhancement tools and techniques was varied. Some candidates had no evidence and others had a realistic number of screenshots from audacity to show the techniques that were used which is good practice.

The second strand of the marking criteria in LO3 is about saving and exporting the digital sound sequence. Generally, this was well done in .mp3 or .wav files.

The limitations imposed by different file formats and sizes was often overlooked but in terms of the support of marks, the primary aspect of the second strand is the complexity of the digital sound sequence if aiming for the higher mark band.

LO4 – Be able to review a digital sound sequence

As with many of the units the review is about the product and not the process that has been followed through each learning outcome. 12 marks are available for the review in order to comment on the sound sequence in terms of what worked and what didn't. The stronger approaches looked at both the recording of sounds in terms of what worked and what didn't together with the editing of those sounds to create the final sound sequence.

Areas for improvement also tended to be done quite well especially where there were some problems with some recording or background noise. It was quite straightforward for candidates to comment on this (although that is not a reason to make sure those problems are included in any future assignment work).

Unit R089 General overview

Most candidates again completed the legacy model assignment for this unit which is a barred combination with R088 creating a digital sound sequence.


The most popular software options were Movie Maker, Serif MoviePlus and occasionally Adobe Premiere.


One of the specific issues in this unit is the use of group work where candidates work together to plan and produce their digital video. A number of URS sheets include comments about using group footage but this is not sufficient for the credit of marks. With any group work it must be clear what the individual contribution is so that marks can be given in an appropriate way. Note that in particular marks cannot be inherited from the work of others in the group - this is fundamentally important.

Key point call out

Evidence must be included for what video footage was recorded by each candidate, which is not the same as photographic (still) images or adequately met using group work

<i>Most successful topic/question/set texts</i>	<i>Least successful topic/question/set texts</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The final digital video sequence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The evidence of a shooting script Evidence of recording video footage

	Misconception	That a group mark can be applied to multiple candidates when working together.
---	----------------------	--

	OCR support	A marking guidance document is available for this unit, which can be downloaded from OCR Interchange. Note that this is for teacher reference only and not to be shared with candidates.
---	--------------------	--

Comments by LO

LO1 – Understand the uses and properties of digital video

The investigation of digital video should cover a range of sectors but merely a description of video products tends to be only supported in mark band 1 or possibly low mark band 2. The stronger candidates commented in more detail on these to more successfully evidence their understanding which is what is required to achieve the higher mark band.

The description of video file formats and the properties of digital video was generally done well but sources of information should always include referencing.

LO2 – Be able to plan a digital video sequence

The interpretation of the brief was expanded on quite well together with consideration of the target audience. To begin the planning for this unit, there is a work plan, shooting script and storyboard required by the marking criteria. Many candidates produced work plans and a storyboard, but the shooting script was sometimes overlooked limiting the support for marks and the higher mark band.

A standard approach the most units should have is to identify the resources and comment on their purpose. However, this unit is slightly different in that the marking criteria is looking for a list of equipment and software but to have it justified in relation to identified success criteria. As a general rule few units have any mention of success criteria although this is one of the exceptions. Hence, rather than commenting on the purpose of the resources, candidates should first identify the success criteria for the digital video and then justify the selection of equipment in relation to the success criteria. In many submissions there was no mention of success criteria as a start to the planning process.

Legislation was typically covered as a generic approach although it is again required in a commercial context for this unit. It should relate to the use of video footage that is both recorded and sourced, with those aiming for the higher mark band providing a clear differentiation between these two types of video footage.

Use of knowledge and skills from other units in the specification was generally well done in a form of mind maps and mood boards for this unit.

LO3 – Be able to create a digital video sequence

Creating the video sequence for LO3 again has two strands. The first strand is about recording video footage and this was problematic in a number of entries especially where group work was used. The use of photographic images (still images) which are edited together to create a video effect is also not a good approach and only support mark band 1. The type of video camera used is not important in this unit although when editing the footage, the consistency of framing can affect the support for marks as a final product. An example would be smartphone portrait style footage that is mixed with a more conventional landscape orientation. This is not a good approach when creating a media product. If working in groups it is possible to use the footage that was recorded by other candidates but this must be clearly stated and credit given to every camera operator where appropriate. Note that the sourcing of additional footage is also part of the marking criteria but this is not an alternative to the candidate recording their own footage using a range of camera techniques. Where candidates did use a camera themselves the camera techniques were quite apparent even in the final video, using examples of different shot types, e.g. long shot, mid shot close up, over the shoulder together with camera movement, e.g. panning, zooming.

For the second strand the evidence of editing the video footage was often clear in the final video sequence but the strongest submissions included a select number of screenshots from the video editing software. The effectiveness of the final digital video sequence is a strong contribution to the marks that can be supported in this second strand.

LO4 – Be able to review a digital video sequence

The final review is again 12 marks and needs to comment on the final product and not the process through the unit. The strongest submissions commented on what worked in the recorded footage together with what didn't and also supported by comments on the editing and the storytelling for the final sequence. Examples were seen where the comments referred to the quality of the video footage in terms of the framing and at times the camera movement, which was a little shaky in places. This is good practice and very relevant to the intended nature of the review.

Based on what didn't work in the video sequence, whether video footage or the editing, candidates quite naturally moved on to realistic areas for improvement.

Unit R090 General overview

Most candidates completed the legacy model assignment for this unit based on the local area or the 'lights, shapes and angles' assignment brief.

There is no need to apply any significant editing using software applications for this unit even though many candidates used Photoshop or an equivalent for some basic image processing. It should be emphasised that the skills in this unit is about using a digital camera effectively using a range of features and settings. This cannot be completed to a high standard in LO3 when using smartphone cameras even though they are not disallowed.

One particular problem in this series by several centres was the hosting of the entire portfolio using a public website on the Internet. This does not work and should be avoided in future since it lacks the secure storage requirements of the qualification. In one particular example work was uploaded to the repository which was little more than a live link to a public website outside of the repository, which was not appropriate. The repository option is provided for the secure storage of all the candidates' evidence portfolios and products.

Key point call out


This unit aims to build skills in using a digital camera as opposed to editing images and graphics. It combines both the technical understanding of digital camera settings together with the artistic/visual skills of composition.


Most successful topic/question/set texts

- Photographic portfolios that demonstrated creative images and visually strong compositions.
- In general, the artistic side of the photography unit was well evidenced.

Least successful topic/question/set texts

- The evidence of the features and settings used to take the photographic images.
- In general, the technical side of the photography unit was not well evidenced.

	Misconception	That a smartphone is a suitable camera even when aiming for the higher mark bands. The issue here is the limitation on what features and settings can be used.
---	----------------------	--

	OCR support	A marking guidance document is available for this unit, which can be downloaded from OCR Interchange. Note that this is for teacher reference only and not to be shared with candidates.
---	--------------------	--

Comments by LO

LO1 – Understand the features and settings of digital photographic equipment

The description of features and settings was not effectively evidenced by including just the camera specifications. This needs to be summarised into the candidate's own words to demonstrate any understanding and gain any significant credit above mark band 1. The referencing of sources of information was an issue in a few submissions for this first strand. Having summarised their learning and investigation on the features and settings of cameras, candidates would then be able to address the second part which is about the different types of cameras and their capabilities and limitations before moving onto the suitability of cameras for a range of scenarios.

The rules of photography and composition was often quite detailed but frequently difficult to confirm the candidate's own knowledge and understanding where there was no referencing of sources. In other cases, an extensive range of sourced information was referenced but not summarised into the candidate's own words, such that limited credit could be supported for their understanding. The strongest submissions were found where candidates apply their learning and take a series of photographs themselves to demonstrate different compositional approaches rather than relying on images sourced on the Internet. This makes LO1 a practical activity and not just a research task.

O2 – Be able to plan a photo shoot

The interpretation of the client brief was often quite short together with the identification of the target audience. The use of knowledge and skills was typically found in mind maps.

The work plan for the photo shoot was also not well done. This tended to be more of a work plan for the unit on the assignment tasks rather than a specific photo shoot. Where the work plan was based around the photo shoot the range of activities tend to be quite brief. These work plans were 'mostly capable' but struggled to meet the clear and detailed descriptor for mark band 3.

Candidates tended to include a list of equipment that was available for photography although not always identifying what they were actually going to use. Here, a list of different types of digital camera is not suitable and this would be better placed in LO1.

This unit also includes success criteria relating to the list of equipment and whether it can be justified in relation to meeting the brief. Hence it is one of the initial planning activities whereby candidates interpret the brief, identifying what the success criteria will be to make the photo shoot successful for the client. From this, the equipment can be chosen in relation to it and include some justifications.

Legislation in the commercial context is slightly different in this unit and tended to be done quite well since it was a more specific to the unit and not generic. Examples would include permissions for taking photographs in public private places together with the age of the people that were being photographed.

LO3 – Be able to take and display digital photographs

There are two strands to the marking criteria in LO3. The first strand was rarely done well, and it cannot be implied that a range of features and settings have been used by just viewing a final portfolio. For the higher mark bands, it must be clear what features and settings were selected as opposed to just using the camera in a fully automatic mode. Alternatively, some candidates used a smartphone as the digital camera, in which case there is very limited opportunities for manual selection of the features and settings that can only be credited in mark band 1. The organisation of the subject and scene is another part of the marking criteria which had limited evidence. A documentary type of approach to scenes and environments tends to have little organisation but on the other hand, some candidates clearly took some photographs in a studio where there is some clear organisation of the scene, set and lighting. In these cases, their role in setting the studio up on the lighting needs to be clearly evidenced so that they are not inheriting marks from the work of somebody else.

The second part of the first strand is to take a range of digital photographs using different rules of photography and composition, which is more the artistic and visual aspect of photography. Whereas the first part of this strand is the technical aspect, it was much clearer how the visual aspect of photography was done much better in a large number of submissions. This resulted in a significant number of impressive images presented, especially for a Level 1/2 qualification. Even where the actual images were visually to a high standard, without the technical aspects from the first part of this marking criteria the work still tended to be over marked by the centre and more often it would be high mark band 1 or low mark band 2 overall, instead of mark band 3.

In the second strand candidates are required to store the digital images and create a portfolio in a suitable medium. Many chose to use PowerPoint for this which is acceptable although it should be submitted for moderation with the separate photographic image files, e.g. jpg. In addition to the portfolio in its intended format, some of the PowerPoint files did not work as a product because they included multiple text based annotations on what the candidate did to take the photograph and how however such annotations would distort the use of the portfolio for the client in commercial context. The annotations would contribute to the review of what worked for LO4 but as a consequence, there would be no real evidence of the actual product that should have been created.

LO4 – Be able to review digital photographs

The review of the portfolio was often done very well. It was clear that a number of comments on individual photographs were included alongside the images in LO3 (in various formats) but it is accepted that this can contribute to the review for LO4. Using a heading for LO4, candidates made more general comments on the portfolio as a whole but rarely commented on the justification for the photographs selected. Note that for this selection of photographs, any that were not selected for comparison purposes will also contribute to the evidence.

The areas for improvement in the portfolio was mixed in its approach. Some did well identifying the strengths and weaknesses. Typical approaches would be to comment on how they would need to be re-taken with different lighting or framing. Others commented on whether more (or less photographs) could be included in the final portfolio, which was typically around ten images.

Unit R091 General overview

Most candidates completed legacy model assignment for this unit.

Note that there is no specific software required for this unit on game concepts but the primary outcome from the unit is the game proposal. This should be created and supplied as a separate document that could be sent to a client in a vocational context and not just mixed/merged with the evidence for all of LO1, LO2, LO3 and LO4. A paper based proposal can be supplied with this unit and it is not necessarily essential to have a digital file format for the proposal although it can help the evidence in LO3 since the marking criteria still includes reference to saving electronic files and folders.

Key point call out


The game proposal should be a separate document that could be sent to a client in a vocational context.


Most successful topic/question/set texts

- The ideas and planning for LO2

Least successful topic/question/set texts

- The content and structure to the game proposal for LO3

	Misconception	The misconception in this unit is the style and structure to the final proposal. If aiming for the higher mark bands, this should be in a format that could be supplied to a games development company and include all the relevant details.
---	----------------------	--

	OCR support	A marking guidance document is available for this unit, which can be downloaded from OCR Interchange. Note that this is for teacher reference only and not to be shared with candidates.
---	--------------------	--

Comments by LO

LO1 – Understand digital game types and platforms

The referencing of sources is very important for the initial investigation and yet this was not always well done. A key aspect of the marking criteria is that it should demonstrate an understanding for the higher mark bands. In a large proportion of the summaries of research, it was more of a description that would be more appropriate for knowledge-based criterion.

For the second strand of the marking criteria candidates often provided a detailed analysis of digital games although this was often more of a review of the game rather than the evolution of the characteristics. It also tended to be fairly narrow in the range of genres, hence restricting the access to mark band 3.

The explanations of game objectives were also more typically evidenced within mark band 2 due to the limitation of the types of games covered.

LO2 – Be able to plan a digital game concept

The interpretation of the client brief and consideration of target audience provided a good introduction for the rest of the planning and was generally well done. The strongest submissions listed a range of ideas with an index to idea 1, idea 2, idea 3, etc. The ideas would comment on the gameplay outlines quite effectively although the consideration of success criteria was under-developed in many submissions. Candidates capitalised quite well on their knowledge and skills from R081 in the use of mind maps and mood boards as part of the game ideas and planning.

LO3 – Be able to design a digital game proposal

There were some mixed responses to the requirement for a proposal. Many of these were quite brief and lacked the detail needed to be supported in the higher mark bands. In many submissions, the proposal was more of a summary of a game idea which would be more consistent with expectations of the planning in LO2 but insufficiently developed for the game proposal in LO3.

The strongest submissions included a game proposal as a separate document with a title, contents, overview of the game, explanation of the game objectives and further supported by a series of game visualisations including the characters and the game screens.

Legislation intended to be under-developed in relation to the use of assets, ideas and concepts, which is a slightly different approach to that seen in other units. Although the game proposal could be paper based there still needs to be some evidence of saving electronic files and folders to meet the marking criteria especially if aiming for the higher mark bands.

LO4 – Be able to review a digital game proposal

The review for LO4 is intended to be a review of the game proposal with a detailed and thorough explanation of game components, narrative and gameplay. This again was under-developed although the identification of areas for improvement and further development where are the stronger element of the review to support the marks.

Unit R092 General overview

Most candidates completed the legacy model assignment that is based on a lawn mower game.

A large number of highly playable games were created and it was often entertaining to moderate the submissions. A popular choice of software continues to be in Game Maker for this unit although Scratch was also used in a significant number of submissions.

What is not such a good approach is to have the games hosted online on the Internet since these cannot be effectively locked down for the purposes of assessment. As with any unit the final product in intended format should be submitted for moderation and stored securely which is difficult to achieve using online formats.

Key point call out


Evidence of the final game must be supplied to the moderator directly and not just hosted online using unsecured public websites.


Most successful topic/question/set texts

- The playable game that was created

Least successful topic/question/set texts

- Planning of the game, which tended to be quite brief

	Misconception	That most of the marking criteria in LO3 can be evidenced by having a functional game.
---	----------------------	--

	OCR support	A marking guidance document is available for this unit, which can be downloaded from OCR Interchange. Note that this is for teacher reference only and not to be shared with candidates.
---	--------------------	--

Comments by LO

LO1 – Understand game creation hardware, software and peripherals

The summary of capabilities and limitations of software tended to be a list of the system requirements in many cases although the strongest submissions included some comparisons to show the required understanding.

The second part of the investigation is about the gaming platform hardware and peripherals to create and test games. The first part tended to be done quite well, which is the creation of the game in terms of the computer and software that could be used. The hardware and peripherals to test the games was slightly under-developed to fully support mark band 3.

LO2 – Be able to plan the creation of a digital game

The planning in general was fairly brief for this unit although to an extent this is understandable since the assignment brief is quite detailed as to what the game should comprise. In general, a lower proportion of candidates achieved mark band 3 for the planning of the digital game and portfolio evidence quickly moved on to creating the game as the evidence for LO3.

Most candidates included a test plan which was used later on in the unit, having created the game. In some cases, this didn't always include tests on the functionality. Instead the approach was more about testing to see if it met the brief which is not such a good match for the marking criteria. Few candidates had any significant evidence of planning the game structure with reference to pathways, game mechanics and consideration of success criteria plus the contextualisation of legislation in this unit.

LO3 – Be able to create a digital game

The game itself tends to be the primary evidence for LO3. A large part of the marking criteria can be evidenced in a functional game although the strongest submissions included some evidence in the form of screenshots such as using geometric parameters, manipulating objects and the environment including their properties. Otherwise a playable game is a significant contributor to the marks that are supported in the strand. For example, interactions can readily be evidenced in the final game together with gameplay controls. In this respect screenshots of setting up the gameplay controls is not essential.

Saving, exporting and publishing the digital game varies depending on the game development software chosen. Here the Game Maker files work well and often exported as a.exe file, whereas the online versions are more problematic.

LO4 – Be able to review the creation of a digital game

Reviews of the game were often more based on comparisons with the brief rather than the review of the gameplay and interactions. As with any unit it is a review of the final product that supports the marks not the process through the unit.

Testing of the game was generally well done where the tests were based on the functionality and to an extent whether it meets the brief. The strongest submissions did identify areas for improvement and further development with justifications but in many cases the justifications were limited, leaving just some ideas for how the game could be improved. A common approach was directly adding more levels to the game to increase its complexity, which is a good approach.

Supporting you

For further details of this qualification please visit the subject webpage.

Review of results

If any of your students' results are not as expected, you may wish to consider one of our review 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.

activeresults

Review students' exam performance with our free online results analysis tool. Available for GCSE, A Level and Cambridge Nationals.

It allows you to:

- review and run analysis reports on exam performance
- analyse results at question and/or topic level*
- compare your centre with OCR national averages
- identify trends across the centre
- facilitate effective planning and delivery of courses
- identify areas of the curriculum where students excel or struggle
- help pinpoint strengths and weaknesses of students and teaching departments.

*To find out which reports are available for a specific subject, please visit ocr.org.uk/administration/support-and-tools/active-results/

Find out more at ocr.org.uk/activeresults

CPD Training

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

Please find details for all our courses on the relevant subject page on our website.

www.ocr.org.uk

OCR Resources: *the small print*

OCR's resources are provided to support the delivery of OCR qualifications, but in no way constitute an endorsed teaching method that is required by OCR. Whilst every effort is made to ensure the accuracy of the content, OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions within these resources. We update our resources on a regular basis, so please check the OCR website to ensure you have the most up to date version.

This resource may be freely copied and distributed, as long as the OCR logo and this small print remain intact and OCR is acknowledged as the originator of this work.

Our documents are updated over time. Whilst every effort is made to check all documents, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, therefore please use the information on the latest specification at all times. Where changes are made to specifications these will be indicated within the document, there will be a new version number indicated, and a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource please contact us at: resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk.

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR, or are considering switching from your current provider/awarding organisation, you can request more information by completing the Expression of Interest form which can be found here: www.ocr.org.uk/expression-of-interest

Please get in touch if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support delivery of our qualifications: resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk

Looking for a resource?

There is now a quick and easy search tool to help find **free** resources for your qualification: www.ocr.org.uk/i-want-to/find-resources/

www.ocr.org.uk

OCR Customer Support Centre

Vocational qualifications

Telephone 02476 851509

Facsimile 02476 851633

Email vocational.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

OCR is part of Cambridge Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge. *For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored.*

© **OCR 2019** Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA. Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.



Cambridge
Assessment

