Version 1.0

**AQA**

**General Certificate of Education (A-level) Applied
June 2012**

**Applied Information and
Communication Technology**

**IT12**

**(Specification
8751/8753/8756/8757/8759)**

**Unit 12: Interactive Multimedia**

*Report on the Examination*

## IT12 - Publishing

### General Comments for ITPA/3

Generally where projects undertaken have real clients candidates produced better portfolios. It was evident that many candidates had used real clients for their unit work in this series and were thus able to access higher marks.

Action plans and monitoring of tasks in the unit, showing estimated and actual durations in hours were evident in most candidate portfolios, though predicted deadlines of project tasks were missing in some portfolios where only start and end dates for tasks were given.

### General Comments for IT12

This A2 Unit builds on the skills introduced in Unit 1 and extends them to producing a published document, creating a house style and recommending a production method for the document. Logically, the portfolio should be assembled to show the process that is followed during the design and production of the document. It is likely that AO2 is completed first, with some elements of AO4; AO3 being completed next, along with some elements of AO4; then the evidence of implementation for AO1; finally testing of the product and review and evaluation for AO4. Presenting evidence in this order allows the process to be seen as a whole, rather than as a disconnected set of discrete events. Candidates who presented their portfolios in this way tended to gain higher marks.

In general the publications were of a high quality and suitable to meet the unit assessment requirements, though some portfolios were unnecessarily large and contained a lot of repeated or irrelevant material.

In many portfolios there was excellent evidence of client involvement throughout the process of producing the publication. This usually took the form of credible evidence involving client signatures, meeting minutes or screenshots of emails, to authenticate client communication. Most candidates did have real clients and the few who did not were usually unable to provide evidence for some criteria and so were unable to access some of the available marks.

Some candidate portfolios showed that they had failed to discuss and agree with the client the format for reproduction and delivery of the final version of the publication. This meant those candidates could only gain limited marks in this area.

In A01 most candidates did provide an initial version of the publication showing that it had been annotated during proof-reading, but had not then described how they had carried this out in order to access the higher marks.

Resizing of images was generally well evidenced by most candidates, however some had not shown the before and after images in a relevant software application, where the difference in proportions or sizes can be seen, or had merely cropped images.

Many candidates produced separate implementation schedules that were of a good standard and contained tasks and deadlines, but often lacked the detailed description of the subtasks to be undertaken in the stages from the design through to testing, focussing only on creation of the final publication.

In A03 the designs for the publication ranged from very basic sketches, which gained few marks, to highly detailed scaled drawings that contained a large amount of formatting

information. This formatting information showed the editing required to produce the document, as well as where all the assets would be used. Some candidates produced excellent descriptions of how the formatting met their client's needs. A few candidates presented design work that had been created in the target software and thus gained few marks for their designs.

Some of the better candidates showed good understanding of house style and had provided authentic evidence of client agreement on an appropriate house style. Many candidates were able to describe the house style used in the final publication and how this related to client needs, thus gaining the higher marks.

In A04 many candidates did a good job of evaluating their product, but a few still failed to correctly identify their evaluation criteria as qualitative or quantitative, which prevented them accessing the higher marks for their test plans.

**Mark Ranges and Award of Grades**

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the Results Statistics page of the AQA Website.