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

Applied Information and Communication Technology   IT14

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

Unit 14: Systems Analysis

Report on the Examination

IT14 – Interactive Multimedia

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 IT14

This A2 Unit is equivalent to Unit 12 in demand, though there is less emphasis in the assessment on showing client involvement. It introduces candidates to the techniques involved in designing and creating interactive multimedia and the demands that it makes on hardware. Interactivity should be between the users of the application and the application itself. The product is an interactive multimedia application that incorporates various media elements, with features that allow the user a choice about the path taken through the application, and involves the user by incorporating other interactive features.

Many candidates produced excellent interactive multimedia solutions, demonstrating high level skills in the use of web creation and multimedia authoring software, video and sound recording and animation – all using appropriate software tools for the job. However in some portfolios, where candidates had produced an interactive multi-media solution that was also presented as evidence for Unit 8, candidates had not presented enough evidence of their own individual work in planning, designing and creating the end product.

In A01 the installation and maintenance guides were good, but some candidates omitted to provide instructions to users on both installation and maintenance of the solution, instead concentrating solely on its maintenance.

Many candidates provided good technical documentation with annotated programming code, though some candidates did not provide enough screenshot evidence to show all the elements of the solution they claimed to have created, concentrating solely on highlighting the software tools used to create the elements.

In A02 most candidates described the client well and gave a description of the application to be developed. Better candidates included the rationale for the application by, for example, explaining why a multimedia application would engage the audience and what techniques were available to do this.

In A03 many candidates did produce well annotated design work often incorporating the inputs, processes and outputs in the design work, a separate narrative, or in a separate table.

Better candidates described all items of hardware and software that users would need to run the final multimedia solution, though many candidates did not describe the hardware and software they needed to produce the solution, concentrating exclusively on the assets needed.

Rarely did candidates justify creating sub-designs for each separate component of their solution. For example in a multi-media solution the designs for the quiz section would be quite different from the designs for slides/pages that contained videos, sounds, text, animated sequences or a gallery of images. Candidates need to explain how and why they have chosen to show the design of each section/element of the multi-media solution in this particular way and why these sub-designs are necessary.

Many candidates produced separate implementation schedules that were of a good standard, but often lacked detail on designing and testing tasks, focussing only on creation of the final solution.

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

Few candidates gained more than two marks for detailing their actions in carrying out the work for this unit and highlighting their strengths and weaknesses. Better candidates explained improvements in their actions and changes made as a result of those improvements. The better candidates had often achieved these marks by building in review points at important milestones during the project rather than just carrying out the review at the end of the project.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

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