



General Certificate of Education

**Applied Information and
Communication Technology
8751, 8753, 8756, 8759**

IT14 Interactive Multimedia

Report on the Examination

2010 examination – June series

Further copies of this Report are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2010 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334). Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX

Unit 14: Interactive Multimedia (IT14)

Generally, where projects undertaken had real clients, candidates produced better portfolios. It was evident that many candidates had used real clients for their portfolio work and were often able to access higher marks than those who had not.

Action plans and monitoring of tasks showing durations in hours were evident in many candidate portfolios.

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 created excellent 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.

The installation and maintenance guides were good, but some candidates still omitted to provide instructions to users on both installation **and** maintenance. Many candidates provided good technical documentation with annotated programming code to gain high marks, though some candidates did not provide enough screenshot evidence to show all the elements of the solution they claimed to have created, instead concentrating solely on highlighting the software tools used to create the elements.

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.

Most projects were appropriate in content and level, but some candidates were unable to access some marks in A03 by not defining Inputs, Processes and Outputs (this refers to the interactive elements and their response to user input).

Better candidates did produce well annotated design work often incorporating the inputs, processes and outputs in the narrative, or in a separate table. Good candidates also listed all items of hardware and software that users would need to run the final multimedia solution, thus gaining high marks in A03. 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 design each section this way and why these sub-designs are necessary. Some good candidate work on designs showed assets linked to design work, but they often did not achieve all the marks available as the hardware and software required to produce the solution (these are also resources) was not described, or was not completely listed.

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

In A04 many candidates did a very good job of evaluating their product, but a few failed to identify their evaluation criteria as 'qualitative' or 'quantitative'. 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. Only better candidates explained improvements in their actions and changes made as a result of those improvements. These 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.

The Marking Grid rows pertaining to time planning and management were re-written for clarity in this series. Some candidates had provided good evidence of setting deadlines for tasks in their action plans which they subsequently used to monitor their progress. Most candidates had also shown, when planning the use of their time, estimates of task durations in hours.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.