



**General Certificate of Education (A-level) Applied
June 2011**

**Applied Information and
Communication Technology**

IT12

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

Unit 12: Interactive Multimedia

Report on the Examination

Further copies of this Report on **the Examination** are available from: aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2011 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 12: Publishing (IT12)

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

Action plans and monitoring of tasks showing durations in hours were evident in most candidate portfolios, though predicted deadlines for project tasks were still missing in some portfolios where only start and end dates for tasks were given. Where this was evident candidates were not able to access all the marks available for this criterion.

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 second, 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 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. However, in some portfolios where candidates had produced a publication that was also presented as evidence for Unit 8, candidates had not presented enough evidence of their own individual work in planning and designing the end product to gain the higher marks available in A03.

In many portfolios of work there was some 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. A few candidates failed to describe in detail their client's needs, instead just listing them which was sufficient only for one mark.

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

In A01 a few candidates only described their use of software tools to check their draft publication's spelling and grammar, and didn't actually demonstrate and describe, via screenshots, how they had carried this out. 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 done this, which is a requirement 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 could be seen. Others had merely cropped images.

Many candidates produced separate implementation schedules that were of a good standard, but other portfolios still lacked the required detail on designing and testing tasks, focussing only on creation of the final publication. Sometimes the required client agreement was missing which meant that no marks could be awarded.

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 publication, as well as where all the assets would be used, and some candidates produced excellent descriptions of how the formatting met their client's needs.

Some better candidates showed good understanding of house style and had shown authentic evidence of client agreement on an appropriate house style. In this series many more of these

candidates were then able to describe the house style used in the final publication and how this related to client needs, which enabled them to gain the highest marks.

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

Many more candidates than in previous series had provided good evidence of setting deadlines for tasks, in their action plans, that 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 which they then compared with actual task durations. Candidates who did not plan their time in this detail were not able to gain more than two of the eight marks available.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

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

Converting Marks into UMS marks

Convert raw or scaled marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

UMS conversion calculator www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion.