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

**Applied Information and   IT14
Communication Technology**

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

Unit 14: Systems Analysis

Report on the Examination

Unit 14: Interactive Multimedia (IT14)

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 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. These candidates demonstrated 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 multimedia solution 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 A01 only a few candidates gained the highest marks for recording and editing their own video and audio for their solution. The installation and maintenance guides were generally 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 that allowed them 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 they concentrated 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.

Most projects were appropriate in content and level, and many candidates gained marks in A03 by correctly defining Inputs, Processes and Outputs (this refers to the interactive elements and their response to user input). Some candidates did this by showing them in a table and others by incorporating them in their design work.

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 gain all the available marks as the hardware and software required to produce the solution (these are also resources) were not included or were incomplete.

Some candidates described all items of hardware and software that users would need to run the final multimedia solution, thus gaining high marks on this section of A03, but many still omitted to provide this evidence.

Many candidates produced separate implementation schedules that were of a good standard, but these often lacked detail on the necessary 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 still failed to identify their evaluation criteria correctly as either 'qualitative' or 'quantitative', which prevented them accessing the higher marks for their test plans.

Few candidates gained more than two marks for detailing their actions in carrying out the unit and highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of the approach they took. 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.

Many more candidates 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.