Principal Moderator Feedback

January 2015

Pearson Edexcel
Certificate in Digital Applications

DA202 – Creative Multimedia

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Certificate in Digital Applications

DA202 - Creative Multimedia

Overall

A total of 1275 students were entered for this unit, 1231 for the 0113 SPB and only 44 for the 0913 SPB. This was the final opportunity for moderation of work for the 0113 SPB.

Some of the work seen during this moderation window was of an appropriate standard for this level, with most of the requirements for the sets of products being met. A limited number of excellent multimedia products were seen, but as in the previous series, examples of work consistent in standard with students working at Level 1 were also submitted.

Strand (a) – Design multimedia products

The most successful students produced detailed designs that demonstrated how the products would function and would facilitate implementation. These students included detailed comments about design decisions. Some students used their up-front designs to gather valuable feedback from others at an early stage. Some of the best designs were hand drawn but some of these suffered from poor scanning where much of the detail had been lost.

Less successful students presented sketch designs, often no more than outline boxes on the storyboard, which gave only a rough idea of likely user experience and how the products would function. In these examples comments on design decisions tended to be brief and few assets were identified.

Several examples of storyboards that appeared to have been produced in the minimum time possible were also seen. Such documents need to be considered as a means of communicating design ideas and need to be presented accordingly.

Designs were also submitted which were not of the required type, as stated in the SPB and several students had not included all of the required design documents. A small number of students produced design documents that were clearly retrospective, and contributed nothing to the process of creating the multimedia products and therefore should not have been awarded marks.

Assessment of this strand was often generous with several instances of marks being awarded for evidence that was not presented to a suitable standard.

Strand (b) – Collect, edit and create digital assets

Most students included an assets table with information relating to the assets gathered for use in their products. Many students correctly acknowledged the sources of their

assets although search engines or 'The Internet' were often quoted as a secondary source. Several comprehensive assets tables were seen. There were also many examples where students had either missed out some of the assets, frequently primary audio and video files, or failed to include information on work done in preparing the assets.

The assessment grid for this strand refers to 'relevant information about the development process. Many students included descriptive evidence of the development of images in their assets tables, but few students provided direct evidence of important stages in the development of the assets, covering multimedia assets in addition to images eg, screen prints illustrating the re-sizing of video or editing of audio files.

As in the previous series, several students had used copyright protected assets in products despite the SPBs stating clearly that the work should comply with copyright restrictions. Some students included statements of what their responsibilities would be should the products be used commercially. This approach should not be used for main assets and when used students should deal with the issue of copyright for each asset individually and not rely on a blanket statement to cover all copyright protected material.

In some instances marks in this strand were not agreed because no attempt had been made to prepare files to suit the recommended size restriction for the project and in other examples because of the use of assets of poor quality, particularly pixelated, poorly edited or distorted images.

Strand (c) – Develop multimedia products

Some improvement in the quality of the final products over the previous series was noted, although the following comments from the summer 2014 report remain relevant.

Movies that required the sequencing of still images with transitions and titles tended to be reasonably well done, although some issues with the synchronisation and level of background music were noted.

The splash screens and various continuity screens also tended to be successful, although students should be encouraged to produce original work and not rely solely on ready-made assets for this type of product.

The preparation and integration of original video assets into an overall product is generally an area for further development. Centres need to consider the suitability of locations for recording e.g. background light and noise levels and make available equipment such as tripods to improve quality. Video clips need to include action to support editing and maintain interest. Audio levels need to be adjusted to suit the video content and synchronised to suit both content and length. If a voice over is required this should be at a consistent and audible level.

Animation is the other main area for further development, although some excellent stop frame products and 'Flash' animations were seen. The use of motion and shape tweens should be encouraged, as should the use of assets comprising separate components to enable movement. Some students had presented products that could not be classified as true animations, with objects simply following motion paths in presentation software.

Strand (d) – Present evidence in an eportfolio

As in the previous series most students produced functional eportfolios, which were easy to navigate. Some students produced very effective eportfolios that had been well designed to suit the stated purpose of presenting work for assessment and moderation. In these examples there was differentiation in the emphasis given to the final products and the supporting evidence, together with detailed commentaries explaining the context for the work. In other examples, poorly chosen colour schemes and small serif fonts made the work difficult to follow.

The advices of the summer 2014 report appear to have been taken on board with fewer links failing once the eportfolio had been transferred from the local network and very few moderators' toolkit issues arising, although spellchecking of commentaries remains an area for improvement.

From this series centres are asked to note the importance given within the assessment grid for this strand to the use of appropriate multimedia assets to enhance the eportfolio pages.

Several students failed to adhere to the recommended size limit for the eportfolio. In many cases students retained redundant files within their folders, in particular raw video files, unedited audio files and pre-published animation files. These significantly increased the size of the students' eportfolio folders.

Strand (e) – Review the products

Students should carry out a comprehensive review of the project, evaluating the products, in terms of fitness for audience and purpose, and drawing on the feedback they receive from end reviewers. Sensible suggestions for improvements should be included.

Most students were able to make some relevant comments about the publications and many recorded interim feedback received during the testing of prototypes.

Where full marks were agreed for this strand the students had provided a detailed evaluation of the products and made specific and valid suggestions for further improvement of the final products, based on ideas arising from their consideration of end user feedback.

Less successful reviews tended to comprise lengthy descriptions of work done and processes followed with little evaluative content. Structuring the review to consider each product separately with specific suggestions for further improvement should help to focus this work.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:
http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx