

Centre name:	Centre number:
Candidate name: Stephen	Candidate number:

Strand	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	Total
Guidance	NG	NG	NG	NG	NG	NG	
Centre							
Moderator	3	0	6	7	7	5	28

Strand (d) The project outcomes - a set of multimedia products

THE PROMOTIONAL MOVIE	
Requirements specified in the brief	
Will it capture the attention of 11-14 year olds?	Yes, the video clips should attract their attention.
Does it explain what can be found on the web pages?	It gives a reasonable idea.
Does it use a combination of multimedia assets?	Yes: stills, video clips, original sound track.
Does it run without user interaction?	Yes.
Does it run for no longer than 2 minutes?	Yes.
Expectations	
Can users view the movie without help?	Yes, it only requires the user to click the link.
Will it persuade 11-14 year olds to look at the web pages?	Yes, we think so, although an opportunity has been missed at the end of the movie to remind the viewer to visit the web pages.
Does it run using a common plug-in?	Yes.
To what extent are the underlying processes of design, development, testing and preparation of assets reflected in this product?	<p>There is a storyboard, but the movie does not bear any resemblance to it - Stephen acknowledges this in his commentary and in his review. Apparently, it was too complicated for him to implement.</p> <p>Some testing of the movie can be inferred from the final product, including the synchronisation of the sound track.</p>

THE WEB PAGES	
Requirements specified in the brief	
Are there five web pages?	No, there are four.
Is there a clear home page?	Yes, but there is a lot of text and some scrolling is required to see the whole page.
Is there an introductory page that links to the other pages?	No, the introduction and links are on the home page, although Stephen includes production of an introduction page in his plan.
Are suitable thumbnails used for the links on the introductory page?	No, text buttons are used.
Are there three different topic pages?	Yes.
Does each topic page include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a link to an external website about the topic • a link to the home page • three facts about the topic • advice for young people • a suitable image? 	Yes to all.
Do the pages include two types of asset created by the student?	There are some images created in PhotoDraw.
Expectations	
Does the home page persuade 11-14 year olds to look at the other pages?	Not really, too much text, nothing much to attract their attention.
Do you think the pages will encourage them to think about their wellbeing?	Unlikely, there is too much to read.
Is the language suitable for 11-14 year olds?	It's OK, just too much of it.
Are the multimedia assets suitable?	Yes.
Are the pages easy to navigate? Do all the links go where they're supposed to?	Yes, it is easy to move around.
Is the font and colour scheme conducive to on-screen viewing?	Yes.
Are the pages consistent?	No, but Stephen has attempted to make each page reflect the topic. There is far too much scrolling to do.

THE WEB PAGES	
To what extent are the underlying processes of design, development, testing and preparation of assets reflected in this product?	<p>There is a storyboard for the home page, but it is retrospective.</p> <p>Although limited testing can be inferred, it is difficult to imagine that Stephen sought feedback from reliable test users or members of the target audience.</p>

THE PRESENTATION	
Requirements specified in the brief	
Does it include 6 slides?	Yes.
Does it include different types of multimedia assets?	Yes, still and animated images, text, sound, buttons.
Does it include the topics specified? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • you and your friends - what do you eat? Is it healthy or unhealthy? • what makes a balanced diet? • how can students of your age improve their eating habits? 	Yes. Although it relates to what young people in general are eating, rather than Stephen and his friends.
Are the slides consistent?	Yes.
Expectations	
Does it work as a standalone presentation?	Yes, although there is a lot of clicking required, acknowledge by Stephen in his review.
Is it suitable for the target audience - the student's peers?	Yes, it is clearly aimed at them.
Is it suitable for viewing on a laptop or projected onto a screen?	Yes.
Are the assets appropriate?	<p>Yes, some of them are very good.</p> <p>Some of the photographs of food items are very small.</p>
Is the language suitable for the audience?	Yes.
Is the font and colour scheme conducive to on-screen viewing	Yes.

THE PRESENTATION	
To what extent are the underlying processes of design, development, testing and preparation of assets reflected in this product?	<p>There are some relevant assets, some of which have been well-prepared and some underlying design can be inferred. However, the storyboard is retrospective (see monitoring document).</p> <p>The number of clicks required is irritating and the forward buttons are redundant.</p> <p>There is too much text for a presentation, some of which is quite small.</p>

And finally, looking at the set of products as a whole.	
To what extent do the products work as a set to promote the Energise Your Life campaign?	There is sufficient common content to link the products together.
Has the student taken the intended purpose of each product into account and gained permission where necessary to use assets?	Stephen has used a large number of assets from secondary sources and, in doing so, has done himself a disservice as he has not managed to gain permission for all of them - he acknowledges this in his commentary.
Did the student work independently? If not, how much guidance was needed (limited or significant)?	Yes.
What degree of SoAP is demonstrated (limited, some, reasonable, good)?	Reasonable.

Stephen has worked independently and has demonstrated reasonable awareness of audience and purpose by producing a complete set of products which meets most of the specified requirements and incorporates some appropriate features.

He achieves 7 marks in this strand

Strand (b) Design	
To what extent did the storyboard and structure chart inform the development of the web pages?	There is only one storyboard for the home page and it is retrospective. There is no structure chart.
To what extent did the storyboard inform the development of the movie (timings, scenes, assets)?	The storyboard was not used to develop the movie.
To what extent did the storyboard inform the development of the presentation?	The storyboard is retrospective. Stephen finished the presentation on 19/1/06 and then started the storyboard!
How well has the student commented on their design decisions?	He doesn't really.
Overall, are any up-front designs detailed enough to give an indication of what the final products will be like?	No.
And finally	
Did the student work independently? If not, how much guidance was needed (limited or significant)?	Yes.
Has the student independently gone beyond the basic requirements of the brief in order to enhance the outcomes?	No.
What degree of awareness of audience and intended purpose is demonstrated (limited, some, reasonable)?	The storyboard was not used to develop the movie. Other designs are retrospective and/or incomplete.

Design documentation produced retrospectively does not contribute to the achievement of the project objectives and must be awarded zero.

Strand (c) Collect, edit and create assets	
Has the student provided some information about the assets used and their sources? Is it relevant?	There is detailed information about most of the assets.
Is there a good variety of appropriate multimedia assets in the eportfolio?	Stephen has used a range of different types of asset, most of which are appropriate.
Has the student created some original assets? How good are they?	Yes, and they are appropriate/good quality.
Have the assets been prepared appropriately for use in the products?	Yes.
And finally	
Did the student work independently? If not, how much guidance was needed (limited or significant)?	Yes
What degree of awareness of intended purpose is demonstrated (limited, some, reasonable)?	Some - reasonable.

Stephen has gathered and prepared a variety of assets for use in the products that demonstrate some/reasonable awareness of purpose and has provided some relevant information about the assets used.

He achieves 6 marks for this strand.

Strand (a) Plan and manage the project	
Initial plan	
Have all the main tasks been identified? Do main tasks relate to project outcomes?	Yes.
Have main tasks been broken down into sub-tasks?	Yes.
Are tasks/sub-tasks in a logical order?	No, Stephen planned to gather his assets before designing each product.
Are timings given and are they sensible?	Not always, for example 3 hours to develop a home page. Some quite large chunks of time.
Does the plan differentiate between tasks to be done in class and tasks to be done elsewhere?	No.
Has any time been allowed in case things go wrong?	No.
Have interim checkpoints been identified and have they been used?	No.
Do you think that the initial plan was agreed with the student's 'line manager'?	Possibly, as time has been allocated to revise the plan immediately after producing it.
Tracking and monitoring	
Has the plan/diary been used to track progress?	There is a monitoring document which provides some evidence of tracking for part of the project.
Is there any evidence of monitoring (identifying and dealing with problems)?	Not really, he doesn't for example record details of his problems with his movie storyboard.
Has the plan/diary been altered to take account of changing circumstances?	No evidence of this.
Has the plan/diary used throughout the project?	Yes.
How well does the plan/diary 'tell the story' of the project?	The comments in the monitoring document help to some extent, but the story is far from clear.

Strand (a) Plan and manage the project	
And finally	
Did the student work independently to create the initial plan? If not, how much guidance was needed (limited or significant)?	Yes.
Did the student work independently to use the plan to help manage the project? If not, how much guidance was needed (limited or significant)?	Yes.

Stephen would have benefited from guidance to produce a fully workable up-front plan but has used his plan to track and communicate progress.
He achieves 3 marks in this strand.

Strand(e) The eportfolio	
Do the project outcomes ‘hit you in the face’ when you open it?	No.
How easy is it to find the way in? Does it have a logical structure? How easy is it to navigate and locate items of evidence?	It is very easy, the structure is simple and the navigation is straightforward.
Does it conform to the technical specification - size and file formats?	Yes.
Is the layout clear?	Yes, very.
Do all the links work? Are there links to all the required evidence?	Yes, all the links to the required evidence work. Only the structure chart for the web pages is missing.
Are the font and colour scheme conducive to on-screen viewing?	No - the text on the background is quite difficult to read. The tiled background is quite intrusive and could have been toned down quite a bit more.
How well have multimedia assets been used to present achievements?	Stephen has made some use of multimedia tools to create an effective background, but there is no other use to present the evidence.
Do the context pages include appropriate comments to introduce the evidence?	Yes, the context pages include some good information that helps to complete the picture.
What can you infer about the extent and effectiveness of testing?	Good.
And finally	
Did the student work independently? If not, how much guidance was needed (limited or significant)?	Yes.
What degree of SoAP is demonstrated (limited, some, reasonable, good)?	Reasonable.

Stephen has produced a basic eportfolio that allows access to most of the required evidence using the Moderator’s Toolkit. His context pages include some good comments introducing the evidence and there is limited use of appropriate multimedia assets.

He achieves 7 marks in this strand.

Strand (f) End of project review	
Does the review include some relevant comments about the products? Are there any evaluative comments/valid suggestions for improvements?	Stephen has produced an excellent review of his products (backed up by the monitoring document and the context pages). He makes some realistic observations with some evaluative comments.
How well has the student reviewed the underlying processes and their own performance?	There are some good comments about processes and Stephen's problems during the project.
And finally	
Did the student work independently? If not, how much guidance was needed (limited or significant)?	Yes.

Stephen has made some evaluative comments about the multimedia products and commented on the contribution of the underlying processes and the effectiveness of his own performance. Although not required at this level, he could have been encouraged to include feedback from others to complete the picture.

He achieves 5 marks for this strand.