



Chief Examiner and Chief Moderator Report

**NCFE Level 1/2 Technical Award in Interactive
Media
603/7005/1**

Series: Summer 2024

NCFE Level 1/2 Technical Award in Interactive Media (603/7005/1)

Paper numbers: P002455, P002476, P002456

This report contains information in relation to the examined assessment (EA) from the chief examiner and non-exam assessment (NEA) from the chief moderator, with an emphasis on the standard of learner work within this assessment series.

The aim is to highlight where learners generally performed well as well as any areas where further development may be required.

Key points:

- grade boundary information
- administering the EA and NEA
- evidence creation
- standard of learner work
- responses to the tasks
- Regulations for the Conduct of External Assessment and the NEA

The qualification is linear, meaning both assessments must be taken in the same assessment series and cannot be combined across different assessment series. Learners are allowed one attempt at each assessment, and there are no resit opportunities.

Grade boundary and achievement information (V Certs)

This qualification consists of two assessments: the examined assessment (EA) and the non-examined assessment (NEA).

After both assessments are completed and marked or moderated, the marks are combined to give a final mark for each learner. Where the raw marks do not reflect the required weighting of the assessment, a scaling factor is applied. For further information on grading information and scaling factors, please see the Qualification Specification.

Qualification scaled mark boundaries in this series are:

		Notional boundaries*	
	Overall	EA	NEA
Scaling factor		1	1
Max	200	80	120
Level 2 Distinction*	176	69	106
Level 2 Distinction	152	59	93
Level 2 Merit	126	49	77
Level 2 Pass	101	40	61
Level 1 Distinction	78	31	47
Level 1 Merit	55	22	33
Level 1 Pass	32	13	19

* The grade boundaries given for each assessment are known as 'notional grade boundaries', as they are for illustrative purposes only. Grade boundaries are the lowest mark with which a grade is achieved.

Administering the EA and NEA

The EA is invigilated and must be conducted in line with our [Regulations for the Conduct of External Assessment](#) document.

Learners must be given the resources to carry out the tasks and these are highlighted within the [Qualification Specific Instructions for Delivery \(QSID\)](#) document.

The NEA must be conducted in line with the regulations outlined in the [Tutor Guidance Document](#).

Evidence creation

EA

Learners should use the space provided to answer questions. Where answers are typed or additional pages included, the learners name, centre number, centre name and task number must be clearly visible. The additional paper must then be securely attached to the workbook.

Where assessments are completed online, centres must ensure they are familiar with the Surpass platform and have completed all testing and preparation before the assessment, to ensure learners are unaffected by technological issues.

NEA

Learners should approach all tasks in the NEA with reference to time requirements and control conditions. Learners should produce evidence to meet each task independently and without guidance or support from tutors.

Learner evidence requirements are stated per task and give required outcomes which can often be evidenced in a variety of ways to best meet the needs of the learner, unless otherwise stated.

Learner evidence submissions in this session often included a range of word-processed documents, PowerPoint presentations and digitised portfolios in line with expectations. Most learners had provided interactive outcomes via upload of materials or weblinks.

Centres are reminded that template documents, word frames and other supporting documents should not be supplied to the learner for the purposes of generating evidence against this assessment. Use of such materials to generate assessment evidence could potentially be considered malpractice.

Standard of learner work

EA

Learners generally performed well with a notable success observed in the common knowledge-style questions, particularly in applying health and safety principles and the practical use of media equipment. In addition, it was noted that in short-answer questions, learners had the potential to earn multiple marks by providing comprehensive responses. This ability also extended to answer longer questions, where learners demonstrated their comprehension of the necessary components for constructing an lmedia product. Furthermore, it was observed that high-achieving learners excelled in responding to more challenging questions, displaying a deeper understanding of the subject matter. This nuanced and developed approach to questions was a positive trend worthy of note.

Learners should be encouraged to attempt the multiple-choice questions rather than leave them unanswered and be made aware of the value of this exercise, highlighting the potential benefit of attempting the questions even without absolute certainty.

In preparation for the assessment, the centre must guide its learners through the command verbs, ensuring they fully grasp the expectations of explaining benefits, advantages, and disadvantages. This step is essential to avoid generic answers, which can hinder the demonstration of in-depth understanding.

Furthermore, learners should be reminded of the exam's interactive nature and encouraged to tailor their responses to the context of interactive media products. This ensures that their answers are focused and relevant to the examination's requirements.

Centres are reminded that learners need a more in-depth understanding of key technical terminology for the small-mark questions. Mastery of such terminology is often instrumental in achieving success in these sections.

Finally, an area to focus on to help learners achieve high marks is to develop a detailed understanding of the differences between resources, types of research, and specific topics. This understanding significantly improves their ability to fully comprehend the subject matter, which is crucial to their success in examinations.

NEA

This was the first NEA for the qualification. The assessment consisted of six tasks to be completed by learners over 17 hours. The assessment was marked, and quality assured internally by centres, with a sample of work externally moderated by NCFE.

A total of 120 marks was available across the assessment. Each task was allocated a range of marks placed against stated assessment objectives (AOs) linked to task focus. In this assessment AO's 1-5 were assessed via levels of response mark grids aligned to each task, with weightings per task varied to reflect the nature of the qualification outcomes.

Learner outcomes were achieved across the available range of awarded grades in this assessment, which was suggestive of learner engagement and useful differentiation of

assessment. Most learners had attempted all tasks within the assessment, producing appropriate evidence in most cases to accrue marks against AOs. A minority of learners registered for the assessment had not submitted any evidence or had not gained any credit for evidence produced. Some learners had not attempted all tasks within the assessment, which led to a reduction in the available credit.

Learner evidence was generally appropriately presented, although learners did not always identify evidence explicitly against tasks, which in some cases led to some lack of structure in responses. The chief moderator (CM) notes that evidence should be referenced to task responses to aid in clarity of assessment and to aid learners in ensuring coverage of tasks.

The structure of the assessment allowed learners to accrue marks in areas in which they were most confident which, to some extent, counterbalanced areas of lesser success. Holistic outcomes therefore frequently differentiated via AO and task level application of marking.

Most learners had produced credible outcomes which indicated application of interactive media skills and understanding of key areas of the qualification content. Outcomes generally reflected the demands of the brief and in some cases showed creativity and imagination alongside technical fluency at level. Learners who achieved well in practical outcomes tended to be able to demonstrate not only understanding of the requirements of the brief but the ability to refine ideas throughout the project.

It was noted by moderators that summative assessor feedback to learners was generally useful and positive. However, assessor feedback did not always include marks and commentary at AO level within tasks which on occasion made assessor decisions unclear for both the purposes of accuracy of feedback to learners and external moderation.

Evidence upload for moderation was generally well handled by centres, although it was noted that some uploads did not initially include all submitted learner evidence and, in some cases, did not include assessment documents. This potentially led to some delays in moderation of learner work. Centres must use the learner evidence upload checklist, available with the live materials to ensure all materials are uploaded.

Responses to the assessments

EA

Question 1

Most learners demonstrated proficiency in answering this multiple-choice question about comprehension of an interactive media product.

Question 2

Learners generally responded poorly to this question, which depended on recalling terminology and processes. This indicates a need for further review and practice in these areas.

Question 3

The learner's performance was less effective in attaining a result, which was attributed to the necessity to recollect specific terminology and procedures. This hindered their ability to demonstrate their understanding and skills in the subject matter.

Question 4

The learners' overall performance in this question has been excellent, showing an understanding of the interactive features of an interactive kiosk.

Question 5

There was a mixed response to this question. The key to success requires the learner to carefully analyse the question's content before attempting the answer, ensuring they list promotional uses of a website, and not provide additional detail regarding websites which are not required within the question.

Question 6

Majority of the learners responded to the three-part question. Understanding the interactive product was imperative. Depicting the benefits would have helped the learners build on their marks.

Question 7 (a)

Most of the cohort attempted to answer the question, however, it was clear that the top performers achieved perfect scores by providing more comprehensive and well-developed responses. Analysing the question and paying attention to the command verb proved crucial for effectively addressing this question.

Question 7 (b)

A higher percentage of the learners attempted to answer the question, yet those who achieved higher marks had the potential to secure all available marks through more extensive and sophisticated responses.

Question 7 (c)

To address this question effectively, paying close attention to the question and correctly identifying the command verb was crucial. Since this question related to general knowledge in a workplace environment, many learners achieved marks, and the highest achievers received the full four marks.

Question 7 (d)

Learners generally responded to this task at a mixed level. Just over half of the learners could correctly explain the benefits of one or more interactive features in the list provided, but marks were lost when they did not discuss all the features provided. Learners should be encouraged to attempt all questions.

Question 8

This question challenged some learners as it required recalling technical terminology and specific equipment names related to lmedia processes. Performance on this question was evaluated based on the ability to remember and accurately use technical terminology about lmedia processes.

Question 9

This question required knowledge of sound production terminology. Learners generally responded poorly to this question, making no attempts or giving incorrect answers.

Question 10

The question received a varied response, as it asked the learners to showcase their ability to interpret graphical data accurately and effectively. A common pitfall for learners who did not receive a mark here was failing to answer. Learners need to be encouraged to attempt all questions.

Question 11

Learners struggled to answer this question with many learners receiving one mark or less. It was designed to encourage learners to engage in reading and understanding before applying their knowledge of video aspect ratios for social media platforms. The question had a 3-mark value and allowed learners to demonstrate their knowledge by identifying at least one relevant aspect ratio to earn a mark, however knowledge of aspect ratios is lacking and area for future focus before the next series.

Question 12 (a)

Learners' responses to this question were mixed. At times, the answers were too vague and insufficient to be awarded marks. Reading the question and identifying the command verbs was vital in this question, something that lower achieving learners were unable to do.

Question 12 (b)

Again, a mixed response across the cohort, with some learners attempting the table with short answer responses or only completing one section and not the other. Demographics are referenced with in the Qualification Specification with learners expected to be able to understand approaches to categorising audiences.

Question 13 (a)

Learners generally responded well to this question and were typically awarded at least one or more marks. Incorrect responses were usually where learners provided vague or wrong answers about how the camera features can improve the quality of work.

Question 13 (b)

This question split learners, where some could identify the advantages of the storage devices but struggled to identify the disadvantages, or vice versa. Those learners who were able to do both were awarded marks.

Question 14

Recall of knowledge and understanding, legislation, and processes, were key points in this multiple-choice question and areas where learners demonstrated varied achievement, indicating an area of focus before the next series.

Question 15

Learner achievement in this question indicates a lack of familiarity with GDPR, with many learners failing to even attempt this question. Learners should be encouraged to attempt MCQs rather than leave blank.

Question 16

Learners generally responded well to this question, with most identifying the correct response.

Question 17 (a)

The response to this question was varied. Since it was an open-ended question, learners could provide various responses. A thorough and detailed response was necessary to achieve the full four marks, whereas some learners only provided one-word answers regarding the colour scheme, lacking a more descriptive explanation. Additionally, some learners failed to recognise the significance of the font choice and the reasoning behind it. It is crucial for learners to carefully read and understand the command verbs used in the question.

Question 17 (b)

Many learners misinterpreted the question and engaged in various unrelated discussions on research topics, failing to provide any awardable response. Once again, learners must read and understand the question and identify the command words guiding the required response.

Question 17 (c)

Some learners accurately identified two necessary resources and explained their importance. However, many incorrect responses provided one-word answers without specifying the resources necessary for creating an e-learning platform, and in some instances, the question was not addressed at all.

Question 18

The first of the longer response questions, and learners provided a wide range of responses, with some learners receiving the full 9 marks available for excellent explanation and application of knowledge.

Learners typically provided around three suggested features and supporting explanations, exhibiting varying levels of comprehension. To assist the learner in this question, centres should address the target audience and strategies for marketing or attracting customers to use the product. The use of appropriate terminology is also crucial in this context, demonstrating detailed and relevant context.

Question 19

Fewer learners attempted this question, which asks the learner to recommend and justify.

This is a 12-mark question, providing a high number of available marks, and by failing to attempt a response learners are limiting the marks that they can receive for the paper overall. Exam technique can be key to ensuring learners do not run out of time or energy before the final questions, and can employ strategies to avoid this by answering questions in a non-linear pattern to ensure they have every opportunity to attempt higher mark questions within the time available.

NEA

Task 1

In this first task learners were required to analyse the product brief and carry out research to inform initial ideas for their interactive media product. Task evidence could be presented in digital or physical format and scope for a variety of evidential content was offered. Most learners engaged with the task to produce research leading to the creation of initial ideas.

Evidence of research undertaken during this task, and in the preparation and research time proceeding it was notable many responses. The range of research undertaken varied across responses.

Learners who achieved higher marks in this task tended to be able to use well selected research sources to create a range of initial design ideas which reflected the needs of the brief and the requirement to focus on one type of interactive media product from the given options.

Research often informed responses by detailed exploration of existing products which was related to the needs of the brief, with reference to interactive components. Learners working at this level were sometimes able to assimilate all demands of the brief into their initial ideas and provide commentary to reflect this to include commentary on audience, resources and constraints.

Learners who achieved less marks in this task tended to have undertaken research which was less focused and more limited in range. Attempts to analyse the brief in some cases restated given information with limited expansion of commentary, which tended to limit available credit against AO1 and AO3. The requirements of the selected product were not always discussed in terms of resources, and in some cases, it was not clear at this stage which type of product the learners had selected.

Useful consideration of initial ideas in this task generally allowed learners to move with confidence into task 2.

Task 2

Task 2 required that learners create a product proposal based on the initial ideas generated in task 1.

The majority of learners undertaking the assessment engaged with the task, although evidence was not always clearly differentiated from that supplied in response to task 1. The CM notes

that, as tasks are allocated a specific timeframe work should be clearly delineated to aid in assessment and allow focus for learners.

A minority of learners had not presented evidence to meet this task.

Learners who achieved well in this task tended to have made good use of initial ideas from task 1 to produce a coherent proposal which considered each of the listed areas in consistent detail. Learners were often able to conceive specific product features, aesthetic choices and resource requirements with justification of each element to accrue marks across AO1, AO2 and AO4

Proposals were often concisely documented and coherently framed into a suitable format which communicated creative intentions, timeline and audience appeal.

Learners who achieved less well in this task tended to have provided a less clear focus in terms of coherency of the proposal and not referred to all areas – often with less consideration of resource requirements and aesthetic choices. Commentary was often more limited and not always well contextualised to the task amongst learners who achieved less well. In some cases, the proposal acted as an extension of research findings, without an appropriate focus on the function of the proposal as a communication of ideas.

In a minority of cases learners development work did not build on initial ideas from task 1, but instead generated further (and sometimes wholly unrelated) ideas which were not explained and did not assist in the coherency of the proposal.

Where learners had engaged with the focus of this task the outcomes often provided a useful basis for consideration in task 3.

Task 3

Learner responses to this task varied considerably in detail. The task required that learners develop a plan for production of their interactive media product, based on the preceding tasks with the intention that this would feed into the approaches taken to create the final outcome.

Learners who achieved well in this task tended to exhibit clear understanding of the requirements and resources available to them and use these to inform their planning through clear use of planning tools to outline timescale, stages of the process and choices.

A range of planning tools was in evidence including timelines and charts which often conveyed the learners' intentions and had been selected appropriately. Commentary on hardware and software requirements were often well reasoned and justified within the plan.

Asset choices were considered, and processes and techniques referenced contextually to how these could be used in the project. Responses often showed consideration of a range of assets and sources for these.

Learners who achieved less well in this task tended to suggest fewer clear timescales, consideration of resources and offered more limited justification of requirements. Commentary was more often limited to simpler statements of intent. In some cases, learner evidence recounted development to this point, with limited suggestion of how creation of the chosen

product would be undertaken, and evidence was not well differentiated in focus from that presented for task 2

In a minority of submissions this task was phrased in a way which suggested a retrospective approach. The CM notes that tasks in the NEA must be undertaken sequentially and that planning commentary, which is reflective of activities, rather than used to drive the design forwards would be unlikely to assist learner in creation of an outcome. A minority of learners did not produce evidence against this task, which limited available credit.

Learners who had applied planning considerations with more detail tended to be able to move into task 4 with more confidence.

Task 4

Most learners engaged with this task which required that they developed assets for use in their interactive media product. A minority of learners had not provided evidence to address this task.

Evidence tended to be presented with visual assets placed alongside supporting commentary as expected. Learners who achieved well in this task tended to have developed a range of assets from various sources. Assets often included images, audio and video. The majority of assets were developed from existing stock images, with few learners capturing original material. However, development of assets was often documented well, showing use of specific tools and techniques to creatively edit and construct assets with reference to the learner's proposal and planning.

The resultant assets often showed clear use of technical skills, application of focused thought and resulted in pleasingly coherent outcomes. Learner commentary was often able to reflect on the application of tools and techniques evaluate success and drive development forwards. Learners had commented on and provided visual evidence of directory / folder structures as part of their work. Exporting options were in some cases evaluated in context to draw suitable conclusions.

Learners who achieved less marks often developed a narrower range of assets, with less evidence of thought given to development in context. The range of sources was often narrower, and editing was less sophisticated. In a minority of cases no evidence of editing was in place and references to processes and tools was limited. In some cases, learners did not explore use of folder / directory structures, although some underlying evidence of use was apparent.

Justification for choices tended to be limited to more simple statements of availability, with less emphasis on creative choices in place.

Cohesive and well-developed assets with a focus on inclusion within the product tended to allow learners to approach task 5 with more confidence.

Task 5

Task 5 was considerably weighted in terms of time and available marks to allow learners to create their interactive media product. Most learners had attempted this task, but a minority had not produced evidence which was creditable.

The majority of learners had undertaken to create a website in response to the brief, although smaller numbers of learners had presented evidence of interactive kiosk and app products. In some cases, accessibility of evidence presented an issue for moderators as products were not always found to be accessible for this purpose. In some cases, this delayed moderation whilst working links and / or additional evidence was requested.

Learners who achieved well in this task often presented an interactive media product which showed focus on the requirements of brief, clear application of technical skills and imagination. Products made good reference to the learners' proposal and planning and often creative use of a range of developed assets. The products were functional and interactive with well-conceived navigation and appropriate content. Aesthetic choices and arrangement of assets often reflected the requirements of the brief and target audience. The results were exported appropriately to demonstrate accessibility and functionality as a product.

Evidence of production processes was often detailed and considered all listed elements within the task sequentially and consistently. Commentary was often placed in the form of annotated screenshots which showed developmental activities and allowed for evidence of configuration, import and editing. Most process evidence was presented in written form but a minority of learners, creditably and effectively, produced screencasts / videos including spoke commentary to support their outcome.

Learners who achieved less well tended to have presented products which were less sophisticated, non-functional or not completed. The products tended to give less consideration to all aspects of the brief in terms of asset placement, links and the requirements of the audience. In some cases, there was no evidence of testing and export to produce a functional and accessible outcome. Commentary was often more limited in scope and depth, with fewer activities and stages of the process detailed in the learner's evidence.

Functional and accessible interactive media products produced in this task tended to give learners a more cohesive starting point for task 6.

Task 6

The final task in this assessment required learners to evaluate their product. Most learners had responded to this task. However, a comparatively higher minority had not attempted the task. In some cases, evidence to meet this task was not clearly differentiated by learners from task 5 responses.

Learners who were able to produce a considered evaluation with reference to the given areas within the task were often able to achieve well against AO5 Consideration of functionality, accessibility, aesthetics and useability were consistently considered and referenced to the learner's application of editing and processing. Evaluations of how well the product met the brief and potential improvements were often drawn logically from this analytical basis to accrue marks.

Learners who achieved less well tended to have produced more minimal evaluations which in some cases did not address all specified areas, so tending to produce a more limited basis for wider and specific conclusions. Learners working at this level sometimes made use of an 'what

went well' and 'even better if' (WWW/EBI) approach which in some cases constrained commentary. This could make suggestions for improvement more limited and broader in nature, and often referred to the learner's wider skills rather than providing cohesive and specific comments regarding the outcome.

A pattern was somewhat notable in that learners who had not achieved well in the earlier tasks tended not to accrue marks as successfully in response to this evaluative end point.