

A LEVEL

Moderators' report

MEDIA STUDIES

H409

For first teaching in 2017

H409/03/04 Summer 2024 series

Contents

Introduction	3
Online courses.....	3
General overview.....	4
Administration	4
Standard of Work.....	5
Set Briefs.....	6
Television	6
Radio	7
Magazines	7
Music videos.....	9
Online productions.....	10
Digital convergence.....	11
Most common causes of centres not passing.....	13
Common misconceptions	13
Avoiding potential malpractice	13
Helpful resources.....	13

Introduction

Our moderators' reports are produced to offer constructive feedback on candidates' performance in the examinations. They provide useful guidance for future candidates.

The reports will include a general commentary on candidates' performance, identify technical aspects examined in the questions and highlight good performance and where performance could be improved. The reports will also explain aspects which caused difficulty and why the difficulties arose, whether through a lack of knowledge, poor examination technique, or any other identifiable and explainable reason.

Where overall performance on a question/question part was considered good, with no particular areas to highlight, these questions have not been included in the report.

Online courses

We have created online courses to build your confidence in delivering, marking and administering internal assessment for our qualifications. Courses are available for Cambridge Nationals, GCSE, A Level and Cambridge Technicals (2016).

Cambridge Nationals

All teachers delivering our redeveloped Cambridge Nationals suite from September 2022 are asked to complete the Essentials for the NEA course, which describes how to guide and support your students. You'll receive a certificate which you should retain.

Following this you can also complete a subject-specific Focus on Internal Assessment course for your individual Cambridge Nationals qualification, covering marking and delivery.

GCSE, A Level and Cambridge Technicals (2016)

We recommend all teachers complete the introductory module Building your Confidence in Internal Assessment, which covers key internal assessment and standardisation principles.

Following this you will find a subject-specific course for your individual qualification, covering marking criteria with examples and commentary, along with interactive marking practice.

Accessing our online courses

You can access all our online courses from our teacher support website [Teach Cambridge](#).

You will find links relevant to your subject under Assessment, NEA/Coursework and then Online Courses from the left hand menu on your Subject page.

If you have any queries, please contact our Customer Support Centre on 01223 553998 or email support@ocr.org.uk.

Would you prefer a Word version?

Did you know that you can save this PDF as a Word file using Acrobat Professional?

Simply click on **File > Export to** and select **Microsoft Word**

(If you have opened this PDF in your browser you will need to save it first. Simply right click anywhere on the page and select **Save as . . .** to save the PDF. Then open the PDF in Acrobat Professional.)

If you do not have access to Acrobat Professional there are a number of **free** applications available that will also convert PDF to Word (search for PDF to Word converter).

General overview

Administration

Generally, administration was good, with most centres uploading their marks by the deadline. There were fewer clerical errors than in previous sessions and these were quickly resolved. These tended to happen where centres did not use the interactive version of the coursework cover sheet which automatically totals marks or where there was a mistake in transferring marks onto Interchange.

This was the first session where Submit for Assessment was used and this was utilised well by centres, although some centres did submit work via OCR Repository which caused some delays in the moderation process. Work was arranged well, although it would aid moderation in future if files were clearly named as cover sheet, Statement of Intent, weblink, Product 1, research and planning. Also, moderation is conducted using candidate numbers, not names, and so it would aid the process if these were used in file names.

Productions were submitted in appropriate file formats as set out in the specification. However, in this session there were a number of print productions which were submitted as Photoshop files which is not an acceptable format. Work must be submitted in universal file formats. Further guidance on the administration of H409/03/04 can be found [here](#).

Wix.com was the most favoured site for website production and this worked well. The most successful websites were produced by candidates who manipulated the templates to achieve a unique look and style for their site. Several centres used Google Sites for website production and this created some problems for moderators. Where sites were created using centre email addresses these could not be viewed by people outside of the centre. In future submissions centres need to make sure that all relevant permissions are set and/or a login is provided to the moderator so that sites can be viewed.

Most centres who submitted postal submissions provided USB drives containing work which was well organised and labelled or a link to a blog hub containing links to individual candidates' work, with just the cover sheets as hard copy.

Occasionally website links provided were incorrect or hard to read. It would aid moderation if all centres could either create a blog hub or one document including hyperlinks to all candidates' work, which many centres currently do which works well.

Coursework cover sheets were completed well by centres, although the section on unassessed individuals who contributed to the production work was not completed in many cases. It would also aid moderation if the section at the bottom of the second page is completed, with the weblink to the candidate's work and also the teacher email. If there are any issues with samples it is then easy for the moderator to contact the teachers directly rather than go through examination officers which can cause delays.

Comments on cover sheets varied in both detail and application of the assessment criteria. The most useful included detailed comments that referenced the assessment criteria, brief and production detail and cited examples from the candidate's work to illustrate where these had been met, making it clear how the marks had been arrived at. Less useful comments were quite brief and at times gave subjective opinions about the candidate's work rather than assessing the extent to which the criteria had been met. As a result, in these cases it was difficult to establish why certain marks had been allocated.

In some cases centre comments indicated that the work should be placed in a different level than that of the mark allocated, for example noting missing elements of the production detail of the brief while suggesting that the work should be placed in Level 5; or stating that the work is 'adequate' while allocating a high Level 4 mark.

Most cover sheets gave a clear indication of which second page had been assessed alongside the home page for Product 2, although a few centres appeared to have assessed more than one of the linked pages, which is not permitted.

Statements of Intent were completed by most candidates, and these varied in quality. Occasionally these were not included and in a very few cases the centre had not applied the ten-mark penalty as set out in the specification. Some Statements were extremely thorough, detailing how candidates intended to create meaning and synergy between the two products and this was linked to ideas explored elsewhere on the course, for example references to theorists or specific texts studied.

It was common for moderators to read statements which were quite detailed about Product 1 but included very little about the online Product 2 or digital convergence, which suggests that candidates perhaps didn't see both products as being of equal importance. It was noticeable that these candidates tended to produce websites which clearly didn't match the standard of their Product 1 and lacked detailed inclusion of material to illustrate digital convergence.

In some cases the Statements of Intent were clearly written after the production work had been completed, with candidates explaining what they had done. This is against the spirit of the specification and in cases where this happened there was often a disconnect between the two products produced. Thinking carefully about what they intend to produce and how the two products will work together before they begin their planning resulted in more effective and consistent synergy.

Key point

Candidates who do not meet all the requirements of the brief and address all the production detail cannot achieve a Level 5 mark for their product.

Standard of Work

Standards varied substantially, as always, ranging from work rightly placed at the very top of Level 5 to less successful submissions which were mainly placed in Level 2 or 3. As in previous sessions marking tended to be generous for Product 1, particularly at the upper end of the rank orders, where candidates had missed certain elements of the production detail of their selected brief, such as the name of the artist and title of the track in music videos or representation of at least two different social groups. Candidates can only gain a Level 5 mark if they meet all the requirements of the brief and address all the production detail.

There was also some generosity in marking where candidates' work was significantly under the required lengths. There were several audio-visual texts which were significantly shorter than the three minutes required and yet were still allocated high marks. Where only one front cover and contents page was produced for the magazine brief this demonstrated a limited rather than adequate realisation of the brief.

In this session a pattern did emerge of generous marking of websites across the full rank orders. In many cases marking of Product 1 did identify the correct level but there was some generosity in the marks allocated; but in the marking of websites a mark in the level below, or in some cases two levels below, was more appropriate.

OCR support



The NEA [Delivery Guide](#) available on Teach Cambridge has suggestions for a range of preparatory activities candidates could complete and approaches to teaching the content.

Set Briefs

The magazine brief was the most popular in this session followed by music video. It was pleasing to see an increase in submissions for the television and radio briefs.

It was clearly evident that the most successful productions were the result of excellent creative decision making and technical skills, supported by appropriate and detailed research relevant to both Product 1 and 2; thorough planning with real attention to detail and a strong central idea which was clearly focused on the requirements of the brief, the target audience and the production detail.

As research and planning is not assessed, perhaps candidates and centres do not think this needs to be detailed. However, having a clear understanding of the codes and conventions of the relevant genre of production, as well as the industry context, really does help in the planning and construction of a text to make sure it demonstrates a high level of knowledge and understanding which is expected for marks in the highest levels.

A number of centres are clearly ensuring candidates are aware of the requirement for the representation of at least two different social groups and that they consider this in detail when planning their production work. There was evidence of some very considered and creative representations in work which were central to the narrative. However, this does remain a key area where submissions are lacking in response to all four of the briefs, and this is often not addressed in the marking.

The online aspect of each brief will be discussed in the section entitled 'Online Productions'

Television

Some highly engaging television opening sequences were seen, with most using the Netflix ident at the start. The most successful productions had considered the brief very well and constructed sequences which built tension effectively with clear narrative exposition and the use of enigmas in order to attract and sustain the interest of the audience. These also used a variety of camera shots to good effect, with very effective framing and smooth camera control, which gave more choice in the edit to create appropriate pace for the sequence. Titles were also integrated very well, demonstrating very good understanding of the house style of Netflix dramas.

Most sequences focused on the horror genre and the best used genre conventions very well to engage the audience. Lighting, locations, mise-en-scene and soundtracks were utilised effectively in the most successful productions to create meaning and appropriate atmosphere with some creative narratives.

Less successful productions tended to focus on a character, or characters, being followed in the woods by someone wearing a dark hoodie and/or mask. Handheld camerawork, mirroring the found footage style of films like *The Blair Witch Project*, was also a feature of much work but generally showed a lack of awareness that such camera movement is quite sophisticated and still needs effective composition and framing in order to make the meaning clear. There were also weaknesses with lighting in a number of productions. If appropriate lighting facilities aren't available candidates would be best advised to not film when it's dark.

Some productions also tried to convey too much of the narrative in the sequence and this led to disjointed productions, some of which had the feel of trailers rather than opening sequences. The consideration of titles in some work was also less successful, with just the title at the start, which showed a lack of understanding of how titles are conventionally integrated in television dramas.

Representations were very well considered by a number of candidates, for example challenging gender stereotypes of the horror genre, but it was common to see productions which only featured teenage males.

Radio

Radio continues to be the least favoured brief, but it was pleasing to see an increase in submissions in this session.

The most successful productions were clearly focused on the production detail of the brief with a range of voices, sound effects and music used to very good effect with consistent and appropriate audio levels and accomplished editing with no dead air and a consistent pace. Content of programmes was also well constructed, for example reviews of films and encouraging the audience to contribute their reviews via the website or social media and interviews with the director or star of one of the films being reviewed, followed by the host quizzing the interviewee about their film knowledge, which would also engage the audience well.

It was common for productions to consist of two voices, with no sound effects or music beds, which were just talking about films with no real sense of it being a film review programme or how this would appeal to the audience. Several productions also showed a lack of understanding of Radio 5 Live, and the fact that it is a BBC speech-based station, with advertising breaks included and productions starting and ending with songs being played. More thorough research into the institutional context would have avoided this.

There could have been greater consideration of content which would also have allowed candidates to demonstrate their skills in audio production to better effect and utilised a greater variety of sound, for example by creating a scene from a film which was then reviewed by the participants in the show.

Some productions were heard which were recorded using low quality microphones or at too great a distance from the microphone and with inappropriate background noise in some cases. Before embarking on the radio brief in future submissions, centres do need to consider whether they have appropriate recording facilities which will help candidates to demonstrate a high level of technical skill and achieve marks in the highest levels.

Magazines

This was the most popular brief in this session. Most magazine productions did meet the brief for a film magazine, but a small number of productions seen were more focused on beauty, fashion and celebrity with film taking a minor role.

The best productions were clearly influenced by focused research into mainstream magazines such as *Total Film* and in particular *Empire*, a Bauer publication, which appeal to the target audience of the brief. There were some excellent examples of analysis provided in candidates' research which clearly established codes and conventions and this knowledge and understanding was translated well into the planning and production phases of their work. This was particularly true of front covers where candidates generally showed effective understanding of form and content with one large image dominating the cover, framed by the masthead and appropriately sized, and written, coverlines. The most successful productions had clearly considered house style, with consistent fonts and type sizes for the masthead, coverlines and

text on contents pages, which helped to create a consistent and coherent appearance between the two editions. Less successful productions did not have a clear house style with, for example, different fonts used for mastheads and coverlines and significantly different layouts for contents pages which meant that the two editions did not sit well together.

There were some excellent examples of photography on front covers where candidates had clearly spent time and effort on construction of mise-en-scene to create images of film stars in the role in their new film with costume, make-up and backgrounds evoking a specific genre. Composition, lighting, framing and angles were also effective and used creatively. Less successful photographs used conventional framing but there was a lack of consideration of the background of shots and mise-en-scene to create the link with film. The quality of photography wasn't always consistent throughout whole productions.

There were some very strong examples of representation where candidates had clearly considered the representation of two social groups. It was pleasing to see images which challenged stereotypes of gender in the action and spy genres, for example.

In general contents pages were less successful than front covers and it was common for this not to be reflected in the marks allocated or comments on cover sheets as it seemed covers were weighted more heavily. It is important that all aspects of the production work are considered equally and the strengths and weaknesses considered when arriving at a final mark.

More thorough research would have helped candidates to clearly establish the codes and conventions of contents pages which would have resulted in more effective production work. Most pages seen didn't include enough content for a full magazine. The best productions linked the coverlines to the contents pages and included a breadth of contents giving a thorough insight into what would constitute each edition of their magazine. In some work all contents were about one film, linked to the main coverline. Many productions seen did not include sub-headings, lacked a coherent column structure, used over large font sizes, had limited use of images and no page numbers on images anchoring them to the written contents.

Many contents pages featured the same person as the front cover with no extra images. While this did meet the requirement for at least four different original images as framing and pose were different, featuring the same model and mise-en-scene was unwise as this didn't help to give an insight into the full range of content of the magazines.

In general, candidates would have benefitted from creating a publication plan, clearly outlining the house style of their magazine such as colour scheme, column structure, fonts and sizes used for coverlines, masthead and contents pages and writing the contents of each edition and planning the accompanying images. This would have helped in the production of two covers and contents pages which had a coherent and consistent design.

In terms of production detail, a number of magazines did not include the price on the cover and several did not refer to the fact that these were supposed to be the first two editions, with some having the same month on the cover.

Less successful candidates sometimes lacked understanding of the brief's industry context. There were some very effective magazines seen which could not really be considered as appropriate for Bauer as a mainstream publisher. In some cases, these were niche topics which were more fitting to niche publishers than a mainstream organisation like Bauer. More focused research into Bauer's output would have helped in this respect.

Music videos

This was a very popular brief, as in most sessions, and there was some excellent work seen. Most candidates had chosen a song with a clear narrative. In some cases, however, the lyrical content of songs chosen was extremely inappropriate, particularly for a public examination, with offensive lyrics and racial slurs. Also, in some instances music videos included footage of vaping, smoking, drug use and weapons which were also extremely inappropriate. Section 2f of the specification has further guidance on the suitability of the content of NEA productions.

Most candidates clearly had a good grasp of what constitutes an effective music video and incorporated performance and narrative well. Some candidates fully engaged with all elements of the brief and the production detail with clear consideration of the target audience and careful and creative consideration of representation.

The most successful productions demonstrated that candidates understood how to film both performance and narrative, and how to structure a music video, considering the rhythm and pace of the song. There was some excellent construction of narrative seen which reflected the overall narrative and theme of the song. In a few productions the performer was integrated into the narrative and this worked very well indeed. Less successful productions focused very literally on lyrics with shots illustrating each line of the song, or narrative sequences which didn't hold together well with quite random shots, which had clearly not been planned, and repetition of shots.

There were some excellent performance sequences seen which showed detailed consideration of the image being created for the artist. These used more than one location and costume and were filmed from a number of different camera set-ups with a great range of shots. Camera movement was also considered well with effective control. Less successful productions filmed the performance aspect once, with little variety of shot used and one setting, often either a bedroom or classroom. In a few music videos seen it was very unclear who the artist was.

It was pleasing to see some very accomplished and considered editing where candidates had clearly thought hard about the pace of the song and edited visuals appropriately. Accuracy of lip-synching was a feature of much work and this was an improvement on the previous session. There was some excellent attention to detail with accurate synching on the word or phrase. Editing to the beat was less evident in this session but where it was done it was achieved well and created a strong link between the visuals and the song.

As with previous sessions, the performer in a number of productions did not match the voice, for example a female performer lip-synching to a male voice. Candidates would be best advised to establish who is going to be appearing in their video before choosing the track to make sure that it is appropriate.

A significant number of videos did not include the artist's name and title of the song and/or direct the audience to the website by including the website address. Where this was done it was achieved very well with the website address, and also the Beggars Group logo, included at the end of the video with, in some cases, links to social media as well.

Online productions

Each of the four briefs has an online product (Product 2) which is worth the same marks as Product 1 and in combination the two products create the third assessed element, Digital Convergence.

There were some very successful websites seen where candidates had clearly considered the cross-media aspects of the brief very well. There were examples which had very effective, and consistent, layouts across the two pages produced, with an excellent level of content on both pages. Some candidates had also clearly thought hard about the visual content of their websites, conducting photoshoots with a variety of mise-en-scene and care in the use of framing and angles.

As has been mentioned in previous Principal Moderator's reports it often appeared as if the website was approached as an ancillary product, rather than a piece of work of equal importance to Product 1 and crucial in terms of creating digital convergence between the two products. It was very common to see websites which included very little content on home pages, but especially on second pages where in many cases this consisted of one paragraph of text and one or two images. Although lacking in a number of sites, it was pleasing to see more sites featuring audio or audio-visual content. In some cases these were excellent, for example interviews with the stars or director of films featured on the magazine front covers or in the television drama, or interviews with the music artist. However, in many cases these were just embedded audio files with no clear explanation; lasted for only a few seconds; or had clearly not been recorded specifically for the website product, such as blooper reels.

It seemed that many candidates spent less time on the planning and production of their websites, and it was noticeable that in many Statements of Intent the section on Product 2 was completed very briefly. It is also the case, as in previous sessions, that this element of candidates' work tended to be assessed less accurately. In general, most centres identify the right level in the marking of Product 1 for most candidates. However, when it came to websites it was difficult to see how the criteria and descriptors, particularly for Level 4 and 5, were matched to the websites, particularly where these consisted of a limited number of images, a small amount of text, overly large font sizes and inconsistent layout with large amounts of dead space.

In general, the content and quality of websites was very variable. There were some sites which were exceptionally detailed and demonstrated a great deal of creativity and commitment by candidates or as mentioned, sites which were lacking in content and seemingly created with little attention to detail. The majority of websites were designed and hosted by Wix.com. The most successful manipulated their chosen template very effectively to create a coherent image for their product with a consistent layout, but some relied on the template and animated backgrounds available on Wix with no real consideration of a coherent design and layout. Most video work was hosted on YouTube or Vimeo and embedded on the website, but several candidates used the built-in video streaming on Wix which is inadvisable as videos cannot be played full screen.

There were some sites where it was difficult to find the second linked page or where candidates had created one scrolling page with internal links. As mentioned in previous Principal Moderator's reports, although this is how some professional websites operate, it did not meet the requirements of the briefs which explicitly require two individual pages and should be avoided in future submissions.

TV websites showed awareness of the Netflix site and house style, although there tended to be an imbalance in content between the home and linked pages and there could have been more content about the programme produced rather than a reliance on other Netflix productions to fill the space. The best sites were produced by candidates who had done thorough research and mirrored the Tudum sites produced for individual Netflix programmes. These followed the layout and house style and included a breadth of content, featuring all original images.

Magazine websites were varied. The most successful included a breadth of content on both pages, such as a range of feature articles, exclusives, behind the scenes articles and reviews. There were some excellent examples of photographs taken as 'stills' from films which were then used to illustrate the reviews or features. Less successful productions relied quite heavily on found images of films or film posters and second pages were very limited, often subscription or 'meet the team' pages.

Music artist websites were also varied. In a few cases candidates produced sites for the song and video, rather than the artist and there was a significant number of sites where the artist did not feature prominently or where it was unclear who the artist was. The most successful made very effective use of original images taken specifically for the site with a large image of the artist dominating the home page when it opened which had real impact and immediate recognition of who the site was for. A range of images, with different mise-en-scene, was then used to create a clear image for the artist, with effective galleries, as well as album covers. There was a consistent and considered colour scheme and layout with consistent use of fonts and font sizes. A breadth of content was used across both pages, including for example detailed biographies, interviews, tour details, reviews, social media posts by the artist and discographies.

Less successful sites relied on either photographs taken at the time of filming the video or screengrabs from the music video. This meant there was a limited image created for the artist. Pages were also lacking in content with, most commonly, tour dates listed and a shop or merchandise on the second page. Candidates cannot be given credit for images on shop pages where these are found images which are edited online with a logo or image and so a number of candidates did not include at least one original image on the second page.

Websites seen for the radio productions were the least successful as these were significantly lacking in content on both pages, consisting of the embedded radio programme and some brief information about the host(s). In some cases these were produced for the independent production company, rather than for the programme, and lacked Radio 5 Live branding.

Digital convergence

As with website productions, this tended to be generously assessed as digital convergence was not always as strong as the marks suggested, which was often a consequence of a lack of content on websites. Where marking was generous, centre comments focused on aesthetic links between the two products in terms of things such as colour, typography and images. While this is very important in creating overall branding and synergy between the two products, the degree to which the products demonstrated effective understanding of the convergent nature of contemporary media should also have been considered.

The most successful work used a clear 'call to action' to direct the audience to the website, for example a link included at the end of the music video; the presenter directing the radio audience to the website where they could find more information; the link appearing on the Netflix ident page at the start of productions and the link on the magazine cover or contents directing the audience to the site where they would find an exclusive interview or competition. Not including the direct link significantly weakened the convergence between the two products which limited candidates' marks for this aspect of their work, as did the lack of Netflix, Bauer, BBC Radio 5 Live or Beggars Group branding across both products.

Some candidates did use the website effectively to create cross-media links by embedding their television, music video, radio programme or magazine front covers and highlighted specific content in the partner product. There were also some very effective methods used to engage and interact with the target audience. For example, featuring subscriptions and contact forms on the website; pop ups when the site opened encouraging the audience to sign up to newsletters; quizzes on film websites and competitions.

Most websites did feature social media icons, but in many cases greater use could have been made of these. Where this was done it was very successful. For example, on some music artist websites original images were included as Instagram posts, encouraging the audience to visit the artist's feed and follow them and similarly with X posts. Social media posts by audience members were also included, solicited by Product 1 or the website, such as audience reviews of films, music or the television production and questions for the music artist or star of a film.

Candidates who did well generally:	Candidates who did less well generally:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • addressed all the requirements of the brief and included all of the production detail • were secure in their knowledge and understanding of the media theoretical framework • were confident in their use of the appropriate technology • researched industry context in detail • planned both Product 1 and 2 thoroughly • gave equal weight to their work on Product 1 and 2 and made sure there was demonstration of digital convergence • considered representations being created in some detail • used original images throughout their work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • did not address all of the requirements of the brief and/or the production detail • demonstrated limited knowledge and understanding of the media theoretical framework • lacked controlled use of the appropriate technology • had one product that was clearly stronger than the other • demonstrated little digital convergence • undertook little research and/or planning • did not spend equal time on the production of Product 2 • relied quite heavily on found material.

Most common causes of centres not passing

Only producing one product.

Not meeting the requirements of the brief and production detail for both products.

Producing products which were significantly shorter than the minimum length or number of pages required.

A lack of coherent meaning in the products created.

A lack of digital convergence between the two products.

Common misconceptions

Magazine front covers and contents pages should be equally weighted when it comes to assessing print production work.

Candidates cannot achieve Level 5 marks if all the production detail of their selected brief are not addressed.

Avoiding potential malpractice

Advise candidates not to include content which is inappropriate for a public examination such as songs for music videos which contain offensive lyrics or racial slurs.

Do not include footage or images of people smoking, drinking or taking drugs.

Section 2f of the specification has further guidance on appropriate content under the heading Suitability of NEA Productions (p.30).

Make sure health and safety procedures are followed.

Do not direct students in what should be included on their web pages in order to avoid all candidates producing websites with the same content.

Make sure candidates work individually, group work is not permitted.

Helpful resources

NEA Delivery Guide on Teach Cambridge

Supporting you

Teach Cambridge

Make sure you visit our secure website [Teach Cambridge](#) to find the full range of resources and support for the subjects you teach. This includes secure materials such as set assignments and exemplars, online and on-demand training.

Don't have access? If your school or college teaches any OCR qualifications, please contact your exams officer. You can [forward them this link](#) to help get you started.

Reviews of marking

If any of your students' results are not as expected, you may wish to consider one of our post-results services. For full information about the options available visit the [OCR website](#).

Access to Scripts

We've made it easier for Exams Officers to download copies of your candidates' completed papers or 'scripts'. Your centre can use these scripts to decide whether to request a review of marking and to support teaching and learning.

Our free, on-demand service, Access to Scripts is available via our single sign-on service, My Cambridge. Step-by-step instructions are on our [website](#).

Keep up-to-date

We send a monthly bulletin to tell you about important updates. You can also sign up for your subject specific updates. If you haven't already, [sign up here](#).

OCR Professional Development

Attend one of our popular professional development courses to hear directly from a senior assessor or drop in to a Q&A session. Most of our courses are delivered live via an online platform, so you can attend from any location.

Please find details for all our courses for your subject on **Teach Cambridge**. You'll also find links to our online courses on NEA marking and support.

Signed up for ExamBuilder?

[ExamBuilder](#) is a free test-building platform, providing unlimited users exclusively for staff at OCR centres with an [Interchange](#) account.

Choose from a large bank of questions to build personalised tests and custom mark schemes, with the option to add custom cover pages to simulate real examinations. You can also edit and download complete past papers.

[Find out more](#).

Active Results

Review students' exam performance with our free online results analysis tool. It is available for all GCSEs, AS and A Levels and Cambridge Nationals (examined units only).

[Find out more](#).

You will need an Interchange account to access our digital products. If you do not have an Interchange account please contact your centre administrator (usually the Exams Officer) to request a username, or nominate an existing Interchange user in your department.

Online courses

Enhance your skills and confidence in internal assessment

What are our online courses?

Our online courses are self-paced eLearning courses designed to help you deliver, mark and administer internal assessment for our qualifications. They are suitable for both new and experienced teachers who want to refresh their knowledge and practice.

Why should you use our online courses?

With these online courses you will:

- learn about the key principles and processes of internal assessment and standardisation
- gain a deeper understanding of the marking criteria and how to apply them consistently and accurately
- see examples of student work with commentary and feedback from OCR moderators
- have the opportunity to practise marking and compare your judgements with those of OCR moderators
- receive instant feedback and guidance on your marking and standardisation skills
- be able to track your progress and achievements through the courses.

How can you access our online courses?

Access courses from [Teach Cambridge](#). Teach Cambridge is our secure teacher website, where you'll find all teacher support for your subject.

If you already have a Teach Cambridge account, you'll find available courses for your subject under Assessment - NEA/Coursework - Online courses. Click on the blue arrow to start the course.

If you don't have a Teach Cambridge account yet, ask your exams officer to set you up – just send them this [link](#) and ask them to add you as a Teacher.

Access the courses **anytime, anywhere and at your own pace**. You can also revisit the courses as many times as you need.

Which courses are available?

There are **two types** of online course: an **introductory module** and **subject-specific** courses.

The introductory module, Building your Confidence in Internal Assessment, is designed for all teachers who are involved in internal assessment for our qualifications. It covers the following topics:

- the purpose and benefits of internal assessment
- the roles and responsibilities of teachers, assessors, internal verifiers and moderators
- the principles and methods of standardisation
- the best practices for collecting, storing and submitting evidence
- the common issues and challenges in internal assessment and how to avoid them.

The subject-specific courses are tailored for each qualification that has non-exam assessment (NEA) units, except for AS Level and Entry Level. They cover the following topics:

- the structure and content of the NEA units
- the assessment objectives and marking criteria for the NEA units
- examples of student work with commentary and feedback for the NEA units
- interactive marking practice and feedback for the NEA units.

We are also developing courses for some of the examined units, which will be available soon.

How can you get support and feedback?

If you have any queries, please contact our Customer Support Centre on 01223 553998 or email support@ocr.org.uk.

We welcome your feedback and suggestions on how to improve the online courses and make them more useful and relevant for you. You can share your views by completing the evaluation form at the end of each course.

Need to get in touch?


If you ever have any questions about OCR qualifications or services (including administration, logistics and teaching) please feel free to get in touch with our customer support centre.

Call us on
01223 553998

Alternatively, you can email us on
support@ocr.org.uk

For more information visit

 **ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder**

 **ocr.org.uk**

 **facebook.com/ocrexams**

 **twitter.com/ocrexams**

 **instagram.com/ocrexaminations**

 **linkedin.com/company/ocr**

 **youtube.com/ocrexams**

We really value your feedback

Click to send us an autogenerated email about this resource. Add comments if you want to. Let us know how we can improve this resource or what else you need. Your email address will not be used or shared for any marketing purposes.



I like this



I dislike this

Please note – web links are correct at date of publication but other websites may change over time. If you have any problems with a link you may want to navigate to that organisation's website for a direct search.



OCR is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2024 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA. Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

OCR operates academic and vocational qualifications regulated by Ofqual, Qualifications Wales and CCEA as listed in their qualifications registers including A Levels, GCSEs, Cambridge Technicals and Cambridge Nationals.

OCR provides resources to help you deliver our qualifications. These resources do not represent any particular teaching method we expect you to use. We update our resources regularly and aim to make sure content is accurate but please check the OCR website so that you have the most up to date version. OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions in these resources.

Though we make every effort to check our resources, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, so it is important that you always use information in the latest specification. We indicate any specification changes within the document itself, change the version number and provide a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource, please [contact us](#).

You can copy and distribute this resource in your centre, in line with any specific restrictions detailed in the resource. Resources intended for teacher use should not be shared with students. Resources should not be published on social media platforms or other websites.

OCR acknowledges the use of the following content: N/A

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR or are thinking about switching, you can request more information using our [Expression of Interest form](#).

Please [get in touch](#) if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support you in delivering our qualifications.