

Moderators' report

A LEVEL

MEDIA STUDIES

**OCR Level 3 Advanced GCE in
Media Studies**

H409

For first teaching in 2017

H409/03/04 Summer 2025 series

Contents

Introduction	3
General overview	4
Standard of work.....	5
Magazines	7
Music video.....	8
Television	9
Radio	9
Online Productions.....	9
Digital convergence	10
Most common causes of centres not passing.....	12
Common misconceptions	12
Avoiding potential malpractice.....	12
Helpful resources	12

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).

Introduction

Our Moderators' reports are produced to offer constructive feedback on centres' assessment of moderated work, based on what has been observed by the moderation team. These reports include a general commentary of accuracy of internal assessment judgements, identify good practice in relation to evidence collation and presentation, and comment on the quality of centre assessment decisions against individual Learning Objectives. The report also highlights areas where requirements have been misinterpreted and provides guidance to centre assessors on requirements for accessing higher mark bands. Where appropriate, the report will also signpost other sources of information that centre assessors will find helpful.

OCR completes moderation of centre-assessed work in order to quality assure the internal assessment judgements made by assessors within a centre. Where OCR cannot confirm the centre's marks, we may adjust them in order to align them to the national standard. Any adjustments to centre marks are detailed on the Moderation Adjustments report, which can be downloaded from Interchange when results are issued. Centres should also refer to their individual centre report provided after moderation has been completed. In combination, these centre-specific documents and this overall report should help to support centres' internal assessment and moderation practice for future series.

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 Cambridge Nationals suite 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 module on Online courses – NEA for their subject. These courses provide subject-specific information about course content; how to prepare for planning, marking and submitting; and support with understanding the marking criteria.

Accessing our online courses

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

These free online courses currently cover the end-to-end NEA process for teachers. You'll find the link to the **Online courses** under the **Assessment** or **Training** tab – hover over **Assessment** or **Training** on the horizontal menu and select **Online courses** from the dropdown.

These self-paced online courses are intended for any teachers. During the course, you will engage with interactive content on subjects such as guidance on unit content, structure and administrative processes.

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

General overview

Generally, administration was good, with most centres uploading their marks by the deadline. Some centres had entered their candidates for H409/03 (online submission) but submitted work by post. Centres are advised to make sure they have entered candidates for the correct option.

Most centres submitted work online using Submit for Assessment and this was done promptly which meant work was there when the moderation process began. In some cases, centres uploaded their work to OCR Repository rather than the Submit for Assessment site which must be avoided in future sessions.

Work submitted online was generally well organised, although it would aid moderation in future if files were clearly named as cover sheet, Statement of Intent, weblink, Product 1, research and planning. As moderation is conducted using candidate numbers, not names, centres are advised to use these in file names. Productions were submitted in appropriate file formats as set out in the specification.

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. While this worked well, centres could consider entering candidates for online submission in future sessions which will make the process more efficient.

Wix.com was the most favoured site for website production and this worked effectively. 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, although not as many as in the previous session, 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. Some embedded work on websites hadn't been set to public and so couldn't be viewed. 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. Centres using Google Sites would be best advised to check all websites, using a login other than one with a centre email address, to check everything before submission to the moderator.

Occasionally website links provided were incorrect or hard to read where they had been handwritten. On the bottom of the second page of the NEA cover sheet there is a box where centres should add the link to the website production. Some centres either created a blog hub or a document including hyperlinks to all candidates' work, which worked very well. It would also aid moderation if the teacher email address were included on the cover sheet. If there are any issues with the sample, it is then easy for the moderator to contact the teacher directly rather than go through examination officers which can cause delays.

NEA 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. 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. Some were incredibly detailed, going into great depth about how and why particular effects would be created and how these linked to ideas explored elsewhere in the course (for example, theorists or specific products). The most successful made clear links between the two main products and explained how digital convergence would connect the two. However, as in previous sessions many statements were unbalanced, with a lot of detail about Product 1 but very little about Product 2, suggesting that these candidates saw a hierarchical relationship between the two. In these cases, there was also little written about digital convergence. 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.

As in previous sessions, 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.

Marking guidance reminder

The NEA marking guidance was updated in 2024 to clarify how teachers should assess candidate work that contains content that is not original. The marking guidance in the [specification](#) and NEA briefs states:

All content (including all images, text, video and audio) submitted as part of the NEA production must be original and created by the candidate themselves. The exceptions to this are the use of music in audio/audio-visual production briefs and in the original audio/audio-visual content required for the website production, and the use of existing brand logos. Where candidates have used any other found materials these must not be considered for credit.

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 under the required lengths. In many cases marking of Product 1 did identify the correct level but there was some generosity in the marks allocated. In most cases where the lowest mark in a level was allocated a mark in the level below was more appropriate.

Over-marking of websites, Product 2, was a common feature of this session. In these instances, it was difficult to see how the criteria and descriptors 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. It was not uncommon to see unbalanced websites, with second pages lacking significantly in content and this didn't appear to have been considered when the work had been marked.

In general, digital convergence was marked more accurately in this session by most centres. However there still tended to be some generosity in the marks allocated, interpreting basic branding or visual consistency as evidence of a high level of convergence.

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.

Set briefs

The magazine brief was the most popular in this session followed by music video. There were very few submissions of the television and radio briefs.

The most successful productions were the result of excellent creative decision making and technical skills, supported by detailed research relevant to both Product 1 and 2 and 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 details.

Most centres did submit candidates' research and planning, which although not assessed is a requirement of the component. The most effective research was extremely detailed with thorough analysis of professional products related to the genre they were working in. This resulted in a clear understanding of the codes and conventions of the relevant genre, as well as the industry context, which helped in the planning and construction phases ensuring a high level of knowledge and understanding which is needed for marks in the highest levels.

It was not uncommon for moderators to see limited research and planning submitted. For example, it was common to see research into magazine front covers (not always music magazines) but little, if any, research into contents pages. This lack of research clearly impacted on productions with contents pages which demonstrated little understanding of relevant codes and conventions.

The same is true of website productions with very limited research into existing websites being a feature of much work seen and extremely limited planning with no clear outline of the content of each page or flat plans showing the intended layout and house style.

Most candidates' work showed an awareness of the requirement for the representation of at least two different social groups. There was evidence of some very considered and creative representations in work, but this does remain a key area where submissions can be 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'.

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.

Magazines

Most magazine productions met the brief for a music magazine, but a small number were more focused on influencers, lifestyle or all articles were about a single artist.

Successful productions were clearly influenced by focused research into music magazine front covers and contents pages. 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 font sizes for the masthead, coverlines and text on contents pages, which helped to create a consistent and coherent appearance between the two editions.

Some outstanding responses were seen where candidates had achieved everything required by the brief, with some well-considered and appropriate photography being used and an overall design aesthetic being carried across both editions of the magazine, including the contents pages, and to the websites. Such magazines had clearly been inspired by existing titles and captured a sense of verisimilitude. Most magazines understood the requirement to appeal to the target audience and there were some inventive approaches to this.

Less successful productions did not have a clear house style with, for example, either the same font used for the masthead and all coverlines or a variety of 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.

Original images were used consistently on front covers and direct address was a strength of most productions seen.

It was not uncommon to see front covers where size and positioning of coverlines was less successful, which tended to be due to the photographs used. In some instances, candidates took photographs without considering how they would be integrated with the coverlines on the covers. As a result, coverlines were sometimes over the face of the model or were unduly small to fit them on the cover without impinging on the model. Taking time to plan the content and layout of covers would have been extremely beneficial and this was lacking in much work seen. Sketching the covers with the masthead and coverlines written on would have helped candidates when it came to the photoshoots to make sure the framing would allow for the textual content to frame the image and be of an appropriate size.

Contents pages, as in previous sessions, were often less successful than front cases. In many cases contents pages did not match the quality of the front covers produced, which was not always reflected in the marks allocated. The main problem with contents pages seen was the lack of textual contents. It was not uncommon to see contents pages which did not give a detailed outline of the contents of editions, resulting in magazines which appeared to contain very few articles. In a significant number of productions, the contents pages did not include reference to articles featured on the magazine front covers.

Due to the lack of textual contents, candidates tended to use either unconventionally large font sizes or overlong explanations of articles to fill the space. The lack of a coherent column structure was also a feature of much work. As mentioned previously, exploring the number and width of columns used on contents pages in the research stage would have helped in this regard. Where double page spread contents were produced several productions did not take account of the bleed area between pages and as a result the completed production would not function properly in a magazine.

It was common to see contents pages which lacked a variety of images with a photograph from the photoshoot for the front cover also being used on the contents page but no other images. This meant the pages did not give a clear indication of the breadth of content in the editions and showed a lack of understanding of the conventions of contents pages. The most successful pages used a variety of photographs and included page numbers anchoring them to the written contents.

Some candidates did not address all aspects of the production details. In particular some did not include the price or barcode on the cover, despite the brief requiring them, and some did not refer to the fact that these were the first two editions of the magazine.

It would benefit candidates undertaking the magazine brief in future submissions to have a magazine at hand when it comes to the planning and production phases of their NEA. Candidates could then print their productions and compare them to the professional texts for such things as column widths, size of masthead and font sizes for coverlines and written contents and adjust where necessary.

Music video

This was the second most popular brief in this session. A variety of rock tracks was used and there was some impressive production work seen. Most candidates combined narrative and performance and had a good grasp of what constitutes an effective music video. Successful 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.

Successful productions had clearly been planned thoroughly with careful consideration of mise-en-scene to convey the genre. In these productions the performance aspect was often filmed more than once, with different locations and costumes used, which was very effective. This, together with a wide variety of camera shots and movement really helped in the edit to create an energetic and appropriately paced video for the track.

Less successful productions filmed the performance aspect once and had a very limited variety of shots which meant there was little choice when it came to the editing resulting in less engaging productions. There were some productions seen where the performer in the music video did not match the track used in terms of gender or, in a few cases, more than one performer in the video but only one voice on the track. However, this was fewer than in previous sessions, and centres should continue to advise candidates against taking this approach.

Some candidates had given clear thought to the narrative aspect of the video and planned this effectively with careful consideration of representations created as well as a variety of mise-en-scene, camera shots and camera movement. In a few productions the performer was integrated into the narrative and this worked very well indeed. In a number of productions the narrative aspect had clearly not been given much thought, and it was not uncommon to see shots of a person simply wandering about or just sitting or standing in different locations with no real meaning created. It was very common to see tracking shots used in the narrative but in many cases, this was tracking forwards, following the characters, and so there were just shots of the back of people. Tracking backwards with the characters walking towards the camera would have been much more effective.

There was some impressive post-production seen. Accuracy of lip-synching was a feature of much work and there was close 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 used it was achieved well and created a strong link between the visuals and the song. Where productions were lacking in the number and variety of shots this resulted in productions which did not match the pace or rhythm of the track.

A significant number of videos did not include the artist's name and/or title of the song. The most successful productions incorporated the Universal logo as well as links to the artist's website and/or social media which greatly strengthened convergence.

Television

There were only a few submissions of this brief seen by moderators. Of those, most were documentary productions. Most demonstrated a clear interest in their subject matter. More successful productions included a variety of content, clear hooks and effective sequencing, while less successful submissions lacked focus and cohesion. Editing was more effective where candidates layered sound and used transitions with purpose. Representation was often tokenistic, and candidates should be encouraged in future submissions to embed representations more meaningfully within the programme structure.

The most successful productions showed effective understanding of the filming and editing of interviews with effective framing and use of cutaways. However, in some work the framing of interviews was less successful with either too much headroom and/or the position of the participant in the frame being unconventional. A lack of cutaways also resulted in either jump cuts or overlong interviews using a single camera shot which meant the production was less successful in engaging the target audience.

Radio

There were very few submissions of this brief.

The most successful productions demonstrated consideration of idents and a clear introduction of two voices to establish representations. However, some presenters signed off at the end, so it wasn't really an opening sequence. Some productions only had voices without any music beds, idents or sound effects.

Most productions lacked demonstration of understanding of a radio programme, lacking signature features, resulting in productions which were more like podcasts.

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.

In this session, as has been mentioned in previous Principal Moderator's reports, in many cases it appeared as if the website was seen by candidates 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 common to see websites which included limited 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, or an embedded video.

It seemed that many candidates did not spend the same amount of time researching, planning and producing their websites as they did for Product 1. It was noticeable that in many Statements of Intent the section on Product 2 was completed briefly with limited detail about the intended content, layout, house style and audience appeal. 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 some centres placed work in Level 4 and 5 which not match the criteria and level descriptors.

That said, there were very successful websites seen where candidates had clearly considered the cross-media aspects of the brief. There were examples which had very effective, and consistent, layouts across the two pages produced, with an impressive 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.

It was pleasing to see most sites featuring audio or audio-visual content produced specifically for the website. In some cases, these were excellent, for example interviews with the cover star of one of the magazine editions or the music artist. However, less successful examples were under-developed, repetitive or added little value; lasted for only a few seconds; or had clearly not been recorded specifically for the website product, such as bloopers reels.

Most websites were designed and hosted by Wix.com. Some were created using Google Sites, but these tended to be a little less sophisticated. The most successful manipulated their chosen template very effectively to create a coherent image for their product with a consistent layout. Some websites 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.

There were some impressive websites seen for magazines. Candidates had clearly researched in some detail the content and appearance of magazine websites. This resulted in a breadth of content on both pages, such as a range of feature articles, exclusives and 'trending' and 'most read' sections which were particularly effective; and considered and effective layouts which mirrored professional sites. There were some accomplished examples of photographs taken to illustrate the feature articles. Less successful productions lacked textual content across both pages and a lack of variety of images, relying on images taken from the photoshoots for the two magazine covers or found images. Layout was often haphazard with large areas of dead space.

Music artist websites were also varied. The most successful carefully considered the image they were creating for the artist and made very effective use of original images taken specifically for the site. These websites often had a large photograph 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 screenshots 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. As has been mentioned in previous sessions, candidates cannot be given credit for images on shop/merchandise 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 which is a requirement of the brief.

Digital convergence

As with website productions, this tended to be generously assessed as digital convergence was not always as strong as the marks suggested. This 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, interpreting basic branding or visual consistency as evidence of full convergence. While this is very important in creating 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 or television audience to the website where they could find more information; and the link on the magazine cover or contents directing the audience to the site where they would find exclusive content.

Candidates who did use the website effectively to create cross-media links embedded 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 bespoke contact forms, subscriptions, exclusive offers, partnership deals, sponsorships and social media feeds. Pop-ups when the site opened were generally used quite well. Not many websites for magazines referred to the digital version of the magazine but where this was done it was very effective.

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. Constructed social media posts by audience members were also included, solicited by Product 1 or the website, such as audience reviews of albums and questions for future interviews in magazines.

Candidates who did well generally:	Candidates who did less well generally:
• addressed all the requirements of the brief and included all 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 Products 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.	• did not address all 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.

OCR support



For support with the NEA access our self-paced, interactive eLearning courses here on [OCR Train](#).

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 are not more important than contents pages. They should be equally weighted when it comes to assessing print production work.

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

Merchandise images found and edited online with a logo or text do not constitute original images.

Avoiding potential malpractice

Artificial Intelligence cannot be used for any aspect of candidates' work on the NEA, including the Statement of Intent. Refer to the JCQ's AI Use in Assessments [document](#) for further guidance.

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 to avoid all candidates producing websites with the same content.

Candidates must work individually; group work is not permitted.

Helpful resources

NEA Delivery [Guide](#) on Teach Cambridge

[OCR Train NEA courses](#) for interactive activities to view and assess candidate exemplars for each brief.

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 the exam paper builder platform for a range of our qualifications. [Find out more](#).

Free for all OCR centres with an Interchange account, it allows unlimited users per centre. We require an [Interchange](#) username to verify your centre's users for ExamBuilder.

If you do not have an Interchange account, please contact your centre administrator (usually the Exams Officer) to request a username.

Once you have an Interchange username, use the form on [this page](#) to sign up for ExamBuilder, or ask an existing user at your centre to create an ExamBuilder account for you.

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](#).

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 the link to the **Online courses** under the **Assessment** or **Training** tab – hover over **Assessment** or **Training** on the horizontal menu and select **Online courses** from the dropdown.

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?

We recommend all teachers complete the module on Online courses – NEA for their subject. These courses provide subject-specific information about course content; how to prepare for planning, marking and submitting; and support with understanding the marking criteria.

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.

Tell us what you think

Your feedback plays an important role in how we develop, market, support and resource qualifications now and into the future. We want you and your students to enjoy and get the best out of our qualifications and resources, but to do that we need your honest opinions to tell us whether we're on the right track or not.

You can email your thoughts to resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk or visit our [feedback page](#) to learn more about how you can help us improve our resources.



Designing and testing in [collaboration with you](#) and your students



Helping young people develop an [ethical view of the world](#)



Equality, diversity, inclusion and belonging (EDIB) are [part of everything we do](#)

Contact the team at:

☎ 01223 553998

🖥 ocr.org.uk

To stay up to date with all the relevant news about our qualifications, register for email updates at ocr.org.uk/updates

Visit our Online Support Centre at support.ocr.org.uk



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

OCR is a Company Limited by Guarantee and an exempt charity. Registered in England. Registered office: The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA. Registered company number: 3484466.

We operate academic and vocational qualifications regulated by Ofqual, Qualifications Wales and CCEA as listed in their qualifications registers.

We are committed to providing a fully accessible experience across all our products, platforms, and websites. Find out more about our [accessibility standards](#).

© OCR 2025. All rights reserved. We retain the copyright on all our publications. However, our registered centres are permitted to copy and distribute our material for their own internal use, in line with any specific restrictions detailed in the publication. Find out more about our [copyright policies](#).

We update our publications regularly so please check you have the most up-to-date version.

We cannot be held responsible for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and do not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

When we update our specifications, you'll see a new version number and a summary of the changes. While we do our best to reflect these changes in all associated resources on [Teach Cambridge](#), if you notice any discrepancies, please refer to the latest specification on our website and [let us know](#).

Our resources do not represent any teaching method we expect you to use. We cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions in our resources.