

CREATIVE iMEDIA

Moderators' report

INCLUDED ON THE
KS4 PERFORMANCE TABLES

OCR Level 1/Level 2

Cambridge National in
Creative iMedia

J834

For first teaching in 2022 | Version 1

R094-R099 Summer 2025 series

ocr.org.uk/cambridgenationals

Contents

Introduction	3
Administration.....	4
Unit R094 General overview	5
Task 1 – Develop a visual identity and plan digital graphics for products.....	5
Task 2 – Plan digital graphics for products and create visual identity and digital graphics	6
Unit R095 General overview	7
Task 1 – Planning your character and comic	7
Task 2 – Creating your character and comic	8
Task 3 – Checking and reviewing your character and comic	9
Unit R096 General overview	10
Task 1 – Planning animation with audio.....	10
Task 2 – Creating animation with audio	11
Task 3 – Reviewing animation with audio	11
Unit R097 General overview	12
Task 1 – Planning animation with audio.....	12
Task 2 – Creating interactive digital media	12
Task 3 – Reviewing interactive digital media	13
Unit R098 General overview	14
Task 1 – Planning visual imaging portfolios	14
Task 2 – Creating visual imaging portfolios	14
Task 3 – Reviewing visual imaging portfolios.....	15
Unit R099 General overview	16
Task 1 – Planning digital games.....	16
Task 2 – Creating digital games	16
Task 3 – Reviewing digital games	17

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.

Administration

There have been a number of administrative challenges in this series which have made the process of moderation run less smoothly than would be ideal. One such challenge is the uploading of URS documents. When using Submit for Assessment centres are required to place the URS documents for all candidates in a separate folder from the work uploaded for individual candidates. This is to facilitate the early check for issues such as clerical errors which form the first part of the moderation process. Where this upload process is not followed, this has a knock-on effect of delaying the moderation process while moderators wait for the URS documents to be correctly placed.

Along similar lines, the number of clerical errors that have been found throughout this series has also been significant. When the total marks recorded for a candidate on Interchange do not match the totals on the URS, this requires correction before moderation being completed, this again causes unnecessary delays to the process.

Challenges with the submission of the final electronic products and other key items of evidence remained in this series. Moderators are required to check all the evidence that is intended to support marks. Marks cannot be supported by comments on the URS forms or links to work hosted elsewhere. Requesting evidence which is not available creates a delay in processing moderation which can then have an impact on timely results.

Centres should also pay particular attention to the dates printed on the front page of the assessments which outline when an assessment is live and in what series it can be submitted and moderated to make sure that the candidates complete and submit the correct live assessment for the correct series.

Unit R094 General overview

This series saw a wide range of approaches to the submissions for the ChocoIndulgence brief. In general, we saw really effective demonstration of conventions and creativity throughout the products. There were at times challenges around differentiating the evidence required for the visual identity from those of the final products, which sometimes led to misapplications of the mark scheme by assessors. Centres should make sure they are fully aware of the teaching content which should be delivered before starting the assessment, but also how this is then linked to the assessment and the application of the marking criteria. One aspect which remains a challenge is supporting marks for skills that candidates have applied to their visual identity and final graphic products. There is often a reliance on the products alone to support marks in these areas which does not allow candidates to demonstrate support for marks well, particularly in the higher mark bands.

Comments by Task

Task 1 – Develop a visual identity and plan digital graphics for products

As with earlier series the evidence for many centres began by completing a section on client brief interpretation and analysis. While it is a useful process to go through for any brief based task, this is not evidence that supports marks in this unit. We have also seen centres where research is presented as an early part of this task. Again, this is something that candidates may choose to carry out as part of the work, but it does not support marks in the assessment criteria nor is it outlined in the assessment task booklet. Use of the tasks and mark grid in the assessment booklet will support candidates to make sure that their evidence fits the requirements and supports marks and that they are not using their assessment time on tasks which are not required.

When evidencing the first two strands of Task 1, there are some common themes to the format of evidence presented for moderation. One such theme is the presentation of a range of different design concepts with one later being chosen. While this approach is not 'wrong', the marking criteria looks at the suitability of a singular design concept, so the designing of multiple versions before selection does not add to the quality of the evidence.

Similarly, candidates often justify multiple different concepts before selecting the one they will develop. This too is not the ideal way to create strong evidence to support marks in the higher mark band. Justification is only required to focus on the singular design for the visual identity that will be developed in Task 2.

There was a lot of evidence this series of really creative and well thought out designs for both the visual identity and the final product which showed a good level of understanding of the teaching content in this area. This was mirrored in the planning aspect of this task. There was a little confusion in some submissions in terms of what the planning was intended to cover. This strand of the marking grid focuses on the planning for the final product, so plans for the visual identity are not assessed in this strand. The assessment booklet has some key guidance for creating suitable evidence for this strand, for example, there is a task which states "show what your intended final graphic image will look like". This task is often not well evidenced in terms of detail as more generic forms of planning such as mind maps and mood boards are regularly used to provide the detail in this task. While all are relevant planning documents that can support marks in this area, the tasks in the set assignment are key to making sure that no important aspects of the mark supporting evidence are neglected and should be used to support students in their evidence creation.

Task 2 – Plan digital graphics for products and create visual identity and digital graphics

The first task remains one of the least well evidenced of the assessment. The visual identities themselves often show great creativity and understanding of what a visual identity is. However, the evidencing of technical skills is regularly shown by implication from the final visual identity files. It is often the case that the URS documents discuss or list skills the candidate has used but this is not sufficient to support marks for technical skill, the candidates must provide the evidence to support marks themselves alongside the final files. The final visual identity files are also key to support marks for the properties and formats, something which is often omitted from candidate submissions.

The second strand of this task is often omitted from evidence, due to the nature of how candidates construct their final product. There is a specific task in the assessment booklet "Create the other assets for your digital graphic product, create and/or source assets for use within your digital graphic, prepare and save the assets for use within your digital graphic". This precedes the task in which candidates create their final digital product(s). As such, to support marks in this strand there should be evidence of creating, sourcing, and preparing assets which are then used in the product. In many cases this may have been done but it is not evidenced and cannot be assumed for the purposes of moderation.

The level of creativity and design skills shown by candidates in the creation of the final product was admirable and the use of conventions was well demonstrated. The evidence to support marks for technical skills were overall better evidenced in this strand, but there were still several cases where the final product was the only evidence provided, which cannot support marks on its own.

The final strand is focused on the properties and formats of the final digital graphic products. File format, resolution and dimensions are all considered here. There has been a marked improvement in the number of candidates submitting work in an exported rather than native format. However, this aspect was often overmarked where only one aspect such as size or file format was considered in the assessment, or where only one of the two required versions of the product was entirely suitable. To support the top marks in this strand we would expect that both versions were entirely suitable, a best fit model should be used to adjust the mark for products which are partially suitable either in format or properties.

Unit R095 General overview

It was really positive to see a range of really creative and imaginative concepts for the characters and the comics in this unit. The comics were generally of a high quality with the concepts of comic design being clearly demonstrated. Candidates seem to have found the character a little more challenging to evidence in some cases. The assessment this year focused on a comic and character that would encourage young children to play outdoors in nature.

Comments by Task

Task 1 – Planning your character and comic

The first strand of this task focuses on the interpretation of the client brief, which was on the whole evidenced well and assessed accurately. We saw lots of original ideas, in this strand. Where evidence was less strong was in the explanation of how the intended product meets the brief and would appeal to the audience. While many candidates briefly touched on this area, it was much less frequent to see a comprehensive explanation in this section. There is a range of teaching content on the use of a client brief and the demographics of target audiences that can support greater success in this aspect of the assessment.

In this first strand we also still see a range of research, in a similar style to that required for the legacy R084 unit. This element of the former assessment is no longer within the marking criteria for the new assessment and does not need to be evidenced to support marks in R095.

As with most units, there is often a tendency to produce the more generic planning documents such as mind maps and mood boards in this section, often with the focus not being on the more product specific planning documents outlined in the specification. It is essential that candidates are taught the relevant planning documents for the unit from the specification before starting the assessment to make sure that they have the option to plan effectively, for example, storyline and panel layout planning. Detailed planning should allow for the support of all elements of the product; this will help support the crediting of marks in the top mark band.

With the final strand of this task, we continue to see a common misconception in the assessment. That is, that a source table if complete will support Band 3 marks, by default. This is not the case, the strand is assessing the understanding of the contribution assets will make to the effectiveness of the product. This information can be added to the source table or recorded elsewhere as part of the planning process, but there needs to be a good level of detail and understanding to support the Band 3 descriptor of comprehensive.

Task 2 – Creating your character and comic

The first strand of this task focuses on the component parts that form the comic. There is a clear guide to the tasks and evidence required to support marks in this task provided by the outline in the task booklet. The first three requirements involve sourcing/creating assets to create the character, creating the character and exporting the character. This helps to emphasise the importance of this component part. There were some creative ideas for the characters demonstrated here but it was often the case that the character was largely evidenced within the comic and its creation and saving and exporting were less well evidenced. We would expect to see the character in a format suitable for use within the comic, within the portfolio of evidence to support marks for saving and exporting. Marks can also be supported for technical skills used in the creation of other component parts of the comic, and we would expect to see this, but the character as indicated by the unit title is key here.

There is a misconception which features in this aspect of the unit also. This is that editing an existing character can be used effectively to support marks for the creation of the original character. This is not the case, as to effectively fulfil the client brief the character must be an original creation not an edited or derivative version of an existing character.

The level of creativity seen in the final products was really pleasing. There were lots of great examples of the application of conventions and comic styling which supported that aspect of the marks well. Where candidates were less successful was in evidencing the technical skills for this strand; as with the characters, skills were often implied from the final product alone which makes supporting marks for technical skills more challenging. When assessing the final product, it is important to consider what the fitness for purpose aspect can include, as well as considering the specifics of the brief, there are other considerations such as the quality and coherence of the storyline and its suitability for the aims of the product. There are also suitability considerations such as ensuring that any spelling, punctuation and grammar is correct as you would expect if a final product was fit for purpose.

Generally, the final strand here was evidenced well in terms of saving and exporting. One consideration to be given is to the suitability of formats that do not allow multiple pages in one document. As the brief states that the comic should be multipage, a format which allows for more than one page in a file would be most suitable to support marks in the higher mark bands.

Misconception



It is a common misconception that the evidence to support marks for technical skills can be implied from high quality final products alone. This is not the case, skills should be clearly evidenced within the coursework portfolio.

Misconception



It is a common misconception that editing an existing character can be used to support marks for the creation of the original character. This is not the case. To effectively fulfil the client brief the character must be an original creation not an edited or derivative version of an existing character.

Task 3 – Checking and reviewing your character and comic

In this unit in particular, there was often a lack of evidence to support the first aspect of this first strand, which looks at testing and checking of technical properties. Centres are advised to make sure the teaching content surrounding this topic is covered well before the assessment starts. The review element was evidenced much better, but using the best fit marking criteria, the impact of a poor testing and checking section had a knock-on effect on marks in this strand.

Improvements and developments were, in a lot of cases, the stronger part of the evidence in this task, with candidates being able to effectively pinpoint improvements that they could make to their character and comic. The explanation of these improvements and the consideration of further developments was less well developed generally, which when using a best fit approach to marking this strand impacts the final mark.

Unit R096 General overview

This unit saw candidates combining audio and animation to create an informative product for an animal charity aimed at 11 to 14 year olds. The aim of the product is to increase donations and the number of people visiting their shop. The approaches to this task were very varied but were consistent in their creativity and originality.

Comments by Task

Task 1 – Planning animation with audio

Candidates were generally effective in the interpretation of the client brief. Where there was sometimes less evidence to support marks was in providing the explanation as to how the planned interpretation was going to meet the needs of the client and the audience.

When it came to the planning aspect of this task, most candidates were able to show what their animation would look like with the use of suitable planning documents. These were often combined with more generic planning documents such as mind maps and mood boards to add detail.

One area where the planning was not as strong was in showing planning for the content and sequence of the audio. In many cases planning for audio did not feature at all in the evidence, which meant that support for the highest mark band where the requirement is "...support the creation of all elements of the final product" was often not present. Planning such as timelines and graphic scores rarely featured in evidence of planning.

For the final strand of this task, the candidates are required to demonstrate understanding of how assets will contribute to the effectiveness of the final product. It is often the case that an assets source table is used to support marks in this area. This can be used but the focus is on the explanation of uses; sourcing of assets is not the focus of this strand. The marks in this strand can also be evidenced in formats which are not an assets source table.

Task 2 – Creating animation with audio

The first strand of this task focuses on the creating the component that will make up the final product. The key component as indicated by the unit title is the audio. Although other components will also make up the product and be evidenced here. In many cases the technical skills demonstrated here were focused mainly, if not solely, on graphical asset creation and editing, which does not support marks well in this strand, where audio is a significant component. The tasks outlined in the assessment booklet help to make sure that this element is covered and centres are encouraged to make sure that the assessment booklet is available to all students completing the assessment.

The second strand is focused on the final product which in this unit is the animation with audio. The evidence here was stronger than that seen in the first strand. Candidates demonstrated good use of creativity and conventions, and in a lot more cases showed their technical skills in their evidence. In some cases, this was harder for the candidates to do due to the software they were using which limited the range of skills the candidates could demonstrate. Centres need to be mindful of this when selecting software to be used for this unit, to make sure that ease of use is not at the cost of the candidates' ability to demonstrate and effectively use their own skills to create the animation and to evidence this.

There were some challenges in terms of accessing the final products submitted for this unit. It is important that centres note the requirements to make sure that their chosen software exports animations in a format which can be accessed on a standalone machine, without the requirement for specialist software. Where centres export using software which has been discontinued such as Flash, this is also not suitable for this unit.

Misconception



It is a common misconception that the evidence to support marks for technical skills can be implied from high quality final products alone. This is not the case, skills should be clearly evidenced within the coursework portfolio.

Task 3 – Reviewing animation with audio

This first strand looks at testing/checking, focusing on the technical properties of the final product, plus reviewing, which looks at the effectiveness of the product for the brief and target audience. The testing/checking of technical properties was not well evidenced to support marks in the higher mark bands, with candidates tending to reflect on the suitability of the product to the brief more so than the properties. Candidates appear to be more comfortable and able to express their reflective thoughts, than they are to test and check their work. This was apparent in the balance of the evidence submitted.

The final strand of the assessment criteria for this assessment is looking at the potential improvements and developments that could be made to the product. In the majority of cases candidates were very able to express the areas they would improve in their product, however the explanation to accompany the suggestions was not always as developed. It tended to only be those candidates at the higher end of the marks that looked in any detail at further developments to their product.

Unit R097 General overview

This unit saw candidates create an interactive digital media product for use in a kiosk facility in libraries. The content of the kiosk was all about famous or influential people from the local area. There was a diverse range of approaches to this task, with lots of different people covered as content for the product.

Comments by Task

Task 1 – Planning animation with audio

The first strand of this task as with all the optional units is interpreting the client brief. There was some effective interpretation of the brief; candidates could identify the people they intended to feature in their product and some general aims around content. But in a lot of cases the specifics of what they intended to include in the content were not covered in the interpretation. The explanation of how the intended product would meet the needs of the client and appeal to the target audience was sometimes a little brief when considering the scope of the potential project.

The second strand of this task is focused on creating pre-production and planning documentation to support the creation of the final product. There were four points in the task booklet which could guide the candidates in the production of the documentation. The planning for the layout was generally well evidenced, However, the planning for content of the product was often less detailed, and vague in respect of the intended content. Planning for functionality was the least successful of the planning aspects. This could be improved, while still in the teaching stages of the unit, by ensuring candidates are experienced and familiar with the use of the whole range of pre-production and planning documents for all aspects of the product, rather than relying on generic planning documents such as mind maps and mood boards.

The final strand of this task assesses the understanding of the contribution assets will make to the effectiveness of the final product. Most candidates provided evidence for this strand using an assets source table. This can be used effectively, but in some cases, using the tabular format leads to candidates focusing on the sourcing of the assets and not demonstrating comprehensive understanding of why and how those assets contribute to the effectiveness of the final product. Candidates tended to focus on the graphical aspects of the product and in a lot of cases didn't feature other media content such as sound and video they later included in the product, which does impact on marks for the level of understanding shown.

Task 2 – Creating interactive digital media

The first aspect of this strand; the use of technical skills to create the component parts, is often not well evidenced and consequently often overmarked. There are many opportunities to demonstrate skills in the first strand of Task 2 due to the range of different media assets the candidates will be working with. Unlike the other optional units there is no one key component part for this product. Instead, the client brief outlines the different media components that are needed in the product and the formatting requirements of the components. As stated in the task booklet, evidence here is expected to show the preparation of these components to make sure of their suitability for the client requirements to support marks. This could involve evidence of skills such as video editing, image editing, sound effect creation, plus many more potential skills outlined in the specification.

The evidence of creating the final digital product was variable; some evidence was comprehensive, but others relied a lot more on implying the skills from the final product alone. Along with the technical skills, this strand assesses the use of convention and creativity and the products suitability for purpose. When assessing the suitability for purpose there should be consideration for the requirements outlined in the client brief, such as the media content and format.

In terms of saving and exporting the component parts and final product, this was generally well evidenced, with products being assessed correctly based on the evidence presented.

Misconception



It is a common misconception that the evidence to support marks for technical skills can be implied from high quality final products alone. This is not the case and skills should be clearly evidenced within the coursework portfolio.

Task 3 – Reviewing interactive digital media

The first strand of this task focuses on reviewing and testing/checking the final product. The testing should focus on the functionality and technical properties, whereas the reviewing should focus on the suitability for the client brief and target audience. A lot of candidates focused their testing on the brief alongside their review, which neglected the testing aspect of the marking criteria. This meant at times this task was overmarked. There is lots of scope for testing technical properties and functionality with a digital media product so the potential to support marks in the higher mark bands is available.

The final strand of the assessment assesses the candidates' ability to identify and explain potential improvements and developments for the final product. Candidates generally evidence potential improvements well and will explain them to a certain extent, although not always in a great deal of detail. The focus tends to be on improvements to fix issues in the product, more than considering potential extra development to the product.

Unit R098 General overview

The assignment for R098 for the 2025 exam series, required candidates to create promotional material for open events for their place of learning. The brief for the visual imaging portfolio was required to include eight photographic images and a video sequence of 20 to 30 seconds.

Comments by Task

Task 1 – Planning visual imaging portfolios

As with most of the optional units, the interpretation of the brief was usually well done in terms of outlining the main requirements stated in the brief. Where candidates seemed to find the task more challenging was considering and applying what this meant for the content of their product and generating original ideas for the portfolio. This along with more limited explanation as to why the intended product was suitable for the brief and the audience meant that in a lot of cases it was harder to support marks in the higher mark bands.

The second strand of this task focused on planning the different aspects of the portfolio. Some aspects of this were planned well, for example most candidates were able to create a storyboard plan for their video content. Where planning was less detailed was in the planning of the photographic content. The task booklet outlines a specific requirement to identify what photographs to take. Some candidates created risk assessments and a recce of locations for their photography, but the specifics of what they intended to take photographs of were often not part of the planning.

As with all optional units the final strand of this task requires candidates to show understanding of how assets will contribute to the effectiveness of the final product. In this unit in particular candidates didn't evidence this very strongly. In some cases, this appeared to be due to the misunderstanding that components created themselves did not need to go on an assets table. As has been stated earlier in the report, an asset table can be used to demonstrate the understanding of asset contribution within the uses column but this is not the only way this evidence could be created.

Task 2 – Creating visual imaging portfolios

The Task 2 evidence for this unit was often one of the most inaccurately marked. There were some significant misunderstandings surrounding the structure and content of this task. In several submissions candidates produced either photographs or a video but not both. This meant there was either evidence to support marks in strand 2 or 3 of the task but not both.

Centres should be advised to make sure that candidates have access to and clearly understand the tasks in the assessment booklet. The booklet will provide candidates with support in creating evidence to support all areas of the marking criteria. The support for technical skills to create the components and the final product was variable throughout the series. The specification clearly outlines a range of photographic and video skills that should be covered in the teaching content. Based on the evidence seen, candidates evidenced editing content much more effectively than they evidenced the skills in taking photographs or recording video footage.

For the final part of this task candidates were required to save and export the final products in a suitable format with suitable properties. This was generally well evidenced and accurately assessed by centres.

Misconception



It is a common misconception that the evidence to support marks for technical skills can be implied from high quality final products alone. This is not the case. Skills should be clearly evidenced within the coursework portfolio.

Task 3 – Reviewing visual imaging portfolios

The final task is focused on testing and checking the technical properties of the products and reviewing the products in terms of fitness for purpose. Candidates generally reflected well on the fitness of their products for the purpose outlined in the brief. However, the testing and checking of technical properties was not well evidenced. Candidates did not seem to have a strong level of understanding of the technical properties of photographs and videos, which hampered the creation of evidence to support marks in this area.

The second aspect of this task tended to be stronger in terms of evidence. Candidates were able to identify areas for improvements effectively. Most improvements were explained, although in some cases not to the level of detail required to support marks in the highest mark band.

Unit R099 General overview

The set assignment for this unit in the 2025 series required the candidates to create a short game that would improve the user's memory, focus and concentration. The game is aimed at young adults between the ages of 14 and 18. The component aspect of this unit is the game design document. In terms of evidence, the candidates are required to make one significant part of the game for example a level, a task or exercise.

Comments by Task

Task 1 – Planning digital games

The client brief interpretation aspect of this task was generally well evidenced and assessed. Candidates did tend to focus more on the aspects of the brief than the needs of the target audience, equal consideration of both parts would help to create stronger evidence for the higher mark bands. In terms of the explanation of how the product meets the client brief and appeals to the target audience, the evidence here was patchy. Candidates readily gave a brief explanation for most if not all points, but often they didn't contain a level of detail which would support a mark in the descriptor for comprehensive.

Planning for this unit often seemed to focus mainly on the visual aspects of the game such as character and game screen layouts, which while valuable in terms of evidence to support marks, there are other areas such as planning for game play which would add to the planning for better support marks in the top mark band.

Along similar lines to the planning, evidence of the contribution of assets tended to be mainly limited to items such as characters and objects, leaving out other assets which make up the game. As with other units, the level of detail in terms of demonstrating the understanding of asset contribution rather than just sourcing the assets was variable.

One point of note here is that in a significant number of cases candidates were clearly using software which provided assets such as characters, objects and backgrounds. This makes it difficult for candidates to effectively plan their content and implement their own original concepts and provide evidence of such skills.

Task 2 – Creating digital games

As mentioned in the introduction, the key component in this unit is the games design document. This alongside the other components required to make the game, form the component parts. We have often seen evidence of technical skills in the creation or editing of some visual assets for the game, but the game design document is rarely prominent in this strand. Centres are advised to make sure that this aspect of the teaching content is covered before the start of the assessment, to make sure that candidates can demonstrate their skills and access a full range of marks in this strand.

When it came to evidencing the creation of the digital game, some candidates, generally those at the higher end of the mark criteria, did evidence their technical skills well. However, in a significant number of cases the only evidence provided for this aspect was the final game itself. When this is the case, it makes supporting marks harder. This is especially the case where the software used created quite generic games and it is difficult to tell the difference between standard content and controls and what has in fact been created by the candidate.

As seen in earlier series, there were some challenges in terms of accessing the final products submitted for this unit; it is important that the centres note the requirements to make sure that their chosen software can allow candidates to export games in a format which can be accessed on a standalone machine, without the requirement for specialist software. Games that are accessed via a link or require the moderator to play the game online or via specific software, do not meet the requirements for the NEA to be submitted as a standalone product and cannot be used for moderation.

Misconception



In this unit the component parts are not the elements of the game. Although assets for use within the game may contribute to the mark for the first part of Task 2, the game design document; as outlined in section 2.1 of the teaching content, is the main component part.

Task 3 – Reviewing digital games

The review aspect of the evidence required to support marks in this task was generally accurately assessed with candidates being able to identify aspects which are both positive and negative in their product and in a lot of cases explain the impact on the effectiveness of their product. Although centres should be mindful of not overmarking when assessing content which is more of a narrative about the creation process than it is a critical reflection on the product.

The testing and checking aspect of functionality and technical properties was not nearly as well developed and in a lot of cases did not support marks well. There is great scope for testing in this unit, but the evidence presented rarely supports marks for fully effective testing.

Candidates generally evidenced their recommendations for improvements effectively but often seemed unclear on the difference between that and further developments. The recommendations were often at least partially explained. Where the detail was lacking to support marks in the higher mark bands it tended to be around demonstrating their understanding of the potential impact of their recommendations on the fulfilment of the client brief and suitability for the target audience.

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?

There are **three types** of online course for Cambridge Nationals.

All teachers delivering our Cambridge Nationals suite are asked to complete the course **Essentials for the NEA**, 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 of the NEA units.

We have also created subject-specific **Understanding the examined unit** courses that provide a wealth of information to support you with the delivery, assessment, and administration of the examined unit. The courses outline the assessment structure, including details on synoptic assessment, performance objectives and command words for your Cambridge Nationals qualification. Working through the course, you have an opportunity to interact with resources developed to support the exam, in particular candidate exemplars and mark scheme guidance. The final section covers details on administrative requirements, including assessment opportunities, entry rules and resits.

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.