OCR
Oxford Cambridge and RSA

AS LEVEL

Moderators' report

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

H155
For first teaching in 2016

H155/04/05 Summer 2023 series

Contents

Introduction

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

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

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

Online courses

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

Cambridge Nationals

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

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

GCSE, A Level and Cambridge Technicals (2016)

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

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

Accessing our online courses

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

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

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

Would you prefer a Word version?

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

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

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

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

General overview

In the second year of returning to live moderations it was pleasing to see that candidates attended moderations with a positive approach and that centres were accomplished at using the full mark range across all six levels to make their practical assessments.

After some challenging years, it was felt that this year was back to the 'norm' and moderators, host centres and all attending centres enabled the moderation process to run smoothly, with positive discussions held and feedback provided to centres as to reasons for marks given. Through these continued discussions and feedback, it was felt that centres were more comfortable with the assessment process and developed their own deeper understanding of how to submit candidate marks. The moderating team is very grateful to all centres, teachers and candidates for their contributions to the moderation process.

Candidates who did well generally:	Candidates who did less well generally:
H155/04 • played regularly in the activity they were being assessed in and kept a detailed log of competitive scenarios • were able to demonstrate a range of core and advanced skills within competitive situations • produced filmed evidence that was in line with the guidance as to what was required and thus supported the mark given.	H155/04 • were not able to demonstrate a range of core and advanced skills within competitive scenarios • completed log books with training sessions rather than competitive situations • produced filmed evidence that did not include competitive scenarios or was of limited duration to demonstrate their range of core and advanced skills, therefore did not support the higher levels.
H155/05 • in the Evaluative Comments, identified a range of strengths and weaknesses, justified why and linked these to how they impacted the overall success of the performer • in the Action Plans, justified why they chose the weakness and produced a plan for this weakness with realistic practices for the level of the performer being observed and duration of sessions for the practices stated • completed Action Plans on either a Skill or Fitness Component • applied a range of Physiological and Psychological concepts within both the Evaluative Comments and Action Plan • applied theory from an area within Socio Cultural that was from the prescribed list and linked to participation.	H155/05 • in the Evaluative Comments, only identified the strengths or weakness, did not justify why or how they impacted the overall success of performance, but instead tried to justify by using theory • in the Action Plans, did not justify why they had chosen the weakness to improve, practices were too basic for the level of performer being observed, lacking in any competitive element and practices stated were not realistic to the duration set for the sessions • within the Action Plans, included warm ups, cool downs and testing. These have all been removed and so are not credited for the response • completed Action Plans on both a Skill and a Fitness Component which limited the depth and detail of the practices • applied a limited range of theory or repeated for Physiological and Psychological concepts

Candidates who did well generally:	Candidates who did less well generally:
	or not from the prescribed list, so could not be credited
	• did not apply theory from an area within Socio Cultural that was from the prescribed list or linked to participation.

Paperwork Submission Overview

The updated version of the PEMIF used for H155 is the only method of providing the assessments to the moderator and this has generally eradicated the transcriptions errors from one sheet to another. However, this has not completely eliminated transcription errors as many errors were still found when entering data onto the IMS1 form.

Centres are reminded that all paperwork must be sent to the moderator by the deadline set in the Guide to NEA, this must include all filmed evidence of 'off site' practical activities and a sample of 'on site' practical activities, all coaching activity evidence (log book and filmed evidence).

We are extremely keen to continue to reduce the amount of physical paper centres need to forward on and would like centres to provide their candidate log books in electronic form on the USB stick, along with their other filmed evidence. This can either be that candidates have initially produced their logs in an electronic form or the hand-written copy is scanned in and saved as a PDF version.

Centres should also note that there is now a Special Considerations department at OCR now dealing with centre applications. It should be noted that this process can only be completed by centres with candidates with disabilities. We can adapt current activities for them to take part in. This must be applied for as early as possible and before the December of Year 12.

We are also aware that centres have concerns over the storage and movement of their candidates' evidence by USB and many are now using encrypted USBs. This is a fully justified approach but it is requested that if such a process is used then please can centres make sure that the type of encrypted USB can be opened on both Windows and Mac operating systems, as in many cases moderators were not able to access the evidence.

Paperwork Submission

Positives

- On the whole the deadline for paperwork was met and centres were able to provide the additional filmed evidence as required.

- The majority of centres provided component marks where appropriate, i.e. Cricket and Swimming.

- Most centres are now compiling all the evidence onto one USB stick for submission to the moderator.

Areas for Improvement

- Many centres still had not fully recognised the need for all marks to be submitted electronically via the IMS1 marks which causes this element of the paperwork to arrive late to moderators. Exams Officers should be fully aware of how to submit a centres' marks and print a confirmation copy that must be sent to the moderator. Centres are reminded that the IMS1 needs to be submitted at the same time as the PEMIF documents by the deadlines set in the Guide to NEA.

- There were some transcription errors between the PEMIF and the IMS1. Centres need to make sure that this process is carefully checked as errors often lead to candidates being disadvantaged. It is advised that where the inputting of the IMS1 marks is completed by the Exams Officer a member of the staff directly involved with the PE process also be present to spot errors at the point of entry.

It is important that all centres make note of the key dates for paperwork submission and adhere to them, as missed marks submissions is maladministration and can lead to OCR not accepting your marks.

Filmed Evidence and Log Book Submission

It was greatly appreciated by moderators that most centres were well prepared for the submission of both filmed practical and log books for the deadline, 31st March. Centres are reminded that all the evidence they pass on to the moderator should be a copy in case there are any issues within the moderation process.

Many centres are rightly concerned about GDPR and the sending of filmed evidence by post and have invested in encrypted USBs. While OCR commend this process, centres need to make sure that any such encryption can be accessed by both Windows and Apple products as many moderators were not able to open some encrypted sticks due to the differing operating systems.

Centres are reminded that there is a need to film all aspects of the live moderation and submit this to OCR within 10 days of a moderation with the accompanying form. This was carried out by many more centres this year and although it does provide some logistical issues not only on the day but also in submitting to the board either as an individual centre or as a cluster, the process is there to support centres and candidates if a review of results is requested. Centres need to continue to plan this into their moderation day going forward as it is their responsibility not the moderators'.

Most centres followed the guidance on filmed evidence that was issued in the previous Moderation Reports and issued via the OCR website, where it identifies that centres should in addition to the 'off site' activities, send filmed evidence of 'on site' activities, requirement of which is stated in the Guide to NEA. Centres should make sure that this 'on site' evidence encompasses a range of marks given by a centre, ideally top, middle and lowest within each of the activities sent.

Centres are reminded that where the filmed evidence is used that it should not only meet the requirements of the individual activity as set out in the Guide to NEA but it must show the performer in a formal competitive situation. Centres are reminded that they are responsible for the production of appropriate footage.

The production and quality of candidate log books showed significant variances across all centres. These logs are extremely helpful to moderators when making final decisions as to the appropriate assessment of a candidate. Centres are reminded that they do not carry any direct weighting towards the assessment process; they are simply there to support the judgement. **Centres are reminded that the log is there for a candidate to identify the regularity of competitive performance in their sport and show the level that they participate at.** It should not be a weekly record of their training and it must record their performances across the two years of the A Level course. For those practical activities where the main 'in-competition' season is the summer such as Athletics and Cricket then it is acceptable that a candidate records their performances from 1st July before their entry to Year 12.

Positives

- Centres were well prepared to provide filmed evidence of both 'on site' and 'off site' practical activities by 31st March.

- Many centres are following good practice of filming a range of marks, so that they can provide additional evidence to a moderator if they feel it is required.

- Many centres had collated their candidate log books in advance of the submission of marks in order to provide these to the moderator with the submission of paperwork by 31st March.

- Most centres are providing filmed evidence in a format that can easily be played by the moderator; centres are reminded that it must be accessible by a VLC player.

Areas for Improvement

- Centres need to check the quality of the filmed evidence they provide to their moderator. Some of the centre filmed evidence was of a low quality which could affect candidates' marks, as a thorough analysis of the assessment criteria cannot be made by the moderator.

- Centres should make sure that their evidence is not just a highlights reel of the candidate but also shows them in continuous game situations.

- Candidate produced filmed evidence is on the rise and here we would strongly recommend that centres check the quality and validity of this before submission to the moderator. This is most prevalent in those sports that a centre itself does not offer 'in house'.

- Best practice for candidates whose filmed evidence is across a range of clips is to compile these into one 'video' so that the entire assessment can be made in one viewing rather than across multiple clips.

- Centres need to be aware of the range of filmed evidence they need to provide to the moderator for 'on site' and 'off site' practical activities and coaching. Please make sure centres keep updated with the latest version of the NEA guidelines for these requirements.

- Provision of filmed evidence needs to be clearly labelled and must be a copy. Moderators find it easiest if the evidence can be provided on a USB memory stick rather than multiple DVDs.

- Centres need to make sure that candidates in the filmed evidence provided to the moderator present to the camera at the start of a video, so it is clear who they are and what their identifying bid/number is.

- Centres need to make sure that the log books reference the competitive performances a candidate has undertaken for the past two years and should help the moderator to have a good insight into both the candidate's level of performance as well as their overall influence on the competitive situation, including the final outcome. Many logs contained training sessions and did not provide the moderator with enough detail about the level of performance.

Although centres are better at producing log books, we feel that best practice in terms of providing these to the moderator is in electronic format either through the original document or a PDF scan of the hand-written document. These can then be placed onto the main USB submitted to the moderator.

Assessment of Practical Performance

On the whole the performance aspect of the specification continues to have a positive outcome for most centres. The majority of centres had applied the assessment criteria well, although there was still some need to amend centres' marks; it is felt that through the moderation process it was made clear to all centres the reasons why any alterations would occur. While this was unexpected for some, once the rationale was explained and the assessment criteria were revisited, it was felt that the assessments were accurate and fair.

Centres are now much clearer on the reasoning for the tapered off marks within each level; the top level (6) and bottom level (1) only being 4 marks wide in each case, with Levels 5 and 2 being 5 marks wide and Levels 4 and 3 being 6 marks wide each. This has certainly helped centres to provide better differentiation between their candidates, especially in Levels 3 and 4.

Centres are encouraged to use the full range of marks within the specification and use the reference points around grade award. It is felt that the adjustments that were made have ensured that all candidate performances align to the grade award and their rationale have been fully justified.

There still continues to be positive shift in the manner in which staff are interpreting the assessment criteria and it is clear that centres are much better at the process of identifying the candidate's performance against the five sub categories (Range of Skills, Quality of Skills, Physical Attributes, Decision Making and Effective Performance) and subsequently finding the line of best fit.

Positives

- Centres had taken on board the advice given in the previous assessment cycles and there was evidence that most centres had a better understanding of the rigours required for each assessment level.

- Most centres had spent a great deal of time working through the assessment criteria and were working to the line of best fit.

- Many centres spent a great deal of time working through the range of acquired and developed skills listed under each individual activity and found that when assessing candidates this helped them to place them into a level with ease.

- The desire to provide a more even spread of marks across the cohort was achieved.

- Centres were well prepared to provide filmed evidence of both 'on site' and 'off site' practical activities by the deadline stated in the Guide to NEA.

Areas for Improvement

- Centres continue to appreciate the breakdown of acquired and developed skills in to 'Core' and 'Advanced' although they did not directly correlate these to the wording within the assessment criteria, which resulted in many candidates being generously assessed especially at the lower range of marks submitted.

- Many centres assessed their performers too narrowly across the mark range and as such did not allow the differentiation between candidates to be achieved. Centres are encouraged to use the full mark range appropriately; by applying a careful focus on the wording in the assessment criteria.

Most common causes of centres not passing

Very few candidates do not pass the Performance Component of the specification; however, those that don't have often not been playing any form of sport for the duration of the course. As such, centres are reminded that encouraging your weaker practical performers to play at least recreationally on a weekly basis will make a significant difference.

Common misconceptions

A candidate needs to be in Level 6 to be given an A grade; this is incorrect as an A grade has been set in Level 5.

A 'highlights reel' or one individual performance (100 m) is the best way to provide filmed evidence; this is incorrect as we require both a range of skill footage as well as a continuous block of performance footage to fully understand the commonalities in performance.

A 'Park Run' or any Cross Country course can be used to assess a candidate in Cross Country; this is incorrect as there are specific course requirements that must be met, these are in line with the ESAA specifications.

Some activities are easier than others to access the assessment criteria; this is incorrect - the standard of performance is standardised across all activities.

Avoiding potential malpractice

Malpractice is incredibly rare in the Performance Component of Physical Education but there are odd occasions, more often than not with 'off site' activities, where significant instructor led sessions are provided as evidence as such do not meet the assessment criteria.

H155/05 EAPI

This series did bring some new hurdles to get over, with the introduction to EAPI moderators only, which meant that some centres were required to send their EAPI evidence to a different moderator to that of the Performance Component. The components are now separate and this is likely to be the case for more centres next year, so it is essential that EAPIs are saved on different USBs to the Performance.

It was again positive to see that centres welcomed feedback regarding the EAPI assessments on the moderation day over lunch break; albeit that this feedback was more generic rather than specific to the centre. However, the majority of centres were able to take away areas to improve, as nationally similar patterns were seen, so could be relayed to centres at the live moderation.

It is clear that the assessment of the EAPI is still causing many centres the greatest difficulty and this is where the vast majority of adjustments have been made across the national picture. As mentioned, many centres are well versed with the structure of the 'oral response' element, however, it is felt that many centres need to look more closely at the specification to identify the changes, especially with those that were updated for June 2022 series, to make sure their candidates are only including what can be credited.

Positives

Candidates were well prepared for the task and general structure of the response. It was very pleasing to see the majority of candidates with the 'notes sheets' and pen ready to take notes throughout the observation.

Centres found the process of completing the assessment grid with a line of best fit accessible and familiar.

Filming of the responses for most centres followed the required guidelines; ensuring the whole response, including the candidates' observation of the performance was one continuous video from start to end.

The vast majority of candidates kept their responses within the approved limit of 20 minutes and used clocks to make sure candidates did not exceed the time limit.

The 'Evaluative Comments' section continues to be the strongest aspect of most responses with a good range of identification, description and linking to overall success of performance shown, as well as applied theory.

Areas for Improvement

Too many candidates used the observation time to include pre-prepared notes rather than observe the performance in front of them. This over-reliance on pre-prepared notes leads them not only to focus too narrowly on one aspect of the observation but often to provide inaccurate observations. Centres are reminded that the time provided to a candidate should be appropriate; essentially enough time for them to observe a performance and make outline notes; not complete a script to read from. It is suggested in the Guide to NEA that 10-20 minutes is ample.

Many candidates' response time across all the sections also limited their ability to access higher levels, due to many spending two thirds of their response time on the Evaluative Comments section and only one third of the time on the Action Plans. With the Application of Theory spent defining it rather than applying it throughout the other two sections.

Although generally the stronger section, in the Evaluative Comments for some, too much emphasis is put on trying to add in theory concepts, instead of justifying why they are strengths and weaknesses and how they impact the overall success of performance.

Action Plans are most notably the weaker section of the response. Many centres did not identify the need to make sure the progressive practices within the action plan must be appropriate to the frequency and duration of the practices, as set out by the candidate. Often it was one basic practice a week, which did not match either the frequency, duration or performer observed, in order to make sure progress would be achieved over the course of the action plan. Centres are advised to suggest candidates think about what they do in a training session; rarely is this one drill for an extended period of time but is significantly related to the final performance situation.

Many centres did not identify the removal of some elements within the development plan of the EAPI, most notably:

- timescale justifications

- measurement of improvements.

Many centres did not identify the 'newer' elements within the Application of Theory of the EAPI, most notably:

- prescribed theory list: many candidates included areas of theory that are not on the prescribed list, most notably from the 03 Component. Any theory not on the prescribed list cannot be given marks. Pages 131-142 in the Guide to NEA provide full details of the prescribed list

- wide range of relevant theory: most candidates identified one or two areas of theory repetitively which although applied differently can only be given credit once. The main ones were muscle/movement terms and guidance. Candidates should make sure that they access a wide range of theoretical topics from Components 01, 02 and 03 in their response; however, it is now possible to access Level 4 with no 03 Theory applied in their response

- lack of Application of Theory: far too much theory was simply a regurgitation of fact rather than applying the concept to the observations or the action plan.

Many candidates did not cover all of the required areas; it is felt that to help candidates, the way in which the question is posed to them should now take two parts, with the candidate responding to each one in turn:

- Part 1: comment on the observation by analysing and evaluating the performance.

- Part 2: creating of a viable action plan.

Pages 26 and 27 in the Guide to NEA provide exact wording which we would suggest all centres follow.

Centres may find it helpful to view the EAPI in the following manner:

- <u>Evaluative Comments:</u>
  - Identify strengths for Skills, tactics/compositional ideas and Fitness
  - Justify why and how they impact overall success of performance
  - Apply theory
  - Identify weaknesses for Skills, tactics/compositional ideas and Fitness
  - Justify why and how they impact overall success of performance
  - Apply theory.

- <u>Action Plans</u>
  - State and justify why chosen weakness
  - Give duration and frequency of plan and sessions
  - Detailed practices realistic to duration of sessions/whole plan and performer
  - Coaching points
  - Apply theory.

Paperwork and Filmed Evidence Submissions - Guidance

Centres are reminded that the EAPI Component is now separate to the Performance Component and therefore all evidence must be on separate USBs and sent to their EAPI moderator, as this may be different from their Practical moderator.

Centres are also reminded that all assessed marks are to be submitted directly through their Exams Officer on Interchange by the deadline set in the Guide to NEA and that their moderator will have access to these marks remotely.

It was greatly appreciated by moderators that most centres were well prepared for the submission of their EAPI filmed evidence by the deadline. Centres are reminded that all the evidence they pass on to the moderator should be a copy, in case of any issues in accessing it during the moderation process.

Many centres are rightly concerned about GDPR and the sending of filmed evidence by post and have invested in encrypted USB's. While we commend this approach, centres must make sure that any such encryption can be accessed by both Windows and Apple products; many moderators were not able to open some encrypted sticks due to the differing operating systems.

When labelling candidates' files on the USB it would help hugely if both the candidate's number and name was included i.e. 1234 A. Surname EAPI – Football.

Centres are reminded that the entirety of the EAPI process should be recorded; the observation/note taking and then the response as one continuous video. This will mean each video recording will be around 45 minutes long and where your recording equipment breaks this into two files, each centre should make sure this is pieced together into one file before submitting to the moderator.

Centres are also reminded that the candidate notes used within their EAPI response should be collected and included in their submission of the USBs to their moderator. It is also helpful to include the centre mark sheet; we can then evaluate how a centre has assessed its candidates and we can provide more detailed feedback. Please be aware that, like the filmed evidence, the centre should keep a copy of all candidate notes and mark sheets.

Most common causes of centres not passing

Candidates who have not prepared or fully understood the task are most at risk of not passing this component. As such centres are encouraged to make sure their candidates are fully versed with the task and how to manage their response.

Action Plans being too basic and lacking a competitive element to the practices until the later weeks of the plan.

Common misconceptions

- The response is about a candidate showing their theoretical knowledge to the moderator. This is incorrect as the Application of Theory is one of three assessed elements. We feel that the theory is there to support the observations, which in turn provide the stimulus for the creation of an appropriate development plan. It was felt that the EAPI task had become too dominated by trying to put in theory wherever possible, to the detriment of the actual evaluation and analysis of performance. We have now introduced the prescribed theory list which we hope will allow the task to be a bit shorter and more tightly focused from previous years.

- All pieces of theory on the prescribed list have to be covered. This is incorrect - the prescribed list covers a range of topic areas across the Theory Components from which candidates should select appropriate things to apply in their EAPI. The list does not need to be covered in full.

- A candidate who receives 'extra time' in relation their exams automatically gets this applied to the time limit for the EAPI. This is incorrect as often access arrangements linked to additional time relate to written assessments, so it should not be assumed that these remain relevant to the verbal EAPI response and can be just 'carried over'.

- If a response goes beyond 20 minutes then the candidate can still be given a mark in Levels 4-6. This is incorrect as the assessment grid clearly states that any response that is more than the stated time limit cannot be given above the top of Level 3, assuming that the other aspects of the criteria also meet at least the Level 3 requirements. Candidates with a documented and evidenced need may require more time than the maximum stated for the EAPI response. In such cases, centres should in the first instance discuss the particular candidate with their SENCo/SENDCO to discuss appropriate access arrangements and reasonable adjustments. If further advice is needed, centres should contact the Special Requirements Team in advance of the assessment taking place.

- Candidates can observe the performance for as long as they wish. This is incorrect the candidate should start their response as soon as an appropriate range of analysis opportunities has been viewed within the performance. While this will vary between different activities, in general between 10 and 20 minutes should provide the candidate observing with enough material to analyse and evaluate, and sufficient time to make any notes they wish to during the observation.

Avoiding potential malpractice

Unfortunately, malpractice does occur in this component and is most commonly found under these categories.

- <u>Using pre-planned notes in their response.</u> Centres are reminded that the candidates can have access to either the 'candidates' notes sheet' <u>or</u> paper, both of which must be blank, to compile their notes and the observation/note taking must be included in the filmed evidence submitted.

- <u>Candidates receiving clear off-camera prompts by staff.</u> There are times when there is clear communication between staff and candidates during the assessment process which both halts the candidate in their response and acts as a prompt that is not reflected in the marks submitted by the centre.

- <u>Use of mobile phone for timing.</u> JCQ rules for conducting examinations apply. If a candidate is using their own phone or watch to monitor the time, the centre must manage any risks around access to other information which may be helpful to the assessment via the device (e.g. smart phones/watches). Evidence at moderation that there may be a risk that candidates accessed information via such a device may be referred to OCR's Compliance team.

Helpful resources

[OCR A Level PE Mark Sheet to Enter Marks](#)

[Official OCR INSET](#) – please be aware we cannot guarantee the content of non-OCR training that is available

[Competitive log template on website](#)

[Internal Standardisation guide for teachers](#)

[Guide to NEA](#)

OCR support
i It is strongly recommended that centres visit the 'OCR Train' section of the OCR website to take advantage of supporting assessment exemplars.

Additional comments

The moderation team would like to thank all centres that participated in this year's moderation process; their continued professionalism and contributions to the discussions held at the moderation days; and the way in which they support their candidates in advance of these days highlights the range of exceptional Physical Education staff delivering the subject.

Centres are encouraged to continue to monitor, log and film candidates throughout the one year of the assessed course to make sure adequate footage is available.

Centres are strongly encouraged to regularly review the Physical Education pages of the OCR website for updates and attend the free "Ask the Moderator" on-line sessions throughout the year to clarify aspects of the assessment process.

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

For the June 2023 series, Exams Officers will be able to download copies of your candidates' completed papers or 'scripts' for all of our General Qualifications including Entry Level, GCSE and AS/A Level. 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 CPD 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 question builder platform for a range of our GCSE, A Level, Cambridge Nationals and Cambridge Technicals qualifications. Find out more.

ExamBuilder is **free for all OCR centres** with an Interchange account and gives you unlimited users per centre. We need an Interchange username to validate the identity of your centre's first user account for ExamBuilder.

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

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.

Find out more.

Need to get in touch?

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

Call us on
01223 553998

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

For more information visit
- **ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder**
- **ocr.org.uk**
- **facebook.com/ocrexams**
- **twitter.com/ocrexams**
- **instagram.com/ocrexaminations**
- **linkedin.com/company/ocr**
- **youtube.com/ocrexams**

We really value your feedback

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

👍**I like this**   👎**I dislike this**

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