



GCSE

Physical Education

General Certificate of Secondary Education **GCSE J586**

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course) **GCSE J086**

OCR Report to Centres June 2014

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This report on the examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this report.

© OCR 2014

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Physical Education (J586)

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course)

Physical Education (J086)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
B451 An Introduction to Physical Education	1
B452 and B454 – Practical Performance and Analysis 1 and 2	3
B452 Analysing Lifestyle task	7
B454 Analysing Performance task	8
B453 Developing Knowledge in Physical Education	10

B451 An Introduction to Physical Education

General Comments:

Centres are reminded that mark schemes are used as a basis for judgements and each examiner's professional judgement is used in finally deciding the marks awarded based on a rigorous standardisation procedure. A 'Levels of Response mark scheme' is used for the final question – Q25. The mark scheme for this question has a number of criteria separated into Levels. The Levels of Response mark scheme includes indicative content which is expected in answer to the question and it is this content which is taken into consideration when awarding marks. Each Level also includes a statement related to the quality of written communication. Examiners use ticks to indicate the number of marks given for questions 1 – 24.

This examination paper includes multiple choice questions which were answered well by most candidates. Candidates are advised to think carefully about each question rather than try to rush through these questions because some otherwise good scoring candidates, once again, made careless errors on these questions. The weaker-answered multiple choice questions were 2, 11 and 15 (some candidates did not recognise spin as the training method). There was little evidence to suggest that candidates struggled to complete the paper within the time allowed.

As in previous series candidates often showed good knowledge but some were unable to apply that knowledge, for example applying aspects of the specification to participation or performance. Some candidates found it particularly difficult to give relevant practical examples when asked.

Comments on individual questions

Question 16

Many candidates scored well on this question and were clear in their responses linking fundamental skills with ways of measuring or analysing them.

Question 17

In this recall question, most candidates scored full marks but the weaker candidates, at times, confused their answers on concepts with key processes.

Question 18

This question proved difficult for some candidates, many of whom could identify the characteristics of skilful movement but who were unable to describe them using practical examples. Centres are reminded that the specification often requires candidates to apply theory to practice.

Question 19

The candidates who were successful in this question were able to apply the environment and climate to participation. Others were unaware of a wider range of environmental and climatic factors that can affect participation and consequently only scored one or two marks out of the four marks available.

Question 20

Many candidates showed a good awareness of the indicators of health and well-being. The better candidates, once they had identified an indicator such as levels of satisfaction, then went on to describe further, with practical examples, as required by the question. Those who scored few marks rarely attempted a description with an example for each indicator.

Question 21

The vast majority of candidates responded well on this high scoring question. Those who scored full marks described different examples of decision making in a range of physical activities. Lower scoring candidates often applied the same example of a decision such as ‘when to pass the ball’ to a number of activities – this did not fulfil the requirements of the question for different decisions.

Question 22

Many candidates showed excellent recall with the components of fitness with the most common being cardiovascular endurance, strength, speed and muscular endurance.

Question 23

This question proved to be a good differentiating question with the best candidates scoring full marks by writing full descriptions of ways in which having a disability might have a positive effect on participation. Some good answers, for example, recognised that those with disabilities increase their participation because it gives a focus in life, leads to greater self-confidence, and provides opportunities to meet and inspire others.

Question 24

Most candidates recognised some pathways, which lead to involvement, but the question asks for four different pathways and some candidates only described one or two or merely repeated the same pathway in slightly different terms. Once again, some candidates only gave a list of pathways rather than giving descriptions and therefore scored few marks.

Question 25

A well answered question by many candidates who gave wide ranging and thoughtful responses. The better candidates made valid points and then developed these points with further information and exemplification, with some also including relevant practical examples. The candidates’ responses to this question are also judged on the quality of written communication. Lower scoring candidates made notes and did not seek to develop or exemplify a list of short points. Some candidates made use of additional answer pages for their response but this did not necessarily correlate with higher marks. The very best candidates developed their points in depth and only used the space available in the main answer booklet.

B452 and B454 – Practical Performance and Analysis 1 and 2

General Comments

This is the first year of the linear version of the course and again it was pleasing to see many fine performances by enthusiastic candidates. It is pleasing to note the continuing commitment of centres and teachers in hosting moderation and organising the activities to ensure that candidates had an enjoyable experience and were enabled to perform to their full capabilities. The moderating team is very grateful to all centres, teachers and candidates for their contribution to the moderation process allowing it to run smoothly in the main.

Whilst some centres met the required deadlines for submitting both the majority of marks and seasonal activities, there were also a lot of centres which missed them, thus delaying the moderation process. It is important that all centres make note of the key dates and adhere to them in the future. The dates are 15th March for the majority of marks and 15th May for summer activities..

Only activities that appear on the summer activity list can be submitted on the later date. It is important to note that COACHING and OFFICIATING, regardless of the sport, are NOT classed as summer activities and thus all marks for these should be submitted by 15th March along with all other activities.

Moderators again involved centre staff in the moderation visits by asking them to do some assessment for each activity on the day. This is an important part of the process as it enables staff to assess candidates from different centres and enhances overall understanding of both the process and the standard of performance.

It is a requirement of the course that centres attend moderation where requested. Live moderations allow for improved feedback from moderators, provide the opportunity to compare moderation performances across groups from different centres, and assist in getting viable numbers in team activities. Whilst filmed evidence is a valuable tool in the moderation process, our aim is still for moderation to be undertaken primarily by visit wherever possible and centres should be prepared to attend moderation each year between 15 March and 15 May, as part of their planning and delivery of the course. It is also worth noting that the moderation model is based upon grouping centres together, not individual centre visits. From time to time, single centre moderations take place due to extenuating circumstances, however, they are not available on request and centres should expect to participate in group moderations organised by their moderator.

For the Analysing Lifestyle and Analysing Performance tasks, 'Task Research booklets' and marking grids are available to help and support centres in their marking of the assessments. Teachers are strongly advised to use them so that better feedback can be provided by moderators. The marking grids enable the moderator to better understand where teachers have awarded marks to candidates for the tasks.

As with previous series, centres, in the main, proved to be accurate in their assessments of practical activities especially those seen at live moderations. Where an adjustment to centres' marks was deemed necessary, this was often as a result of the Analysing Lifestyle and Analysing Performance tasks or due to lack of internal standardisation, often involving off-site activities, coaching and officiating. There are still a significant number of arithmetical and administrative errors in the paperwork from some centres. These were identified and corrected by moderators. **Centres are advised that there are interactive versions of forms on the**

OCR website that perform the calculations and thus can reduce the risk of errors.

Whichever format is used when completing paperwork, it is vital that centres double-check before submitting to minimise the risk of candidates receiving incorrect marks.

It is a concern that at moderations there were a number of instances where candidates did not wear appropriate clothing and equipment for the activities in which they were performing, such as hockey players not having gum shields or shin pads. The use of appropriate clothing and equipment is in the interests of candidates' safety and centres should be aware that the teacher accompanying candidates is responsible for their health and safety during moderation. It should also be noted that candidates not in possession of the correct clothing and equipment at moderation may be denied the opportunity to participate if it is unsafe for them to do so, and would therefore be deemed to be absent from the moderation.

It is vital that centres regularly access the GCSE Physical Education section of the OCR website in order to keep up to date with developments in the materials provided to support the assessment of the qualification. OCR is always working to improve the support to centres after every series of the GCSE full course specification and in response to feedback from centres and moderators. There is an onus on centres to keep up to date with these developments by accessing the website regularly.

It is also advisable that centres read not only this report, but the one from the moderator to ensure that the suggested improvements are carried out in future series to improve standards.

Practical activities

Candidates were assessed in a wide range of activities this year, and centres continue to deliver new activities allowing for greater flexibility and choice and more of these are being seen at live moderations.

A number of centres applied for additional activities via the special activity submission process, details of which can be found at the GCSE Physical Education section of the OCR website. Centres are reminded that any special activity submission only applies to the year of the assessment and must be re-applied for in any subsequent series. The deadline for all submissions is 15 October of the academic year in which assessment of the activity will take place.

Games activities from the 'invasion', 'striking' and 'net/wall' categories were predominant among the activities submitted by candidates, and in general these were accurately assessed by most centres, with good evidence of effective internal standardisation within these activities.

With off-site activities, Rounders, Coaching, Officiating and Resistance Training, some centres were less accurate in their assessments. It is vital when assessing candidates in these activities that the activity specification is carefully checked, and that if outside assessors, who specialise in the activity are used, there is liaison between them and the staff at the centre. It is also important that internal standardisation processes encompass these activities as well as coaching and officiating. Effective internal standardisation ensures comparability and fairness for all candidates across all activities and assessments within the cohort at the centre.

It is also to be noted that although external awards such as the Duke of Edinburgh and Life Guarding awards can be used as a guide into which band the candidate may be placed, the GCSE Physical Education criteria are NOT the same as for the award and thus they need to meet the requirements as laid out in the guidance and not just pass the award. If offering Resistance Training, please also note the requirements for the number and variety of exercises required, otherwise, if criteria are not fully met this can result in the activity having to be withdrawn by the candidate.

OCR Report to Centres – June 2014

Centres must note that in off-site activities all candidates being assessed need to be filmed and that in order to produce evidence which supports the marks awarded, this occurs in the appropriate environment. For example, evidence for a candidate assessed in Rock Climbing should show that they have been assessed over four different routes over at least two different rock faces. Candidates performing at levels 3, 4 and 5 may be assessed on indoor climbing walls. However, candidates performing at levels 1 and 2 should be assessed on natural, outdoor terrain. Filmed evidence in any activity must be long enough to show all the skills that would justify the marks awarded. It should relate to the assessment requirements of the activity and show the skills individually and in an appropriate environment or game situation. It is also vital that the candidate(s) depicted in the evidence are clearly identifiable so that performances can be linked to the marks awarded.

Resistance Training, Coaching and Officiating must also be filmed and log books completed. If this evidence cannot be provided, this could result in the marks not being allowed to be submitted.

For all other activities which are assessed, while it is not necessary for all candidates to be filmed, a sample of footage showing the range of marks assessed (i.e. top, middle and bottom mark) should be retained. This includes swimming pool based activities which, with correct liaison and hiring of pools, is able to be filmed.

Filmed evidence sampled for Coaching/Leading showed progression within a session but often did not include progression over a period of time. Additional evidence such as coaching or officiating logs, resistance training programmes and hill walking route cards was variable in quality and in many cases did not relate well to the mark the candidate had been given. Some centres have provided above and beyond the required evidence for these activities, whilst others provided very little evidence. Centres need to be aware of the full criteria for assessment in these activities and ensure they can provide evidence which justifies the candidates' marks.

Please also note that the context for officiating should be able to provide opportunities for assessing the effectiveness of the candidates. Suitable situations could be generated by candidates working with primary school children, candidates within their own centre, or youth groups. The assessment conditions should be as indicated in the criteria, with games officiated by candidates in the top two levels being played in full game conditions. These may, however, be organised within the centre, for example inter-form or inter-house fixtures but not as part of a PE lesson.

While the challenge presented by the requirement for centres to produce filmed evidence of practical performances is recognised, its importance cannot be over-stated. An ever-increasing range of activities is being assessed in GCSE Physical Education, with more and more assessments taking place off-site. Filmed evidence is therefore not only needed to allow moderators access to further assessments by the centre, in addition to those they are likely to see at moderation, but also to facilitate internal standardisation by the Physical Education department at the centre. Filmed evidence is also relied upon should a centre wish to instigate a review of their moderation outcomes following the publication of results.

Filmed evidence must be long enough to show ALL the skills that would justify the marks awarded. It should relate to the assessment requirements of the activity and show the skills individually and in an appropriate environment or game situation and not just them playing a game. It is also vital that the candidate(s) depicted are clearly identifiable so that performances can be linked to the marks awarded.

Centres are reminded that they should declare all activities being assessed on their Visit Arrangement Form (VAF) when it is submitted. If assessments in an activity not declared on the VAF are subsequently submitted, evidence such as filmed evidence and log books (if

OCR Report to Centres – June 2014

appropriate) will be called for to be moderated. Any activity declared must be made available if requested by the moderator.

Controlled Assessment - Analysis tasks

Further guidance and support, in the form of marking grids, research booklets and clarification of task induction have been provided and are available on the OCR website and in the updated Guide to Controlled Assessment.

In the main, most centres have used this guidance to improve their understanding and marking of the assessments, however, some of the most significant issues which moderators found with the approach taken to delivering and presenting the analysis tasks were as follows:

- The use of templates for the data collection, task production, or both. Templates are not allowed, and in many cases the approach taken showed why, as the templates were very prescriptive and meant that candidates were teacher-led in their approach to the task. It was therefore difficult on some occasions to know what the candidate understood about the task which they were undertaking, as much of the method and information had been provided for them.
- Not distinguishing between the 'task research/data collection' work and the 'task production' write-up. This made it difficult to see if time controls and resource controls had been adhered to. It is important that these two sections of the task are kept separate and clearly marked when submitted to the moderator. Please note that no part of the notes should be a prewritten attempt at the task and huge extracts should not be copied from the task research notes as this is deemed to be malpractice. **The task research has to be included alongside the task production write up in the sample sent to the moderator, too often it was omitted.**
- Adherence to resource controls. Linked to the point above, candidates should not have access to resources which can be cut and pasted into their 'task production' write-up. Pictures should not be embedded within the work but can be included in appendices and referred to within the work. Any word processed research notes or data collection should be printed off and the hard copies used in the 'task production' stage, as per the Guide to Controlled Assessment. Candidates should either reproduce charts, tables, diagrams, etc. in their final write-up within the 2 hours allowed if they wish to include them, but a better use of their time is to cross reference to those included in their research notes/data collection. Where no distinction was made between the two stages of the work, it was impossible to know at what stage some of these resources had been used.
- Candidates need to be aware of the need to reference fully any material taken from an external source which they use within their tasks; in some instances candidates used no referencing system and included no bibliography. Guidance on how to reference is available on the Joint Council for Qualifications website as part of their support for the delivery of controlled assessments.

B452 Analysing Lifestyle task

In many cases, centres produced good work that had been accurately marked. Good pieces of Analysing Lifestyle work were ones which selected subjects for analysis where there were weaknesses to improve, such as parents who had poor lifestyles in terms of diet, smoking, work/exercise balance and did not participate in much physical activity. Choosing young, relatively fit and active fellow PE students did not always allow scope for many weaknesses to be found and thus improved. In choosing an appropriate subject, candidates were able to look at improving a range of aspects of a healthy balanced lifestyle and not just fitness aspects, which limited the amount of analysis that could be done in some of the work seen for this task.

Where candidates chose to analyse themselves, this was accomplished with varying degrees of success. While some pieces of self-analysis were very good, there is still a tendency for candidates to ignore data/evidence collected and allow their own perceptions to dominate their approach to the task, whereas when observing and analysing a third party, they tend to be more objective in their work. This should be kept in mind for the 'task induction' and options in terms of subject choice should be discussed ahead of the task being conducted.

In cases where centres had over-marked this aspect of the unit, some of the main issues were as follows.

1. Candidates focusing too much (and sometimes solely) on fitness rather than a range of aspects of a healthy, active lifestyle as indicated in the marking criteria.
2. There was not enough detail presented in the action plans; some just made brief recommendations after comments made about a lifestyle aspect without any progression over the period and had not produced an action plan as such.
3. Irrelevant theory included, such as descriptions of fitness tests.
4. No methods of measuring success/progress of the action plan suggested.
5. There was no distinction between the task research/data collection (which is not awarded marks directly) and the task production.
6. Candidates not referencing work which they have quoted.
7. Some centres still produced centre-led writing/collection of data frameworks or templates, which actually hindered candidates as sometimes they did not cover all criteria required.

Centres should note that the task research/data collection should not be a pre-written attempt at the task production, and that the guidance refers to:

- observations (including data collected);
- headings;
- analysing lifestyle or analysing performance action plan/ideas;
- brief quotes and reference details;
- reference details for sources/ideas to use in task production.

In some instances, candidates had produced either an entire first draft of the final piece of work, or substantial paragraphs or pieces of written prose which were then simply copied into the task production piece of work. This does not reflect the guidance, or the purpose of the task research/data collection stage of the analysis tasks and it is important that all concerned are aware that this is not allowed.

B454 Analysing Performance task

The Analysing Performance written task was again completed much better than previous series' and more consistently marked than Analysing Lifestyle. The best pieces of Analysing Performance work were again ones where candidates had chosen weaker performers and thus had many skills to analyse and on which to produce an action plan. In the main, candidates who completed the action plan accessed marks more readily because they actually had results, rather than subjective comments about what they might expect to see, which were quite often vague and superficial. Completing the action plan also meant that they had first hand experiences of what the issues were with them and could make more informed comments as to how it could be improved.

In cases where centres had over-marked this aspect of the unit, some of the main issues were:

1. Some candidates still concentrated on fitness improvements and not on skills as the criteria state. This caused issues as work on fitness could often not be given credit and thus caused a reduction in marks. In some activities, such as dance or gymnastics, credit was given for action plans based on fitness, if, when completed, it would improve a skill that was a weakness, and the link between the fitness component and the performance of the specific skill was made explicit. For example, if the skill weakness was that the subject did not have enough extension in their handstand, and thus an action plan to improve flexibility was designed and completed it meant that the quality of the handstand was improved, then the relevance of the action plan to performance was clearly shown.

The key aspects which are being assessed, and for which marks can be awarded, are:

- Key Skills evident in the chosen activity;
 - Skill strengths and weaknesses of the performance and their impact on the game;
 - Targeting/prioritising weaknesses for improvement;
 - Action plan with progressive practices and a timeframe;
 - Criteria to measure improvements;
 - Results from implementing the action plan (see comment 3, below);
 - Evaluate how to improve the action plan.
2. Although not as prevalent as in previous years, candidates are still using their 'task production' time to reproduce diagrams for practices, and included material of limited relevance such as the rules of the game. A much better use of time is to include all these in their task research notes in an appendix and then refer to them within the task production.
 3. Candidates did not explain how they arrived at the strengths and weaknesses about which they then wrote. Some type of observational check sheet/form would benefit candidates in a) working out what the strengths and weaknesses are but also b) allowing them more scope to explain why they select the ones that they do for their action plan. Any such form must be devised by candidates, though, not supplied to them by the centre.
 4. It is not a requirement of the criteria for the action plans which have been proposed to be carried out. However, where candidates did not undertake the action plan, evaluation of the plan and how it could be improved was often very limited, given the absence of actual results. Where the action plan has not been undertaken, candidates should be encouraged to discuss expected results and to suggest ways to improve the action plan; first-hand knowledge gained by putting their plan into action is highly recommended where possible.

OCR Report to Centres – June 2014

5. Action plans lacked the detail required. Practices were not progressive, did not relate to the weaknesses identified with plans often lacking details of the way that the improvements would be measured i.e. skills tests that would be undertaken to show any improvements that have been made.

Administration

The majority of centres produce documentation which is completed accurately and submitted according to OCR submission dates. This makes the moderating team's work much easier, and centres are to be thanked for their hard work. However, as in previous years it is of great concern that there are often a number of errors in the documentation. These errors can seriously disadvantage candidates if they are not identified and corrected prior to the issue of results. Centres should note that errors generally fall into one or more of the following categories:

- Controlled Assessment Summary Forms should be completed in candidate number order, as per the MS1, whereas Order of Merits (completed for ALL activities including both the Analysing tasks) should be in rank order of marks.
- B452 rubric infringements – two activities in this unit must be from different categories;
- Arithmetical errors when adding up the figures on the Controlled Assessment Summary Form (CASF);
- Transcription errors when transferring marks from the Order of Merit sheets to the CASF sheet but more often when transferring marks from CASF sheet to the MS1 form.

Centres are requested and reminded to ensure that all documentation is thoroughly checked and that Order of Merit sheets are required for both Analysis of Lifestyle and Performance. A Centre Authentication form (CCS160) covering both unit B452 and B454 **must** be completed as well.

B453 Developing Knowledge in Physical Education

General Comments:

Centres are reminded that mark schemes are used as a basis for judgements and each examiner's professional judgement is used in finally deciding the marks awarded based on a rigorous standardisation procedure. A 'Levels of Response mark scheme' is used for the final question – Q25. The mark scheme for this question has a number of criteria separated into Levels. The Levels of Response mark scheme includes indicative content which is expected in answer to the question and it is this content which is taken into consideration when awarding marks. Each Level also includes a statement related to the quality of written communication. Examiners use ticks to indicate the number of marks given for questions 1 – 24.

This examination paper includes multiple choice questions which were answered well by most candidates. Candidates are advised to think carefully about each question rather than try to rush through these questions because some otherwise good scoring candidates, once again made careless errors on these questions. The weaker-answered multiple choice questions were questions 4, 5, 9 and 13. There was little evidence to suggest that candidates struggled to complete the paper within the time allowed.

As in previous series candidates often showed good knowledge but some were unable to apply that knowledge, for example applying aspects of the specification to participation or performance. Some candidates found it particularly difficult to give relevant practical examples when asked.

Comments on individual questions

Question 16

Many candidates scored well for this question and showed a good understanding of the long-term effects of exercise on muscles. The question does require a description and those candidates who simply gave a list of single responses scored few, if any, marks.

Question 17

The better candidates for this question described fartleck training well and gave two clear description points. Others repeated the same point related to changes in pace when undertaking this type of training. The best candidates then went on to identify clearly two separate points related to fartleck improving fitness.

Question 18

Some candidates seemed to misread this question and gave an explanation linked to increased, rather than reduced funding. The better candidates gave full explanations with at least six separate points to gain the full six marks.

Question 19

The candidates who were successful in this question had seemed to have revised fully the roles of the agonist, antagonist and synergist terms and were able to describe these using a practical example for each. Some candidates clearly knew the roles of each but did not give practical examples and therefore lost valuable marks. Candidates are reminded that when a question asks for a practical example then the examiner is seeking to test the application of knowledge. It is this application of knowledge that is often not shown by weaker candidates in particular, or for some, it is simply reading the question carefully to assess exactly what is required.

Question 20

Many candidates produced excellent responses showing a good understanding of the circuit training method of training. The best candidates clearly described two features of circuit training and then went on to explain how they would use the key principles of training when planning circuit training.

Question 21

The better candidates were able to describe two organisations, other than the IOC and the BOA, although some included these organisations in their answer and lost marks. Some candidates could name appropriate organisations but did not describe how they seek to promote participation in physical activities.

Question 22

This question showed that candidates either knew about cartilage, and scored full marks, or knew little thus scoring few or no marks. Candidates should note that when four marks are available for a descriptive question, examiners normally require four separate valid points in order to award the marks available. Those candidates who did not visit both structure and function were unable to access the total amount of marks available.

Question 23

Many candidates could recall the meaning of the acronym SMART for goal setting but the remaining marks were only accessible if the candidate gave a practical example for each part. The question clearly asks for a practical example for each and those candidates who gave examples for each element of the SMART principle gained full marks.

Question 24

Most candidates gave a valid practical example for extrinsic feedback but many did not give more than one other valid point regarding the use of different types of feedback that might motivate participants. The best candidates used knowledge of results, positive and negative feedback, and knowledge of performance in their answers.

Question 25

This question included the variables of an explanation of reducing risks, outdoor activities and practical examples. Those candidates who read the question carefully and addressed each of these variables did well. Those who reached the top level, gave a variety of examples of how to reduce the risk of injuries, for example protective clothing/equipment, checking equipment and the correct use of a warm up. These good candidates developed each point to state how each might reduce the risk and gave different practical examples. The weaker candidates gave scant information or did not address each of the variables stated in the question. This question also assesses the quality of written communication and some candidates struggled to express themselves clearly and accurately whilst some simply wrote notes which lacked fluency and development.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2014

