OCR
RECOGNISING ACHIEVEMENT

GCSE

Design & Technology (Industrial Technology)

General Certificate of Secondary Education **GCSE J304**

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course) **GCSE J044**

Report on the Units

June 2010

J044/J304/R/10

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, 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 syllabus 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.

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education
Design and Technology (Industrial Technology) (J304)

General Certificate of Secondary Education
Design and Technology (Industrial Technology) (Short Course) (J044)

REPORTS ON THE UNITS

Unit/Content	Page
Chief Examiner's Report	1
A541 Intro to designing and making	5
A542 Sustainable design	8
A542 Sustainable design	8
A544 Technical aspects of design and making	11

Chief Examiner's Report

This report provides an overview of the work seen in the written examination Units 2 and 4 and the Controlled Assessment Units 1 and 3, for candidates who took the examination during this series. It precedes a more detailed report to centres from each subject area within the Innovator Suite and highlights general issues that have occurred across the suite of specifications.

This report has been prepared by the Chief Examiner, Assistant Chief Examiners, Principal Examiners and Principal Moderators and covers all specifications within the Innovator Suite. It should be read in conjunction with the examination papers, the mark schemes, and the marking criteria for assessment given in the specification booklets.

This is the second examination series in the first year for the new Innovator Suite.

An important point for teachers to remember about the Terminal Rule in relation to this suite of specifications and re-sits:
The terminal rule is a QCDA requirement. Candidates must be entered for at least two units out of the four (full course) at the time that they certificate. ie the end of the course.
Please be aware that the QCDA rule states that marks scored for terminal units will be the marks used in the calculation of candidate grades. Therefore, if one of the candidate's terminal units is a re-sit and the mark is poorer than the original mark, the poorer mark will be used to calculate the final grade for that candidate.
Obviously, the terminal unit marks are then added to the highest marks scored in the other units making up the certificate.

Teachers are reminded that it is also a requirement of QCDA that candidates are now credited for their accurate use of spelling, punctuation and grammar across all four units.

It is pleasing to see that centres and candidates have responded well to the new style of examination approach, especially when the nature of the work between subject areas within the suite is so varied. Centres are to be commended for this.

WRITTEN EXAMINATION - UNITS 2 AND 4

Unit 2 - For this examination series of the new GCSE Innovator suite entries were seen from all six subject specialisms:

A512 Electronic and Systems Control
A522 Food Technology
A532 Graphics
A542 Industrial Technology
A562 Resistant Materials
A572 Textile Technology

The overall performance and range of results for Unit 2 varied considerably. Many of the candidates demonstrated a general awareness of the main points and issues linked to sustainable design, but often failed to answer in sufficient depth to gain high marks.
In **Unit 2 - Section A** of the papers most candidates across the suite attempted to answer some of the questions, some candidates however did give 'no response' (NR) answers. Candidates need to be encouraged to give an answer for the multiple choice style of questions even if they are uncertain that they are correct.

With reference to Section A of the paper it was noticeable that;

- At times, candidates had not read the instructions correctly and centres would benefit from explaining the correct examination procedures and requirements to the candidates.
- Candidates need to be able to identify signs and symbols in particular giving information about materials, products and safety issues in relation to environmental and design issues.
- Candidates must take greater care when circling their answers in Section A. They should not circle more than one answer and completely clear incorrect circles to eradicate confusion in marking.

Unit 2 - Section B of the papers showed more varied responses and teachers need to ensure that they read the subject specific reports for further detailed feedback on specific issues and individual question performance. Many candidates did manage to use subject specific 'terms' in their answers, but at times these lacked sufficient depth and tended to be generally weak. Occasionally candidate answers were merely taken from the question itself and care needs to be taken here. For example, where two reasons or an explanation was required the same point was made twice with slight word variation.

Candidates need to be made aware of the importance of the wording for each question and have struggled to answer specific questions in regards to 'explain' or 'describe'. Many candidates did not score marks on these questions, because they gave a list of unrelated points instead of developing one of these.

The questions marked with an asterisk * provided candidates with an opportunity to give a detailed written answer combining good subject knowledge with an ability to produce a structured response. The range of responses varied considerably in the specific subject areas and it is advisable that guidance is sought from the subject report within this document.

Hand writing, at times, was difficult to decipher and candidates need to be prepared to make an effort with their hand writing, particularly on the banded mark question * and questions requiring a detailed explanation or discussion of points.
Centres are reminded that candidates are marked on spelling, punctuation and grammar on the banded mark scheme question. It is also important to note here that candidates need to ensure that they write legibly and within the areas set out on the papers.

Unit 4 - For this examination series of the new GCSE Innovator suite entries were seen from the following subject specialisms:

A514 Electronic and Systems Control
A524 Food Technology
A534 Graphics
A544 Industrial Technology
A564 Resistant Materials

On the whole candidates responded well to this Unit across the suite of subjects, with very few questions showing 'no response' (NR), which was encouraging. Candidates should be reminded that it is always better to attempt an answer, rather than leave a blank space with a guaranteed zero.

It is still apparent this series that candidates need to be practiced in examination technique; reading the questions carefully, responding to the instructions given in the questions and having an awareness of the full range of question formats.

All candidates seemed to have sufficient time to complete the paper and were able to access most parts of all the questions, which is encouraging.

Centres are to be reminded that questions marked with an **asterisk*** provide candidates with the opportunity to give detailed written answers combining good subject knowledge with an ability to produce structured, coherent responses. This type of question format still requires practice, although candidate performance was much improved this series.

CONTROLLED ASSESSMENT – Units 1 and 3

This series has seen portfolios for all subject areas being submitted both through postal and repository pathways. Most centres have been prompt in the dispatch of documentation to OCR and moderators, which is to be commended.

In general, centres have been successful in applying the marking criteria for both Units 1 and 3. However, it was noticeable that some candidates were being awarded full marks for work that lacked rigour and depth of analysis. Words highlighted on the marking criteria grids such as 'appropriate', 'fully evaluated', 'detailed' and 'critical', which appear in the top mark band, were not always adhered to.

Centres are reminded to apply the mark scheme on a 'best fit' basis. For each of the marking criteria, one of the descriptors provided in the marking grid, that most closely describes the quality of the work being marked, should be selected. Marks should be positive, rewarding achievement rather than penalising failure or omissions.

It was noticeable this series that a significant proportion of portfolios, particularly for Unit 1, resembled the legacy format. Care must be taken here to ensure that the marking criteria and format for the Innovator Suite is not confused with the legacy approach.

It is important that centres encourage candidates to organise the portfolio according to the different marking criteria strands as it enables the candidates to produce work that clearly shows an understanding of the controlled assessment requirements. Portfolios should be clearly labelled with the Candidate and Centre name and number, with the Unit code and title also evident. (*Specification - 5.3.5 Presentation of work*.) This is particularly important when the Centre submits work via the OCR Repository, where individual files are used to store portfolio work. Centres need to ensure that candidates clearly label each file using the marking criteria section headings; this facilitates a more effective completion of the moderation process.

Centres are also reminded to ensure that the OCR cover sheet is evident on each portfolio of work, outlining the theme and the starting point chosen by the candidate.

Many candidates included a bibliography or referenced their research sources, which was pleasing to see. It is good practice to ensure that candidates acknowledge sources of information used for the development of their portfolio work.

There was still some evidence this series of strong teacher guidance influencing candidate portfolios. Where this was evident it greatly hampered the candidate's ability to show flair and creativity, and therefore achieve the higher marks. Centres should avoid the over-reliance on writing frames for candidates work. It is essential that candidates have the opportunity to show flair and creativity in the way they approach the various aspects of these units.

Centres are to be reminded that the '*controlled assessment task must NOT be used as practice material and then as the actual live assessment material. Centres should devise their own practice material using the OCR specimen controlled assessment task as guidance.*' Specification - Section 5.2.2 Using Controlled Assessment Tasks.

It was noticeable this series that some candidate's failed to provide any visual evidence of practical work within their portfolio. Centres are reminded to ensure that candidates provide clear

photographic images in both portfolios for Units 1 and 3, particularly within the making and evaluation sections.

It was noticeable that where candidates had scored the high marks, they had used specialist terms appropriately and correctly and had presented their portfolio using a structured format.

Centres are to be commended on the amount of work produced for the portfolios in Units 1 and 3, which has been realistic in terms of the amount produced and the time allocated to this unit – 20 hours.

Unit 1 – specific areas of importance

Centres are to be reminded that Themes for Unit 1 are based around environmental awareness and sustainable resources/processes. Therefore, it is considered good practice for teachers to encourage candidates to consider Eco-design and sustainability when making decisions and combining skills with knowledge and understanding, in order to design and make a prototype product. This knowledge base also acts as a 'spring board' to active learning for Unit 2.

It was evident through the portfolio that candidates struggled with the critical evaluation section of the marking criteria. Unit 1 requires that the candidate evaluates the processes and subsequent modifications involved in the designing and making of the final prototype ONLY. Too many references were made to the performance of the prototype against the specification, which meant that candidates' marks were compromised. (Not applicable to Food Technology)

Unit 3 – specific areas of importance

Due to the low number of entries for this Unit specific guidance is limited. However, centres need to ensure that candidates complete a quality product for Unit 3. The weighting of marks available for the making section therefore, must be reflected in the time available for the candidates to complete a quality outcome.

A541 Intro to designing and making

General Comments

This has been the first occasion that candidates have been entered for this unit in the new 'Innovator' specification, and entries were particularly low. It is apparent that centres are 'feeling their way' with the new specification and taking advantage of the flexibility possible in the delivery and assessment of the individual units. A number of centres have already expressed a preference to treat the specification in a linear way, making entries for all four units at the end of the course. There is no prescribed or suggested approach to the delivery of the course, and centres are able to make their own decisions, based on their particular situations and knowledge of the cohorts.

Candidates' work will have been completed under 'Controlled Assessment' conditions for the first time, and it is important that centres apply the correct levels of control to the completion of the project. Work presented for assessment should represent 20 hours of input by the candidate, and must be completed in controlled conditions, under the direct supervision of centre staff. Centres are advised to allocate time to the various sections in proportion to the marks available for each section.

The writing frame approach was used by some centres and, whilst this can be a benefit to the less-able candidates, it should be used with care. All candidates should have the opportunity to show individuality in their approach to the work in all areas of the project, and this is particularly the case for higher ability candidates who may find writing frames restrictive.

In assessing candidates' work against the Assessment Criteria, it should be noted that the levels of response are banded into 'Basic ability', 'Demonstrates ability', and 'Works competently'. Centres should adopt a 'best-fit' approach in deciding the level of response given in each section of the work. It is quite possible that a candidate might perform better in some areas than others and could, for instance, be judged to 'Work competently' in the making section whilst only showing 'Basic ability' for critical evaluation. The mark appropriate to the candidate's work should be decided upon by considering the criteria within the chosen band in each individual section.

The standard of presentation of candidates' folders was disappointing in many cases and centres are advised to ensure that the 'Controlled Assessment' time is used to good effect in ensuring that candidates structure and present their work in a clear, concise and logical way. Although none of the centres with candidate entries in this unit presented 'e-portfolios', either on disk or on the OCR Repository, some made particularly good use of digital photographs within the folders. The minimum requirement is for two clear photographs of the finished prototype, but photographic evidence should also be provided in the 'Making' section of the project. Centres need to ensure that all photographs presented are of sufficient size and quality to clearly show the required detail.

Paper portfolios should be securely bound down the left-hand side when sent for moderation, with a Controlled Assessment Cover Sheet attached to the front of the folder. Most centres added comments to the cover sheet indicating where marks had been awarded, and this was most helpful in the moderation process. Centres are reminded that, in addition to the Controlled Assessment Cover Sheet, the MS1 mark sheet, CSF summary form, and CCS160 authentication form must all be sent to the moderator with the sample of work.

Performance in the individual sections.

Creativity
This section was not particularly well done, with most candidates scoring marks in the lower or middle band of the Assessment Criteria. Only a very small number of candidates were seen to have 'Worked competently' in the section, which was generally marked rather generously by centres.

Most candidates treated this section simply as 'Research' and provided information about existing products relating to the chosen theme. Although candidates identified technical details and principles of good design, these were often not related to users' needs and were rarely applied to the design of their prototype. Candidates should analyse products fully and summarise their findings in a way that allows them to apply the information 'creatively' to their design work. It is expected that candidates will collect information and initially analyse it outside of the controlled assessment time allocation, preparing the way for the final presentation of their findings, this being done under controlled conditions.

When assessing work in this section of the project, centres are advised to consider the work presented throughout the portfolio initially, in order to establish whether the candidate has applied the work done in this section to subsequent designing and making.

Designing
This was the most disappointing section of almost every portfolio seen, as the standard of presentation was generally quite low, and was often particularly poor.

All candidates presented a specification in some form, but these were often included with the work in the creativity section and were very basic. A number of specifications seen were quite generic and produced from a set of prescribed points. The specification presented should demonstrate an appropriate response to the given design brief, and be seen to result from analysis of the brief and the information summarised in the previous section.

All candidates used freehand sketching to present initial design ideas, but sketches were mostly of poor quality, with many being very simplistic 2D drawings. Only one centre made use of CAD packages to produce better quality drawings and, in the case of some candidates, rendered 3D images of final designs.

Modelling was used by a number of candidates in the development of their design ideas, although in most cases the modelling was rather limited and served little purpose. Whilst modelling is an appropriate strategy to use in developing design ideas, candidates should consider the time taken to make them and balance this against their value in meeting the Assessment Criteria for the section.

Making
All candidates produced an outcome of some sort, but the lower achieving candidates often failed to complete the assembly of their prototype.

Only the higher achieving candidates presented any real evidence of planning in their portfolio, and a number of candidates appeared to confuse the 'planning' and 'recording key stages' elements. Presentation was again very limited in many cases, although the better candidates did present plans in tabular form, with some detail of what would be required at stages in the making.

Traditionally, candidates for Industrial Technology have worked only in metals or plastics, but it is accepted that prototypes will be made in whichever 'resistant' material is suitable. The only limiting factor is that the prototype must be capable of being tested for function when complete,

and this does allow for the use of wood-based materials in the making section if they are appropriate.

All the work carried out in the making of the prototypes was of a 'traditional' nature, with no centres following the CAM route at this stage.
It should be pointed out that fine finishing details are not required in the production of the prototype, and centres should encourage candidates to consider the time factor carefully before applying any 'finishing touches'.

The final element in the making section is vital to the success of any submission of work for postal moderation. Candidates are required to record the key stages in the making of the prototype, presenting photographic evidence and comprehensive notes relating to the processes carried out.

The higher achieving candidates produced a 'making diary' to present this to best effect, often in tabular form with digital photographs imported into the table. It would be tempting to present a very large number of photographs showing every step taken here, but attention is drawn to the requirement for the photographs to be of sufficient size and quality to show important details clearly.

A number of lower achieving candidates attempted to produce a making diary using sketches and brief notes, but this was particularly unsuccessful, and the importance of photographic evidence cannot be stressed too highly.

Critical evaluation
Almost all candidates that attempted this section carried out a 'traditional' evaluation of the prototype, rather than an evaluation of the processes use in designing and making.
Although the prototype must be capable of being tested, that testing is not the basis for any evaluation.

Candidates should consider the processes they have used in the designing and making sections of the portfolio and comment on their suitability and success. They should then make suggestions as to how improvements might be made in the designing and making sections. An example of this could be how the application of CAD might help in the presentation of designs, or how the prototype might be made quicker by using different materials or processes.

It should be pointed out that this section of the portfolio is used to assess the candidate's 'Quality of Written Communication', and the use of specialist terms and correct spelling, punctuation and grammar must also be taken into account when applying the Assessment Criteria.

A542 Sustainable design

General Comments

The majority of candidates performed well on Section A & all candidates were able to access most parts of Section B. A significant number of candidates exhibited a sound knowledge across the whole range of questions which was pleasing & demonstrated an excellent understanding of sustainable issues.

Section A

Question 1
Virtually all candidates gave the correct answer as recycling.

Question 2
Virtually all candidates gave the correct answer as mild steel.

Question 3
A majority of candidates were able to name strength as a property of a material.

Question 4
A majority of candidates stated casting as the correct answer.

Question 5
Virtually all candidates gave the correct answer as – appearance of a product.

Question 6
This question was not so well answered and some candidates did not offer any response at all. However, a significant number of candidates gave the correct answer which was smart materials.

Question 7
This question generally was not well answered, but nevertheless a significant number responded correctly – smart materials.

Question 8
Nearly all candidates gave the correct answer as electricity.

Question 9
A majority of candidates gave the correct answer which was ergonomics. However, several candidates put anthropometrics which was not correct.

Question 10
A significant number of candidates correctly explained what geothermal energy is.

The majority of candidates answered the following true or false questions correctly.

Question 11
Using recycled materials is good for the environment.

Question 12
Insulating a house will save on energy costs.

Question 13
Oil is a renewable energy source.

Question 14
Single use disposable products are good for the environment.

Question 15
The Fair Trade Foundation is committed to tackling poverty and injustice through trade.

Section B

Question 16
(a) This question required reference to technological advances such as the development of efficient electric motors. A significant number of candidates answered correctly though many candidates simply identified that the car could run on petrol or diesel, and for this no mark was awarded.

(b) This question concerned environmental pressures influencing the design of car B. It was generally well answered & most candidates gave two good responses.

(c) This question asking for two advantages of car A was well answered with maximum marks being achieved by the vast majority of candidates.

(d) Nearly all candidates could give one good reason why globalization benefits a multinational company. However, two good responses were only achieved by the higher scoring candidates.

(e) The majority of candidates gave two good reasons why globalization benefited a country where products are manufactured.

(f) Most candidates performed well on this question and there was a good understanding of how globalization affects the carbon footprint of a company.

(g) Very few candidates answered this correctly and most described Fair Trade rather than the Ethical Trading Initiative.

Question 17
(a) The majority of candidates had a reasonably good understanding regarding the purpose of packaging.

(i) Most candidates were able to identify at least one reason why packaging is important to a manufacturer.

(ii) Most candidates were able to identify two good reasons why packaging is important to a retailer.

(iii) Most candidates were able to identify at least one good reason why packaging is important to a consumer.

(b) Certain candidates produced an excellent discussion about how designers could reduce the environmental impact of different types of packaging. However, the majority of candidates achieved the middle band marks of three or four as their discussion did not bring in a range of different points or enough reference to the 6Rs.

Question 18

(a) Candidates that responded with reference to the 6Rs scored well on this question and successfully identified positive and negative aspects of the three containers. A small number of candidates made little or no reference to the 6Rs and consequently were unable to score well. The three types of container were:

(i) Glass bottle.
(ii) Card carton.
(iii) HDPE bottle:

(b) Most candidates were able to gain at least one mark on this question for identifying a way in which fashion has influenced the design of mobile phones. However, very few candidates scored full marks.

(c) Most candidates had a reasonable grasp regarding how technological advances have influenced the design of bicycles. However, answers were sometimes superficial, and terms such as lightweight should be qualified by reference back to developments of new materials.

(d) Most candidates were able to explain at least one or two environmental pressures that have influenced the design of houses. However, only the most able candidates were able to answer in enough depth to achieve the third mark.

A544 Technical aspects of design and making

General comments

This has been the first occasion that candidates have entered for this unit in the new 'Innovator' specification and entries were low.
It is most important that candidates read through the question paper carefully before attempting to answer questions. It should be pointed out that the examination allows ample time for candidates to fully answer all of the questions in an appropriate manner.
Where a question requires candidates to produce a sketch as part of the response, it is important that the sketch is clear and suitably annotated to allow clear interpretation by the examiner.
Questions marked with an asterisk * provide candidates with the opportunity to give detailed answers, combining good subject knowledge with the ability to produce structured, coherent responses. (Quality of Written Communication)

Comments on specific questions

Section A

1 (a) It was disappointing to see how few candidates were able to identify these basic measuring and marking-out tools. In some cases even the scriber and try square were incorrectly named, and the scribing block (surface gauge) was not recognized by a single candidate.
Marks were awarded for correctly giving the use of the tools, even if their names were not given.

(b) This question was quite well answered, with most candidates being able to give at least one reason why a centre punch should be used to mark the centre of a hole before drilling.

(c) Only the more able candidates attempted this question with any degree of success, and a number of candidates gave no response at all. In some cases compasses were suggested as being suitable for marking the circle onto the piece of 3mm thick mild steel.

2 (a) The majority of candidates answered this question well, with many gaining full marks. The most popular safety precautions given related to the use of goggles and guards, but covering loose clothing and providing a safe working environment were also mentioned.

(b) Responses to this question were very disappointing and few candidates scored well. In some cases, candidates had misread the question and included stages relating to making the hook, whereas the question required them to give the stages of brazing the hooks in place.

(c) This question required the candidates to sketch a jig, and responses to it were varied. The over-simplistic response of bending the hook over a block in a vice appeared quite often and few candidates scored more than half marks on this question. The standard of sketches produced often made it quite difficult for examiners to interpret the jig being shown.

3 (a) A considerable number of candidates failed to give the correct response of ‘high impact polystyrene’ for this question, and there were some very interesting and inventive suggestions as to what HIPS actually stands for.

(b) Most correct responses to this question related to the ease of producing the required shape, with others mentioning the ability to repeat the shape in batch production.

(c) Responses to this question were generally of rather poor quality, with sketches being particularly unclear and often not annotated. A 'benefit of doubt' mark was given where the sketch suggested a draft angle on the mould, even if this was not labelled.

(d) Few candidates scored full marks on this question about the vacuum forming process, and the various stages were frequently not in the correct order. No mark s were awarded if the candidate had failed to include the stage of heating the plastic to soften it.

(e) The majority of candidates failed to score on this question, as their responses suggested that they were not familiar with the principles of rapid prototyping. Candidates who did attempt the question most often simply referred to making a prototype quickly on a CAM machine.

4 **(a)** Candidates' knowledge of plastics and plastics manufacturing was quite limited in many cases, with few answering both parts (i) and (ii) correctly.

(b) This question was generally well answered, with most candidates gaining full marks by correctly identifying two advantages to the user of the kettle shown.

(c) Most candidates demonstrated some knowledge of ergonomics, but many responses were simply descriptive, and did not gain the full mark for an explanation.

(d)* It was apparent that the majority of candidates had no real understanding of the principles of 'end of life disposal' of products, and those that attempted this question simply made unsupported comments relating to recycling. This question also assessed the candidate's 'Quality of written communication', allowing marks to be gained even if technical knowledge was not evident.

.

5 **(a)** Knowledge of industrial processes was again shown to be limited, and the correct response of 'extrusion' was very rarely seen.

(b) Explanations relating to batch production were generally quite weak, with very little reference being made to such details as repeated accuracy, cost of tooling and regular orders. A single mark was awarded where candidates had made reference to 'batch size'.

(c) There were some good answers to this design question, but often the limiting factor was the quality of the sketching in the response. In a number of cases the solution presented involved changing the position of the top rail in relation to the uprights, and this was accepted as a perfectly satisfactory approach.

(d)* Most candidates were able to identify benefits of 'flat-pack' manufacture, and responses relating to both the manufacturer and the user were accepted. The lower achieving candidates presented their responses in the form of simplistic statements or bullet-points, a structured response being needed for the higher marks in this 'quality of written communication' question.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)
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