

**ALIGNMENT WITH CFE:** extent to which assessment tasks reflect CfE Experiences, Outcomes and the four capacities, as appropriate to each age and stage. **(Positive feedback)**

### **ABERDEEN**

I am a Primary 1 teacher. The numeracy was alright and did reflect some of the benchmarks.

### **ABERDEENSHIRE**

Ok.

Numeracy – ok.

This was reasonably adequate.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

### **ARGYLL & BUTE**

Numeracy was fine. Reading appropriate and matched professional judgement. Writing was not appropriate and did not match expectations.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

I felt the numeracy one was a reasonably good reflection of the CfE outcomes at Early Level.

### **DUMFRIES & GALLOWAY**

[two sentences redacted – out of scope]

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

From discussion with learners, and analysing questions / outcomes in the SNSAs after the assessments had taken place, I would say that they are matched to the CfE Es and Os.

I feel the P1 Maths SNSA links very well the CfE Es and Os.

Numeracy was appropriate and reflected aspects of the curriculum within maths and numeracy.

I thought they aligned well to CfE although I still have reservations about computerised tests as it does not allow children the opportunity to miss something out, think about it and go back or, indeed, to check their answers when they have finished.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

Ok but didn't link too closely.

The numeracy was as expected, and the children coped well.

## **EAST AYRSHIRE**

I thought most of the content was age appropriate except the passages in the literacy.

The P1 numeracy task was appropriate and aligned with Es and Os.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

Seemed to match for the level of my class but not so much for the younger stages.

Reflects level & Es & Os to some extent. Don't think it suited p1 to use ICT as they require good ICT skills.

## **EAST DUNBARTONSHIRE**

Some areas covered with regards to reading.

## **EAST LOTHIAN**

It is okay, but numeracy seemed heavily focussed on measure, data handling and time - calendar focus. Literacy had a good mix, but the reading passages were very long.

Generally, well aligned to CfE.

I think the tasks were linked to experiences and outcomes but not so much to four capacities.

## **EAST RENFREWSHIRE**

I thought they fitted in quite well with levels and provided a range of questions. Maths in particular for P1 was very visual and interactive.

## **EDINBURGH**

The tests were very good and linked well. However the hummingbird question in the p1 literacy was far too difficult. Also, the length of the literacy.

Seemed okay.

Appropriate for numeracy.

## **FALKIRK**

There is a limited correlation between the elements.

Gives snapshot to learning.

There was certainly relevance in the tasks, but maybe not the breadth of coverage which pupils cover and certainly some contexts appeared outwith pupil experiences.

Reflects what children are being taught although the hummingbird passage was very difficult for P1 to read independently.

[two sentences redacted – out of scope]

Yes, the tests were well matched to the levels of CfE. [one sentence redacted – out of scope].

A lot of the assessments were aligned with benchmarks. The numeracy assessment was very context-based, focus was all on application.

I think that the assessments are set at CfE levels. The children can work individually on the tasks with minimal input from adults.

## **FIFE**

Think it covered the areas well. Broad spectrum of questions and the way that the results were accumulated at the end gave a clear understanding of the areas of CfE that pupils still had to cover/learn.

[two sentences redacted – out of scope]

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

Fine.

Some questions seem a stretch too far but mostly the tests are compatible.

Ok.

These seemed to align well; though the member of staff who attended the training for SNSA could not find a way to easily collate and interpret the data.

The reading and numeracy assessment were reasonably okay for first level, but I think the writing was more difficult.

The content of the tests was appropriate, but I am testing pupils who have not reached the end of the First Level curriculum.

They are somewhat relevant.

I think they did reflect CFE experiences and were generally appropriate for each level apart from a few reading questions for P1 which I felt were far too hard.

## **GLASGOW**

I feel that the Numeracy test was a good fit and was aligned to the curriculum and benchmarks.

I felt only Numeracy was suitably matched.

Around 30% of the questions were aligned to CfE.

The maths assessment was appropriate to p1.

## **INVERCLYDE**

Numeracy was mostly relevant and asked questions which were in line with what was previously taught.

Reasonable, but most was work pupils had not done for a while, so were likely to forget.

Many of the tasks were useful and correlation to CfE was evident although it would have been preferable to see the actual Es &Os/benchmarks identified in each question. Some tasks were beyond the level taught.

Very limited connection with content and principles of CfE.

Numeracy was the most accurate. Literacy was at times, above level expectations.

## **NORTH AYRSHIRE**

Reasonably well.

## **NORTH LANARKSHIRE**

I think they did align to CfE for the most part but P1 test was too difficult.

## **PERTH & KINROSS**

Very appropriate.

[one paragraph redacted – out of scope]

The maths assessment was fine.

Vaguely reflects.

Well aligned.

## **SOUTH AYRSHIRE**

I found the writing assessment to be appropriate in the most part for First Level; however, some questions e.g. use ch consonant blend with ao vowel digraph to be very specific and a skill that not all children would have developed in their spelling skills. The numeracy assessment was almost perfectly aligned with the benchmarks I believe.

## **SOUTH LANARKSHIRE**

In the P1 assessments some of the tasks reflected the outcomes undertaken through this session.

From my experience the assessments were linked to some aspects of capacities but not to benchmarks

Tasks mostly reflect CfE but the context does not reflect the life experiences of the learners. Wording of questions can be vague, and, in some cases, the multiple-choice answers are too similar resulting in confusion.

Somewhat.

P1 maths was fine. [one paragraph redacted – out of scope]

## **WEST DUNBARTONSHIRE**

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

## **WEST LoTHIAN**

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

The maths test was appropriate. Questions provided enough challenge to let the more able shine.

**PRACTICAL DELIVERY:** extent to which SNSAs impacted on classroom management, deployment of additional support staff/ teachers and availability of ICT. **(Positive feedback)**

## **ABERDEENSHIRE**

Took up NCCT to administer P1 assessments. [one sentence redacted – out of scope]

ICT wasn't a problem. We used iPads as I had seen online comments stating these were more user friendly. I've only got 3 P1s so PSA time was available. Assessments were completed on iPads. I sat with each child individually during my NCCT. This was my choice in order to give my pupils a fair chance to negotiate the iPad. A logistical nightmare but DHT assisted when she was available.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope] However in a larger school this would have been more time consuming.

The impact was minimal and the SNSAs were achievable with the resources available to us.

School is lucky to have enough iPads across the school that we could administer the tests all at the same time. Children were given independent tasks to work on while everyone finished that particular test each day.

The assessments had a huge impact on P1 learning as children were unable to use ICT independently. Further up the school the impact was less as half a class at a time could sit the assessments. However it did impact the whole school as ICT equipment was unavailable for teaching and learning. Teaching staff were tied up completing the assessments and felt under pressure to complete the assessments. Fortunately the software worked well and when problems did occur there was support available.

Fortunately we have had a very good student teacher in school so have used some time out of class to complete these although otherwise I am unsure how these would have been arranged. The P1 tests were lengthy for many pupils and individuals required 1-1. To undertake we have required a full time member of staff to take almost 2 weeks to cover all levels. (3 classes)

Technology not a problem but with Maths it would have been better to have had sound as it was maths being tested not reading and to support children better more adult supervision would have been preferable.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope] P1 was a logistical nightmare and ridiculous in questions. It was of no benefit that I can see except in stressing staff if that was the goal!

## **ANGUS**

Completed on our class iPads rather than on a laptop/PC - much easier for younger children to handle. Support staff for small group intervention taken away for approximately 2 weeks in order to complete bulk of assessments.

Class teacher carried out assessments in NCT.

## **ARGYLL & BUTE**

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]. We have enough iPads for them all to complete at the same time & children are all technically able so no problems using technology. P1s were very tricky though! Lots accidentally double clicked & skipped questions & unable to go back. P1s went out with support assistant in pairs as they are not yet technically proficient enough to use the iPads on their own. Huge implications for staffing!

It was easy to get all pupils to sit the tests. We have 3 computer suites and we did not need any more additional support than we already had.

Meant that HT time was used for individual assessments as we are a one class school - so management time was lost over a three week period. ICT ok but worked on iPads much better than any other hardware so we need access to more of these to give an equal chance to children.

## **CLACKMANNANSHIRE**

Impact wasn't too severe but another inconvenience when we had already done Incas testing. Also did NGRTs. It also resulted in laptop timetable being suspended again for pupils.

## **DUMFRIES & GALLOWAY**

ICT was widely available due to being a large school. It was agreed that the computer suite would be used and that classes would use the laptops/netbooks available. SLT member was tasked to complete SNSAs with all 3 primary sector classes which took pressure off class teachers. This was helpful. However, after professional discussion with stage partner, I would say that some could be completed by the class teachers.

Not a problem for me re computers as I only have 7 P4s in a composite P3/4. Learning assistant and student teacher had to be used, one to one, to support all pupils as all receive additional support for learning. This was the reading of the question throughout all assessments and also the help to decode tricky words during the reading assessment as this would be the support that would be

usually given in class. Reading of the questions was a barrier to pupils to answer them.

No real issues. Pupils did not appear to be stressed about the process, but this was probably because I impressed upon them that they were not to worry, as the assessments they do for me will be much more informative for me and them.

The whole class did them at the same time in the class with myself and a learning assistant supervising. We were short of a few laptops so the children who didn't have one had to do accelerated reading until a computer became available for them to use.

It was possible to deliver the assessments with a minimum of disruption.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]; however I know that P1 assessments took a lot of time and manpower.

As all done at same time the depute and myself did our best with 32 pupils. ICT readily available and not an issue. The assessments were remarkably easy to set up and access, [one sentence redacted – out of scope]. Learning Assistants were deployed to support targeted individuals. Teachers administered assessments to remaining pupils, in pairs or small groups.

## **DUNDEE**

The process restricted access to our ICT suite for an extended period ... however this would not really have been necessary with a bit of good planning on management's part.

## **EAST AYRSHIRE**

[one sentence redacted – out of scope] P1 & P4 struggled to complete tests independently and lack of classroom assistants made this a difficult task.

Head teacher and a classroom assistant carried out the assessments in groups.

Thankfully we had new laptops and fast internet connection and enough staff led by a member of management enabling the experience to run smoothly.

## **EAST DUNBARTONSHIRE**

Anything like this is tricky to manage with a composite class. [two sentences redacted – out of scope] I am not, however, against computer delivery for this.

## **EAST LOTHIAN**

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]. P1 pupils found the assessments extremely difficult, and use of ICT added an extra layer of difficulty. P1 assessments were administered 1:1 which had an impact on staff.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]. P1 assessment needed one on one adult support to ensure the children could work the mouse and navigate the website.

## **EAST RENFREWSHIRE**

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]. For P1 additional teachers were used due to the challenges of administering the assessments, particularly the literacy.

All children managed to log on ok, no ICT issues. Tests were treated more like their lesson for the day. Tests done in groups so I could focus on the group doing the test while a member of management taught the rest of the class. At one point there was myself, a deputy head, a teacher that was on hand for technical support and two learning support teachers in my room. This felt like a huge waste of resources in some ways as they were all taken off timetable, impacting on several other classes.

Assessments were difficult to organise in a large school. Well run by SMT but disruption caused with pupils completing the three separate assessments. Some took longer than a period to complete. ICT availability was good as study leave meant that no senior pupils were in the school. Staffing was effective and had minimal impact.

I am a manager in a small school and we chose to implement all the SNSA assessments for all stages. It involved a significant investment of time and we required significant ICT access to chrome books, PCs and iPads. We had to purchase headphones for the iPads for the Primary 1 assessments. We are fortunate that we are a small school and are relatively well off in terms of Digital Technology.

## **EDINBURGH**

The tests were completed over a period of two weeks. The P1 children were taken one to one with an adult (2 adults, sometimes 3 available). This took up the largest amount of time. The P4 and P7 tests were administered to the whole class at once with smaller groups taken out who needed more support or one to one support. As above this was administered with 2 or 3 adults. The P4 and P7 teachers were in the class when their tests were delivered; however the P1 children were taken out. ICT (iPads) were not available for some classes for part of the week. It did not impact the class teachers as it was all organised for them. Their role was to support the children in the class.

Our ICT is pretty good in our school as we have an ICT Suite with 15 laptops. It was also VERY helpful that the SNSAs were compatible with iPads. [one sentence redacted – out of scope]. It impacted hugely with the Primary 1 tests as these had to all be done 1:1. Therefore all PSA timetables were filled with helping out.

Organised outside of class time so did not impact on class teaching. This was, in part, due to the availability of ICT.

Delivery of assessments had little impact as we were able to use a class set of iPads for the assessments. Although this did mean that other classes missed out on their iPad time. As we were working with P7 they were able to complete the assessment independently and quickly preventing too much impact.

Was fairly straightforward as we had a class set of iPads.

## **FALKRIK**

I was involved in P4 (Numeracy) and P1 (Literacy & Numeracy). [one sentence redacted – out of scope]. P1 (Numeracy) - children were in groups of 4 as they needed help when reading the question. Required 4 additional teachers/support staff to help. P1 (Literacy) - these were done on a one to one basis as children required guidance throughout.

Good that could access via iPads.

Management and SFLA s supervised the tests. Computers were available.

SMT took pupils out of class to complete the SNSAs. Primary 1s were done individually, and pupils that had learning support were taken individually too. Computers and iPads were available to use when I was ready. The P1 literacy test took a long time because of the amount of text that they had to read by themselves.

Easy to implement.

We were able to use iPads and PCs. Some children needed individual support up the school. However, all p1 assessments had to be carried out 1:1 and this impacted on our teaching resources. Like the fact that by using iPads children could sit assessments in their own classroom and made it more flexible for delivering the assessments.

As class teacher I was to carry out the testing with support of a SfLA. This has meant that I was not in class teaching. It also meant that a SfLA was taken out of another class so that I could be supported with my class while I did the testing with each child. In Primary 1 this had to be done on a one to one basis, Primary 1 could not be left to complete the test on their own. Our ICT suite has been unused by the rest of the school while the testing of all classes has taken place.

We were able to carry out the assessment on the school's set of iPads, allowing the ICT suite timetable to remain unchanged. It also allowed the assessments to take place in class, in a comfortable and familiar environment. I was able to carry out the assessment across a number of shorter sessions which was beneficial to pupils who can get tired easily. I did not require any additional support. However the portability of the tablets allowed pupils to take their

assessments in a different environment if beneficial and also to work closely with one to one support.

Was easy to carry out, test did not take too long and children could complete them at their own pace on an iPad. Some management time was used to deliver assessments.

## **FIFE**

Little impact. We have many laptops.

No huge impact other than pupils being out of class. Tests did not displace other classes and worked around class commitment in room. Classes were not disadvantaged to facilitate delivery.

ICT suite taken over and support for learning staff taken off timetable. Impact on day to day teaching was moderate as I could send working groups. It did impact learning.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]. P1 found it tricky, even with the 'hearing' button and was therefore much more time consuming.

They had to be done by class teachers and some of the SMT in order for the P1 tests to be completed. The other tests were done as part of class work and were done easily as we are lucky enough to have an ICT suite and a class set of net books.

## **GLASGOW**

I deliver ICT as NCCT lesson so aiming to teach the 8 classes so will use those time slots for SNSA.

Children taken out of class on individual basis and supported by another teacher to administer test in school media room.

Children were taken individually while I was returning to work. Using iPads to avoid any complications with p1.

## **HIGHLAND**

[two sentences redacted – out of scope]. P1 needed lots of support with using ICT and the time taken to administer the tests was lengthy and required high level of adult support.

Little impact. Small class they just were out of maths couple of lessons.

No effect on maths. They were withdrawn from timetable elsewhere.

I had to use my time out of class to carry out these assessments, which is fine. It was good to be able to use iPads as this made it more child friendly.

These would not have been possible within a classroom as the children needed 1-1 to work the mouse control function of the computer. As the ASN teacher, I administered the P1 assessments on a 1-1 basis - all 44 of them for both literacy and numeracy. [two sentences redacted – out of scope].

ASN teacher and class teacher and PSA supported P4s and P1s. [one sentence redacted – out of scope]

## **INVERCLYDE**

It was agreed by SMT for Classroom Assistants to administer the SNSA using classroom computer as we calculated it would take approximately 3 weeks worth of teaching time if Class Teacher was to do it.

Children were removed from class and class teacher was not involved at all. They were taken to ICT suite by Depute Head.

Thankfully SMT covered classes while tests were being administered. The staff in school were understanding and accommodating when ICT suite was out of action. A few glitches with access on some computers.

ICT rooms arranged by SMT.

## **MIDLOTHIAN**

ICT not an issue although it restricted other class' availability to this. Assessments carried out by SLT, SFL teacher and NCCT teacher in P1. This reduced their time spent on other roles but minimised disruption to the class and their teacher.

## **MORAY**

A lot of man power. Luckily, we have a set of iPads in the school which was great for the p1. However, it depended on our intermittent Wi-Fi, so a lot of time was lost logging out and in.

## **NORTH AYRSHIRE**

No significant impact, easy to administer.

I teach Technologies during teacher's curricular insert time. [one paragraph redacted – out of scope]. The P1 assessment was harder to deliver. The pupils could not be left to navigate the assessment independently. It required a one to one approach. We used support staff and SMT to deliver this. Very time consuming.

Our Depute Head administered most of our tests. [one sentence redacted – out of scope]. He arranged cover (SFL teacher) so that I could assess the P1 children

individually. We have very small numbers so this was manageable but as it took around 45 minutes per child it could be a huge task in a big class.

We had to put a timetable together and get them done so normal class timetable had to be dropped and ICT timetable altered for whole period as other classes had to complete GL assessments too. I had 1 period of support per week so administered the tests myself.

### **NORTH LANARKSHIRE**

We had enough ICT resources as can be done on laptop or iPad. They took a great deal of management time. [one sentence redacted – out of scope]. They could access independently however P1 were far too time consuming. We only have 14 P1 children however the total management time for testing was 20 hours.

Login had to be done by teacher for P1, often problematic and had to be entered several times. Practice tests administered on iPads and were much simpler than actual tests. This gave children confidence to try main assessments at later date. Most conducted in class with a few children at a time, mostly with just the teacher in class and occasional support staff.

### **ORKNEY**

Absolutely fine for everything other than p1, which was a human resource nightmare.

### **PERTH & KINROSS**

Minimal to my knowledge.

Teachers used their effective management to administer tests. No additional staff required. Used existing classroom support.

I had a student at the time of the assessments which allowed me to work with children whilst she had the rest of the class.

The task was easier when the whole class had 1 laptop each and completed assessments at the same time. The DHT removing children 1 or 2 at a time was disruptive, as were groups of 4 or 5 coming in and out repeatedly for days.

Managed centrally by SMT.

I undertook them with the P1 class as the class teacher was absent. We used iPads.

P1 children needed 1-1 support. I, teaching HT of small school managed this to allow support staff to continue their work.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]. Difficulties arose in the respect of IT not working, room would be far too small for classes over 22. Not enough IT equipment if class was bigger either.

## **RENFREWSHIRE**

We are fortunate to have an ICT suite with 14 working PC's. I was in room with PT and half of class when test was being completed. There was 1 ASNA in with us supporting 2 children who required some help.

Managed via SMT.

Fairly straightforward.

The classes have been assessed according to what ICT was available, therefore random groups of 10 or so pupils have been removed and tested at any opportunity by SMT.

Availability of ICT was not a huge issue as our seniors were on exam leave.

## **SOUTH LANARKSHIRE**

There was a major impact in P1. To support children with their technical skills we found it easier to have small groups sitting the assessment, but this had a huge impact on the amount of time taken to complete the assessments and the teaching time disruption. We are fortunate that we had ample ICT provision and space.

[two sentences redacted – out of scope]. We had recently purchased chromebooks which were used for the tests. The ICT suite remained free for other classes to use. All classroom support was changed during assessment week to cover the children who required support or the other half of composite classes (all classes are composite in our school).

In P1, the assessments were carried out on iPads and the child often had no idea how they were being formally assessed. There were 2 additional members to help support. Worked well.

A support teacher and management team had to come off timetable to assist with the assessing. We had adequate ICT equipment as we have just bought in laptops with our PEF money. I would not have been able to do this on my own as a class teacher. Once this was organised, there was minimal impact.

I (principal teacher) took responsibility for delivery of SNSA's half a class at a time whilst the class teacher remained with the other half. It worked fairly well but next year we hope to use chrome books with the other half of the class to make time delivery more efficient.

Didn't apply to my class with support. ICT was made available.

We were all informed by PT that it was happening at 8.45 am. Computer suite and iPads were to be used. I supervised while PT and DHT put children through tests, with P7 children assisting P1.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope] for P1, each child taken individually so extra hours paid to teachers, support for learning teacher taken off timetable and PTs used.

## **STIRLING**

All ICT deployed to support with SLT assisting.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]. The use of ICT did have a negative impact on other teachers as it was unavailable to them.

## **WEST DUNBARTONSHIRE**

Management team came into class, logged the children on and were in class to support throughout the process.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

We had extra staff who withdrew children a group at a time. Earphones are required for literacy to be effective.

Completed by SLT out with class.

## **WEST LOTHIAN**

I was given time out of class to administer the assessments.

Took all our PSW time away from class to ensure all tests were administered fairly and under the same conditions for all pupils.

**TIMING OF ASSESSMENTS:** extent to which you were able to use professional judgement to determine the timing of the assessments with a view to supporting the learning of individuals and groups of children. **(Positive feedback)**

## **ABERDEENSHIRE**

I was given full support from HT to use my judgement when to assess my P1 class.

## **ANGUS**

Yes we could use professional judgement.

## **ARGYLL & BUTE**

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

Yes - we used them diagnostically in November to plan forward for end of school year.

## **DUMFRIES AND GALLOWAY**

In my school, term 4 was perfect.

I was given the day and time that my pupils were sitting the test. It didn't pose a problem in reality.

These assessments were in no way timed to benefit the children in my class.

Timing decided in consultation with SMT.

Timing was appropriate at end of term for end of year results for Primary 1.

## **EAST AYRSHIRE**

Did summative at end of year to support level assignment of pupils

## **EAST DUNBARTONSHIRE**

Flexibility was ok.

## **EAST LoTHIAN**

Timing of assessments are reasonable.

We could select when to undertake testing, however this year we completed our training in the third term. For this reason we have had to do tests in term three.

Within my classroom it was up to me to decide when in the week I wanted to assess the pupils.

### **EAST RENFREWSHIRE**

Children did manage to complete them in an appropriate time, I didn't feel that it dragged on. Children with severe dyslexia were given extra time and breaks as needed.

Professional judgement was used in relation to the assessments as we chose May when study leave meant more availability of staff, ICT, rooming and allowed pupils to be in a position to sit the assessments.

Some children completed the tests quickly (especially the Numeracy assessment).

### **FALKIRK**

My understanding is that this testing can happen whenever so professional judgement would be used.

Really liked that there wasn't the use of timers to ensure children were given thinking time and support if required. I also liked the voice to read to the P1 children throughout their test.

### **FIFE**

Suitable for the P1 testing I did.

Timing was fine. Although a suggested time line was made we suited ourselves and undertook the assessments when we were able to do this.

Timing was fine. Most pupils took two periods to do the test (this included doing the practise test).

It was good that the tests themselves were not timed and gave the children ample time to complete.

### **GLASGOW**

I think if a child is ready for the test in February and complete the test then I would say the child who completes it in June would do better as they have had more teacher input.

Judgements made to assess children in the final term.

I am at the P1 stage and the thinking behind it was to allow the children to have the maximum possible time for learning before administering the tests.

My Head Teacher suggested these could be done during class time with the support of myself and a classroom assistant if need be.

This was fine - have been testing ability groups since January - it's still ongoing though.

Waited until term 4 to deliver so children were settled into school.

## **HIGHLAND**

None.

None. Whole school sat them on demand.

## **INVERCLYDE**

Some advice given from authority on this. Advice welcome.

## **MIDLOTHIAN**

I agreed with doing the assessments in March as that gave the pupils the best possible chance to show their learning and skills so far.

We could arrange it ourselves, in conjunction with the Learning Assistants, who went when.

## **NORTH LANARKSHIRE**

None.

There were no timings enforced on us. [one sentence redacted – out of scope].

[one sentence redacted – out of scope] Also had cem p1 pips end assessment to implement. Training on how to analyse results was given in term 4 so also decided to hang fire until this was completed. Will use to feed next steps in teaching and learning. Practise tests were issued Nov and March to relevant children as requested by authority.

## **PERTH AND KINROSS**

I was informed that I should use my professional judgement to decide if individual children were 'ready' to take the assessment.

## **RENFREWSHIRE**

None.

### **SCOTTISH BORDERS**

P1 timing in May is ok as the required IT skills are relatively high. All pupils in P1 were happy to work with class teacher on a 1 to 1 or 2 to 1 basis.

### **SOUTH LANARKSHIRE**

I think the timing of the assessments, May, was fine.

May - assessments were included in annual calendar through discussions with whole staff.

No real issues with timing of assessments (maybe not enough time in the 6 week window as teachers found it very time consuming to complete with 70 P1 children). All authorities doing it at different times also therefore where is the consistency with results?

Our HT allowed us to use our own professional judgment about timing.

We had a meeting (under 50 mins) to discuss what it was for, 1 period to allow kids a practice, SMT completed the test outwith my class, 1 period going over results.

### **WESTERN ISLES**

Was able to use my judgement. Waited to last moment i.e. last few days.

**USEFULNESS OF SNSA DATA:** extent to which data provided in SNSA learner reports has been useful to you in providing reliable information on progress, in identifying next steps in learning and informing your professional judgement on the achievement of CfE levels. **(Positive feedback)**

## **ABERDEEN**

I liked the data and it did help support my views achieving the level. However some children who had very little number knowledge managed to guess their way through.

Good for next steps especially for groups. After norms testing results should be more beneficial. Good as a minor support when judging CfE levels.

## **ABERDEENSHIRE**

Tests threw up a few anomalies with certain children that when investigated became clearer. A breakdown of question types useful to see exact strengths and areas to investigate. Lower scores in Numeracy mainly due to work not covered yet at timing of tests. Confirmed professional judgements.

My group of 6 all came out as high level which I wouldn't agree with. It was useful to see across the year group where the gaps are but for one of my group there were no next steps as she answered all questions correctly in literacy. The Incas scoring was more useful for informing groupings for next year's classes.

As this is first year we have no baseline to compare it to.

## **ANGUS**

The feedback is of a high standard and will be of good use, alongside teacher judgement for identifying next steps and supporting transition discussions.

## **ARGYLL & BUTE**

Data matched professional judgement. So help to build confidence and sits comfortably with other form of evidence.

Fairly useful when used alongside additional assessment info.

There is a lot in both the reading and writing that is useful and can be built upon. We are, however, a little worried about the pupils who gained High in writing when they have clearly never shown those capabilities in the classroom.

## **DUMFRIES AND GALLOWAY**

Very useful! Found it incredibly detailed and exactly what I was looking for. Validated exactly what I thought about pupils in relation to levels.

I have found that the breakdown of the questions answered have been beneficial to me because I can see the areas which need to still be covered for children or the areas in which I need to assess again because the children may have not understood the question due to their lack of clicking on the right area (e.g. The pages of the book).

[one paragraph redacted – out of scope]

PIPS was better for P1. SNSA for the rest is fine. The diagnostic information is useful.

Very useful information about where the gaps are and what further teaching is needed.

The data has been detailed enough but more analysis and comparison will be required to see how it aligns with our own data and what we know of our pupils.

Data is clear and useful. It will be better next year when we have something to compare it to. [one sentence redacted – out of scope] P1 not as accurate. Implies children are more capable than we think with our professional judgement.

Useful information gathered. Feel that they are not suitable for P1 [one sentence redacted – out of scope].

More detailed than INCAS and can see where problems lie.

Can't comment as haven't had time to analyse. [one sentence redacted – out of scope].

Class teachers found skills based question/answer breakdown provided in individual report somewhat useful. Table format overview of results also helped to inform next steps, particularly when gaps in knowledge could be easily identified for individuals/whole classes. Questions over how reliable (or useful) the low, medium and high capacity result is. The results have often not been consistent with class teachers' own professional judgements and other assessments carried out throughout the year. As far as achievement of a level, the results of the SNSA formed an extremely small piece of the jigsaw. I do expect this to change and improve in future years.

## **DUNDEE**

It was useful to learn, ok at gaps in pupils learning however it only gave high/medium/low as a result which was hard to analyse.

## **EAST AYRSHIRE**

The learner reports have been extremely useful in identifying trends and they completely reiterated my teacher judgement which was reassuring.

We have only started to analyse the data but it has already provided lots of important information that first of all supports the decisions we have made in terms of our curriculum and informs some planned changes.

## **EAST DUNBARTONSHIRE**

Very useful to compare against teacher judgement alongside all of the ongoing assessments.

## **EAST LoTHIAN**

Liked being able to compare children with the different tools available and get group assessment data.

Interesting and useful as handover information and in informing next steps of learning. Has proved to be a good confirmation of teacher judgement.

Will be used to identify any gaps in learning and can be passed on to next teacher as a transition document.

## **EAST RENFREWSHIRE**

The diagnostic data was very useful for individual children and potentially for identifying areas where a number of children were finding the same difficulties.

We have still to find out further information about the data we will receive, however the tables showing where pupils sit within the class and the stage seem helpful. My biggest concern is that many pupils were simply guessing multiple choice answers, therefore resulting in the data being unreliable as it is not showing their true understanding or ability in the tests if they are able to guess the right answer. I do not feel the results will provide more evidence or information which is already being provided through class formative and summative assessment.

## **EDINBURGH**

Some useful info. High and medium seem quite arbitrary - 2 children classified as different despite getting same questions wrong. Less information about phonological awareness than pips. No information about written skills.

## **FALKIRK**

Detailed categories.

It is another piece of information about progress, not more relevant than other information, although very useful to compare progress against "National Standards".

Would be beneficial to have a baseline at the start of the year and at the end to compare the data to.

I think that because it is not differentiated to children's needs it is hard to say where the children are. However, for the children you expect to do well it is good to have that confirmed.

## **FIFE**

Useful and informative for parents and reporting

Limited use so far, but huge potential benefits. I would see a mass testing approach being a positive, preferably at the start of a year, [one sentence redacted – out of scope] Testing mid year may limit potential uses of data for long term planning of pupil learning.

Excellent. I really valued the immediate feedback which informed next steps for the children and allowed good reference point for reporting also.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope].

The function to identify areas as a stage/school we need to develop is useful.

The data is useful and provided staff with confirmation of their professional judgements.

## **GLASGOW**

The children weren't all asked the same questions therefore more difficult to use as a tool for next steps. The results haven't surprised me but reinforced what I already know about my children's attainment

Data from SNSAs reports are useful but timely to print out and analyse.

## **INVERCLYDE**

It was good to see my professional judgement was accurate against most of the data provided. I would've preferred an easier to read report as it took some time to read and evaluate. Again, no clear reference was made to progress within CfE level. Since different questions were asked of different children, it was

perhaps less meaningful. An option for individual children to be set low/medium/high questions might be useful, or start off with all low questions, progressing when an appropriate number had been answered correctly.

Definitely useful.

Data is useful.

Very useful data provided.

## **MORAY**

The numeracy test was better at setting next steps. I felt I couldn't use much of the literacy data reliably as it had no comparison to the early level standards that are reflected in the benchmarks.

Some of the information is useful as it identifies gaps in their learning. Perhaps particularly useful for airforce children or children who have moved schools lots. The majority of results matched my own professional judgement.

## **NORTH AYRSHIRE**

Has added more weight to what we already knew.

Useful.

## **NORTH LANARKSHIRE**

We carried out assessments in March and it was useful to identify gaps that had been missed.

Data is incredibly detailed and personalised. Feedback will be very useful in looking for next steps. Some of our data showed areas of weakness we hadn't expected and some showed strengths, especially in P1, that we hadn't expected. I think that they will support teacher judgement and will make us look at some things and children's needs. They are not definitive though. We will use them alongside other types of assessment to build a picture of the whole child.

Currently analysing after completing tests. Shared with relevant class teachers and further discussion planned at this year's final curriculum development staff meeting. Hopefully help pin-point specific learning needs for individuals and groups in line with CfE targets. Colour coding seems useful. Used to cem age related results. Individual reports seem useful.

## **ORKNEY**

They've been useful to me as HT where some teachers are not awarding a level due to their personal view of a child, based on ASN or behaviour - the SNSAs have given me a way to prompt conversations about underestimating children. I hope that they will be used by class teachers next year to plan learning.

## **PERTH & KINROSS**

Great use. SNSA data confirmed teacher judgements through effective moderation cycle in school. Clearly identifies the next steps and makes it manageable for the class teacher to manipulate the data on excel.

The information has been useful to back up my decision on the achievement of individuals within early level. Some of the children who I have decided have not achieved early level scored well in the assessment as they were able to guess a lot of the answers. It has been useful to identify areas of weakness within literacy and maths and has informed my planning this term.

The feedback was useful, but would have been far better if the clearly matched up to the benchmarks. In some ways there was far too much detail in the feedback.

Confirmed what I knew aside from 2 examples where PSA had overly supported and therefore our data is ridiculously flawed.

I have found the data to be very useful in class.

Very useful in general.

It was useful after I had been trained in using it fully.

Like the reports, the layout & detail. High, medium, low not overall helpful but believe that was for first year only.

## **SCOTTISH BORDERS**

Quite useful but I feel that the NGRT and PTM was also reliable and identified next steps in learning at both group, class and individual level,

## **SHETLAND**

Numeracy results have been used when reporting and identifying 'gaps' in learning but I wouldn't value the results gained from the literacy assessments.

I like the generated reports that highlight areas all pupils are struggling with, but felt with the English I was well aware of the skills highlighted. I felt the maths was much more helpful. This highlighted areas which we had yet to cover towards the end of the year, and allowed me to see that 3 of my P1's already had sound knowledge of aspects they wouldn't be learning about until the beginning of P2. I have therefore change my approach with this group and feel confident to push them further than I may have done before.

## **SOUTH AYRSHIRE**

I have valued the data that has been produced and used it to inform my planning in ensuring that where children have been shown to have gaps in their learning, that I am targeting this and ensuring more experiences for depth of learning are provided. The data has been very useful in aiding the judgement of achievement of a level.

## **SOUTH LANARKSHIRE**

Data is very useful and we are already using it for comparative purposes.

Breakdown of questions useful although not sure how reliable as questions were skipped by mistake.

## **STIRLING**

Been ok, useful as another measure alongside other forms of assessment. No other insights.

## **WEST LoTHIAN**

The reports have been useful as they support your professional judgement, just as the 5-14 National Assessments did! They also help you identify next steps in learning and where there may be gaps in learning.

Our data was analysed by our PEF coordinator within a cluster group-each school analysed individual results and cluster results which have been used to inform our school improvement planning. We also discussed individual children who had performed more or less well than expected and the reasons for this.

**USER FRIENDLINESS: (for children and young people)**- appropriateness of level of digital and keyboard skills required, and accessibility of language, font, layout, and assessment tasks. **(Positive feedback)**

## **ABERDEEN**

Easy to use.

## **ABREDEENSHIRE**

All ok. Primary 1 don't have good mouse skills to do this.

## **ANGUS**

Due to the task being suitable for a smart board, the children completed this fairly independently.

We used iPads and the children could access the assessments easily with adult support. The children enjoyed the tests although many seemed to lose interest in the long reading passages (the recorded voice was not engaging nor was the story content). The use of capital letters on the front cover of a book also caused many difficulties as they do not use capital letters regularly yet.

## **ARGYLL & BUTE**

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

All our pupils had ample keyboard skills to deal with the test. I am just worried that some were clicking any box to get finished.

When using an iPad, I thought the assessment was quite user friendly. Most of my P1 pupils navigated it easily enough.

## **DUMFRIES AND GALLOWAY**

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

Very small text and graphics for pupils to see on the screen, especially on the laptop where navigation of the page became a barrier. Pupils on desktop PCs coped much better.

Seemed fine. Some of the questions that I managed to see (over shoulders) could have been expressed better or the concept tested in a better manner.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

All the children managed to navigate the tests fairly easily.

Young children found the scrolling down hard to get used to. Otherwise fairly appropriate.

Most students needed little or no help to complete the task at a PC.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope] P1 has too much ICT skill required. Too much clicking and scrolling.

Pupils reported they were easier than Incas assessments but preferred the layout of Incas as they were easier to read and listen to.

See above...children did find the site easy to access once they managed to put in their passwords which took time due to capitalisation of some letters.

## **DUNDEE**

Accessibility was fine however as previously stated, the assessments required a huge amount of reading.

## **EAST AYRSHIRE**

Pupils did not report any issues regarding digital skills. A number of pupils found the length of time taken to complete tests off-putting and lost focus.

The language for questions was fine, and the listening option was helpful. In our situation children needed keyboard and mouse skills which they are lacking at the age of 5.

Fairly well received by pupils.

I have had no access or input with SNSA as it has been done during my NCCT period and senior management have conducted the assessments with support from P7 peer mentors.

There were no issues highlighted by our learners. Avono reader worked well to allow our SFL pupils to access the assessment.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope] P1s needed support to log in.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

## **EAST DUNBARTONSHIRE**

These were fine and engaging.

Fairly user friendly.

[two sentences redacted – out of scope]

## **EAST LOTHIAN**

The layout of the tests is user friendly and straightforward.

I think they are very accessible to the children.

### **EAST RENFREWSHIRE**

[one sentence redacted – out of scope].

ICT wise my class coped fine. No issues.

Some found dragging more challenging than others, but the touchscreen helped.

### **EDINBURGH**

Good

Very good.

Fine.

Appropriate.

The keyboard skills required for the P1 tests were age-appropriate as were the font size, graphics, sound, etc.

[two sentences redacted – out of scope]

My class managed this, more or less.

This was actually ok- a lot of drag and drop.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

The children enjoyed using the iPad and this approach actively engaged them.

Seemed very user friendly apart from having to scroll up and down to read and answer.

Pupils were able to access testing on iPads which they are very familiar with.

### **FALKIRK**

Children were happy to do assessments as using iPads.

Very clear but pupils still struggle with basic ICT skills.

If they knew their Glow log-in - it was easy to access and once they had done the practice tests, they were familiar with how to navigate the assessment. The font was easy to read.

Next button had to be scrolled down. Fine for older children but not for p1. Otherwise very well presented.

Pupils found the tasks accessible.

Children completed these assessments on a 1-1 basis with an adult to negate issues of ICT competency.

The pupils found using the iPads very straightforward. [one sentence redacted – out of scope]

[one sentence redacted – out of scope] The Primary 1 assessment had to be carried out on a one to one basis as it was difficult for them to navigate the page and remained focus for the prolonged period of time.

Most pupils coped. One or two found it a bit overwhelming and just clicked the first answer to move on.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope] We completed the tests on a mini iPad and in hindsight this was maybe slightly too small a screen for pupils to access this on because of the size and amount of text on the page.

The digital skill required seems pitched appropriately.

Children who were ICT literate were more comfortable completing the assessments. The layout was suitable for the age/stage of most pupils [two words redacted – out of scope].

Everything seems very straightforward to use. We have had no issues with the interface so far. The children can follow the instructions well.

## **FIFE**

Only required mouse skills with was beneficial to most.

It works with Ivona which is good. But pupils had to keep changing font size and there is a lot of scrolling down unnecessarily.

Fine.

Tests were accessible, and pupils were able to use them with no significant issues. Biggest problem was pupils refusing to do them.

Very easy to use [one sentence redacted – out of scope]

Fine - kids had no worries.

Seemed easy enough once connected.

The level of ICT skill was in keeping with age and stage.

## **GLASGOW**

Fine for upper school.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

Using iPad made this more user-friendly.

Very user friendly.

Appropriate for most.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope] Having to scroll down to click next was useful, stopped the children being click happy.

## **HIGHLAND**

Apart from speed issue, I don't know of anything. The s3 results showed me nothing my own exam/assessment didn't tell me back in Feb.

All my P1 pupils coped with the level of technology using a tablet.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

[two sentences redacted – out of scope]

## **INVERCLYDE**

The font was appropriate and the spoken aspect of the test was clear.

Seemed ok.

Children coped well with digital and keyboard skills required of them.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

No issues I'm aware of with the children in my class.

This part seemed ok.

## **MIDLOTHIAN**

Older children found it okay on the whole.

Fine.

The assessments were very accessible to most pupils. They didn't require much in the way of IT skills.

[three sentences redacted – out of scope]

## **MORAY**

Again use of ipads greatly helped this.

On an iPad these tests were suitable.

Fine.

## **NORTH AYRSHIRE**

For the most part it was fine.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

[one sentence redacted – out of scope] Assessment is iPad friendly and we have sufficient devices in our school.

We used iPads for P1 as the children are very comfortable with using them to select, click and drag etc.

## **NORTH LANARKSHIRE**

The language, font etc were all appropriate for the age and stage of the pupils.

## **ORKNEY**

All fine. Kids are very screen-savvy these days!

## **PERTH & KINROSS**

[one sentence redacted – out of scope] P1/4s did struggle.

Excellent on laptops. Children needed a quick demo on using an iPad but worked well and easily managed.

The assessment itself was user friendly. The children got the hang of pressing the mouth to hear the instructions. Some of the instructions were a little complicated for the children but more often than not they could get the gist of the question.

The children (Primary 1) used iPads which made them much more accessible, the only problem was that some of them kept pressing the 'next' button twice which skipped questions. I felt that the literacy was very difficult for P1 and I have some excellent readers! It took them a long time to complete the task, although it was good that they could go back to it and not have to complete it in one sitting. The maths was set at a much more appropriate level.

[two sentences redacted – out of scope].

No problems.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

The layout looked okay.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

## **RENFREWSHIRE**

Quite accessible on iPad for children.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

Children were all able to complete tasks and navigate through questions. There were no technical problems or issues.

P1 tests were completed individually with teacher. Easy for pupils to select answers. Why names such as Aysha and Noah were chosen I cannot understand!

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

## **SCOTTISH BORDERS**

Fine

Good.

Easy enough.

Seemed okay, just tests were really long!

## **SHETLAND**

Children could progress easily through the assessment independently using iPads.

As I said mine completed the assessments on the iPad, but would have struggled a bit more on the laptops. Worked well with the iPad, but some pupils accidentally pushed the next button instead of the ear symbol. I felt the layout of the tasks was fine for mine, there was sometimes a bit of a delay on the talking symbol. My pupils managed to read the font well.

My pupils managed to access the tests with the computing skills they possess. The audio button available to P1 pupils would have been very helpful for some pupils in P4/7 as well.

## **SOUTH AYRSHIRE**

Layout was fine, no time limit is excellent, and language used was appropriate for children.

Very user friendly for children.

## **SOUTH LANARKSHIRE**

Everyone successfully negotiated the practise papers with ease. I did not administer the real assessments.

Layout and format was accessible .

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

[one sentence redacted – out of scope] P1 were shown how to complete the assessments by the p7s using a practice test.

Easy to use, even for P1.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

Fine, clear.

Children fine with digital and keyboard skills.

## **WEST DUNBARTONSHIRE**

Children easy to manage as long as they were able to enlarge the screen to read questions properly.

[one sentence redacted – out of scope]

Digital skills were appropriate. Language was ok.

## **WEST LOTHIAN**

The children found it easy to use.

Seemed fine.

Digital skill level was good.

We used an iPad which was much easier for primary 1 than trying to use a laptop. We did not attempt to change any sizes, font etc.

## **WESTERN ISLES**

[two sentences redacted – out of scope] Not so for p1s - see above. P1 tests also far too long, even with self-imposed breaks.