

Email chain 1

From: [redacted]

Sent: 25 May 2018 09:42

To: Central Enquiry Unit <CEU@gov.scot>; info@snsa.org.uk

Subject: P1 Testing & SNSA Concerns

Dear CEU & SNSA,

Firstly let me say I believe in the need for national test results and whole school test results for school improvement and to understand how many children are on track. However I feel there has been some oversights and I am writing to you to share my concerns regarding the P1 SNSA Testing.

As a member of middle management in my school I'd like to report 100% of my team felt that the P1 test was far too difficult not only in terms of the level of digital literacy required by the pupil to access the test on a PC (one pupil actually lifted the mouse in the air like an aeroplane to try and make it work) but also for the way the questions were worded and their level of difficulty.

We also felt the guidance on how to support children with ASN was very ambiguous and therefore I feel that this needs to be much more clear and focused on the questions and answers page. We had one child with additional support needs who triggered severe distressed behaviour as he couldn't be helped answer the questions and another P1 who just clicked anything.

On the "Scottish Primary School Teachers Facebook page" and from dialogue with other establishments in my local community I was also informed that some schools had their teaching support staff 'carry out or do' * the test and answer the questions or direct children to the answers for the children, whereas my school absolutely did not thus the results I fear are not as robust or reliable as we'd like.

In saying this, my school did have to pull all support staff resources to organise all tests, and due to the lack of pcs in our school (2 per class around the whole school some of which the network keep failing and breaking down even after continual logged repairs). We had to use our support staff out of class to supervise tests. We only have 5 support staff and for 10 weeks they have been constantly taking children away across the school to supervise them for SNSA testing.

I feel that there needs to be EQUITY around the provision of resources in each school in terms of digital resources and support staff. Some schools have 30 and 40 PCS in an ICT SUITE. We have a tiny number of PCS dotted across the school and the extra equipment we did purchase through fundraising a few years ago was removed and taken away during our LA 'Refresh' to keep everything standardised.

Due to these issues we have seen an increase in distressed behaviours and and a decrease in HWB occurring more in our ASN children and high tariff learners who have missed out on their chance for extra support in their classroom for a full two and a half months.

The SNSA ASSESSMENTS require an adult to help our children to log in to support the P1 children get settled never mind actually understand the questions.

We had 8 working older laptops we hoped we could use to speed the process but our broadband does not have WiFi and our network servers are so poor quality that even after

staff use their lunches, breaks and hours after and before school they cannot stay 'on the network'. So this is unviable as well.

We had a number of children in P1 who felt very down and confused after there test which also affected their self esteem.

Moving forward my suggestion is that the digital literacy team in Scotland do an audit of every school to find out what ICT resources they have in place already to administer tests efficiently and what establishment's main barriers are and then concentrate on supporting the schools with the least resources first to provide equity across the country.

Next I would recommend that schools submit a Digital Literacy Support plan for themselves because as we think about moving to ipads more and more this impacts on procedures for SNSA tests. I also think on the SNSA website there should be a list of dos and don't when supervising a test for support staff and teachers.

Then the next thing I would like to suggest is that P1 either have paper tests or that the test is simplified and the test take into consideration the range of Early level ICT abilities children in P1 have when its design is reviewed or edited.

Lastly I would like pupil equity to be considered when administering the tests because many of our SIMD 1-4 children do not have access to ICT at home.

Thank you for your patience in hearing these concerns and suggestions.

I am passionate about the improvements already being made by the government and I just want these smaller issues to be addressed so that it does not undermine the achievements already in place.

Thank you kindly,

A Passionate Principal

Email chain 2

From: [redacted] [redacted]
Sent: 25 May 2018 11:21
To: Swinney J (John), MSP <John.Swinney.msp@parliament.scot>
Subject: SNSA feedback

Good morning Mr Swinney,

I hope this finds you well.

As I understand, you are aware of concerns regarding the new standardised assessments, particularly the negative effect they may be having on Primary 1 learners. I too share many of these concerns.

For disclosure, I am a teacher and a parent, and I have lived in Glasgow all my life. I value play based learning for children at least to aged 8 as an end in itself and also in addressing the poverty related attainment gap. I believe in supporting the capacity of teachers to make judgements about learning and decisions about the curriculum. I think we could all benefit from learning more about the impact of childhood development.

As such, the SNSAs are counter to these values, and I believe they run counter to the values of Scotland's education. I recently read a blog post from George Gilchrist, who sits on the board of Connect, and makes the case much better than I could:
<http://gg1952.blogspot.co.uk/2018/05/testing-times-for-scotland.html?sref=tw>
<<http://gg1952.blogspot.co.uk/2018/05/testing-times-for-scotland.html?sref=tw&m=1>>
&m=1

Also, if you are interested in the evidence to justify a play based Early Level in our curriculum, please read a book called Upstart by Sue Palmer, or at least read her open letter to you: <http://www.upstart.scot/an-open-letter-to-john-swinney-from-upstart-scotland/>

As Cabinet Secretary for Education and Skills, I trust that you will show wisdom, justice, compassion and integrity towards our young learners by listening to their parents and teachers, as well as Scotland's educational experts and researchers.

If I can help you with anything else with this matter, I would be more than happy to.

Kindest regards,

[redacted]

Email chain 3

From: [redacted] [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, May 29, 2018 10:01:39 AM
To: Swinney J (John), MSP; [redacted]
Subject: SNSAs

Dear Mr Swinney,

I am writing to you to express my horror at the introduction of the SNSAs, particularly in Primary 1.

I am the Depute Head with responsibility for Nursery, P1 and P2, of a school with a high (85% +) school population of those living in SIMD 1 and 2. We have worked incredibly hard over the past couple of years to examine our pedagogy, our school environment and our relationships with our pupils and families to create an atmosphere where children are explorative, confident and have positive self-image of themselves as learners. This is evident in our progress through the curriculum and the confidence and problem solving abilities of our children. My staff team, with close oversight from me, know exactly where our children are in terms of literacy, numeracy and each aspect of the curriculum. Steps are taken each day to ensure that children are being supported and stretched to suit their needs. The idea that an online test will give us invaluable insight into their difficulties and allow us to provide the correct support is ludicrous. If this reflection isn't a standard part of a teacher's week then that teacher is failing. The tests DO NOT provide any useful diagnostic information.

I understand that the results this year are the first tranch and we will not be able to do much with them, as they classify the children as High, Medium and Low. This kind of language is out-moded and harmful. Particularly in Primary 1, where the levels of development vary so wildly that a child given a test a year later may be *developmentally* ready to show their knowledge in a manner like this, risk children being labelled like this from the start of their career. Many studies have shown how difficult it is to avoid this kind of bias following children throughout their school life.

Teachers across the country break their backs to ensure that children are confident and nurtured. To do this we have to build meaningful relationships based upon trust and respect. It is not an overstatement to say that I feel I have betrayed relationships and harmed them with our children, particularly our most vulnerable, by putting them through these tests. They are completely inappropriate and have left even those children who are flying and are ahead of where we would expect, upset and worried. Comments like "I'm no good", "I can't do this", "Why are you making me do this?" are common. Less common, but still far more frequent than is at all acceptable are children who display extreme signs of distress, shaking and crying. Where this happens we stop the test *but by then the damage is already done*. One child has soiled themselves due to the extreme distress caused by the test.

This is not a function of how we administer them. We sit, 1:1 on a beanbag, with the child, supporting them and offering them comfort. It is entirely a function of the tests themselves.

These tests have taken 4 weeks to administer to my Primary 1s, not to mention the drain further up the school on my teacher's time to administer the tests to P4 and P7. One whole month of lost teaching time. Stressed teachers, distressed learners and angry parents. You want me to close the gap and yet to take away 4 weeks of my dedicated time to do so?

Through professional dialogue with other Deputes, Headteachers, QIEOs, and those working for Education Scotland I have yet to meet a teaching professional who thinks that the P1 tests have any value. Every single person I am aware of has expressed extreme concern about these test, not least the validity of the information gained.

Your policy of introducing these tests has made me compromise my professional values. I am in conflict with what I know professionally and personally to be right. The GTCS is clear about the high standard that we should be held to with regards to safe guarding the wellbeing of our learners. This policy is in direct contradiction to those standards.

I beg you to halt this damaging endeavour. The information gained is useless, the distress caused is massive and the damage done to relationships with families and children cannot be overstated.

I look forward to your reply.

[redacted]
[redacted]

Email chain 4

From: [redacted]
Sent: Monday, May 28, 2018 7:24 pm
Subject: Sorry if this is late
To: Swinney J (John), MSP <john.swinney.msp@parliament.scot>

Dear John Swinney,

I apologise for what is seemingly the lateness of this email. I heard you speaking recently and you said that you hadn't been 'inundated' with emails regarding the developmentally inappropriate SNSA tests for Primary 1. To be honest this is the first chance that I've had, and I can tell you that is partly due to the time consuming nature of implementing said test. However, as a matter of utmost concern and urgency, I have composed this email in the

good faith that you intend to read and respond to each individual that raises concerns around this subject, and by doing so hopefully these tests will be deemed completely unnecessary and unworthy as I am sure every other concerned teacher has expressed.

PLEASE do not take your lack of emails by individuals as a sign that we are okay with being micro-managed and our pedagogical values and beliefs completely undermined through the introduction of these tests, I can assure you it is more likely that these teachers are just busy people. Or if I were to be completely honest, I would probably hazard a more realistic guess that they are totally and utterly desolate at being presented with yet another hoop to jump through, another doubt in their mind about what the actual purpose and value of our education system truly is.

I don't mind telling you that I am a fairly new teacher, I am 25 years old and am in my 5th year of teaching. I have seen so many changes already in my 5 year career, and understand the importance of a growth mindset and undertaking study of the most recent evidence coming through research (I completed an Early Years Pedagogy PGC) in 2017 too. I have a passion that I can not begin to describe for my job. I thrive on building relationships with pupils, parents and colleagues and get a sense of joy and satisfaction out of the targets we set and achieve together. When I was studying and when I graduated I could only ever see myself being a teacher, in a classroom surrounded by children and working towards making a difference, one day at a time. However, as time has marched on and the goalposts have changed so frequently depending on what is popular/ current/ working elsewhere I have become disenchanted, alongside the majority of the workforce.

So much has changed even since I was at school - what has not changed is children. So please indulge me a little longer and let me tell you what we know about children.

We know from research and really just from being learners ourselves that learning happens through experiences. Positive, repetitive experiences. This is particularly true for our youngest learners, in this case I speak about Primary 1. I have to concede that contrary to other reports, I have not had experience of the 5 year olds in my class breaking down in tears at the thought of clicking through questions on a computer. However, I have experienced frustrated, bored, disengaged children that have been pulled away and extracted from their play and their classroom (we are an open plan base so it is absolutely necessary for children to go to a quiet space) to mindlessly take a lucky guess at an answer to a question that is so far removed from being remotely interesting or engaging to them that they simply do not care about getting it right or wrong. A member of staff, of course, supervises children as they complete this box ticking exercise because in the SIMD decile in which I work, children do not have access to computers and laptops and so require support to be able to navigate the mouse to the answer they wish to select, after the question has been read to them, along with the selection of answers - none of which have any relevance at that moment in time because it is a stand alone task, with no context surrounding it. We phrase it to children as though they have a choice, "Do you want to come and do this wee job?" but in reality it is not a choice, because if I had a choice I would absolutely refuse to put Primary 1's through this - it is of NO BENEFIT.

The 'data' produced from this exercise WILL NOT inform any future planning of learning and teaching for ANY child that sits this test. What will inform their future experiences is what the children are interested in, linked to my own professional judgements of where their developmental needs are. I will take into account that they are holistic learners. I will use my own knowledge, based on relationships we continue to work to build to put together a picture of where these learners are and what their next steps could be, which will then be shared in a meaningful context. Not a one off 'on this day they could...'

I fully believe that the 'data' from the implementation of the SNSA tests, in P1 at any rate, will be wholly unreliable.

That being said, the most frustrating part of this whole scenario is the fact that my Primary 1 children are, on the whole, more than capable of the concepts and skills which the test aims to determine. We carry out experiences around these skills DAILY - children are constantly investigating, enquiring, challenging, PLAYING and LEARNING. They carry this knowledge on to other experiences and continually build on and evaluate what they already know, linking it to other areas of their learning and making connections in real life. NONE of this is reflected or evidenced in any part of the SNSA test.

The only possible tiny piece of silver lining I can fathom that could come of this 'data' being submitted and analysed is that perhaps schools that score low (possibly ours) will be given extra resources or funding. Being honest, the levels of funding available at the moment are not even touching the sides to be able to start to make a sustainable impact towards raising attainment. We so desperately need resources which look OUTWARDS towards communities and parents and family learning. We do not need more courses and more programmes of work given to teachers - we know how to teach, and we also know how to assess, without a SNSA.

I write this to you, in the belief that by emailing you personally I will be granted the diplomacy of an email in return. But I also write this to you in the hope that you will ACT.

Yours sincerely,
[redacted]

Email chain 5

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, May 25, 2018 11:15:58 PM
To: Swinney J (John), MSP
Subject: Tests

Dear Mr Swinney

I wish to add my voice to those expressing despair at the proposed testing of five-year-old children in schools. I just believe it is a positive step.

All the best
[redacted]

Sent from my iPhone

Email chain 6

From: [redacted]
Sent: Saturday, May 26, 2018 10:38 am
Subject: P1 play not tests
To: Swinney J (John), MSP <john.swinney.msp@parliament.scot>

Dear Mr Swinney,

I am an Early Years qualified teacher with 25 years experience. I have already had to fight continuously for a play-based pedagogy to provide continuous provision at Early Level. This should always be the case as is stipulated in "Building the Curriculum 2". I should not have

to fight for play the way that I do, it should be instilled in teachers training as the most natural and developmentally appropriate way for young children to learn. Still I have to fight against deep rooted beliefs in SMT and staff that learning and teaching needs to be formal to raise attainment. This belief will be further compounded as SMT analyse data from SNSA'S and begin to put pressure on staff in Nursery and P1 to teach towards achieving good scores in these standardised assessments. The fact that young children are having to spend hours sat in front of a screen completing these assessments is wrong and goes against all that we know about developmentally appropriate learning and teaching. Our young children should be learning through play- based pedagogy and enjoying more time learning outdoors in nature. We have a serious mental- health problem with our children as they struggle with trauma and peer pressure. We should be harnessing the play- based and outdoor learning pedagogy as emphasised in the CFE.

Trust teachers to observe and assess children in developmentally appropriate ways rather than endless meaningless assessments in front of a screen.
I am reminded here of Michael Rosen's wonderful poem about data.

The data have landed

First they said they needed data

about the children
to find out what they're learning.
Then they said they needed data
about the children
to make sure they are learning.
Then the children only learnt
what could be turned into data.
Then the children became data.

PLEASE do not let this be what our Early Years Education becomes, we are so much better than this and our children deserve the best developmentally appropriate learning experiences that we can give them.

Please re- think computer based standardised assessments in P1.
Play not tests.

[redacted]
Principal Teacher

Email chain 7

-----Original Message-----

From: [redacted]

Sent: 26 May 2018 21:44

To: Deputy First Minister and Cabinet Secretary for Education and Skills

Subject: Concerns about P1 tests

Dear Mr Swinney,

As [redacted] who is starting school in August, I am highly supportive of the Scottish Government and the wider campaign for independence, whilst at the same time extremely disappointed with the direction the government is taking in terms of early years education.

Evidence shows that testing younger children is unnecessary, provides poor data and can be potentially harmful. With the best will in the world and even in the most relaxed

environments children know they're being tested. When my [redacted] is happily writing away she will be trying things out, be bold and creative with her letter choices; if I peep over her shoulder she can sense that I'm watching, she's is more tense, more uncertain and wants to double check all her answers. She is much more likely to make mistakes.

My [redacted] is fairly advanced in terms of literacy and numeracy because she enjoys patterns and has a good memory. She was counting up to 100 before she was three and can attempt to write most words phonetically at 4 and a half. This ability has all been developed through play and curiosity, none of it has been pushed. I'm telling you this because I'm not worried about her performance on the test, I'm worried about her reaction to it and that it is a waste of time in gathering the data you're looking for. Children at this age can perform wildly differently depending on their mood that day. How much sleep they got, whether they'd rather be doing something else. Train your teachers and trust them. This information can be more accurately gathered through observation of playful activities that children have an opportunity to access at their own pace and when they're ready.

Look to education systems that work well, like Canada and Scandinavia. Look at how they monitor the development of their little learners, use that to inform your decision. Don't look to England for inspiration. The education system there is taking the wrong path. We're crying out for you to be brave and show the country that we can be different. You don't have to make decisions to placate newspapers and opposition MSPs who demand evidence and stats to prove that children are learning. Show them the evidence of experts, show them examples from other countries, make the argument all our children need you to make for them.

Trust that human beings are biologically wired to learn at this age, if they are given the freedom and opportunity to do so. Some teachers might want guidance on how to assess in order to prove children are learning. Bring in experts from pre-school settings both here and abroad to give our teachers the skills and confidence to observe well chose playful activities and report on the children's progress. Not for stats and league tables, but to inform their own teaching. Take away the targets and tests and give them space to teach. Support them.

I don't want my [redacted] to go through this unnecessary test so I will be boycotting. Because the independent Scotland I want live in is one that puts all of our children first and follows a new path where creativity, happiness and kindness are given the same value as literacy and numeracy.

There is so much more I want to say about how desperately our children need play rather than phonics and that the skills learnt through play give children so much more such as confidence and resilience (something that the adolescent mental health statistics show is severely lacking).

Please be brave, please be progressive.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]
[redacted]

Email chain 8

From: [redacted]
Sent: Saturday, May 26, 2018 06:57
Subject: P1 SNSA

To: Swinney J (John), MSP <john.swinney.msp@parliament.scot>

Good Morning Mr Swinney,

This morning I read an article in which you were cited as keeping a close eye on the P1 debate around SNSA but had not been inundated with feedback. I thought as one of your current P1 teachers in neighbouring Fife, I should contact you.

First of all, the upper school SNSA went without a hitch, it was delivered on mass on netbooks in the class and seemed to go without any difficulties. In my setting we have 75 wonderful P1 learners. Here's my experience:

Logistically it has been very difficult and expensive for the service to undertake the SNSA. Contrary to what you've been quoted saying- it is not possible to deliver the SNSA in the classroom... certainly not putting a learner on the computer and supporting them one to one while delivering a play based curriculum. The classroom is too busy and distracting and I have found it very difficult to comprehend supporting each child one to one on the test while running a classroom of 24 others with no other support.

So my school, like others, has opted to hire in supply staff to take learners for testing. This has been at a huge expense, considering the one morning supply teacher we have can take 2 children a day (if they're not called to cover the many other staffing issues we, like so many other schools, are experiencing). We've now been SNSA-ing for a month and are still only 2/3rds through the children in P1.

Myself and colleagues are currently sacrificing what NCCT we can to administer the tests.

We've instilled a positive mindset in our learners in approaching the test. Mainly, not using the word test. To them, it is a game and delivered in as relaxed an environment as we can provide. Some children have still experienced distress and cried when faced with the several long passages, unreflective of the early benchmarks. The test appears to not be as responsive as the PIPS, which would adapt to learners levels. There seems to be 3 main test formats emerging with little deviation.

The maths assessment, we've felt, has been unreflective of many of the early outcomes/benchmarks. In no mathematics test I've delivered so far has a child been asked to mentally add or subtract within 20. Possibly a core piece of data.

In analysing/interpreting the SNSA data we've collated so far (after training), I've found much of it to be in line with my own judgements and previous formative/summative assessments undertaken in class. However, the ability for some learners to guess and randomly select some questions in P1 has made for a few skewed scores.

Moving forward, it would be important to weigh up the cost and time spent gathering this data through the SNSA format in P1 against the actual use of the data. Unlike the upper stages, this balance seems disproportionate. The SNSA forms only a small part of informing teachers judgements but takes an inordinate amount of time and resources to deliver. It would be imperative to evaluating the success of the SNSA implementation for the Scottish Government to collate data on the cost of additional teaching staff in P1 for schools. Our budgets are tight enough as it is without the added weight of supply staff to implement a test with limited use which we, as teachers at the chalk face, did not ask for.

Thank you for your time. I hope you've found my feedback somewhat useful.

Kind regards,

[redacted]
Class Teacher

Email chain 9

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 May 2018 21:20
To: Swinney J (John), MSP <John.Swinney.msp@parliament.scot>
Subject: A disappointed and demoralised young teacher's P1 SNSA feedback

Dear Mr Swinney,

I am writing this email to give you feedback about the recent P1 SNSAs. I know many other teachers will have sent you feedback and the EIS have just asked for feedback but I think its important to that you hear from as many sources as possible.

I am a teacher of a P1-3 class of a rural school in Aberdeenshire. I know that I am in a very privileged position as I have a very supportive head teacher who made herself available to carry out the assessment with my pupils so I did not have to worry about timetabling issues or using my McCrone time as I know other teachers have done. However, I still felt like the assessments took a significant length of time from productive learning and teaching opportunities. I would not mind this time being used for effective assessments but felt that the SNSAs caused more worry and stress than needed without giving any useful results.

We were told that this would be a responsive and supportive assessment and would be an improvement from PiPs unfortunately I was sorely disappointed. The programme is not always responsive and continues to get increasingly difficult for pupils who are struggling with previous questions. I do not like that the questions begin at a middle level then get more difficult or simpler depending on how the child answers the question. By beginning each topic like this it can demoralise the children who find the first question too difficult which then leads to children with lowered self-esteem and therefore do not have the confidence to tackle other 'tricky' questions.

I was able to have a look over the P1 SNSA and it became very clear that the assessments were written by people who had only read the experiences and outcomes and benchmarks and not by teachers who had taught the curriculum and have current experience of working with pupils with a variety of needs and abilities. The questions did not always take into account the need for concrete materials or visual cues which then made the questions harder than they needed to be.

I find it extremely disappointing and disheartening that the most creative and best idea that the Scottish Government had for raising attainment was more rigorous testing. This only causes anxiety, stress and unnecessary pressure on class teachers, Head Teachers and unfortunately, pupils. Mental health is of huge importance and something I and my school take very seriously and we are continuously researching and looking into ways of a creating mindful, healthy and nurturing environment for the children. Testing like the recent P1 SNSAs completely contradict this. I have pupils in my class who have suffered traumas and who's wellbeing is at the forefront of my mind at all times, their ability to cope and thrive in and out of school is far more important to me than if they remember a list of facts to complete a test.

I truly feel that if you really want to raise attainment in Scotland then proper funding needs to go into education. The class sizes need to be smaller, there needs to be far more support staff in classrooms, especially infant classes and there needs to be far better training opportunities for teachers so that they feel better equipped for the issues that are facing them in their classes. I, like many of my colleagues, feel like we are consistently letting our children down because we can not provide them with the high quality, expert resources or support that they need. They need time to be children, to play, experiment, explore, collaborate, construct and investigate. They need to be outside digging, running, creating and taking risks. I can assure you I take as many opportunities like this as I possibly can because this is when they learn best and when they are happiest. However, I am constantly aware of the high attainment that needs to be reached in such a short timescale. I believe that if Education Scotland take more time to look into the research on genuine, child led play as well as the benefits of outdoor learning, this would really help. There needs to be far more training opportunities on these aspects for current teachers and student teachers alike.

Like I have said earlier I am very fortunate that I was able to move to the school that I am in now where the staff are supportive, the grounds that we are on are great and full of learning opportunities and the families and local community are very supportive. If it wasn't for the school, supportive family and very supportive fellow teacher friends I would be questioning my ability to stay in the education system and can understand why many others leave it. All I have ever wanted to be was a Primary Teacher; I absolutely love my job and cannot imagine doing anything else. However, the amount of work, worry, stress, time and commitment it takes alongside the lack of respect and appreciation can be very hard to take and extremely demoralising. It seems silly to take so much time, money and effort to train teachers to then completely disregard their professional judgment.

I understand that you are very busy but I would just like you to take a serious look at the feedback given from teachers all over Scotland and take this into consideration when you start to plan more assessments or strategies to improve attainment.

Thank you for your time.

Regards,

[redacted]

Email chain 10

Sent: Sunday, June 3, 2018 10:28:26 PM

To: Swinney J (John), MSP

Subject: P1 testing!

Dear Mr. Swinney

I have a [redacted] just coming to the end of [redacted]. [redacted] goes to a lovely school and [redacted] is very fond of [redacted] teacher and all [redacted] friends. [redacted] transition into school went smoothly enough except [redacted] was troubled by one thing. The lack of a decent outdoor space to play in. You see [redacted] [redacted] had the most amazing garden and the children spent most of their time outside. [redacted] loved this and when [redacted] started [redacted] [redacted] regularly asked if [redacted] could go back to nursery instead.

I know that school is not the same as nursery so I was encouraged to hear my son's school talk a lot about 'soft start' and emotional wellbeing and nurturing. I thought to myself wow this is different and refreshing!

I was so disappointed then to hear that in P1 children are being tested and even more disappointing that I didn't hear it from the school!! became aware of it through the online campaign #playnottests.

So I am expressing my disappointment to you because I fundamentally disagree with testing for children in Primary School at whatever age but particularly in P1. What is the purpose of it? Why were we the parents not told? I have asked several parents and no-one knew about it. I even brought it up at a parent council meeting and no-one knew about it.

My [redacted] came home from school last week and said [redacted] had to do something for literacy and numeracy on the iPad. I asked [redacted] was it a test and [redacted] said yes. [redacted] said [redacted] "felt nervous cos I didn't want to do it". Why are we putting children to the test? I mean why are we putting their young developing brains and bodies under stress? Is it necessary? I do not think it is and I know many people feel the same way.

Perhaps you will reconsider?

With best wishes

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

Email chain 11

From: [redacted]

Sent: Tuesday, May 29, 2018 8:45 pm

Subject: SNSA P1 feedback

To: Swinney J (John), MSP <john.swinney.msp@parliament.scot>

Dear Mr. Swinney,

I am writing to you to let you know of the extreme disappointment I experienced today in school. I am a Primary 1 teacher in the south side of Glasgow and today we started the SNSA assessments. The children - and myself - found the tests to be pitched far too high and not in line with the early level benchmarks. I have attached a photo of one section I was particularly concerned about.

Primary 1 children being expected to read non fiction texts about hummingbirds totally independently. Whilst some children in my class could decode aspects of this text, they are not yet fluent enough readers to read and understand the whole passage.

I have left school today questioning everything I have thought to be right about a playful, engaging and exciting Primary 1 setting. How can we shout about the benefits of play and it's important impact on language and social development if we are going to face children with these tests at the end of the year? I feel time would be much better invested developing a progression of play, properly training staff and resourcing play in P1 through to P3 instead

of formally assessing reading. I feel like there are two totally opposing views in place just now about what early education should look like.

After having attempted the literacy SNSA with one boy in my class today, two girls came over and asked him to play. He replied that he was busy building a Lego bridge but might join in later. This child is awaiting a potential ASD diagnosis and was almost non verbal at the beginning of this school year. He would not achieve well in the SNSA assessments but today I observed him informally developing language and communication skills with his friends. How can we log achievements like these? Can we develop a framework for observing naturally occurring learning instead of formal sit down tests?

The children and I were so disheartened by the assessments today that we had to stop. The children in my class are bright, creative, independent thinkers. They could tell you the whole life cycle of a frog from having a real life experience of looking after tadpoles. They can create and tell amazing stories from our collaborative work with local storytellers. They are entrepreneurs who have decided to publish a book of these stories to raise funds for Syrian refugees settling in Glasgow. None of this is reflected in the SNSA assessments and I urge you to reconsider their place in Primary 1 and, ultimately, the purpose of Primary 1.

[redacted]
Class Teacher
[redacted]

E-mail chain 12

-----Original Message-----

From: [redacted]

Sent: 29 May 2018 16:52

To: Swinney J (John), MSP <John.Swinney.msp@parliament.scot>

Subject: P1 assessments

Dear Mr Swinney,

I am writing to you regarding the new P1 assessments. I feel strongly that it is important that you are made aware of the concerns felt by many primary teachers regarding this move made by the Scottish Government. This decision is clearly in contradiction to the resounding feeling that P1 children should learn through experiential rich play. The rote learning that would be required for children to perform in these assessments is a clear contradiction. P1 teachers, like myself, have now fallen into what has been coined the 'P1 Puzzle' where we are expected to focus on play based learning that develops life skill such as verbal language acquisition, problem solving and creativity and yet the children are assessed on more formal educational benchmarks. These assessments are sold to us as evidence of a child's learning but will ultimately lead to 'teaching to the test' in order for Head Teachers to match neighbouring schools. Please re-consider your decision to go ahead with these assessments. It may fundamentally damage our goal for learning through play.

Regards
[redacted]

Email chain 13

From: [redacted]

Sent: 06 June 2018 18:53

To: Swinney J (John), MSP <John.Swinney.msp@parliament.scot>

Subject: Issues with the P1 Scottish National Standardised Assessments

Dear Mr Swinney,

I am writing to add my voice to the many others who have contacted you and your colleagues to express their dismay about the Scottish National Standardised Assessments which have been delivered this year.

I am a P1 teacher working in [redacted]. We have been in receipt, this year, of a substantial amount of PEF money designed to assist us in addressing the attainment gap. So to end this year with several weeks of teaching time lost to a testing process which does not in any way support us to progress the learning of our children runs completely counter to everything we have been trying to do.

The question of whether it is wise or appropriate to perform standardised testing on this age group of children has been hotly debated at some length. I am not going to address that here, I understand the political will for this form of testing to be introduced and I am reasonably resigned to that. What I wish to address here is the fundamental flaws in the way these tests have been designed. Administering these tests to our 54 P1 children took approximately 30 hours of teacher time for numeracy and 40 hours for literacy. The amount of progress that could have been delivered if those hours were used for effective teaching is significant and instead we were required to use that time to run testing which, as I will outline below, is problematic in almost every regard. If this government is to commit this investment of time and money in this process, then below are a number of issues which will need to be urgently addressed.

As I have taken the time to give you a substantial amount of detailed and specific feedback, as you will see below, I would appreciate detailed and specific responses to these issues and some idea of how they will be resolved for next year.

I look forward to hearing from you.

[redacted]

Issues with the P1 SNSAs – Summer 2018

Interface: Issues with design and functionality.

My first question about the design of the SNSA system is – WHY was it not possible to design a system in which the interface fitted the screen? Regardless of the device you use to access the system, almost every page requires that you swipe or scroll down a short distance to locate the green 'next' arrow. This is one of the many reasons that the tests took such a long time to administer. It is just a basic example of thoughtlessness in the way that the tests were created – without considering the experience of the end-user.

There are however a range of other issues in the design. Some of these may seem like relatively pedantic details but I spend my working life designing and using 'assessment is for learning' strategies in which I think carefully about how I phrase questions and whether the thing that I am asking is actually allowing the child to show what they know about the topic under discussion. I am acutely aware that, especially with very young children, extraneous information or a badly worded question can absolutely make the difference between them being able to share their learning and demonstrate their skills or being utterly confused by context and unable to respond.

1. The 'drag a line' method for answering questions is really confusing to young children. You are being asked to match a picture on the left to a picture on the right by dragging a line from one to the other. However, you are asked, not to connect the pictures themselves but to connect two spots which are situated in the vicinity of the matching pictures. I can see the intention and that the result does not seem all that far from the intention but for a young child it feels counterintuitive in a way that interrupts their thought process.

2. There are a number of questions that required children to drag 4 possible answers which were contained in a row of 4 rectangular boxes into a particular order in 4 corresponding empty boxes either above or below where they were. Unfortunately, none of those questions actually explained to the child that the row of items as they were initially displayed was not in the correct order. As such a very large number of children just dragged the row of items in its existing order into the row of empty boxes. I don't know whether the designers of this system will take the time to examine the responses of the questions they set but I think if they do, they will see a sizable percentage of children simply moving the existing row of objects, in the existing order into the new boxes.

3. The yellow 'mouth buttons' which there are to provide support and read some questions and answers aloud to children are often provided on a page in baffling profusion and with no indication or apparent logic as to the order in which they should be deployed. One child, presented with a page showing, 5 mouth buttons simply gasped and looked at me and said, "It's too much!". Sometimes the first button you come to is a button which simply reads you the label from one of the axes of a graph – so the first thing you hear on a page is an out-of-context statement like "number of shells". To an adult it may seem obvious that this is simply a graph title but to a 5-year old it is not.

4. Many of the questions contain extended multi-part instructions. It is extremely bad practice to use over-complex multi-part instructions with young children. We are encouraged by communications specialists to 'chunk-down' our instructions to make them more accessible to young children and yet this test asks children on occasion to remember an instruction which contains 6 different elements (e.g. question about placing different coloured balls in different locations discussed below).

Content: Issues with phrasing of questions and answers.

Many of the questions in the tests are very poorly phrased – often at best they are ambiguous and at worst they are so badly written that they are actually misleading. On many occasions they fall into the classic trap (which any good teacher labours to avoid) of asking a question in such a way that it does not assess the target information but the ancillary skills required for the child to access the question. The questions detailed below are a selection of examples that I could recall rather than an exhaustive list – although having watched 54 children complete the numeracy test and approximately 20 complete the literacy test I have the dubious pleasure of knowing these tests pretty well.

Numeracy Questions:

1. [redacted]
2. [redacted]
3. [redacted]
4. [redacted]
5. [redacted]
6. [redacted]
7. [redacted]
8. [redacted]

9. [redacted]
10. [redacted]

Literacy Questions:

11. [redacted]
12. [redacted]
13. [redacted]

Outputs: Issues with the data provided by the assessments.

Having completed these tests, I now have my children divided up into 3 categories – high, medium and low. This is a very simplistic way of outputting this data. Previous standardised assessments I have encountered have given me an actual standardised score which provides much more detail about relative performance than ‘high, medium or low’.

Having watched the children complete the tests I also have no confidence in the validity of the assessment of any of those three categories. Out of our 54 children, not one child came out as low on the numeracy test, even though some of them only gave a handful of correct answers. This assessment does not in any way support or marry up with the detailed understanding that we have developed over the past year of the strengths, challenges and support needs of our children.

The only conclusion I can reach having watched this process from beginning to end is that these tests have been set up to give a deliberately vague picture which broadly supports the idea that the attainment gap is closing.

I can not use the data from these tests to support my teaching in ANY way. It does not provide reliable information on any aspect of my children’s learning or development. Their response to any question on this test is equally likely to be the result of guess work or confusion than it is any indication of their skills or knowledge in that area of the curriculum.

If this process is to continue next academic year then PLEASE take the time to allow experienced Early Years teachers to feed back on the testing before it is finalised and PLEASE listen to what they say. We are not simply trying to make it easier for our kids so we look good (the results of this process make my teaching look fantastic!) but we are keen that a process which is so demanding of time, energy and public money should provide usable, valid data which supports the work we strive to do.

Email chain 14

From: [redacted]
Sent: 04 May 2018 23:41
To: National Improvement Framework <nationalimprovementframework@gov.scot>
Subject: SNSA Support

Hello,

I have scoured the SNSA website, but seem unable to find answers that I am looking for.

I am quite concerned about the current SNSAs used within my primary 1 class - particularly the literacy questions.

I am under the impression that children can use support they would be given in class, e.g. concrete materials in numeracy. This raises some serious questions for me in relation to the literacy assessment - children in primary 1 are unable to read many of the words which use Read, Write, Inc, set 2 and set 3 sounds, nor long sections of writing and rather than excite them about reading, I have been faced with children feeling disheartened and switching off completely to the rest of the assessment.

I have seen a recent facebook group chat which mentioned some teachers have read aloud passages to the children whilst they have followed along and then they have answered the questions using comprehension skills - many of which getting the majority incorrect but still receiving a passage about hummingbirds.

These assessments do not seem to match with the early benchmarks.

If some teachers are reading passages to children and others are not, how will the results be truly realistic?

Though, if in class we would assist children in reading passages (granted, much shorter), then why should we not during the assessments? Surely this would be the relevant support materials used for the children?

It also seems as though we are setting the children up to fail if they are only able to read simple CVC and CVCC words at this time, but we are expecting them to read words such as [redacted] hummingbird etc.

I can see an excellent value in assessments when used in an age, stage and ability appropriate way, but I am concerned about these assessments and their impact on the children themselves.

I look forward to an informative reply.

Many thanks,

[redacted]

Email chain 15

-----Original Message-----

From: [redacted]

Sent: 02 May 2018 06:36

To: National Improvement Framework <nationalimprovementframework@gov.scot>

Subject: Standardised Testing

As both an Early Years worker and a mother of a soon to be [redacted] I am absolutely disgusted by the way in which these tests have been dressed up in the guise of the 'child's best interest'. If this was the case information for parents would have been distributed prior to August 2017 and not drip fed down the line a year later.

All studies, research and guidance, (most created by the Scottish Government) contradicts to the very core what you are carrying out in P1 with this out dated, unnecessary testing model.

As a government you are robbing this generation of their childhood. If you NEED this idea of assessed children's knowledge, for your stats figures (pretending it is for anything else is quite frankly insulting!) then introduce qualified playworkers and early years workers into

primary schools, who have the ability to promote learning, development and opportunities through play. Who are trained to observe children, who work with children, following their lead. Do this as part of a thought through commitment in promoting and protecting children's RIGHT to play!

Let's create teaching environments that enhance a child's natural curiosity, let's break the mould by revolutionising schooling for children in Scotland, let's lead by example and create a model that GETS IT RIGHT FOR EVERY CHILD, naturally BUILDING THEIR AMBITION both protecting and promoting their FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT TO PLAY!

I ask of this government to be courageous, to truly mean what they say when they discuss CHILD AT THE CENTRE, SHANARRI and CURRICULUM FOR EXCELLENCE.

Eradicate standardised testing in the early years and whole heartedly support the fight against ACES, poor childhood mental health and obesity. SUPPORT, ENCOURAGE, PROMOTE PLAY!

When we truly consider the child as paramount and their well-being holistically surely you must agree that the need to focus on such areas are far superior and should take precedent over these ridiculous and unnecessary tests?

Regards

[redacted]

Email chain 16

-----Original Message-----

From: [redacted]

Sent: 03 May 2018 17:53

To: National Improvement Framework <nationalimprovementframework@gov.scot>

Subject: P1 testing

Hello,

I want to write to share my thoughts on the snsa testing particularly in p1. I am very much against testing in p1. At this stage of schooling children should be being encouraged to play and learn through play. This type of testing goes against this line of thought. I feel that children of this age should not feel the stress involved with testing particularly if they are struggling and find question after question hard. This can cause a child to feel a sense of failure which can be detrimental at any age let alone a child so early in their learning. We do not want to put children off of learning.

I feel that the way that the test is undertaken is not really appropriate. Many schools do not have enough computers or laptops to be able to facilitate these tests. Also I feel children of this age do not have the computer skills to be able to complete these online tests. I know my p1 child has never, until recently at school, used a lap top and will struggle to control the cursor and click appropriately let alone be able to scroll down. I understand that I pads can be used but not all schools have these available. I think that children of this age may without support just click randomly and in order to support children the tests would need to be done in small groups taking a member of staff away from other duties. In schools with large rolls this could take considerable time and thus other children missing out on potential support from pupil support assistants that they need.

To surmise I feel that early years education should not be about testing for government statistics and that more should be done to encourage and facilitate a play based approach to learning to provide our children with the ability to use their imaginations and have a chance to take risks and develop their resilience.

Yours sincerely,
[redacted]

Sent from my iPhone

Email chain 17

From: [redacted]

Sent: 09 May 2018 13:10

To: National Improvement Framework <nationalimprovementframework@gov.scot>

Subject: Concerns about SNSA in Primary 1

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to raise my serious concerns regarding the new primary 1 national tests (SNSA). The tests are unreliable at best and damaging at worst. Similar baseline tests in England and the United States have had no impact on improving attainment and to impose them on local authorities and schools without consulting them first is ill-informed, a waste of taxpayers' money and undermines trust in teachers' professional judgements.

I fear that next year teachers will be prepping p1s for them despite assurances from policy makers that there is no need to do this as they are for data collection purposes only to help teachers plan next steps. Play will fall by the wayside (despite neuroscientific evidence that unambiguously proves this is how young children learn best) and I foresee p1 'league tables' becoming a reality down the line. Schools will be asked to explain why pupil performance hasn't improved compared to previous years and before you can say 'play not tests', the 'academic creep' will have clawed its way down to nurseries and pre-schoolers will soon be forced to do homework and learn spurious, de-contextualised facts in attempt to achieve inappropriate targets, outcomes and benchmarks for their age group.

This flies in the face of the overwhelming body of evidence which proves young children naturally develop at different rates and that many are not ready at 4/5 for formal education (and that this is totally developmentally appropriate and does not affect their attainment down the line if they don't start reading and writing till later - infact it can often have a negative impact if they do start too soon).

International comparisons of countries which don't start their children's formal education till 6 or 7 (88% of countries worldwide) show they have a narrower attainment gap in classes, less of a rich/poor divide and children with fewer mental health issues. They also regularly top the PISA rankings in all areas. Finland is one such country and it is no great coincidence that it also came no. 1 in the UN's World Happiness Report this year. It knocked Norway off the top spot and it was Denmark before that - all countries which regularly outperform us in PISA tests and all of which send their children to school later than we do.

The other reasons why I disagree with testing at such a young age are summed up in the 'Play Not Tests in p1' Upstart Scotland campaign which I strongly encourage you to read:<http://www.upstart.scot/play-not-tests-in-p1-campaign/>

I am also extremely concerned that schools are under no obligation to tell parents their children are being tested and therefore the vast majority of parents don't know this is happening. It seems particularly stealthy and underhand. Testing p1s, not informing their parents about it and that they have the right to withdraw them is unfair and unacceptable.

I trust you will feed these views back to the relevant parties and I urge you to join Upstart Scotland to support the campaign for an introduction of a kindergarten stage for 3-7 year olds. The evidence shows that that is what is best for young children and society would also reap the benefits down the line with happier, healthier, better educated citizens: the key priorities of the National Improvement Framework.

I look forward to hearing from you regarding these concerns.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

Email chain 18

From: [redacted]

Sent: 25 May 2018 20:58

To: National Improvement Framework <nationalimprovementframework@gov.scot>

Subject: FAO John Swinney

I'm taking time out from my caravan holiday (all I can afford, how about a pay rise?) to let you know my personal experiences of the SNSA tests.

I teach in a primary school and have 28 years experience but am actively seeking a change of direction as my already heavy workload is becoming unbearable. Holistic assessment is the last straw - but that's another email.

[redacted]

[redacted]

But...since the SNSA started with P1 I have had NO SUPPORT AT ALL for this [redacted]. I have been given a walkie talkie for "emergencies"

Every bit of school assistant time has been taken up with SNSA - 60 P1 pupils each doing two assessments which take 45 minutes each and needing 1:1 support with them. That's 90 hours of 1:1 - or it would be if the children conveniently fitted onto a conveyor belt and not a second was wasted - in reality one school assistant is able to work with 3 or 4 children per day.

Meanwhile my class and everyone else in earshot is disrupted regularly. Inclusion is exactly the way things should be - but when it was first mentioned we were assured pupils would be supported.

Close the gap by cutting class sizes, by increasing support, not taking it away, by letting us TEACH instead of mounting artwork and reinventing the wheel! And please, please have a word with whoever decided that teachers should be creating holistic assessments when those on high don't have a clue what they're looking for - if we gave pupils such a woolly, confusing task with so little guidance we'd be slammed (rightly)- how about giving us clear Learning Intentions and Success Criteria?

Disillusioned, exhausted, sad sad teacher.

Email chain 19

From: [redacted]
Sent: 27 May 2018 09:23
To: National Improvement Framework <nationalimprovementframework@gov.scot>
Subject: Primary 1 testing

I'd like to complain and share my experience of the primary 1 testing.

John Swinney said he hadn't been inundated with complaints, so on behalf of myself and all the teachers I know who find them a waste of time and resources, as well as unhelpful and stressful for some children, I decided to email.

The tests apparently should take no longer than 40 minutes - yet the reading assessment has so much reading that it took much longer for some of our children. Children cannot focus on that kind of assessment, and the using a computer added an extra layer of difficulty. In my school we decided to test children one at a time so they'd have more chance of answering all the questions they knew, instead of getting distracted by the computer, the environment and getting fed up and just not reading the question. This is a massive use of staff resources that could be put into supporting children instead of performing tests that are not useful.

In addition, the stress of making children answer a question that they can't understand is unnecessary and cruel.

The test itself seemed far too hard and with too much reading. One of the questions had a simple text, with a question that a lot of children couldn't read because it contained the words 'who' and 'leaves'. Such a shame for children to read the 3 sentences correctly only to be left with a question they don't understand.

I hope you receive, or seek out, a lot more feedback from teachers who have experience of these tests.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Regards
[redacted]

Email chain 20

From: [redacted]
Sent: 08 May 2018 10:58
To: National Improvement Framework <nationalimprovementframework@gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Adjustments for children with disabilities

Hi Many thanks for your email. I have raised it with the school and more attention will be paid to [redacted] understanding that [redacted] can ask for a break if [redacted] feels unwell.

However what the school can do nothing about is the inability to go backwards in the assessment if the 'next' key is tapped in error. This was the point that I was highlighting that

caused such distress. I am advised by the school that this is an inbuilt feature that they cannot over ride?

Can you advise if that is the case and what assessment has been done regarding a child doing this in error due to their medical condition?

Many thanks for your help.

Email chain 21

From: [redacted]
Sent: 27 April 2018 09:27
To: National Improvement Framework
Subject: Adjustments for children with disabilities

Hi, my child [redacted] has just sat her SNSA. I am concerned that in setting these there appears to be no consideration of childrens needs for adjustments depending on their disabilities?

[redacted]

I will be raising this with [redacted] school about ensuring [redacted] has recognition of [redacted] care needs built into any assessment process. However I am interested to understand why the assessment does not allow a pupil to go back if they have skipped in error? Also what consideration is provided about individual needs of the child?

Many thanks
[redacted]

Email chain 22

-----Original Message-----

From: [redacted]
Sent: 23 April 2018 16:51
To: National Improvement Framework <nationalimprovementframework@gov.scot>
Subject: SNSA question

Good afternoon

I have just received the leaflet around the standardised assessments.

My daughter is in Primary 1 just now and will be completing one. I have read the Q&A section and it advised that the teachers will use the information to feedback to me around how my daughter is doing.

I would personally really like to see the questions and answers that she chooses. Can this be made available to me upon request or would I need to place a subject access request to gain access to this information?

Kind Regards

[redacted]

Email chain 23

From: [redacted]
Sent: 15 June 2018 07:14
To: First Minister
Subject: Stage not Age of Development

Dear Ms Sturgeon,

As a voter of the SNP since I became eligible to vote and a strong supporter of the valid developments made since, I am disheartened to find that on this occasion I am strongly opposed to the Standardised National Tests sweeping across P1 classes in the busiest time of the year for educational establishments. As Senior Early Years Officer with the privilege to undertake a graduate post in August in one of the lowest SIMD areas within my authority I can hand on heart say that these children are not and will not be at the stage of development where they can confidently name another word for hummingbirds beak. You were quoted the other day as saying 'Being able to assess in an appropriate and age-appropriate way how our young people are doing in school is an important part of that.' It is not about age appropriateness in early years, it's about stage of development, especially in our low attainment catchments- we are striving towards play based pedagogy, but let's do a formal, structured and segregated test?!

I think it may be time to stop and listen to those in the midst of SNSA, listen to the practitioners and our children, visiting one or two schools is not a true reflection of Scotland. For the first time in my voting life I wonder is it time for a change?

Thank you for your time.

[redacted]

E-mail chain 24

From: [redacted]
Sent: Sunday, June 17, 2018 12:31:32 AM
To: Nicola Sturgeon
Subject: P1 SNSA assessments - teacher perspective

Good Evening Nicola,

As a current P2 teacher moving into P1 next session I felt compelled to write to you following the ongoing debates regarding assessment in the early years. I understand the drive you have to close the attainment gap and the need to track young people's progress. I believe the key to finding a common ground is assessing what is important... Do these kids know their initial sounds? Numbers to 20? Colours? Can they use 1-1 correspondence to mark count and touch count to 20? Can they order the days of the week? etc...

I think teachers and parents would be far more supportive of less formal, more targeted assessment that really ties into the early level benchmarks. One of the maths questions this session was along the lines of... 'use the calendar to identify how many Tuesdays are in the month' - this in no way relates to the time benchmark for time. At Primary 1 what would be important would be the awareness of the use of a calendar to track important dates to the child e.g. birthday month, when is Christmas? etc You are obviously aware of the 'hummingbird/beak/bill' fiasco... that is not even

geographically relevant. What we are looking for at Primary 1 is can the kids blend 3 and 4 letter words with understanding and have a growing bank of sight words. I have worked with kids that haven't been out with their locality and haven't seen a real life farm animal... or the extent of their outings is school-Tesco-home-repeat... A hummingbird is not on their radar!

I have 15 years experience in a variety of schools, including overseas, with a wide range of socio-economic backgrounds. I have held class teacher and management positions so understand the value of assessment - but the key is valuable and relevant assessment!

Regards,
[redacted]

Email chain 25

②

The introduction of these tests
show 10 to 15 years after
first use - I reckon this
the minimum time scale
would take to show their
effect.

Yours Respectfully.

redacted

28-5-18.

redacted

The Education Secretary.
Scots Government,
Scots Parliament
Holyrood,
Edinburgh.

Dear Mr. Swinney, I am writing
to you today to congratulate
you on the introduction of
tests for Primary school
age children. In my
absence of such tests was
responsible for Scotland's miserable
attainment for educational standards.