

**User-friendliness (children and young people)** – appropriateness of level of digital and keyboard skills required, and accessibility of language, font, layout and assessment tasks.

## **ABERDEEN**

The language and font were geared to much older children. The length of the text required to read caused a lot of stress on my pupils. Really not acceptable. Not a reflection of the benchmarks. Even the simple questions such as rhyme were so badly laid out, that even my confident rhymers got them wrong - so badly worded, too many choices and silly words.

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

Wasn't user friendly. We completed 1 to 1 and asked child to identify answer by pointing then adult clicked/dragged as appropriate. Had to scroll down sidebar to get to next button.

I carried out the assessment on iPads as I felt they were more user friendly. The need to scroll to find the next button or answer part of the question caused some issues. Some children would scroll too close to the answer section and their answer would be deselected and they would press next before they realised. There was not a lot of empty space for children who were heavy handed to control with care. I ended up scrolling for a lot of them.

## **ABERDEENSHIRE**

The layout was too large for screen on some literacy tests so had to keep moving about in order to see all the text.

Having to read off a screen was problematic for some pupils. I also ended up sellotaping coloured overlays to the screen to help a dyslexic child. The fact that the maths and writing tasks weren't able to be listened to on the computer was not helpful.

It was okay for upper stages but due to sitting them in January we hadn't covered half the curriculum.

Children of this age cannot scroll and click independently for such a sustained period of time. They needed adult support to stay on task and ensure they didn't miss questions they could answer. They are used to reading aloud and need to do this to comprehend text. The text needed to be enlarged for some questions and reduced again for others. This is not something the children can do independently.

Very difficult for literacy difficulties and children with ASN who were unable to use any of the tools or strategies we've spent ages encouraging them to use.

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

## **ANGUS**

The fact that the majority of questions have three multiple choice answers means that children have a 33% chance of guessing correctly (which many children have been doing). This will ultimately result in national results showing children to be at a higher ability than they are.

Next button off bottom of iPad screen requiring scrolling just to reach next page. Questions were not at the appropriate level for the children. Children asked to read full passages of writing which does not correspond to early level benchmarks.

Ridiculously hard for early level.

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.

Not very child friendly! A member of staff had to sit and direct the children. Font too small. Far too much reading. Sentences too close together. The stories were far too long, and the children were getting bored by the end of them. Even higher ability readers found it difficult to read the sentences and the questions.

## **ARGYLL & BUTE**

The writing didn't fit on the screen, so the children had to keep scrolling up and down to access all the information. This made it difficult for some pupils.

P1 totally inappropriate! We have high achieving pupils & they struggled with the reading tasks! Please look at the Es & Os & benchmarks before making a test!

I am just worried that some were clicking any box to get finished.

80% of class were still learning how to use cursor and mouse pad on laptop. Step by step instructions, repeatedly and also had to be reminded not to lean on the pad as errors constantly made size changes and jumped pages.

Most of children's computer skills are too limited for coping with this.

I have a lot of outdoor children raised with a low digital experience - so very difficult for some to access fairly. We have 80% children with ASN, so most assessments were not accessible or relevant for them.

## **CLACKMANNANSHIRE**

Not great to view on the little netbooks we have in the authority.

## **DUMFRIES AND GALLOWAY**

Not very child friendly, especially reading. A LOT of instructions within text which often distracted rather than enhance experience. Very small text too. Enlarging

text then led to children scrolling up and down to see options, often forgetting what initial question was. ICT skills had to be quite good.

Font far too small. Too much scrolling.

P1 children can't complete the tests on their own. They need help with the ICT skills. "Drag and Drop" confused many of them. Having to scroll down was also difficult.

As previously stated, the passwords and usernames were too difficult for the children to input themselves. I thought the reading test was too 'busy' as well. At one point, children were expected to click on several 'read to me' buttons on one page, therefore some got missed.

I found that children found the drag and dropping activities difficult because they have never been taught this in P1 before. Due to the time the assessments took it was not feasible for children to complete the practice assessment. Children had to be shown as a whole class. The books were also difficult for the children to manoeuvre and a lot of the children missed pages of the book because they thought that they had clicked on all the pages even although they hadn't.

The ICT skills required of a P1 to complete the assessment means there is no possibility of completing it at any other point than the end of year. Children are expected to zoom in and out or scroll down as on some questions the 'next' button is too far down the page. At no point have I had to teach children how to zoom in and out on a screen in P1 until now. The language of some of the questions doesn't support a P1 understanding what they have to do. The ability to skip questions without answering also means that some children become 'skip happy' hoping the finish the test quicker - especially the literacy. The Hummingbird question was absolutely ridiculous as children looked at what they were being expected to read and immediately said "I can't do that" and wouldn't even attempt it.

Not user friendly at all. Too long, far too much reading.

Very small text and graphics for pupils to see on the screen, especially on the laptop where navigation of the page became a barrier.

Absolutely awful! It kept freezing and needed constantly refreshed, the children had to click and drag using the mouse, they thought they had answered wrongly because their selection bounced back out of the dotted lines, instead of trying the same one again they selected a different answer and tried to get it to stay in place. The literacy layout is horrendous! By the time the children had clicked all the numbers to read the pages on different screens, clicked the mouth to hear the question, and clicked the 3 mouths to hear the answers they had lost interest and forgotten what they were meant to do in the first place!

Tricky for P1s hence why I had to sit with two at a time. Even this was difficult as many of the children talked their way through the assessment. Some parts of the sound did not work. Scrolling down was tricky. Took too long to complete - doesn't match with average attention span.

Several P1s found the whole process exhausting and demoralising. The more able could do the assessments but the result didn't tell us anything we didn't already know.

In the primary 1 assessment the font was too small for the children to read, I had pupils tell me they were struggling because of this. Primary 1 pupils cannot be expected to complete this assessment independently if you would like reliable answers as they are likely to click on anything at times. We do not have access to tablets, the assessments were completed using PCs, the children do not have the capabilities to use the mouse accurately for the length of time expected in these assessments. The assessments take far too long to complete, and the children were visibly exhausted by the end. Assessment tasks were pitched far beyond what is expected in Early Level.

Very complicated. Multiple instructions given at the same time. It was difficult for pupils to 'drag' answers. In my opinion completely inappropriate. Primary One could not and did not complete these on their own. Great expectations from those in government.

So, the child has to listen with headphones, then read text, then move mouse to listen to question then read the three answer options, then drag with the mouse the correct answer. A five-year-old doing this for 50 minutes solid! They are spending so long trying to work it they just guessed answers!

P1 has too many ICT skills required. Too much clicking and scrolling.

Every single P1 pupil required 1:1 support as they had to be confident using system, working a mouse, using computer/laptop and needed prompting with what to do if unsure/struggling. Language used not always relevant in P1 assessment. Names used could be sounded out but were unusual names, therefore even more able pupils struggled to understand the context as they did not know what the name meant or was about.

The assessment relied completely on mouse control which is not secure with many Primary 1 pupils (particularly with so many children having tablets at home, PCs are alien to them so many forget and try to touch or swipe the screen). As the teacher or any adult delivering the assessment, there should have been some kind of basic training or leaflet supplied so we knew what to expect and what to do if the child can't answer, like in the CEM testing (PIPS).

Needed to buy mice for all the laptops as kids found it difficult to use the pads. Some had difficulty in scrolling to bottom of pages.

Children all required individual support at P1 stage- could not leave pupils to do tasks independently. Assessment tasks most definitely not set by a P1 teacher and not relevant to their life experience. Even the listening stories set for those who were unable to read were far too long for understanding, analysing and evaluating came too near the end of the assessment and they had already lost concentration by this point.

Keyboard skills- for P1 way beyond their ability. Drag and hold really difficult with little hands on a large mouse. You need to scroll down using the bar on the

right to be able to access the button to click for the next page. Too many mouths all in different places and P1's will not click them in the correct order. PC mouse often not working, and you then have to click the back key and then return to page to get the mouse working. As for logging on, a 5-year-old cannot type all the user name and then the password correctly without adult help and giving them a very long time to do it!! As for the font- that caused confusion for a few of my children.

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

Keyboard skills required. Accessibility of language, layout and in particular font, were all horrendous. Reading in particular proved extremely challenging for some as a result of the size of the text font and the length of and number of texts. Again, texts did not appear to be suitably adaptive to meet individual needs.

## **DUNDEE**

Would have been better if accessible on tablets/net books. Hard to scroll through and find multiple choice and receive all the information needed. Would have been much easier if it was all on 1 size of screen with no scrolling needed.

Because we were testing P1, an adult had to take children individually. This was also due to our lack of computers to complete the tests. Children definitely could not undertake these tests independently.

Awful - P1s are used to using touch screens not a mouse. Click/drag etc...awful for P1 children.

Computer based assessments are often seen by some children as gaming and "not important". The scroll down feature on the screen was not child friendly and children would only choose from the first 2 or 3 options. The font on the reading assessments was far too small.

Absolutely shocking to expect 5-year olds to navigate around these assessments. They just couldn't do it, they would've taken around 1.5 -2 hours if I had left each child to do the dragging, dropping, clicking etc. The layout is boring and unappealing for young children. My children certainly appeared bored and disengaged when doing them. "Can I go back to class now?" And what made it worse is that they could hear the joy of their peers as they were busy, focused & learning so much during their free-play.

I observed a lot of 'happy clicking' in order to finish and get on to the next job. The need to 'scroll down' on some language pages in order to read what was there was confusing for some children who 'couldn't be bothered' to do this. This therefore affected their overall comprehension of the text.

The assessments required a huge amount of reading.

## EAST AYRSHIRE

Too many things for young children to think about before actually answering questions.

Using a mouse in P1 is difficult enough. The assessments were far too long, if you did not sit one to one with pupils, they got tired and bored and started clicking through the questions without even answering them at times. One to one was necessary but it was not manageable with a class as well. No teaching or learning happened during these assessments due to no support. Pupils were asked to read books, given tasks and activities but were not checked up on to see if they were doing them correctly.

A number of pupils found the length of time taken to complete tests off-putting and lost focus.

In our situation children needed keyboard and mouse skills which they are lacking at the age of 5.

Early level tests were not appropriate, took too long, pupils lost interest so expected results not always achieved. Other pupils who were reluctant to do the tests found that they could just click any answer and finish the test quickly, again not giving a true reflection of ability. Some of the contexts were new to the pupils, so they could not relate to the questions.

Some children could not read the instructions by themselves never mind the questions. Struggled to log in with difficult passwords containing spaces and capital letters. Pupils also more careless with computer tests as easy to move on/guess if they don't know which can taint results.

The use of the mouse was very difficult for many pupils who nowadays use touch screens.

There was far too much reading for P1 to do.

More skills were needed to complete these tests than the children had. Many P1s were trying to use PC screens as touch screens.

three words  
redacted - out of  
scope

P1s needed support to log in.

For some children the tasks were difficult for the younger stages and some middle school children needed support to navigate the site.

The majority of my P1 found it difficult to navigate the assessments. Logging in was difficult enough for the adult administrating the assessments. A number of my children simply didn't answer the question as they couldn't navigate the keyboard or use the mouse confidently enough. So, you don't know if the child is unable to answer the question because they don't have an understanding or is it simply that they couldn't navigate the ICT. Some of the questions totally inappropriate for age and stage e.g. hummingbirds

words redacted - exemption  
33(1)(b)

P1 children struggled with click and move objects.

Children could easily click their way through all the questions without even reading them. Mouse and keyboard skills in infants are very poorly developed, so the time taken to complete assessments was much longer than anticipated.

Not suited to some P1s.

The children couldn't access the mouse technology, but the touch pads were more appropriate. Unfortunately, the whole question wouldn't fit on the screen at once meaning the children were needing to scroll around to find options, resulting in them forgetting the question or key info required to answer. The school's internet also caused problems for accessibility.

### **EAST DUNBARTONSHIRE**

The content was not pitched at the right level for primary 1 readers. Some older children guessed or answered too quickly without properly reading the questions.

Management team told us to manage the digital/keyboard skills for the P1 pupils, so this was completed by a teacher.

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

### **EAST LoTHIAN**

Not user friendly at all for P1 children.

Literacy reading sections were too long. Fine for more able readers, but less able readers were guessing a lot and sometimes good guesses gave a potentially less accurate result. Listening sections also too long for children to remember and recall. Also read aloud in a different way to how stories are read aloud in class. No account taken for children who found using the computers stressful. Quite a few anxious children. Point size very small and it took a while to work out how to make the point size larger. When you do enlarge it, it looks confusing on the page. Children's IT skills too minimal to actually use the computers themselves so supported by the adult. Irritating that the "next" button was not on the same screen as the items so had to scroll down to find the button.

Children assessed in groups of 10-12 so little support provided with ICT. Success very dependent on mouse skills and resilience to work independently. Some higher ability primary one children were on computer for over an hour without a break/drink.

Totally inappropriate to expect that level of mouse and keyboard skills at P1. We have 2 iPads for 135 children at P1 so not an option either. Also, inappropriate

that SMT expected children to do all assessments in one sitting (90 minutes plus) with no movement or water breaks.

Layout and style not appropriate for dyslexic children. There should be an option to have the tests with different coloured backgrounds for dyslexic children or those with visual stress. No option to sit assessments in different languages to support our EAL learners (where English is a barrier to learning).

P1 children require a member of staff with them to be able to carry out the assessments. Due to having to complete the assessment on a laptop the children require support to manipulate the touch pad or mouse.

Logins too long - needed adult to support. P1 assessment too technical and required an adult present at all times to ensure everything was listened to, instructions understood, and pages weren't skipped.

Not suitable for 5-year olds. An adult has to press the buttons for them.

Wasn't so good when given on netbooks as small screen, click and drag techniques tricky for younger children. Numeracy was more of a literacy task involving a lot of reading. Would like spoken option of questions as per early level to continue into first level at least.

Font level is too small for children to read when staring at a computer for 25mins.

Limited mouse control of P1s means that each individual child needs supervision to select answers and in some cases, they select, and teacher clicks for them.

Absolutely not user friendly for P1. The level of keyboard skills required is beyond the capabilities of most 5-year olds. The tests themselves are far too long and by question 16 in the literacy test most children (and I) had lost the will to live. The size of the font is too small, and the pages can't be expanded to full-screen. Some of the names P1s were expected to read were far too complex.

The login usernames and passwords were not child-friendly at all.

## **EAST RENFREWSHIRE**

Not straightforward for P1.

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

Some questions required inferential reading skills which Primary 1 children do not yet possess.



No. Although the voice option was useful the mouse skills that are required are beyond difficult. The inability to go back and check an answer was ridiculous. Some pupils were clearly clicking to reach the end of the questions rather than spending time giving thoughtful answers.

The pupils were able to use touchscreen computers. However, they often had to scroll down to find the next button and many double-clicked, meaning they missed questions and became upset that they could not go back to answer them.

There were some issues with having to scroll and there would be access problems in my opinion using SNSA user names which are frankly not child friendly at all. We changed passwords to more suitable ones but there isn't a way to change usernames as far as I am aware.

Not the best layout.

The actual tasks created many problems. The children had to scroll down each page before finding the 'next' arrow. In the P1 literacy test, two pages of text had no question, so the children were confused and had to ask what to do. The children had been pre-warned that they could not go back so had to answer each page. This was confusing. The font was small, and children had to read a 'book' online before answering questions on the next page. The text appeared again but there was too much text and the layout was cramped. Several children were double clicking so missing every second question. Some children guessed an answer, but this does not mean they knew what they were doing. I saw children who understood a concept but made a mistake and children who guessed and got it correct. I know who has grasped concepts in my classroom and those who haven't yet, so the assessment was not helpful.

## **EDINBURGH**

Not at all user friendly for P1 - having to scroll to see full page and needed to follow icons for listening in order to see instructions - not at all intuitive. If children had been supported within a group they would not have been able to complete the test as successfully as they potentially could.

We completed on the iPad. We definitely could not have left the P1 children to do this themselves as they would have very quickly just clicked through it. The writing was rather small. There was quite a lot of reading in some of the questions (writing and maths) and I think this might have confused the children slightly. As we are very active in our teaching children do not have lots of experience of reading a question and answering it. Sometimes I think this results in an unfair result and not reflective of what the children can actually do.

Awful interface for P1.

Small writing if on mini iPad. If on computer they needed mouse skills. Lack of headphones for wee ones.

P1 assessments required one to one support to deal with the level of digital and keyboard skill required. Too much scrolling down required. Assessments at all levels take too long to complete, disheartened/switched off many of the children. Not particularly engaging activities.

Wording of questions was often unclear or open for interpretation due to it not being accessible for the age of the children. Font was too small for children with vision problems. The fact that the layout differed throughout the tests was confusing for the children.

At my school we are lucky to have a number of iPads, which were used for P1 assessments. Adults were required to help them move to the next page and ensure that all questions were actually answered. If we had not had iPads, then we would have had to give assessments individually because children do not have the requisite keyboard skills (despite this being a major teaching focus this year). Many schools will not have the best equipment.

There are a range of issues with the design of the system. 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.

The older children found the multiple choice to be unappealing and they just wanted to get it over and done with. Multiple choice is not really helping to assess the children.

Completely unacceptable. Having to scroll down an iPad screen for every question to find the 'next' button put additional stress on each pupil. The log in detail provided had to be entered by a teacher for every pupil in P1,4 & 7 as they were too long and random, with case and space sensitivity.

Terrible for P1 two words redacted - out of scope

Tests too much for P1 to complete without one to one support. This is mainly due to length of time they can focus and the length of some of the reading and listening passages. The names children had to read were unfamiliar. At this age they can only read their friend's name and those they can sound out.

The language used was confusing.

P1 found it tricky to navigate the tasks due to the amount of moving up and down which needed to be carried out, particularly to keep clicking on 'next' at the bottom right hand corner. one paragraph redacted - out of scope

Not at all. Huge number of EAL learners struggled. Learners with significant levels of need found the process highly stressful and more able students questioned (quite rightly) the reason for these seemingly abstract assessments.

The reading test glitches a lot for our P1 pupils. I know several adults said they had to skip questions with the pupils as it would not let them choose an answer. This was extremely difficult for P1 pupils.

For early level not at all appropriate. For some children we had to say 'you point and the teacher will use the mouse and click'.

Explaining how to use the tabs on the book about "Sally" so that they could turn the pages was lengthy.

I think the questions could have been worded a little better, with more detail to help the younger children.

Not child friendly to use on iPads. Having to scroll down to find the next arrow and dragging things wasn't successful. Extremely time consuming. Having to scroll up and down to read and find answers made the test less user friendly particularly for younger children. At times it would not let the children

put their answer in the box also, so the children would be marked incorrect as a result even though it was a technical error.

Would be great if the question and answer was on one screen without having to scroll on a tablet.

Lack of option to go back was tricky as sometimes pupils clicked the 'next' button accidentally.

## **FALKIRK**

For P1 the font was too small in both literacy and numeracy. In the literacy task the layout of the story books and factual information about hummingbirds were confusing.

The P1 was adult led one paragraph redacted - out of scope

It was very easy for the children to accidentally skip a question on the iPad as the arrow button did not always respond and they would then tap it too many times. One to one support was required to ensure this did not happen.

Sometimes the pronunciation was a bit off and required an adult to repeat for the child (e.g. 'iron' was pronounced wrong in a rhyming part of the test).

Pupils struggle with basic ICT skills.

I have children in my class whose hand sizes and fine motor skills impede their ability to manoeuvre the mouse.

Very slow and a bit tedious. Some questions ask for pupils to do many different things so a bit confusing.

Suitability of SNSA tests for P1 and 2 was ridiculous. Too much writing on screen. Keyboard skills not there, maybe even reading skills not there.  

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

Teacher had to use mouse for child when using computer. We chose to use computer over iPads as the sound was better.

Children were given 1:1 support, so assistance could be given with using the mouse etc.

These assessments are not very effective. There is no way that these assessments can give a fair and accurate reflection of a child's ability. If a child has problems with reading, then they are unable to complete any of the tests properly even when reading is not what is being tested. It's poorly designed and there were questions that did not relate to the progression pathways that have been released.

No audio proved challenging for children to stay focused and on task. The sheer amount of questions for each section led to the children becoming disengaged. Some of the language proved challenging for users.

For my children with literacy difficulties many found the numeracy section tricky as they could not read the questions. A "read me" button would be useful. There was a lot of reading for my poor readers and many just guessed as they couldn't understand the passage or question.

'Next' button had to be scrolled down. Not good for P1.

P1 found manipulation of digital skills difficult.

Shocking layout for literacy P1 in particular - not child friendly - font far too small. Questions were not graded appropriately, they went from easy to hard on some and vice versa- not the same version from the first question nor each pupil so not fair. Teacher had to give much reassurance -have a go and try your best. Children randomly guessing answers and if lucky guessing correctly! Hummingbirds? Need I say more!

The logins were taken from SEEMIS, but this meant that some of younger children would have had to put in 4 names. Therefore, all younger pupils needed to have their accounts pre-loaded before beginning assessment.

My class of primary 1s could not navigate the site themselves, I had to sit with each child and use the mouse to click their answers. Each test was done one to one. There was also no way of clicking back to previous questions. Many maths questions were too wordy for primary 1, particularly the position questions where children were given 3 instructions at the same time. Some of the maths questions also required children to read (questions about the calendar) which then hindered their ability to answer the question.

Lack of clarity over whether pupils should be allowed to do working on paper for numeracy questions.

Would be beneficial to children to use on an iPad with touch screen technology as not all have access to a computer and a mouse so these skills let them down and person administering did the clicking/dragging for them.

Primary 1 pupils may struggle with this. The language was at times quite advanced and required an explanation to allow a pupil to proceed.

## **FIFE**

P1 children do not have mouse skills.

Having to scroll down a page to find more info questions wasn't user friendly.

P1 absolutely disgraceful. P3 difficult. Overall the layout of the test was shocking, with not the full screen on show for each question and children relying on scrolling. Some questions were quite leading to wrong answers.

Some children struggled with their ICT skills. In a play-based classroom children are not used to sitting for long periods of time.

Text too small. Too much reading. Very like 5-14 Assessments. Primary 1 needed an adult at all times as most of the children weren't able to drag at a good enough level. The screen kept going black. Tasks that were read to them needed repeated and chunked as they couldn't remember 3 sets of instructions. The assessments were far too long. Over an hour for each child. I could only manage 3 a day. 32 children = 32 hours.

Primary 1 tests are quite demanding in terms of navigating. As an administrator the main difficulty is downloading results in an easy access form. If you download individual reports for a whole class it is impossible to see what test belongs to which child without opening it. Each report starts with the Scottish national, it would be better to start with a pupil's name.

Lots of reading involved. And having to scroll down to see the rest of the information was a bit unfair as it wasn't highlighted that this would be the case - I think many children missed valuable info.

Not appropriate. Far too challenging. Reading was long, and the children got very bored. Screen layout was very confusing. Some assessment tasks were misleading and often children guessed and got the correct answer.

two words redacted -  
out of scope

P1 found this challenging.

Poor.

It is not user friendly for primary 1. Teachers have had to do all of the mouse work otherwise it would have taken more than the 45 mins they already take. assessments are far from user friendly. A high level of related IT skills is required to fully access the tests. Most young children will not have developed these fully. Numeracy is not speech supported. In order to have questions read means working individually with an adult or using a text to speech program such as Ivona. Font is generally too small.

For P.1 pupils this was a total waste of time. An hour and a half minimum for each child? Unsustainable.

Unfortunately, my pupils found out very quickly that if they pressed F12 the answers to the questions came up in a separate window. Even the best of the class found it tempting to 'check' their answers.

P1 was terrible. The text and pictures often needed resized so that it could be seen. None of my P1 pupils did anything independently. Some of the pictures in the reading assessment were too ambiguous for young children. There was picture of someone who was meant to be playing hide and seek that the children thought was upset! Tasks were sometimes long and dull. Children completing P1 assessment stated they were bored.

The children were required to conduct the assessments on netbooks meaning that they had to scroll up and down more than was ideal. This was especially

true of the reading assessment. There should definitely have been an audio feature so that children could hear the questions - especially maths.

Not suitable at all. Far too much scrolling, not 'friendly' looking.

Far too small font especially for the 'books'. Poor system as sound sometimes never worked.

## **GLASGOW**

Totally inappropriate for many P1s, especially on laptops. Far too distracting for P1s, so we did them one at a time, with an adult clicking the mouse based on the child's response. The stories and longer texts were far too long and far too much information before the questions at the end. Children were exhausted after attempting the long text, so too tired and fed up to look back and check their answers and I believe wouldn't have attempted as much if they didn't have an adult sitting with them. The question about mum dad and granny going to the shop had a text that was not too difficult, but the question 'who leaves the car?' had 2 words, who and leaves, that many children didn't know. Why was this question not spoken like the others?

Not suitable for P1s trained to use iPads.

The font was quite small, and this caused a few difficulties in the writing assessment with punctuation marks as they all looked the same to a few children. Some children were sitting first level maths but working on early level literacy. A speech feature would be beneficial for these children.

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

In hindsight iPads would have been easier but our internet was too slow. Many children kept pressing 'next' as they didn't notice the screen change or didn't turn the pages of the books.

5-year olds cannot use mouse log in easily. All questions need verbal button answer.

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

The tests cannot be seen on the whole screen and pupils have to scroll to see more of the text, questions and the Next button. Some pupils find this difficult. The reading test had far too many different texts and took up to 45 minutes to complete. The lack of PCs meant that it took a long time to complete all pupils.

Issuing extremely lengthy mixed case and character username and passwords for small children is a time-consuming challenge. Not all language used was appropriate for our children. Time was required for explaining layout etc. It's not

the most intuitive user interface. A lot of scrolling down which some students missed.

Not appropriate at primary one level.

User names cumbersome. Some children have several middle names. EAL children have difficult spellings. Many of our P1 and P4 children can't confidently spell names without adult support. I changed all passwords to be the same, though not mentioned this was possible. Before that the 3-word passwords included capitals and spaces were unmanageable. P1s found it hard to keep on task whilst concentrating on answers. Older children keen to keep clicking 'next' without taking enough time to be sure of answers. Teacher trying to encourage careful reading and answering can't manage large numbers of children at the same time. No time to work with smaller numbers.

Children found the hummingbird questions difficult and also found it difficult to drag the lines to match their answers. Some of the questions aren't stage and age appropriate.

As a few of our speakers don't work it was required to read put the questions with oral questioning. You need to be quite computer literate to access the assessment.

The large amounts of text to be read in early literacy required a lot of concentration and focus. Children of this age are more used to short sentences with related illustrations. They lost interest and appeared to be relying on previous knowledge to answer rather than show evidence of any real understanding of the text.

The assessments require a degree of mouse control and keyboard skills that almost all P1 pupils do not have.

A number of children required support using technology.

The log in process was extremely difficult for P1's and therefore had to be done by an adult. The short 'books' in the Literacy test were extremely confusing for children. The children did not know how to turn the page due to the layout. Additionally, the font size in the Literacy test was far too small for P1 learners.

Too many questions for such young children.

The size of text could have been slightly larger especially when you are reading similar spelt words.

The system was flawed and not being able to read aloud to certain children, cruel.

If school is lucky enough to have headphones or a quiet space for assessments, then perhaps audio would have been helpful. iPads worked better than PC. P1 children required help to make the font bigger for reading at times. The layouts of the comprehension tasks in the Literacy SNSA made the question too long and the majority of children lost focus. The content of the assessment tasks



was, in general, extremely difficult. This made the children lose interest, become anxious and refuse to answer any more questions. No child had an assessment shorter than 32 questions. One child sat for 37 questions. There was also a practice assessment which lasted 10-12 questions. The length of the assessment was completely inappropriate for such young learners.

P1s needed 1-1 help as are 'click happy' with a mouse. Tried iPads but kept losing signal. Tried coaching older children to sit and click the mouse for the P1s. P1s really couldn't do it alone.

Not a great website, maybe easier to do in touch screens but not great. Font was way too small, not visually attractive and just too long. 30 plus questions too much.

Logins were quite tricky.

Literacy assessment was not age appropriate for P1.

Due to the length of both the literacy and numeracy assessments for P1s we are working one to one. Myself or a CDO are reading them the questions and working the computer mouse.

This was completely inappropriate for P1 children. They lack keyboard skills and even the focus required to click on the speech icon and follow the instruction was too challenging. Could also move on without selecting an answer.

Given we have a number of learning needs in the classes and a large proportion of children with EAL the language used in the test was not appropriate. Many children needed additional support to read and understand the questions. P1s need a lot of help with the keyboard and mouse skills and this meant 1:1 working with them.

I had to read the questions to about 1/3 of the class.

Most children do not use laptops so have no skills with the mouse or keyboard. Our school will not get 'proper' Wi-Fi until 2020 with Glasgow's roll-out programme so more nightmare years ahead. Test didn't work on an iPad mini and we don't have the big iPads. None of that even matters as the test was so ridiculously hard. My most able pupil cried and became distressed at being unable to read the text. I had to abandon it until a later date. The results are ridiculous. My most able children have scored between average and well depending on their guesses and random clicks for answers. My non-readers have some surprisingly good results because they happened to click the correct answer by sheer luck. No skill was involved for them and the data is meaningless. Many mid-range ability children have scored in equal measures, well and poorly by luck and guesses.

I didn't think it was appropriate for the children as the layout was confusing. In addition, the questions were misleading.

I have only seen the infant one, but layout is poor, non-linear. I was not confident P1 could independently follow it.