

Usefulness of SNSA data – extent to which data provided in SNSA learner reports has been useful to you in providing reliable information on progress, in identifying next steps in learning and informing your professional judgement on the achievement of CfE levels.

ABERDEEN

Absolutely useless. My lower ability children outperformed my able pupils by guessing!

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

Not useful. Pips was better. Lots of children guessed the answers from the pics or guessed regardless

ABERDEENSHIRE

I understand the results might be useful from a cluster or whole school to see gaps but they were not useful for individual children. In fact, it was disheartening to see some children really struggle. It was setting them up for a fail. I cannot see why that is helpful.

Didn't show me anything that my own professional judgement didn't tell me! We don't know what high medium and low means. SNSA data meaningless if test was not appropriate for p1.

My group of 6 all came out as high level which I wouldn't agree with. It was useful to see across the year group where the gaps are but for one of my group there were no next steps as she answered all questions correctly in literacy. The Incas scoring was more useful for informing groupings for next year's classes. I haven't received any training on how to interpret the results. Required printing and analyzing reams of paper and I'm not sure I was really able to interpret it properly.

Nothing I didn't know already. Not accurate as I know some guessed correctly. As this is first year we have no baseline to compare it to.

ANGUS

The generated report at the end would be helpful if the test was an accurate assessment of children's capabilities, however due to guesswork it isn't.

The data of the assessments was meant to be shared to teachers by SMT but so far has not been.

Not sure what they could show as they are massively over-pitched.

Not very useful at all. Much of the literacy test was too hard and the P1 teachers could have identified the areas of strength and development without having to spend the huge number of hours doing the tests. I'm not convinced by the validity of the tests as I felt as though the skill actually being tested was not the skill that was supposed to be tested. E.g. the question about the day that the boy went on his journey. Is this testing remembering or is it actually testing the ability to go back to check and retrieve an answer? If it is the latter I would suggest this is not an appropriate skill to assess at P1 level. If it is the latter then I would have failed as a teacher as I could not remember the 2nd word in the story when it had no impact on the rest of the story.

I understand they want evidence; however the SNSA tests are extensive and do not assess our curriculum. Why stress the children? My professional judgement is more reliable and helpful. This is just a paper exercise and pointless. Children are not robots and perform differently on a daily basis. It's an unfamiliar situation and this results in the children being distracted. Not helpful at all! I do not think the SNSA will show a true reflection, especially for the lower ability children.

ARGYLL & BUTE

Nothing I didn't already know.

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

It didn't provide me with anything I didn't know about learners already. In fact, some SNSA data was wholly inaccurate where a pupil had guessed all the way through and ended up coming out at a high level when he struggles with literacy and has nowhere achieved the level.

No help to next stage at all.

Does not reflect at all on information and progress.

We had high hopes for diagnostic feedback. Nothing new came from the reports, at least not enough to justify the time spent on them. Our cohorts are too small to be able to look across groups to see if there are gaps in teaching as well as learning. Identifying next steps information was not really that useful. I would not say overall that we are any better informed in terms of making a professional judgement about achieving a level as a result of using these.

CLACKMANANSHIRE

I have been bombarded with data to such an extent this last year. It did highlight some pupils requiring support but I was already aware of these from my own assessments. I feel this data is not really for teachers.

DUMFRIES AND GALLOWAY

This year hasn't really helped. High, med low capacity for learning? A few children performed much better than anticipated. What is threshold for low capacity? I was lucky enough to be on hand during the assessments and saw where the children struggled. However, feedback in report was not as clear. Future years when SfLA might conduct tests might make this even less useful.

The assessments did not provide useful information. Some of the lower ability P1 children couldn't read the "Hummingbirds" text and just guessed the answers and by chance got most of them correct. So it is a false representation. The questions should be more like "PIPS", where if they get more than 2/3 wrong in a certain area, they don't progress any further. The results are not showing any differentiation. Higher ability pupils who could read the text fluently and get all the questions correct and the lower ability pupils who couldn't read any of it but guessed the answers and got them correct. So they all come out as the same.

I was quite disappointed with the reports. One of my less able children (who does not know numbers to 10) was answering middle level questions in Maths, along with others who are way ahead of him. In Literacy, a girl who can read short sentences was answering low level questions along with this same child who cannot read simple CVC words. I feel I can't trust the results.

I am unclear as to what the data means for the child. Does a high score mean that the children are working on the next level of the curriculum or does that mean that they are secure in the level that they are working?

I have not found the information to be reliable. Multiple choice questions lead to children guessing when they don't know and I have children who are particularly low achievers from my professional judgement, coming out as High. They cannot explain why they chose their answers, they were lucky guessing.

On the whole the data reflects my professional judgement of the pupils tested but there were some inconsistencies with the reading.

I have been given a spreadsheet telling me which pupils were graded High or Medium, and which questions were answered correctly or incorrectly by each pupil. However, not knowing what the questions were means this information is of no real use. This morning I spent 2 hours opening cells on the spreadsheet to see word descriptions of each question, but some of these descriptions are so ambiguous that the exact nature/level of the question is impossible to determine. Still need to try to analyse these as best I can.

I cannot use the results to determine the next steps in learning. Of no use in determining the achievement of CfE levels. Of interest, for example, was the success rate of my pupils in one particular question relating to expected

outcomes/probability - my pupils have not been taught this concept and absolutely do not possess the ability to reason their way through to the solution. Only lucky guesses can explain the success rate. Another question had a very low success rate, and according to the word description of the question my pupils are more than capable of dealing with questions on this concept - I have evidence from formal/informal assessments to confirm this. Could the question be poor, or badly worded?

I am not against the idea of testing throughout the country to gauge. It is what they are trying to gauge and how they are going about it that I am not at ease with.

Fairly useful but not really giving me any information I didn't already have through assessments of my own and professional judgement.

Not useful at all. Some of my pupils scored low because they couldn't cope with the terrible format of the test and some have scored high from randomly clicking and guessing. We assess the children daily in small steps and respond appropriately by adjusting our teaching to meet their needs. Of course we know which children in our classes need extra support, we don't need these tests to inform us of that. Many of the answers were lucky guesses or random clicks. So many of my pupils got upset, fed up and frustrated, they were unable to demonstrate their full potential. The test is far too long and complicated. There are so many better ways to assess pupils, these tests are a huge waste of time and not at all age appropriate.

There's a lot of data to sift through. Didn't really tell me anything new. No comparisons as yet as to where children are at in terms of an 'average' child.

Would prefer it is assessments matched clearly with the benchmarks and helped more with achievement of a level at the end of the year.

A miss that all questions are the same and do not change depending on the child's answers so very able children score full marks but it's not shown how much further they can go in the next level.

As we have still not managed to complete all of the assessments due to staffing issues we have yet to review any data provided by the SNSA assessment. However, while administering the assessment I did not feel it told me anything I did not already know about my children and had already recorded using our schools formats. Instead of being of any value I feel they have taken my time away from the class as a whole during what is already an overloaded term. It has had no relevance.

Incas gave a more detailed breakdown of results. SNSA give general non specific info not able to be used for supporting the learners. Incas were done for the right reasons with data to support learners. SNSA are only for government to gather data and not for the children.

Not helpful at all! My very able child got so bored he guessed all the answers and came out low. My academically poor child also guessed and got high!

one sentence redacted - out of scope P1 not as accurate. Implies children are more capable than we think with our professional judgement.

Feel that they are not suitable for P1.

The SNSA data has confirmed my professional judgement however I think the method used to obtain the data from the children needs re thought, particularly questions on abbreviated days of the week, which we just wouldn't have taught to a P1, or huge passages of writing.

Some came out where expected but many came out higher than expected, backing up staff and pupils' perceptions of them being pitched at an easier level.

Knew before SNSA where pupils were with their reading and their next steps. Did not need them to confirm my judgement. Complete waste of time.

I have not seen the data yet as only my HT has access to it at the moment. However as I have sat with every child to complete the assessments I know that the data provided will be incomplete as many guessed correctly. I am a hard working professional who is constantly assessing, planning next steps and evaluating my pupils on a daily basis. That after all is my job. I don't need some unreliable Australian assessment to tell me that my professional judgement is correct.

High medium and low doesn't tell me anything! What does that actually mean?

Questions over how reliable (or useful) the low, medium and high capacity result is.

As far as achievement of a level, the results of the SNSA formed an extremely small piece of the jigsaw.

DUNDEE

Some teachers felt the results were not representative of their own judgements or assessments in class. I also feel that the experience of testing in these circumstances was intimidating and overwhelming for some children, as they were unaware of what was expected and had to leave their classroom environment and visit parts of the school they were unfamiliar with due to lack of resources.

No use at all. Don't feel they have told me anything I didn't already know. Children highlighted have been highlighted by me from the start of the year. Pips are better... but I don't think we should be testing p1 children especially.

I don't know as it has not been shared with any of the class teachers involved.

These assessments have not been useful to me at all with regards to my children's learning. My own professional judgement and daily observations/interactions with my children serve me better in judging where they are in their learning & overall development.

Having recently been on an educational study trip to Finland and speaking with teachers there, it is clear that in Scotland we need to have more trust in our teachers and allow teachers more autonomy rather than always being fixated with gathering data & results focused! We can learn so much from our Finnish peers by being much more research driven, and as copious amounts of research tells us, children at 4 & 5 years old learn best through play! The teachers in Finland were utterly shocked to hear that in Scotland we administer tests like these to 5 year olds - "...when they should be learning through their play at that age" (was a quote from one teacher). I really hope these assessments can be reviewed or even better removed completely from primary 1 as they serve no purpose to me as a professional or to my young learners.

We administered the assessments just before the Easter break...and, while I know that the results have been discussed/compared at cluster level, I (and my stage partners) have yet to be told what the results are. This information may have been useful to know to confirm judgements when writing pupil reports. It may also be helpful when preparing transition paperwork for the children moving on to secondary school.

Not useful at all - did not see how children could get 14 questions wrong and still be judged as 'high'.

EAST AYRSHIRE

Don't feel all the results were truly accurate. Level of concentration having a big influence on young children who got fed up and started clicking next button to get it over with. If an adult was sitting with the child to ensure they answered all questions to the best of their ability, then the learner reports would be useful.

It has not identified anything. Professional judgement tells me if my pupils know how to identify half of an object or a rhyming word. The assessments were not completed properly due to lack of support and therefore results are unreliable. Even from class to class in my school, one teacher read the paragraphs to the pupils but I did not. It is not an accurate representation of where the pupils are at in the curriculum.

The individual pupil reports do not appear to be useful. Diagnostic reports are too much data with no clear/easy way to analyse - for example only one question appeared to deal with multiplying while six questions dealt with probability/chance. Descriptions of questions are no use without seeing the question it refers to.

It is only giving a snap shot of the pupil at that time, on that day and it is ESSENTIAL that the results are used in the correct way, i.e. as part of a whole range of assessments. If they are used as stand alone to give for example a rating for a school or authority then they are NOT giving a true picture of the pupil, the school, or the authority.

No data received as yet. Better used when your professional judgement has determined a child has achieved the level. one sentence redacted - out of scope

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

Some use in determining level but only vague. Tests so disconnected from Es and Os that not CfE useful.

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

The information is completely useless. Children who are academically poor could and did achieve high scores just by clicking the correct answers by chance as it was multiple choice. I would never use the data to inform my next steps. I know my children inside out and my own judgement is far better.

Somewhat useful. But totally expect the data from SNSA's to become used in some sort of league table like England.

Not convinced of usefulness of data as some of my more able pupils scored badly due to lack of effort when I know them to be more than capable of completing tasks and the high medium and low score levels did not really give clarity of scores.

In my opinion, the SNSA has told me nothing about the achievement of CfE levels. For example, 1 child who needs support on a daily basis working with numbers within 10, scored better in their numeracy assessment than some of my very able children in numeracy. A case of 1 child guessing the correct answers and another not being able to navigate the ICT as their work in class on a daily basis reflects their actual achievement. Also, tests will be administered differently across all schools, i.e. some schools give no help with navigating assessments to schools that provide guidance on navigating assessments especially with the P1 tests when the children are so young. So how can a fair comparison be made? As previously mentioned, so many of my P1 class thought they answered the question but hadn't and then moved onto the next question.

My class results showed lots of questions not answered. Either the children didn't know or they couldn't navigate the ICT. So the data is flawed. To enable for the data to be accurate you would have needed to observe each P1 individually and recorded if the child didn't answer due to understanding or lack of ability to navigate the ICT.

Lots of anomalies! Children were able to guess and come out high capacity. Considering one lower ability pupil scored highest in maths I really don't think the tests carry much weight.

I didn't like how pupils only answered some questions. As you couldn't compare well.

The results didn't show reliably what level the children are at. I had a few children who struggle to retain single sounds or count objects get results of high. I also had a few children who are able to show understanding daily in the classroom activities and assessment that scored poorly in these assessments,

most likely due to the abstract and new format for the children, as well as questions being too hard. I haven't learned any more about my pupils than I already knew and I have a wealth of classroom evidence that shows that many results are not accurate to the child's current ability.

EAST DUNBARTONSHIRE

Very little use. Feedback of low, medium or high mark was not particularly useful. Detailed feedback on individual questions was overwhelmingly in depth and did not provide an accurate overview of a pupil's strengths/ areas for development.

I feel it was a pointless task. Teachers could have placed pupils easily without the need for this style of inappropriate testing. I sat watching pupils who couldn't read the text, guess and answer correctly. Therefore, the computer records it as right, rendering the whole process as pointless. Give teachers the professionalism they deserve and allow them to assess pupils or help to create an appropriate test.

I have not seen the results of the tests yet therefore the data has not been useful.

I was surprised by the number of pupils who scored 'high'. Results did not seem to reflect the spread of ability within the class. Hopefully this will improve with full standardised results.

EAST LoTHIAN

After approximately 30 -40 hours of assessment I have now had it confirmed that the one child who struggles most in my class is low in literacy. I already knew this before any of the assessments and have discussed his progress with his parents.

The results generally look good but a lot of the answers were definite guesses especially in the literacy section.

Assessment data has not provided reliable information as success dependent on keyboard skills, resilience and attention span. Data not reliable as tests being administered individually, pairs and in groups depending on school context with differing levels of support. Learning in the early years and its application should take place in different contexts not sitting with earphones on pointing and clicking!

Of no use whatsoever since we have not yet received data from SMT despite our end of year reports having been written, approved and signed ready for issue. Four weeks of term to go - even if we receive the long-promised data today (1st June) we only have until 7th June to submit data to the SMT for levels to submit to Scottish Government. So of no benefit to us for learning and teaching.

Difficult to tell. Some children scored high abilities in the assessments, when this ability is not reflected in class or written work.

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

If you are a good teacher with good formative, summative and diagnostic assessments in your classroom, you know your children and thus do not need hours of testing instead of teaching and using play to develop the whole child! Not really useful at all as it doesn't tell me where my child is or how much they have achieved in the year. The activities do not match the CfE and benchmarks.

My own assessment and school/authority tracking systems better inform teaching and learning. Tests not needed.

I am aware of the children in my class who are achieving as expected and those who aren't. I'm aware of the areas of literacy - including talking and listening - and the areas of numeracy and maths that the children are competent in and those areas that need further development and consolidation. It doesn't inform my professional judgement, it only confirms it which leads me to think that someone, somewhere has put this test in place to question it. It's extremely disappointing that these tests, supposedly tailor made for SCOTTISH education, clearly aren't and as such, are unfit for purpose.

We have not been trained properly on how to unpick the data. Looking at Low, Medium and High does not seem to reflect our rough groupings in the class but we are unsure how wide the parameters are to be in each group.

There were no major surprises for me in how my pupils scored in their assessments which confirms to me that I already knew where my pupils were but it acts as an additional piece of assessment. It doesn't really help me with achievement of a level as it's just one piece of assessment and can't be used in isolation. I think this information will be more useful to their next teacher as carried out so late in the year it is not massively helpful for me to plan next steps.

EAST RENFREWSHIRE

It may be the fault of my school not relating information but I have no idea what this data will be used for. I haven't seen any data or had feedback on how my class did. However, I will certainly not be using this to inform next steps or progression of pupils. It's multiple choice so children can guess and get some correct when they actually don't have a clue. Also, there will be huge discrepancies over how the test is administered. We were quite strict not reading questions out etc. but I've heard of schools doing these one to one and doing practise papers.

I have not yet seen the learner reports for my class but based on my experience of supervising some of my children whilst they completed the test, I would be very surprised if they told me anything that I don't already know, having taught them all year.

I have not even looked at them. This does not inform me as it is so far removed from the content or manner in which we teach. I use the benchmarks to support

my own professional judgement and I cannot deem the results of this as accurate as much was too difficult or presented in a very poor way for the stage of the children.

To date, we have not utilised this data as it is in a basic format at the moment. We have other data which is useful to use for pupil progress and identifying next steps.

My biggest concern is that many pupils were simply guessing multiple choice answers, therefore resulting in the data being unreliable as it is not showing their true understanding or ability in the tests if they are able to guess the right answer. I do not feel the results will provide more evidence or information which is already being provided through class formative and summative assessment.

Haven't been able to work out how the data will be of any use.

The data has been of no use and will not change my professional judgement. As already stated, some children guessed an answer so if I accepted this data as reliable I would be moving on to an unsuitable next step. Some children accidentally double clicked so missed every second question and this will have a huge impact on the data. Some members of staff did not see any of the assessment so would not be able to comment on the data.

EDINBURGH

Didn't inform me or their teacher of anything we didn't know already know about them.

Not helpful as so many children guessed answers and the guesses were correct therefore tests results do not reflect their true ability.

The Literacy comprehension section about Hummingbirds was very especially poor - one question had nothing to do with reading but more general knowledge
one sentence redacted - exception 33(1)(b) Finally, both tests were far too long for this age group - unnecessarily long and very boring to administer. It was quite possibly the worst experience of my 24 years of teaching and goes against everything that is good Early Years practice. The fact that these tests were seen as appropriate for our youngest children is really worrying and makes me question the professional understanding of those that made this decision. Shame on the Scottish Government for putting our children and staff through it.

This is the part I am most confused by as I really don't know what the results tell me or how I would begin to use the results of this. The last thing we want to do is have class teachers spending hours poring over the results and trying to work out the next steps for the children when they probably already know where they need to go.

There were no shocks or surprises with regards to high, medium and low so in essence the tests have told us nothing that we didn't know already. Overall I really don't see the point in these tests.

Not at all useful- complete waste of everyone's time.

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

Assessments did not add anything new to the teacher's own professional judgement. Not really any great surprises. Fee we are already able to identify pupils' next steps based on current use of assessment and moderation in school. Therefore not too sure if this is a layer of assessment that is really needed and is useful.

There is a 4 page document for each child and each test. Not exactly user-friendly. As I've just finished them I've not really collected the data yet, I'm hoping there is some nice page-to-view kind of thing where I can see an overview of the whole class.

Nope. Very little meaningful data. High, medium, low doesn't give me what I need to set classes.

The tests ask a child one question to cast judgement on whether they can or can not do something - all this tests is that one question, but it is used as a clear cut measure of their ability. A vast number of the children performed significantly differently to their actual ability level, so the tests provided little to no meaningful data.

The data is totally unreliable and cannot be used to indicate children's levels in any way, shape or form. Because the questions were too difficult, children were simply guessing. They had no idea what they were guessing. I know because I was with them. I have not used the data to inform children's attainment levels at all. And yet I have to enter it into our tracking system. A total waste of time.

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 cannot 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.

The current reporting system is not much use as we have no real data to look at to compare with last year to see our progress. I know that this will change next year but this year should have been clearer on how we can actually use the reporting system.

The results are far more inaccurate than those of previous assessments as the questions on all assessments gave children too many opportunities to select any answer without reading the questions. The next steps are not really any use with such an assessment as the results are generally inaccurate.

one sentence redacted - out of scope

We have no low learners in P1 according to the results in numeracy, not at all accurate!

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

Not at all. Multiple choice meant that many pupils guessed the answers and scored above their ability. Not useful data at all.

one sentence redacted - out of scope

P1 horror stories and not accurate of our learners.

Not sure how useful or reliable the data is!

Reports and data already submitted before testing complete so no use to current teacher to assess level for SEEMIS.

Data has mostly been in line with professional judgements made by staff. It would be helpful if all of the reports could be downloaded as some can only be printed. It would be helpful to have an indication of the question that the child was asked, particularly in Maths and Writing as previously teachers have had access to this information when carrying out other standardised assessments.

Completely useless in terms of CfE. Identified one or two areas of interest but nothing significant that we were not already aware of. The feedback has not had any impact on my learners' targets or my professional judgement. How could it when there is absolutely no link with Es&Os or benchmarks? I question how much money has been spent to create these meaningless assessments not to

mention the additional pressure put on young people. Whilst I teach in Secondary, I really do not understand the thinking behind assessing 5 year old children in this way. What was the rationale? I do not know a single member of the teaching profession who sees anything positive in these assessments.

Not at all. We still use our own assessments to set classes.

I found it very unhelpful to only receive feedback on if pupils were 'low, medium or high'. I would have just preferred to get a score and a breakdown for each pupil. It felt like a waste of time to only be told low, medium or high.

Have yet to see the data as at the moment has only been shared with management and support for learning.

SMT dealing with this aspect so have not seen anything so can't comment. Pity really seeing as it would impact final year levels.

We have not yet seen this. I hope there will be a breakdown of each question, alongside the standardised score.

Invalid data. Personally I think it is a complete waste of time. We would be much better using assessments we conduct regularly in our own settings and value teacher judgement. We are skilled professionals who know our children very well and our own assessment data is more valid. Some children were guessing answers and guessed correctly so it's meaningless. Children's dates of birth will also affect these results so a younger child may appear more able than an older child when in actual fact this is false.

Very difficult to access data and analyse it. No way to quantify and compare results at all. Too general. Not enough detail about questions asked. No way to generate diagnostic results to view trends and analyse specific results and outcomes for pupils. No idea what high, medium or low refers to and how to use it within teaching and reporting. Would need to spend hours looking at the data to help identify next steps and also unhelpful for judgement on the achievement of CfE levels. Doesn't support and enhance professional judgement at all.

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

As a practitioner who loves nothing more than analysing data and identifying next steps in learning, the SNSA is the most useless pieces of assessment data I have ever come across. When I tracked individual learner results, it was clear that scores DO NOT reflect the abilities of all children. Children who had not yet learned content were scoring highly as they had randomly guessed the correct answer. In addition to this, children were asked different questions. How is that data comparable? It quite simply is not and makes a mockery of our whole assessment process. An open ended approach to the questions would make this data useful and relevant. An unreliable and arduous process. Highly disappointing.

I would like to receive a standardised score as our data from previous years is focussed on standardised scores. I found high, medium and low a bit vague and the 4 page report for each pupil was helpful but almost too much. Somewhere in between would be better.

Tests did not reveal a lot as it was unclear whether high medium and low referred only to our class or to a wider area e.g. local authority. Also, multiple choice meant that a number of pupils were able to guess the answer and received a score that was in no way reflective of their achievements over the course of the year. Formative assessment info was much more useful in informing judgement on achievement of CfE level.

FALKIRK

Not yet got the results but regardless, the management team will intervene and interpret the data without seeking professional judgements from staff.

Data seems fair in terms with children's abilities, however a few performed highly but this is not shown in class work, could be guessing or they liked the format of test?

The SNSA data will be useful for passing on to the children's P2 teacher however they did not tell me anything I did not know about my children from my own assessments, observations and from working with the children every day.

The results of the SNSA did not inform my professional judgements I had already made them and they did not need to be changed from the information.

Didn't find low medium high very useful.

Some usefulness but when we are told to differentiate learning and are provided with standardised tests, how much is it to be valued...really?

This has not supported my professional judgement. I learn more about my pupils through my own assessments and observations.

I have not seen the results yet as they were only completed on Friday. I do not believe they will be worthwhile in providing me with more reliable information than my daily observations and continuous classroom assessments.

The data is useful in as much as you can see any patterns or areas of literacy and numeracy that need revised/covered etc. There are flaws even in this area however - children guessing, rushing, feeling pressure.

There is not really a great deal of information in the reports. Correct or incorrect only tells you the type of question that they got wrong and the line of Low Medium High is just that. By analysing each question, you could identify next steps in learning but I don't think it helps to decide whether they have achieved a level or not.

The reports generated are not very useful. I have found my own assessments more reliable.

The data only confirms our own professional judgement of where the children are at, next steps were totally dictated by the narrow focus of the assessment; and totally irrelevant where individual children underperformed due to stress, boredom and frustration.

Results do not match what children are achieving in class-complete waste of time for pupils and lots of staff. We used to do CEM testing in P1 which was a more accurate assessment and child friendly assessment in numeracy and literacy which pupils enjoyed and teacher found very useful.

Only just started to analyse data in school. The high medium and low doesn't really give you a true indicator of ability. In administering tests many staff felt the assessment should start at low and work its way up rather than start on the middle.

I have had no information on what the results mean or what the low, medium or high levels refer to. The results, at the moment, don't tell me anything.

The results have confirmed my teacher judgement as my children came out where I would have expected, there were no surprises in results.

The data provided for my P1 students told me nothing new. The 'dot' indicating high, medium and low largely matched with my own teacher judgements and other assessment data gathered throughout the year. I feel that there are less cumbersome, more child centred ways of gathering this sort of data and am not overly impressed with the new assessments.

There appears to be very little data of any use from the learner reports. All we were provided with was an indication of what level of question difficulty each pupil attempted. This has not made any impact on identifying next steps, I would like to see the level of information to be far more useful in future.

I felt the Writing assessment did not help to evidence a child's level.

This year the results only show low, medium and high. Most pupils came out as expected.

There seems to be a huge breadth of ability in the bands of categorisation. This did not add to my understanding of learners and their ability.

I don't think the reports are very clear. Quantitative data would be useful. Clear guidance on what High, Medium and Low scores mean who also help.

FIFE

Feedback is actually quite generic. So not useful.

Simply not very.

Not at all. No surprises and the level of questions is meaningless.
Not available yet. Lots of children guessed so not sure how accurate the results will be.

Data has not been shared with me as yet.

No idea. Had no input on how to use the data. one sentence redacted - out of scope

No idea of results but cannot take them seriously anyway after watching the way in which the test was taken.

No idea! No training! Haven't finished the P1s yet.

As a teacher of 30 years, ASN/ support for learning for 12 years, I found the assessments pointless.

I am a fan of standardised assessments and felt that Fife had it right with PIPs and AfE. Not perfect but I could sit with a P1 while they were doing there 20min assessment and pin point their strengths and learning needs.

Still trying to interpret results and download results in an easy to access format. Spreadsheets are wide and difficult to read.

The feedback was good and detailed but doesn't necessarily tie up with benchmarks or the language of CfE.

Promoted staff have not released the data to class teachers so a) can't use data to support reports b) pupils got no feedback therefore exercise pointless. I did not find the P1 data useful in providing summative or formative information. It was not rigorous enough for the former nor diagnostic enough for the latter.

For me, the assessments were conducted too late in the year to be of full use. The data I was given was on an individual child basis and so was difficult to correlate and make judgements on for the class.

Not linked closely enough to benchmarks to help provide reliable data.

Confirms my professional judgement was spot on. Really hasn't given me any more insight than before the test other than confirming I had assessed them myself accurately. Overall a waste of time and only suggesting that teachers' judgement is not trusted.

GLASGOW

Not at all. Doesn't tell you anything we didn't already know about our learners.

Children who couldn't read the passages or got lots wrong came out scoring as high on the scale. Something far wrong with that!

The children weren't all asked the same questions therefore more difficult to use as a tool for next steps.

The results haven't surprised me but reinforced what I already know about my children's attainment.

I asked to see the results of assessments. There is a wealth of information but I've asked to speak to someone who went on training about the best and quickest way to use the detailed information.

I did not gain any further insight on my pupils' progress. It confirmed everything I knew and had already had evidence of through consistent formative assessment and school summative assessments.

Quick reports. But some not reflective of other assessment carried out and my judgements as their teacher.

Cfe levels clearly unclear - not matching up to benchmarks. Lack of consistency and waste of time.

I haven't had the chance to go into detail yet but some pupils who are not achieving First Level in class are doing well in the test and vice versa able pupils are making a lot of mistakes.

The data results were hard to decipher. SNSA failed to explain what the levels are. You have to really drill down on each student to get a full understanding. Not very manageable.

Not been useful to me and I don't think P1s should be put under pressure and stress of a test.

Still to be confirmed. Not sure that it will provide any information not already identified through ongoing recording and monitoring system within the class setting.

Formal assessments like these seem to be in direct contrast to what children at early level are familiar with. Formative assessments and observations made during play based learning are less time consuming and can be equally useful and effective.

So much time has been set aside for the administration of the assessments that we have been unable to take the time to scrutinise the data.

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

We have still to be given feedback from management on the data provided but from speaking to the teacher who carried out the assessments I've been told that the only information received was that the children were able to answer easy early level questions or hard early level questions.

These tests didn't tell me anything new. In fact, many of the results can be considered invalid as the children simply guessed answers or clicked to the next