

page without answering which in turn gave them a 'low' score, instead of directing the children to an easier question.

The information is not widely available.

Not received any SNSA data.

The results were eventually given to me, (the class teacher) about 5 weeks after the pupils sat the assessments. Even then it was at my request as I had to discuss their progress at a tracking meeting. I'm not sure if I received all of the available data, the printouts I received were simply colour coded to indicate if pupils had a high, medium or low score. I did not find that particularly useful. I do not even know what percentage matches each category. I would have preferred actual scores or percentages. The information I was given did not refer to strengths or weaknesses in any way. Nor did it break any marks down into particular skills. It would be impossible to formulate next steps from the information I was given. From my tracking conversation with HT, I was led to believe that high or medium (yellow/ green on printout) meant pupils were on track for second level. Low (red) meant they were not. This did match my professional judgement of how my pupils were doing, but the vagueness of the information was really not useful to me at all as a class teacher.

The range of ways to assess children's learning as individuals is better reflected in the many different assessment methods used in the classroom. The SNSA data may help inform learning for the next stage of learning - but closing the attainment gap would only continue to improve when funding is targeted on learning resources and additional staff, not testing of children under 11. As a professional these stats are simply for the bosses to use for their own benefit. These were not created for the benefit of the children who should ALWAYS be at the core.

Does not provide accurate data. Many capable children clicked anything to get it over with as they were bored or copied a friend. Next steps more reliable when taken from professional judgement and evidence build up consistently over time. One of random assessment does not provide reliable information.

The SNSA data has been completely meaningless in providing information on the children. All of my children achieved the level I thought they would. I therefore spent 6 weeks on forcing children to complete assessments which were too difficult and demoralising.

Very little. It is more meaningless numbers.

Children that came out as low were pretty much expected to.

A lot of the medium/high results I didn't agree with as I think the children just got bored and began to click anything. They perform better in class.

Not used yet but teachers would have been able to predict where the children would struggle/ excel without the need for the SNSA.

SMT have not shared data with staff yet.

Would have been more useful if carried out earlier in the year.

It wasn't useful at all. The assessments carried out during the year and my own professional judgement matched the information these assessments provided. It seemed a lot of work and stress for staff and children for no reason when we already had the information it provided. In my professional opinion there was no benefit to the p1 children I teach and goes against the way we deliver the curriculum in p1 i.e. play based learning.

Not useful. No feedback has been given.

These tests do not provide any data that the class teacher does not have access to through normal ongoing assessments

It has not informed practice in any way. It was a waste of time and given teacher professional judgement about where children are, and the test not being directly linked to class learning, it was not fit for purpose.

A waste of my time and the children's time. Still to do maths which I believe is better but the results will have no impact as far as I'm concerned. So angry about this.

I have a secure grasp of my children and their levels and therefore I didn't find the data necessary.

We have not been given SNSA results.

The data provided was not useful at all. It stated 'high' or 'medium' for all children in my class however some of these children are not on track to achieve early level, so I do not understand how they can come out as 'medium' in the testing. Totally baffles me. I do not support these assessments. They need to be modified. They are stressful and unnecessary for 4 and 5 year olds. Teachers would NOT be able to carry out these tests particularly in an infant classroom whilst coping with the day to day demands of teaching.

## **HIGHLAND**

Owing to timing the children were being asked to complete maths they had not covered during the session yet.

I had no surprise in my results.

Obviously as these are new there is no recognised standard to compare with. For p1 the reading is far too hard for them and several were noticeably worried, even though we made it a game and fun. Most of the answers to the reading were guesses which were often correct thus, I believe, not true results.

Absolutely useless. My own professional judgment is a much better reflection of where my children actually are in their learning. I am not using the results to help me plan my next steps. A huge waste of teaching & learning time.

SNSA provides no more information than I can gather myself in a child friendly way. Children did not enjoy the test and the results have not impacted my classroom/teaching.

Nowhere near as useful as sosca.

Pupils only come out with low, medium or high. How high is high and how low is low? Unfair to use as reliable as the assessments don't seem to have been administered the same in any school.

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

Helped with achievement of a level but that was all. Next steps could've been (and were) identified in other ways.

Not sure as no-one has told us how to analyse this data thus far.

There is too much data.

Because not all were asked the same kind of question did not feel could use data as well for comparisons. Did not feel these were as responsive to pupils getting right/wrong. Difficult to know the reliability of them - easy to guess and do well. Feedback was detailed, but as we did not have a record of the wording of the actual question posed, it was not as useful as it could have been. Could the actual question posed be noted, along with the feed-back, to make this more useful?

The data may be useful if it was easier to actually see the whole group without having to print off huge amounts of pages. Overall, given the amount of time taken (our ASNT had to be used to test 40+ p1 pupils), these tests are an incredible waste of time and teacher resources.

Not particularly. Especially so for P1. Children who teacher knew weren't achieving Early Level came out as medium. Teacher judgement a lot more reliable alongside benchmarks and pupils' work. The PT has also spent quite some time collating information- reliability is questionable.

## **INVERCLYDE**

I have had no training at all from my SMT or LA regarding SNSA although I have requested it. Consequently, I have no information about the learners as I do not know how to access this and don't have time to find out how to.

So far, I have only had a report which confirmed my pupils as low, medium or high ability, which matched my own professional judgement. I have not yet been shown how to access the more detailed reports, and would I really have time to read them all anyway?

The data provided by these tests are skewed. Children have a chance of guessing answers and obviously have a chance of being correct although they have no idea. This resulted on one of my most able children having the same test score as one of the least able children in my class. I have many other pieces of information, tests, etc. which support my professional opinion. For a few of the results, my opinion does not marry up. The guessing element meant that the branching questions were not ability appropriate. Children guessed and luckily clicked the correct answer. This meant they were continually faced with questions far too difficult for their ability.

The report with next steps could be useful for planning next steps but in the real world, when do we have time to collate this information in order to use it appropriately for supporting individual learning?

I feel really strongly against these tests. We are using a standardised test for non standard children in order to provide nothing but league table data. It goes against all research into the fact that children need play to develop. Valuable teaching time was lost due to the time taken to test. It put children under unnecessary stress. There is also no way of regulating how much support is given by each school/ class/ authority. Let children be children. Allow teachers' time to teach.

Told us nothing that we do not already know from our own assessments. EIS should boycott them, yet another total waste of teachers' time.

Tells me nothing. Do the results show how long they could pay attention? If they can use a computer? If they can follow instructions? That's before the literacy or numeracy content- only observations & professional judgement can give us a true baseline at early level.

I would've preferred an easier to read report as it took some time to read and evaluate. Again, no clear reference was made to progress within CfE level. Since different questions were asked of different children, it was perhaps less meaningful.

Not telling us anything that our own judgement through our internal school assessments hadn't already told us. Massive workload issue for PTs in analysing how pupils have done in the tests. In general yet another needless increase in workload for no reason at all, the Union should instruct us to boycott them.

## **MIDLOTHIAN**

The high, medium and low scores have not been explained. Is high above what is expected of children of that age etc?

Not at all useful. Nothing to compare them to. Children not managing skills in the assessment that I know they can do.

Disappointed in the data received following the SNSSA Assessments. Yes it was good to have the results right away but the data that we previously received following GL assessments was of far better use. GL assessments have Reading

ages and was able to highlight possible SfL issues. I felt the SNSA data was not specific enough to each child and the general comments given for each assessment were not always fully reflective of the pupils' performance in the assessment.

I don't think the data gathered tells me very much about my learners. I knew most of the information already.

## **MORAY**

NO training has been given in use of SNSA. I'm shocked that an in-service day was not dedicated to SNSA by the Scottish Government. At least with PIPS analysis, value added could be quantified. I don't know where to start with SNSA. Also even downloading each individual result is VERY time consuming. The numeracy test was better at setting next steps. I felt I couldn't use much of the literacy data reliably as it had no comparison to the early level standards that are reflected in the benchmarks.

The majority of results matched my own professional judgement.

Really poor. Very difficult to use to assess a level. Only use is to identify class strengths and weaknesses.

## **NORTH AYRSHIRE**

As only giving high/medium/low it's difficult to really see levels. Very time consuming to analyse individual children. Will require teacher training to update all staff.

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

We have children in our school who are capable but do not cope with digital assessments. Their assessment results do not reflect their ability. Our teachers use both summative and formative assessments to help guide their judgement. We are using the benchmarks to guide us with achieving a level.

Some of the data is useful although I have been able to interpret it more accurately because I observed the children closely while they were completing the assessments. E.g. I know that one child scored 'high' because of an unusual amount of lucky guesses on questions that I knew they hadn't understood! I also feel it is vital that all the assessments are carried out in the same way. From various discussions with other staff this has not been the case. Should the children be guessing if they don't actually know an answer or should they click next? Should they be allowed to attempt the questions if they haven't been able to read the text? This all has an impact on the data produced.

We have been told to analyse the data but have been given no training on this. Our PT is going on the data coach training as no-one is volunteering for it as it

looks to be a mammoth task as no-one has explained what the data is for, where it is going, what we've to do with it as I know what the children in my class are capable of or not.

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

### **NORTH LANARKSHIRE**

Not useful! Teachers know their children! One of mine who is extremely bright and in my top reading group was bored and was guessing answers because he wanted to get back to class to complete his task, came out low. Another of mine who is in my need of support group, worked her wee socks off but also made some lucky guesses and came out high! I cannot and will not use these results to determine my work with these children, I encourage and challenge each child to their full capacity but I also want to see them confident and engaged not bored and demoralised.

Many children became anxious / frustrated and gave up / just clicked buttons so the assessments were complete. This will therefore not give an accurate picture of the child's abilities.

I am not sure if they are going to tell staff any more than they already know.

The tests were lengthy, time consuming and did not tell me anything I didn't already know about my pupils. The assessments I already use in class were far more useful in providing reliable information I need on progress and next steps for my class. I feel this is yet another drive for data which does not take into account the individual needs of the learners.

Not relevant. Find class-based assessment more realistic and effective than stand-alone assessment piece.

Need to assess how useful data is and act on it appropriately to justify time spent on them, alongside teacher judgement and daily assessment in the classroom.

### **PERTH & KINROSS**

No time to analyse data so pretty useless!!

As a small school, much of the data is not relevant or useable by us. I simply don't have the time to look through such an abundance of intricate data. Who does? Just more work for us to do with very little gain.

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

For the majority of children who have an ASN and find accessing the curriculum difficult on a day to day basis the results were generally as you would expect. However, for the middle and upper groups of learners the results seemed to be all over the place and didn't truly reflect their ability across the three areas being assessed. When we looked and compared the results across this large group of children, we started to question the scoring or the assessments; for example, pupils who got the majority of low to medium questions correct but made mistakes in the high level questions were scored lower than pupils who got fewer questions correct overall but the ones they did get correct were classified as high. Our teacher judgement in this case was that the majority of the pupils in this second category (low overall score, questions correct in the high category) were likely to be guessing the answers as in class they would not have been able to answer that level of question without support.

They don't seem to match benchmarks and are limited in coverage. It's a tiny snapshot in whole-assessment evidence. It does show gaps but would this encourage 'teach to the test'?

Across school/Scotland there is a huge range of support or lack of for children undertaking- how can judgements be made reliably if one class got lots of support while another got no support?

The findings confirmed my judgements in most cases but not all. The writing assessment doesn't actually assess extended writing as I expected so not sure it is of value. I have not used the results in my report writing.

Good to look at but so far from CfE that it hasn't influenced teaching. Day to day AiFL and moderation in school does that. Reports from SNSA filed neatly, which means they don't get used.

Computer print outs given to me by management were "interesting" and not reflective on their abilities and what they had completed in class.

The information has been of no use at all at early level. The majority of the children came out very well - much better than I would have anticipated. Some of the children who came out high, in my opinion, were not secure at early level. I felt the assessments were an unnecessary burden on the children and staff, and didn't provide any real information on progress.

Time-consuming to print out results.

In a way it confirmed my professional judgement for most children but there were too many that I would say wouldn't/ shouldn't have come out high if you look at the work they have been producing over the year.

## RENFREWSHIRE

The data provided is vague. Having used GL assessments previously the information from GL is more informative and allows the measuring of improvements and use of the information to plan future learning.

Not had results through yet but I am sure they will have no impact on my next steps as I felt the questions and task were irrelevant and not what I would use to measure my children's ability.

Don't even have the data and don't know when we'll be given it or what the results will look like!

I've not seen the results yet although SMT have still to attend training on how to analyse data.

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

I have E&O's and benchmarks along with my own professional judgement. These ridiculous tests have provided me with no useful information.

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

Unknown but I suspect that the data received is not fully representative of what the children are capable of.

The results told me nothing that I didn't already know!

I feel the testing has deprived my students of valuable learning time in a term that is already jammed full of other activities and events. As far as next steps are concerned it didn't tell me anything I didn't already know.

At P1 stage not at all. My HT is pleased with results, however, there are some children who scored well whom I will not be presenting as secure at Early Level.

Data merely supported progress information that had already been collected by myself. In a few instances data was incorrect, highlighting pupils as better than they actually are, as they had correctly guessed questions on passages they had not been able to read themselves.

I have been sent a link to access Seemis for the data now that my children have finished the tests (29.5.18). Again, no information about what I'll see or how to navigate the information. It will be interesting to see how the data, in whatever form it is, tallies with my knowledge of the children.



The data was not a true reflection in any way. One child in my p1 class with severe learning needs had great difficulty with the numeracy test and could only answer 2 questions correctly but came out as medium level in the results.

### **SCOTTISH BORDERS**

Only get low medium high.

Detailed result table is great but interpretation is not easy.

Difficult to use as it is only a snapshot of a child's learning.

We are all still very confused by data.

We have not done this yet. Not sure when we will get the time to do this. Summer term is so busy with other things that we may not get round to it.

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

It hasn't been and while it may be viewed as a management tool it isn't likely to be accessed or used by classes teachers.

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

Scottish Borders only did the phase 2 training last week. Phase 1 training was cancelled.

I do not feel that schools have had enough time to give this new initiative the credence that it needed.

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

I haven't had sufficient time or training to do this properly.

Nowhere near as good as what I already know about my kids.

Interesting but assessment already ongoing in class is more useful for benchmarks and cfe levels .

They provided nothing that our school didn't know already.

My class is still being withdrawn to sit the tests and I have had no feedback at this stage.

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

We already have assessments to give us summative data for planning next steps.

These are not useful in literacy as they do not tie in with the end of level benchmarks and are not user friendly for P1.

Haven't seen the results yet! Will have to look at them alongside progress in maths and English too! Over testing for what purpose?

## **SHETLAND**

With the literacy assessment, I felt it was not so cut and dried. I felt the increase in difficulty with the questions for my less able readers was not gradual enough and therefore their strengths are maybe not fairly represented as they had answered a question which was just beyond their reach. Maybe the literacy could be reconsidered for next year, some random questions which could be more focused.

SNSA data has told me little about my pupils that I didn't already know. It is an expensive and time-consuming way for me to learn nothing new. It adds a great deal to my workload but not a lot else. Besides this, different pupils got different questions at different levels at different times so it is worthless as a standardised assessment.

## **SOUTH AYRSHIRE**

Currently I have found the data not very useful as it is very generic, however I hope this changes after the first year and they are able to tweak them to challenge or support children more.

I did not find the assessment information useful, as I knew from classroom learning, observations and assessments the progress learners had made. Also several children randomly guessed and selected the correct answers resulting in

them being identified as 'High' whereas they are in fact in a support group for reading.

Not been given the opportunity yet to look at data.

## **SOUTH LANARKSHIRE**

Could have obtained data from teacher judgment without putting young children through such a demanding task.

Yet to be determined. There is an abundance of data available to me, but no time earmarked for me to access the data for each student and draw conclusions. I also wonder practically what use it would be to me when I have no knowledge of the questions asked.

Some of the reading assessments required pupils to have fairly niche background knowledge to be able to access the key ideas of the text. Not all children, for example, will know what a tsar is and be able to understand a passage about Russian history.

Data does not support teacher judgement at all.

My knowledge of the child and ongoing assessment of the child is a more valuable and reliable source of information to inform next steps. Using benchmarks to assess classroom activities/tasks is a good tool to judge achievement of a level. I was very concerned in the Literacy assessment that even though a child could not read a given passage, they could select a correct answer randomly ~ not an accurate picture of their understanding.

This data in my opinion is invalid because it did not reflect the same results as the other many assessments or the teachers' judgement.

I would say that the information at P1 is not wholly accurate as there were a lot of children either guessing or skipping questions which meant their data was less valuable. I do worry that these assessment indicators or benchmarks might become more influential in planning therefore adding another layer of bureaucracy into our planning particularly when we need to see progression at intermediary stages in between.

It is difficult to compare such a small number of pupils (12) as a few did completely different questions from the rest.

The individual reports are interesting when analysed however not all results were reliable as children who didn't understand questions guessed correctly on numerous occasions.

On the whole the data proved what I had predicted at my last forward plan meeting. I haven't had time or the required information to access and fully analyse the data. Another issue, p1, 4 and 7 teachers now have extra work in terms of analysing additional assessment data.

The results surprised me as children who struggled with initial sounds and blending came out as high and others who cope well with daily school work came out lower than expected.

I have other data that I've collected over the year. I do not feel data has been beneficial to me as a class teacher. All children in my class came out as HIGH in numeracy when I know clearly that not all of my children are at the same level.

Did not find these tests helpful at all. Needs to be some big changes to P1 tests. Multiple choice questions maybe not best practice either as some children who were guessing and choosing any answer were coming out as better than children who were trying hard (again, not accurate results).

Having had feedback of the results from the HT, the SNSA results do NOT reflect the children's ability (especially the lower ability children). It put them much higher than they actually are and this is very disappointing. I will not use the results at all but will go with my own professional judgement.

Merely confirmed what I already knew. Information came too late for report writing.

The results made our very slow-paced pupils who use lots of concrete support i.e. cubes, number line, etc look comparable to our fast-paced independent learners. It has not given a true reflection on the independence or progress of some.

No use whatsoever. Some of the children 'achieved' better results than their true ability would have predicted, just by sheer luck.

Looking at which questions were typically answered incorrectly, it was clear that the questions were those that do not appear to tally with the benchmarks. I know my learners and assess as part of all planned learning, so know what next steps I need to plan for for every group and individual.

Fairly useful, however it didn't tell us anything we didn't know. It caused so much stress to some pupils that I don't think it was worth it. If I was a parent of a P1 pupil, I'd have withdrawn my child from this.

Not particularly helpful as some children who we expected to score lower have come out high, not due to understanding but by 'lucky guessing' multiple choice answers. As mentioned many P1 missed out answers accidentally and so received a low score when we know them to be in the highest achievers category.

We have had some surprising results from the data which we are reluctant to rely on (guesswork). The expectation from the p1 reading test was, in our opinion, too high, so we again are reluctant to base any predictions/achievements on this data.

High/medium/low not very detailed. Children all answer completely different questions so cannot compare results between children either. Not useful data in the slightest.

The data in some cases did not reflect the actual ability of the child as they were able to guess correctly from the multiple choice so they came out much higher than they actually were.

Does not match previous assessment data and very difficult to interpret.

We have already used the data to inform us of gaps in pupils' learning that we will target.

SNSA data has been of no use to me at all! It may have confirmed what I already knew, although some did come out higher due to their luck guessing the multiple choice answers!

The actual results they provided were time consuming to access & really would require me to spend too much of my already over stretched time to read fully. Therefore I wouldn't bother to use it at all! The whole process took much longer than was it worth.

The evidence provided is not true reflection of where children are. Most of P1 came out high or medium, yet at least half couldn't read the reading material provided. Not a good way to move our children forward as most of them just hit a button or guessed.

Not really looked at this in depth but the classification of the questions not related to the level.

### **STIRLING**

Not useful at all. Told us nothing that other school assessments can't tell us and most importantly teacher judgement.

No use whatsoever. Not even as 'part' of professional judgements. Nearly all had to be completely ignored during 'tracking and assessment' meetings as teachers knew results were not representative! All staff objected to 'having' to make the children take the tests at all, and especially as whole year cohorts, at a given time in the year! Council and school doing exact opposite of all recommendations, despite this being pointed out to those in authority!

Not really useful. The Class Teacher is best suited for identifying next steps. At best the SNSA data is a small and limited piece of the picture as to whether a level has been achieved or not.

### **WEST DUNBARTONSHIRE**

As a classroom teacher I have not been given information about the results. I don't feel I can comment as yet as haven't seen results.

I haven't accessed these yet, and as I have received no training on using the tests, I had no idea that I could access them.

Completely useless. The layout and the questions were not linked tightly enough to the benchmarks. In Primary 1 I want to know about the children's progress

for phonological awareness, phonics, sight vocabulary, common words and comprehension. Our school-based assessments are of greater relevance for planning the next steps in learning. Furthermore, I am dismayed at the stress some of my young children endured, particularly with the literacy assessment. One of my young, confident girls burst into tears and despite reassuring her she was left very distressed. Completely unnecessary in my view.

They have told me NOTHING that I don't already know and some poorer pupils have had lots of lucky guesses and have been banded as medium or high, which does not reflect their ability.

They are a stressful waste of time which is taking away valuable teaching time.

I'm not entirely sure how helpful the results will be. I have only seen some results and the children appear to have been given a "high, medium or low", but the description at the side seems far too vague. Also, as the test kept changing and adjusting for each pupil it makes it difficult to compare. Plus, as the tests were multiple choice, I know that some children 'guessed' their way through the test because it was too difficult for them.

Data is useful if reliable, however I am reluctant to say that all children in all schools are receiving the same level of support within/across schools to complete the assessments. Therefore, I question the reliability of the data for using for next steps.

## **WEST LOTHIAN**

As a lot of children were guessing answers and getting them right, I do not think it was useful when pitched at this level. It could be useful if pitched at a suitable level to support professional judgement, but as we are being told to take a play-based learning approach I feel this form of assessment does not fit with that approach.

We found our own in school assessments far more beneficial. We have worked with colleagues to develop our own use of the data as we did not find the training sessions terribly helpful. Why can't some of the results be on one A3 page rather than over 18 pages? I can do this myself taking ages to copy paste and fiddle on excel but I shouldn't have to do this.

The box graphs do not show you much as the children from professional judgement who need extra support and struggle with areas guessed and get the answers correct not giving us a true reflection of their level.

Information is useful. As was sitting with each child and watching them complete the assessment. Many children guessed a lot of answers correctly. This cannot be judged from the data alone.

Not particularly helpful - the benchmarks are a better indicator of progress.

The data could be presented in a less confusing manner.

The results were not a surprise however the reliability can come into question as some children guessed their way through.

Data was not very accurate as some children who really struggle got lucky with multiple choice questions but as we did it with them we knew that they had just guessed the correct answer so not to take the results too seriously.

It did not tell us anything that we didn't know already from professional judgment.

Not at all as most children guessed answers and at times these guesses were correct therefore not informing me on their actual knowledge at all.

As mentioned above, I found in many cases that the data was unreliable. Staff administering the tests confirmed that in many cases where the pupil was unsure of the answer they simply guessed and in a lot of cases got the answer correct. I have assessed my pupils on some of the areas that they got correct in the SNSAs and found that their knowledge did not match what I read on the SNSA results. Overall, I think it is better to use varying assessments throughout the session to support teacher judgement instead of stressing pupils out with a lengthy, difficult and time consuming standardised assessment.

Very haphazard as a lot of children guessed answers and got them right, which meant they were onto the more advanced questions. The tests are supposed to tell us what we don't already know but some results were actually misleading due to the nature of multiple choice questions.

I don't know how reliable the assessments are when the questions are multiple choice. Several of my primary 1 children came out at a much higher level than anticipated and than all other previous assessments have shown.

Always interesting to analyse the data but a few less able children came out really well due to lucky guessing. At least I was able to see that that's what it was by sitting alongside them as they were completing it. Even still, I would have known based on my assessment evidence in class.

The results did not give me any new information. They just confirmed what my lengthy teaching experience and professional judgement told me having taught the pupils for best part of a year. Not fit for purpose and a waste of 3 days good teaching time in my opinion.

All the SNSA has really done is back up what I already knew. Given a blank scale and asked to place my children on it I would have put them pretty much in a similar position. I don't feel it helped particularly with next steps because telling children to just 'have a go and choose an answer' tells me they don't know whether they guessed correctly or not.

Time would have been spent far more effectively in primary 1 on active, hands on assessment with children rather than this computer 'game'.

## WESTERN ISLES

Many of the tests were not a true reflection of the child's age or stage. Children were able to guess the correct answer without fully carrying out the task or showing any understanding of the question.

Not given me anything I didn't know. Dismayed that a judgement/ rating given for answering only a third of the questions correctly!! ( but don't worry that child is rated 'medium' !!!)