

then asked questions which were a test of memory. The literacy test needed to have more focus on letter sounds and blending and breaking CVC words.

Some of the literacy questions were very far beyond the early level stage, in my opinion.

SNSA directly conflicts with the play based experiential learning approach that we are trying to adopt in P1.

P1 literacy assessment seemed high level.

I fail to see how the above experience supports my child in her work through the Early level or in achieving the dispositions and transferable skills she needs to develop the 4 capacities.

Not really reflected at all, sorry.

Literacy- not enough focus on initial sounds/simple phonemes or simple blending. Comprehension task not relevant to children (about hummingbirds which children have no interest or prior knowledge about). Numeracy- too much focus on graphs and calendars.

There is a limited correlation between the elements.

Does not seem to be in line with CfE at all. Of course, summative assessment is useful and necessary, but this format is not helpful. It does not build up children's confidence - a few of the children in my class left the ICT suite more than a little deflated as they worried about their results - regardless of what I said. These assessments do not assess some of the most important areas in the Scottish curriculum. It doesn't assess HWB; their team work skills; their personal skills; their skills in a range of other curricular areas. I understood the whole point of CfE is that it is meant to be more holistic. These assessments are a far cry from that. They are prescriptive, intimidating and limiting. I have a range of exceptional children in my class whose abilities and skills have not been measured or acknowledged by these assessments.

I thought that the questions did not start at a reasonable level for some children which made them anxious at the very start.

Not totally relevant at times, particularly with the reading relating to hummingbirds for P1.

Numeracy P1 -didn't cover all early level outcomes and adults had to read to children! Literacy far too difficult-not early level!

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

The P1 assessment for reading was pitched far too high. It was asking children to answer questions that would be unable to find in the text. Along with that had

long passages which had to be struggled through before finally giving an easier option. In some cases, children had to struggle through 3 stories.

Assessments covered CfE benchmarks, although I found that many of the questions were going beyond what would be expected of a primary 1 at early level. The reading passages in particular were very difficult and far beyond the expected reading level of a child at early level. The maths seemed to focus a lot on time and not on basic skills of addition and subtraction. The maths test was far too wordy for primary 1, there were too many word problems and no basic sums.

As an infant teacher I am struggling to see how time consuming standardised assessments are helpful within a play-based curriculum.

I felt that the numeracy assessment focussed on some areas more than others. The writing assessment did not in my eyes assess the pupils writing rather further assessed their reading ability.

The Primary 1 SNSA started at a level which was detrimental to the children's performance. For many children they struggled from the first question which was disheartening.

The SNSAs, for the most part, do not correlate to the benchmarks. It has been extremely frustrating to see engaged and motivated learners become disheartened, and in some cases distressed, by a test that is far too difficult for them. The content of the reading text and questions seem deliberately designed to mislead pupils. The inaccessibility of the material encourages learners to skip or guess questions, which can lead to misleading data.

A lot of the assessments were aligned with benchmarks. The numeracy assessment was very context-based, focus was all on application. Children who find literacy challenging were then put off the numeracy too. The writing assessment assessed tools for writing (grammar and spelling). In this type of assessment, it is difficult to assess how the children apply these tools.

## **FIFE**

Very difficult to see any alignment with CfE experiences and outcomes.

one sentence redacted - out of scope

The comprehension questions for p1 are horrific. By the time most have read the story book they have forgotten some of the details due to the length of the text. The hummingbird passage is badly laid out and the pupils are put off. Some of the names they are expected to read cannot be sounded out e.g. Zoe.

Literacy was far too difficult and not in line with benchmarks. There was far too much reading before a question was asked. Lots of information handling in the numeracy questions. One question was a bar graph which looked more like First Level.

Tests delivered en masse, no relationship to pupils' learning.

Children found many of the questions too difficult even though we were told questions will differ dependant on progress. Many children just guessing answers.

It was difficult to match E & O with the assessment tasks. The tasks appeared to be random sometimes starting with difficult questions at a higher level. There are also enormous omissions. E.g. one example of initial sound recognition does not the end of Early level make. The rhyme questions were very confusing, being more of a memory test rather than being able to recognise rhyme. The reading assessments were particularly hard. The most difficult one appearing for pupils who couldn't read a simple sentence. I think the reason for this being the children who were allowed to guess the answers, guessing correctly, making the test think that they could read.

once sentence redacted - out of scope

The maths assessments for P1 does not go far enough for the pupils that can work up to 1000. Again, alignment to Es & Os and the benchmarks is difficult to identify.

Not appropriate for P1.

Not at all! Nothing about the test considered anything else than memorised learning.

Not at all at early level!

It does not reflect well how teach in primary 1. Primary 1 is very active and uses a lot of conceptual learning and understanding. The assessments are also quite abstract. The story about Looking for Sally does not reflect how we teach reading in primary 1 - using context cues and has tricky words that we do not cover. The stories that are read are ok as it then shows understanding. The hummingbird text is extremely difficult, even for my most able readers.

Assessments are narrow and do not reflect the principles of CfE. We claim to provide a BROAD and BALANCED education while actually we are only interested in Literacy and Numeracy

Mmmm. Not really impressed. 8 questions on pronouns in one assessment says it all really.

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

Hit and miss! Some aspects covered and others not. It was possible for children to make lucky guesses in the P1 assessment and there were not enough opportunities to try similar questions to negate that.

Not linked closely enough.

Reading test was not appropriate to show that P1 children were achieving early level. Some of the questions and reading expected were far too difficult. The

children are not used to reading books on a computer, they are used to touching and feeling a book, tracking words with their finger and turning pages, this made it very hard for them. The sound didn't work for a lot of the questions either which meant we had to guess what it was asking. The numeracy test focused a lot on information handling and calendars which I thought was odd. I think more focus should be on basic number skills, this is more important at this developmental stage.

I can only comment on the P1 assessments, but I felt they were too difficult and did not reflect what children were expected to achieve at Early level.

## **GLASGOW**

The P1 words were too difficult - I was told question words are not supposed to be covered in p1. And other sounds were in the text that haven't been covered. Felt difficult for P1.

Utterly ridiculous to expect p1 children to read certain words contained in the literacy passages!

The reading and numeracy assessment were reasonably okay for first level, but I think the writing was more difficult. The CLOL literacy within Glasgow are telling us not to place emphasis on punctuation yet a lot of the writing assessment focussed on grammar and punctuation.

As we did the assessments in term 4, we had covered most of the work I saw in papers. However, I don't know how this would work if you did this in Term 1. I thought the writing paper focussing on tools for writing did not give a good indication of improvements pupils had made in other skills within writing. I am concerned that the writing focus will now become this area.

The numeracy assessment was more linked to the early level benchmarks and E&O's, but the literacy was beyond the benchmarks by far. Many reading and spelling questions did not use phonetic sounds that would be taught in p1 and reading passages were irrelevant to pupils' lives.

In p1 the benchmarks in maths did not reflect some of the questions e.g. using calendar how many days, numerals beyond 20 (verbally to 30 numerals to 20 is the benchmark). Also, not consistent. One of my pupils who can't read numerals to 10 scored high and did not attempt parts yet scored better than others who had more correct and attempted all. Literacy passage about hummingbirds is a disgrace for p1. Do not teach skills for reasoning i.e. question and answer. First level not early.

It was very difficult for children as it was not in a context they were familiar with and from the questions I saw (which were few) I don't think they met with inclusive and supportive ethos of our school as some children were struggling but still had to take part.

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

Considering the assessment is designed to take different parts depending on how the student answers, can we really tell? From peering over their shoulders and seeking glances at questions (since we were not allowed to even see a typical test) how could it possibly reflect all our experience and outcomes. Should writing skills not be tested on how a child writes and not just their ability to select the correct multiple-choice answer?

The P1 test doesn't align with the benchmarks for achieving a level. The questions set in this test are not age and stage appropriate and put the child under quite a lot of stress and pressure.

The text in the 4 'page' booklet part of the Early level literacy assessment did not reflect the cultural capital of children in our area. Very few children in areas of deprivation would find it easy to connect with a text relating to 'humming birds'!

A general overview of the data seems to confirm teacher professional judgements. Our holistic approach to assessment in the school through various formative and summative assessments provide us with the confidence to determine which pupils have achieved at level at the different points in their primary experience.

We are operating a play-based approach to learning in P1 and the use of these assessment did not reflect this.

The Literacy test was outrageous. Children were expected to read lengthy paragraphs for themselves and then answer extremely difficult questions. I had children who are very high achievers becoming anxious and almost reduced to tears over this test. The literacy test did not test what is on the curriculum or the benchmarks.

P1- literacy very inappropriate for stage. EAL pupils were not given a lot of questions to show their progression in acquiring English language such as sounds and visual literacy. It did not respond to pupils' answers very well and reading tasks on hummingbirds far too difficult for p1 Es and O's. Did not have many CVC words to assess pupils basic reading at this age. Numeracy was better in terms of Es and O's. with wide variety of appropriate questions.

As a mother and teacher, I was extremely disappointed in these tests. The poor primary ones were expected to sound out ridiculous words without help support and guidance from the role models who have supported and encouraged them all year. So much for encouraging learning through play?!

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

Tests do not. Play based emphasis across Early Level yet Government expects a summative assessment at end. Content of curriculum and curriculum delivery not assisted by this constant urge for summative scores and data. Why 4 and 5-year olds are pressurised to sit tests at this early age is beyond me. Crucial stage for building confidence and resilience. This goes against all of that.

Around 30% of the questions were aligned to CfE. However, the rest of the assessments were far too difficult. Difficult questions contained 'trick' answers.

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

There was no connection at all to the four capacities.

Having seen samples from the pilot testing last session I am not entirely convinced that these tests support or challenge learning going on as part of the BGE.

Thought that they were all too difficult for each level apart from numeracy in p1.

P1 have a play-based curriculum which is responsive but having to do these horrendous tasks. Can't see how some of the text such as the ridiculous hummingbird passage can be viewed as early level. Lots of the passages to read were not things children would have encountered. P1 children were demoralised doing this.

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

The maths assessment was appropriate to p1. However, the literacy assessment was far too difficult and not age appropriate for p1. This assessment had my children very stressed and in my opinion was setting up the children to fail.

Tasks set at too high a level for the children I worked with they certainly didn't feel confident or successful.

I am working with P1 children. The literacy assessment is far too long, and the content is not relevant to our P1 learners.

P1 assessment was only applicable to the very able children. Difficult to have accurate information from those who are less able.

The p1 test was far too hard. one paragraph redacted - out of scope

The tests were not appropriate to the age and stage of the children and did not help meet their needs.

The children found the questions difficult as it was totally out of the norm and unusual for them. Most coped ok, despite us trying to keep everything informal and relaxed, some pupils found the process very stressful and their results are not reflective of their ability.

A few pages at the beginning had relevance with sounds and word recognition. The jump between recognising a CVC word to reading the most ridiculously long passages was an absolute joke.

Some of the tasks were relevant to age and stage but on the whole the questions were ridiculous due to them being irrelevant to many children. There was also no separate test for children with dyslexia or EAL learners.

I do not think the literacy tests were relevant, or necessary. The children were expected to read large parts of non-fiction text and were overwhelmed. It was awful.

## **HIGHLAND**

The p 1 literacy was beyond the reading ability of all of our p1 and had little relevancy to their lives.

The p1 literacy assessment does not align with benchmarks - far too high expectations in comparison to benchmarks.

Some of the areas matched up & others didn't. The test didn't truly reflect the ability of my children.

Completely inappropriate and not in line with outcomes nor benchmarks.

Benchmarks were relevant. No indication of anything else being taken into account. 4 capacities, write make do, etc.

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

The reading passage for the primary ones was ridiculous. None of my children could read it well and still guessed some questions right due to their general knowledge.

Looking at the benchmarks, it would seem the P1 assessments are well above expectations. Some elements were appropriate such as recognising initial sounds, CVC words, patterns in maths but others were well beyond - reading paragraphs about hummingbirds, using a calendar. It appears to go against what we are being taught as teachers about Emerging Literacy and slowing things down. The free flowing, lack of structure and routine, ability to choose what they want to do in ELCC setting is slowing down progress in P1 with many unable to even sit and listen to a story.

P1 assessments required too much reading. I have some able children and they were required to read two long passages which were too challenging and required an extended period of concentration beyond that expected of a P1 child. All the children, even the least able were asked to complete these passages - there didn't

seem to be an adequate range of differentiation. As a result, I did not test my additional needs children, as they would not have coped. The phonics they were expected to know was also too ambitious. Despite me encouraging my pupils to move on when they got thwarted and not answer the questions they scored 'high', so was this level of challenge necessary?

Did not feel these aligned - would be much better aligned to benchmarks to allow judgement of a level. This made use of data difficult.

These assessments appeared to be pitched towards the end of CfE First and Second levels, with no allowances made for pupils who were only half way through a level. Given the fact that we were asked to complete these mid-year, none of our children had completed all of this content. This made them stressful for those children to complete, as they were too hard for them. Every question was in a context, particularly for numeracy, which, although meeting CfE outcomes, meant that many lower ability pupils did not know where to start - they were so flummoxed by the language of the question, that they were not able to attempt the mathematical skills being requested. They would have had some success however, if some of the wording was removed and questions were posed in a more straightforward manner, and not all problem-solving contexts. More allowances need to be made for mid-low ability pupils, who were very stressed by these assessments.

Expecting p1 pupils to read about hummingbirds!!! Definitely not age and stage appropriate.

P1 assessments bore very little resemblance to benchmarks for the end of Early Level. Horrendously difficult and way beyond anything you would expect of a P1.

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

P1 assessments bore very little resemblance to benchmarks for the end of Early Level. Horrendously difficult and way beyond anything you would expect of a P1.

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

## **INVERCLYDE**

At this stage, I do not feel that the tests accurately reflect the ethos or approaches of CfE.

Content of reading tasks was incredibly abstract for many children e.g. hummingbirds.

The literacy tasks were, in my opinion, far too demanding for P1 pupils. The Hummingbird passage was just ridiculous! In no way, are these tests in their current form, appropriate for pupils in Primary one. With a curriculum that has positive health and wellbeing at its heart, these assessments go against this completely, as they caused undue stress and anxiety in a number of children and,



in many cases, left lots of children in classes without the support required to achieve.

Numeracy was mostly relevant and asked questions which were in line with what was previously taught. Some questions were asked using unfamiliar vocabulary. Literacy was pitched way higher than the level at which my class are working at. The texts used were not Early Level appropriate and had far too much language. Punctuation was more complex than what my children are used to or aware of and did not provide relevant picture clues, a reading skill encouraged at this stage of reading development. The graphics did not appeal to this age group. For example, the book cover used as a question to test where the title of the story was. At no point would I present my children with such a long non-fiction text as the hummingbird passage in the test and expect them to remain engaged. My children felt far removed from the confident individuals they are striving to be. They felt despondent, stressed and an element of boredom as a result of being forced to complete these tests.

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

Inappropriate for p1 who are exploring & learning through play. Children who require support of nurture class removed from routine to do a test that bears no resemblance to the learning that has been taking place in class.

Early level, not at all.

Very limited connection with content and principles of CfE.

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

Not very good, most questions were on content pupils had passed on from a year ago. Total waste of time.

## **MIDLOTHIAN**

I don't think they reflect well. The writing test in particular as that was children identifying grammar and spelling rather than applying these in to their writing. Did not adjust much to children's ability.

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

P1 Reading was not in line with CfE and expected the children to complete questions of a first level standard bit early level.

P1 reading in particular was very hard.

## **MORAY**

Primary 1 SNSA reading assessment was in no way aligned to benchmarks! Luckily in my school, PIPS reading results have been above national average for

past 6 years so our results have come out really well. We use quite a traditional approach however.

The tasks set for early level do not reflect the benchmarks - partially the reading element. The words are not phonetically and most of it is alternative sounds and sight vocabulary - exceeding the early level benchmarks. Most children were aware that they could not understand the text and were overwhelmed so guessed most of the answers as a result. The text to listen to was also far too lengthy for them to recall - they would need to hear 1 page at a time then answer a question about it before moving on. There should also be a much stronger focus on phonics skills sounding out decodable words.

I felt early level reading in particular was extremely difficult. Children were completely put off by the length of some of the reading tasks and also if they couldn't read for some of the questions it then didn't give the opportunity for them to answer comprehension questions as they were trying to decode the text.

Not great at all. It has been difficult to use numeracy test result in a meaningful way.

## **NORTH AYRSHIRE**

P1 quite different to our pathways one sentence redacted - out of scope  
P1 reading had one section where the children were to read a short story independently. This was far too advanced for the children, and I do not believe should be expected as 'standard' for this stage.

The writing test was based on tools for writing. I have a few children who do not produce extended pieces of writing in class. They are reluctant writers, yet the writing assessment showed high ability. Without other evidence this result would be misleading.

The literacy assessment for P1 was appropriate in parts and they saw it as a game. However, some parts were completely inappropriate - the long passages with flicking between parts of a story etc. This did not fit well with the approach to learning in a P1 classroom and my pupils were a bit confused by the whole process. The names of the characters in the texts were also particularly challenging. My pupils are very proud of the reading skills they have developed in P1 and I felt that it was demoralising for them to be faced with some texts which were completely inaccessible to them.

The assessments were not differentiated for the abilities within the class and so children working at the beginning of second level were not fairly assessed. The tests do not tell staff anything new. A good teacher knows the children inside and out, their barriers and abilities which are carefully planned and catered for including assessments of the work which they are doing and able for.

## **NORTH LANARKSHIRE**

P1 are being encouraged to investigate and experience learning, having to explain to a 5-year-old that he/she has to read a full non-fiction passage about hummingbirds was soul destroying! Boring, too long sentences and why? Were some of the things he children said to me. The parts where children were asked to make a word, focusing on each sound or to change a word to something else were very stage appropriate but the reading sections were terrible. The functionality of reading the book was ridiculous, what exactly was being tested? Reading or navigation skills? Even in terms of ICT requirements for p1 this was way too advanced!

I felt the P1 tests were not linked to the benchmarks for Early Level. Reading activities were far too difficult for the majority of my class and were not aimed at the children's ability level, unlike the CEM testing we have previously used. Some of the maths questions were also far too difficult, especially some of the graph and calendar questions.

Literacy was extremely hard- for children that were not capable there was no option to skip they just had to guess.

Linked to outcomes but if more play is being pushed as desirable in P1 classes it seems inconsistent with the constant assessment of P1 pupils in literacy and numeracy.

## **ORKNEY**

Not really! They align well with the benchmarks, but certainly not the overall ethos of the CfE.

## **PERTH & KINROSS**

Some children exceeded expectations and I would argue the accuracy of the tests.

The P1 assessment was like nothing they would usually do in school, lacked any active learning and meant they were sitting for a ridiculous amount of time in front of a computer. Fun for 10 minutes only! The concepts were not relevant to our children. Many answers were guessed and therefore, in my opinion, wasn't a true representation of ability.

The literacy assessment was far more advanced than the benchmarks suggest a child who has achieved early level should be able to access. The texts were lengthy and contained phonemes that had not been taught at Primary 1 yet. The Hummingbird question was particularly complex, and many children required a significant amount to time to try to work out the content of the text and then answer questions about it.

Very detailed feedback but it doesn't match up to the benchmarks!

The numeracy assessment included a few areas which we had not covered yet. I also felt that although the children were allowed to do workings on paper, these weren't part of the assessment and in many cases the children were using the

correct method but inaccurately and so their score was low and did not reflect their mathematical processing. Also, in the numeracy assessment, for my pupils with dyslexia who have a good mathematical ability but a barrier due to the literacy element they could not access the assessment without support as being able to listen to the question was not activated at their stage. The reading assessment in some questions included a lot of highly inferential questions where the answers did not include any of the original wording from the text and so were very difficult to answer. For pupils with a literacy barrier the high quantity of inferential questions was really challenging and I did not see the question type changing to more literal questions when a pupil was answering consistently incorrectly. Finally, we were told that the tests would adjust to the ability/answers of the child, I did not see this in any of the assessments.

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

From reports downloaded after SNSA finished, literacy looked to be well out of line with CfE. Grammar and spelling questions - more like old fashioned tests I did in the 1970s.

Beyond what I would expect for P1, especially literacy.

The early level tests were in no way reflective of the CfE outcomes. The format of the test did not reflect in any way how learning takes place in P1 classroom. Each test was far too long - even though children were encouraged to take breaks - some assessments were taking over one hour to complete. The literacy assessment in particular was in no way relevant to the early level outcomes. Many of the children were distressed as they were unsure of the format and felt under pressure, causing unnecessary anxiety. The language used in the literacy assessment was in no way age appropriate.

Not really linked to the true spirit of CfE or the way that we are meant to be teaching. Children couldn't prepare for this. Normally, when testing spelling and maths etc, children are given time in class and at home to revise.

P1 literacy was far too demanding & had detrimental effect e.g. child saying "I can't read" despite them making very good progress. Some started too hard and it put them off trying. Many guesses - sometimes correct.

## RENFREWSHIRE

Assessments do not align well with CfE. Writing assessment is actually testing spelling and grammar - only tools for writing not the child's ability to write a piece or apply the tools for writing. P1 assessments are completely against the pedagogy of a P1 class which is focussed on play-based learning.

Very inappropriate to age and stage. Children that couldn't identify initial sounds in words were then taken to passage on Scottish wildcats and asked to read independently.

Writing assessment completely NOT reflective of current or good practice. Only tested grammar and spelling and was very difficult and quite alien to the tasks pupils usually receive.

Reading and Numeracy assessments did not alter. All children completed the same 30 questions. Only the writing assessment seemed to adapt to the level of the child.

Successful learners - P1 can't access the material independently as they need an adult to help them. So, no success here for the children. Effective contributors - the children contribute nothing as they sit there passively for an hour being asked a series of questions. Responsible citizens - how exactly are children committing to political and socio-economic life with informed views through these tests? Confident individuals - every time they can't answer a question their confidence dies a little bit more.

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

It was too difficult and not relevant in some cases.

Some content was far too difficult for P1 children. Certain contexts had not been taught as not in Early E's and O's.

Not at all!

Not sure the assessments add much value. If teacher assessment is king what is the purpose of the assessments? Many children did not do as expected - it was clear they were impacted by the 'assessment' environment.

P1 test in no way fit for purpose. Has no depth. Skirts over the outcomes and relies on cultural capital rather than understanding of text. Laborious and even capable children switching off. Very demoralising.

I found the P1 assessments a waste of time. Very little content matched benchmarks. Children scored well by guessing at times. Not a true reflection of

their abilities. On an iPad the children can ask it to read the text to them which defeats the point of a reading assessment.

P1 Literacy. Awful. The expected level of fluency in reading was not reflective of early level expectations. Children were left feeling like failures. Lots of comprehension questions. Not enough other reading strategies such as reading CVC words or reading short sentences. P1 Numeracy. Lots of data handling questions. Children at early level would not have come across some of the bar graphs yet, also time question with the calendar: not early level expectations for a child to interpret a monthly calendar. Not enough numeracy e.g. basic addition and subtraction.

The tests did not reflect the ethos of an active approach, nor of the way we have taught the children using concrete resources, specifically for measure. The questions did not relate to the benchmarks for early level but were more aimed at first level, which was soul destroying for my children.

## **SCOTTISH BORDERS**

Writing task covers mainly spelling and grammar. Other aspects are not represented.

Some questions in P1 assessments that were way beyond early level.

one paragraph redacted - out of scope

Some of the questions in the Numeracy paper for P. 1 were well above expected early level work.

one sentence redacted - out of scope P1 differed considerably to both how Early Years are being taught and what they are being taught- particularly in reading.

I saw one child answer a question incorrectly even though he used a mini whiteboard and his working out was correct. The question asked which of these numbers is closest to  $\frac{1}{2}$ . His working clearly showed that he knew how to convert all of his numbers to percentages, but he then chose the number directly above 50 % when the number below 50% was closer. There is no scope in the Numeracy paper for showing any working out which goes against all CfE principles of reasoning and also against what we ask students to do every day in class.

Felt they didn't match benchmark and that the P1 in particular was much too difficult and more like first level.

The P1 assessment in Reading was certainly not aligned to the Early level benchmarks. Given that most P1's are still learning some speed sounds on phonics and are at initial stages of blending, some of the vocabulary they were expected to read was nothing short of nonsense. Hummingbirds???? Some of our children barely know where they live, never mind having any prior knowledge of hummingbirds or how to blend the sounds to read the word hummingbird. They

did nothing to promote confident individuals as our P1's were losing the will to live after approximately 10 mins.

The Writing response tasks were not a reflection of the way in which we get the children to write.

The P1 literacy was much much more advanced than the Early level benchmarks and E&Os. Children were instantly put off by the amount of text. The subject choice (humming birds) was not something they could easily relate to and understand even if they could read it. We are told to have play-based learning in early level, so the children are not used to tasks of this nature and don't read from a screen.

Having looked at a few - clearly not linked to CFE and no knowledge of phonics awareness for P1 tests! Who in P1 can pronounce Zoe? The text on hummingbirds was rather challenging too! EAL children had to do the tests in English in P1, rather than their native language thereby testing their understanding of English, not maths.

## **SHETLAND**

NUMERACY Most questions were appropriate to stage and age, but children were asked to identify and sequence missing numbers up to 50 and sometimes beyond, complete number line sequences in increments of 5. I did not think these questions were suitable for P1. LITERACY Identification of missing, initial or correct phonics were right for P1. All the reading texts were much too difficult for P1. The texts were much too long, unfamiliar words and names of characters that children were not able to 'sound out.' The text about hummingbirds was completely wrong. Children felt demoralised and quite upset by the thought that they were expected to read it. It took a lot of reassurance and honesty from me to tell them that I wouldn't expect them to read that and we would just move on.

I felt the stories in the assessment for their literacy assessment did not grasp the attention of my pupils as well as it could have done. The bird reading task was a great challenge for my top reader but was a huge leap for my struggling readers and they became disengaged and disheartened quite quickly. Need a more sensitive progression for those who need more support. I felt their abilities were not represented fairly enough due to the jump in difficulty. For example, can you find the letter 'f' followed by, read the three words to the picture (the picture was a group of girls and there was the option of choosing from three words beginning with p, one of which was people, the correct answer). This was a bit of a tough jump. Then it went to read the story yourself. The story that was read to them was read so monotone, they switched off. I read the story myself to try and make it more exciting.

I disliked the overcomplicated way questions were worded and it felt like multiple choice answers had been designed to catch children out in many cases. The test was wholly unsuitable for testing dyslexic pupils, those with language difficulties or other ASN requirements, unless they were afforded a great deal of support (which I didn't have and couldn't easily give them).

## **SOUTH AYRSHIRE**

All assessments were very much the same and had very little differentiation. I witnessed high achieving children complete the same questions/passages as children with severe dyslexia so for these children the experience was very negative as it was too much!

There was one question where children were expected to simplify  $\frac{3}{12}$  which learners found to be very tricky! The reading assessment was relevant to outcomes and four capacities however some of the passages were increasingly difficult with some very tricky questioning. This assessment for me was the most difficult to administer. The children were increasingly exhausted by the time they had read 6 different, tricky passages and for my learners with dyslexia who are not used to reading such lengthy passages I felt extremely guilty for having to put them through such a distressing test. For children with additional needs it would be an idea to include more user-friendly passages.

These assessments were not reflecting the Early Level for P1, many of the questions and phrasing of the questions were too mature for 5-year olds. These assessments do not help us develop confident individuals as they are being asked to read challenging passages of texts and answer questions. The assessments did not appear to branch depending on the number of correct or incorrect answers.

We felt the p1 literacy assessment was bordering on first level, some parts not suitable for early level.

There was a lack of mental maths. There was a lot of language also in the maths a few aspects which are not covered till first level, e.g. calendars.

## **SOUTH LANARKSHIRE**

Primary 1 numeracy has several questions which were more in line with first level benchmarks. Literacy - very demoralising for poor/less able readers.

It tested Reading and Writing which are CfE strands. The assessments suggest a level of detail that has never been present in any CfE documentation, but good teachers assumed was implied.

Have no significant correlation to outcomes, benchmarks or capacities and either P1,4 or 7.

P1 too high.

P1 assessment not appropriate. Reading especially. Passages too difficult and instructions not clear.

In the P1 assessments some of the tasks reflected the outcomes undertaken through this session. The Literacy assessment is particularly difficult for P1 stage and parts did not reflect outcomes undertaken in the course work if the class.

The tasks on the P1 assessments were often aimed at first level.



I felt that the assessments were more aligned with the benchmarks than the Es and O'S which resulted in some extremely difficult questions. I'm not sure how the P1 assessments related to the four capacities, there was no opportunity for success from a child's perspective so how would they know if they'd been a successful learner? I was also interested to note the assessment indicators/benchmarks, what are those? How do they relate to the benchmarks and Es and Os? They are extremely prescriptive, and I can see schools and teachers beginning to use them to inform planning.

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

I don't feel the P1 test was in line with the benchmarks or ages and O's and as pitched far too high .

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

P1 children having experience of Hummingbirds? The reading was not relevant in terms of the topics used.

P1 assessments- did not link well to the benchmarks at all. Numeracy- Far too many questions based on measure, calendars etc rather than numeracy addition or take away which we focus on a lot in P1. Numbers to 100 questions in test but not on the benchmark for P1, only says children to know to 30. Also, division/sharing questions in test and not in benchmarks as children should only be doing it through play at this stage. Questions didn't really seem to change much with each child (who were at different ability levels) which we were told they were. Lit- the names in the questions were far too tricky to read e.g. Zoe, Fatima etc why not Ben, Sal (words which sound out which kids are used to). Far too much reading expected at P1 levels. Whole books were ridiculous and hummingbird question at the end was far, far too difficult. Level of reading required is well above the standards we expect in P1. Although lower ability level pupils did not need to read and had to listen, there was still far too much listening/pages in the book (very time wasting). When matching words to pictures the words were not sounding out words and very difficult e.g. shoe, leaf (most children at this age do not have the skills to work this out?) Far too many questions in the literacy tests at 36 questions.

I am in P1 and the SNSA did not reflect CfE at all. We are active, play based learners and this wasn't reflected in the SNSA at all.

P1 definitely did not match up to E's & O's. Tasks far too advanced. Lots of aspects not even taught yet. Children able to guess some correct answers.

Benchmarks in literacy lack enough precision about which letters, digraphs and common words need to be learned to achieve Early Level - we use the North Lanarkshire Active Literacy pack, which seems like a realistic but still very challenging interpretation of the benchmarks. On that basis, I would not expect any P1s to read the words people/popular/ or bridge/bread/beard. Most books that P1s read independently have one or two sentences of large font text per page