

- one screen of the SNSA had a lot of text, including ten words that the NL programme would not expect the P1s to read. In numeracy, SNSA questions about calendars and numbers beyond 30 do not appear to relate to the benchmarks in particular.

P1 Literacy assessment was not appropriate at all to the age and stage of the pupils. one sentence redacted - out of scope

I very strongly believe that the P1 Literacy and Numeracy assessments are not in line with the expectations for early level CfE. The expectation across both areas is much higher than school and local authority level expectations. Reviewing our results to date only our highest achievers are experiencing high levels of success, these are children we have been saying since Easter to have achieved early level and now working within the early stages of first level.

P1 reading was far too challenging.

No alignment as far as I can see. Not linked to benchmarks. P1 assessment far too hard. Not creating successful learners and severely denting the confidence of many pupils.

I felt the Primary 1 assessment was much more advanced than the expectations set out in the benchmarks for both literacy and numeracy. A lot of the teaching had not been covered for numbers to 100 and the expectations for data handling were more in line with P3/P4 work. As for the literacy, the content did not reflect that of the expected knowledge for a 5-year-old - especially the hummingbird passage.

The P1 assessment does not match what we expect of children in P1. Instead of building successful learners we had broken, defeated children trying to answer questions that were pitched at the wrong level.

I found the P1 assessments difficult especially the literacy and was more first level than early level.

Where do I start! The p1 maths & literacy tests could not be completed independently even due to being administered on pcs. The p1 tests hardly covered any of the Early Level benchmarks but were pitched way above much of the teaching at this level. The amount of reading being asked was huge and very off putting especially for less able. The stories were not exciting or interesting enough. The format of books was not like a real book or even a electronic book so not like real life experience.

These tests put all stages of children under pressure. They found some of it difficult and struggled to interpret the test. Personally, they were completely different from usual classroom practises.

Not appropriate for P 1 at all. No account of the actual stage of children in older classes working at lower levels as took some time to adjust and caused unnecessary stress.

## **STIRLING**

No use whatsoever. Many questions in 'reading' sections simply general knowledge and no assessment of reading at all.

The assessment can't reflect every aspect of literacy and had limited usefulness.

## **WEST DUNBARTONSHIRE**

Assessment task did not reflect Experiences and Outcomes. There was very little for assessment of phonics, reading common words, and, quite frankly, the Hummingbird reading assessment was a joke. The Mathematics assessment was slightly better but still not fit for purpose, too much Information Handling.

Primary 1 pupils are asked to read SEVERAL PARAGRAPHS about hummingbirds independently. This is far above the reading achievements stated in the benchmarks. Children are becoming distressed when they cannot do this. Poorer pupils are made listen to non-engaging texts and answer several questions. The book pictures are too small, and most pupils zone out and don't listen properly to the boring voice. Many pupils have 2 of these to do with not many questions between them. Numeracy assessments contain many FIRST LEVEL questions - e.g. using 100 squares and answering several calendar questions. There is also far too much reading involved in the Numeracy Assessments at all levels.

I feel that some of the literacy, reading and writing assessments were far too hard. The p1 literacy assessments required the children to read a 4-page book by themselves and in some cases a large of information about hummingbirds! Many of the children saw how much they had to read and guessed their way through the questions rather than try and "sound out all those words". Even the very able children spent so long trying to decipher and read the 4 pages that they had forgotten the beginning by the time they had finished. The children who had not been given that question and were required to listen to a book being read, also found the text too long and almost all of them switched off and were distracted before the text was finished. one paragraph redacted - out of scope

The activities in the Early level SNSA were not aligned with the Early level benchmark. The vast majority have no interest in reading about humming birds and were unable to read independently the passage. The task did not reflect Early level benchmarks. If it was intended to present a challenge it should still be within Early level parameters, otherwise create a different test!

## **WEST LoTHIAN**

I do not think the P1 assessment was an appropriate level especially for children in deprived areas. For example, in the literacy assessment children were expected

to read about hummingbirds with words like 'hover' and had to find an alternative word to 'beak'. We are told to make learning relevant to our children and most of the children in my class have not heard of a hummingbird. I feel this caught out of a lot of children as they couldn't read the text let alone understand it. The maths assessment was pitched at a more appropriate level, but as we are being told to have play-based learning in classes I think these assessments are contradictory to that approach.

P1 is not in alignment and way beyond the level. The hummingbird passage was dreadful as was the calendar question in numeracy. Some questions were tricky to understand as the adult administering them.

It was very difficult with the children in the literacy primary 1 assessment having to read a lot themselves on sounds we had not covered as they would not be covered until primary 2. The hummingbird question was very difficult as it was a lot to read let alone answer the questions after.

Literacy assessment did not match CfE. Numeracy assessment was a little closer to benchmarks for early level. But still too children found it very difficult.

My major concern in this area was the writing assessment - this assessment is not writing it's a test in grammar rules, very unhelpful!

As I didn't see the questions I am unable to answer this.

The assessments did not match all the e and o or the benchmarks.

Not at all!! Too difficult!

The P1 Literacy tests were in my opinion, pitched far too high. The vast passages that the pupils were expected to read was unrealistic and off putting. The words within these passages such as 'hummingbirds' was something that a P1 would not be expected to be able to confidently read. This resulted in many pupils becoming disheartened and not wanting to continue reading. The passages and stories were very lengthy, and many children had forgotten the information by the time the questions were asked. There was an option to go back and read for the information, but again, in such lengthy passages many children were unwilling to read the entire thing to try to find the correct answer. Due to the multiple-choice aspect of the of the tests, a few of my children were graded as 'high' in the literacy reading aspect of the tests yet they cannot blend a 2-letter word. Another of my pupils with an IEP done quite well on the tests thanks to a few good guesses.

At early level the assessments were far more advanced than the experiences and outcomes.

Lots not suitable for P1. Font too small and so much text compared to what they would read in a reading book. Took so long to complete children had to have breaks. Paragraphs about hummingbirds for P1 was utterly ridiculous!

I found the P1 assessments completely inappropriate for early level, especially the literacy assessments. Asking pupils to read huge passages on 'Hummingbirds' or

by themselves, was not appropriate for the majority. The numeracy assessments were not quite so bad but didn't seem to differentiate quickly enough.

The literacy test was appalling. There were very few CVC questions and even the simplest reading passage had words which were not phonetic, and children could sound out easily. The stories were too long and not interesting enough to hold most of the children's attention. The hummingbird passage was far too complicated and even the few children who could read the words correctly could not answer the questions because it was such a bizarre topic to them that they had no frame of reference. One poor child sounded out every word in that passage (most incorrectly) then got faced with another about Wildcats! Not child friendly at all.

I felt that some of the questions do not reflect the E&O's of early level curriculum. Certainly, did not feel that from completing this assessment children would feel like confident individuals or successful learners. It did not lend itself for children to become effective contributors or responsible citizens.

## **WESTERN ISLES**

The reading tasks within the literacy SNSA were very hard for Primary 1 children, in particular the comprehension task on humming birds.

P1 test not appropriate for five-year olds. Computing and mouse control is not well developed and is a negative factor on these tests. The tests were hugely different from usual approaches used in class/ activities. The questions in literacy were very far reaching, often with multi instructions... some pupils were totally lost before they even reached half way through a question! Pupils were telling me I don't know, I'm stuck, I can't read this and what does that even mean? Often the children just clicked next as they gave up or forgot that if they clicked that then that is that page closed. The children are not independent enough to navigate and manage themselves through the rest. They found it very hard to be logical in following the instructions.