



Standards
& Testing
Agency

2012 Key Stage 2 National Curriculum tests review outcomes (provisional)

November 2012

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Table of figures | 3 |
| Introduction | 4 |
| Reviews | 5 |
| Key Stage 2 test review services in 2012 | 5 |
| Review fees and process reviews | 7 |
| Comparability | 7 |
| Key figures for 2012 | 8 |
| Technical information | 11 |
| Population of interest | 11 |
| Cohort numbers | 11 |
| Data sets | 12 |
| Reviews upheld | 13 |
| Rounding | 13 |
| Appendix A | 15 |
| Historical reviews data 2008-2012 | 15 |

Table of figures

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 1: Key Stage 2 level 3-5 test in English reading – review requests and outcomes | 8 |
| Table 2: 2012 Key Stage 2 level 3-5 tests in mathematics – review requests and outcomes | 8 |
| Table 3: 2012 Key Stage 2 level 6 tests in English reading – review requests and outcomes | 9 |
| Table 4: 2012 Key Stage 2 level 6 tests in mathematics – review requests and outcomes | 9 |
| Table 5: Cohort numbers for Key Stage 2 tests 2008–2012 | 11 |
| Table 6: Data sets for Key Stage 2 tests level 3-5 2008–2012, and level 6 2012 | 12 |
| Table 7: Data sets for single level tests in December 2009 and June 2010 | 12 |
| Table 8: Number of schools requesting reviews | 16 |
| Table 9: Number of reviews requested | 17 |
| Table 10: Number of levels lowered after review | 18 |
| Table 11: Number of level increases after review | 19 |

Introduction

This report provides provisional information on the outcomes of clerical reviews and reviews of marking for the 2012 Key Stage 2 National Curriculum tests.

This report is published by the Standards and Testing Agency (STA), an executive agency of the Department for Education. STA is responsible for developing and delivering of statutory assessments from early years to the end of Key Stage 3.

The 2012 Key Stage 2 test reviews service remained unchanged from the service offered in 2011 for the level 3-5 tests in English reading and mathematics. No reviews service was offered for the level 3-5 English writing test in 2012. 10 per cent of schools were included in a national writing sample and were required to administer an 'externally marked' English writing test. The remainder of schools had the option to either administer and internally mark the 'internally marked' English writing test, or administer the 'externally marked' English writing test on a prescribed test date and send the test scripts for external marking. The test results from both the internally and externally marked tests, including those for schools in the national sample, were used only to inform teacher assessment judgements and were not used for accountability, therefore a reviews service was not offered for the externally marked test.

Level 6 tests were available as part of the suite of Key Stage 2 tests for the first time in 2012. Schools could choose whether to administer them in addition to the level 3-5 tests. The English reading and mathematics tests were externally marked and had an associated reviews service; the English writing test was offered for internal marking only and no reviews service was offered, mirroring arrangements for the level 3-5 tests.

The figures in this report are produced from the datafeed provided by the test operations agency on Monday 29 October 2012. The information in this report is provisional and subject to the outcomes of a small number of outstanding maladministration investigations, and thus any potential review and process review applications which may be received following any release of results to these schools.

Reviews

A review is when a child's test script is checked to ensure that the original application of the mark scheme was appropriate and that no clerical errors were made. A request for a level 3-5 review should be considered when, in the opinion of school staff, a child has been awarded a National Curriculum level above or below the level that their work is entitled to, according to the published mark scheme. A request for a level 6 review should be considered when, in the opinion of school staff, the review would result in a change to the child's level 6 test outcome, according to the published mark scheme.

Key Stage 2 test review services in 2012

Following feedback from schools and local authorities, a number of changes were made to the reviews services for the 2010 Key Stage 2 test cycle in order to help simplify the reviews process for schools. The two review services available to schools in 2010 and 2011 remained available in 2012 for both the level 3-5 and level 6 tests. Schools had the choice of the following types of review application:

- clerical review; and
- individual review.

The nature of the clerical review service for the level 6 tests differed from that offered for the level 3-5 tests. Due to the level 6 tests being marked onscreen, transcription or addition errors (which would lead to a clerical review application for the level 3-5 tests) could not arise in the level 6 test marking. The administration process did however create a risk that a child's test script could be incorrectly matched to another child's data record; therefore a clerical review service was available for schools to highlight any instances of test results being incorrectly assigned to the wrong child.

Since 2010, an individual review service has involved a review of marking of the entire test script (at component level for English in 2010-2011) to check that the published mark scheme was applied to the agreed national standard throughout the test script. The review marker reviews the mark awarded for each item or question against the mark scheme to confirm it has been correctly applied. Since 2011, schools have been provided with the option to highlight any specific item(s) or question(s) they wished to bring to the review marker's attention. The entire test script is reviewed but this provides schools with the opportunity to highlight specific concerns. Both practices continued in 2012 for both the level 3-5 and level 6 individual review services.

For the level 3-5 tests, an individual review also includes a clerical check of the addition of marks on all test scripts submitted for review. Where an individual review request is not successful because the application of the mark scheme by the original marker is deemed appropriate, but a clerical error is detected, the review is reported as a clerical review

rather than an individual review. This is not applicable to the level 6 tests, because the addition of marks by the onscreen marking software is automated.

Schools that participated in the 2012 Key Stage 2 tests received their marked test scripts and results for the level 3-5 and level 6 tests by the published deadline of Tuesday 10 July 2012. The deadline for requesting a review was Friday 20 July 2012.

For the level 3-5 tests, the system of collecting the national results data was consistent with the 2011 approach. Individual markers transferred the component scores from marked test scripts to an online mark capture system. Once the component scores had been captured, the aggregation of component scores for a child's test script to calculate a total mark for the test, and application of level thresholds to that total mark, was completed automatically.

For the level 6 tests, all test scripts were onscreen marked, with markers inputting item level marks into the onscreen marking software as part of the marking process. Questions from each test were grouped together into three (English reading) or four (mathematics) sections for marking, meaning up to three markers marked each child's English reading test script and up to four markers each mathematics test script. Once all item level marks for a child's test script had been captured, the aggregation of item marks to create a total mark for the test was automatic. The agreed level thresholds were later applied to the datafeed by the test operations agency. The level 6 test scripts that were not able to be marked onscreen (e.g. modified test papers) had their item level marks input to the onscreen marking system by a marker, who had marked the entire test script in hard copy. They were then automatically aggregated and the level thresholds applied in line with the test scripts marked onscreen.

Details of the 2012 Key Stage 2 test reviews process is available on the Department's website at:

<http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/teachingandlearning/assessment/keystage2/pupil/b00210121/marking-reviews>.

Review fees and process reviews

Schools were informed that they would be charged for any review applications that did not result in a change to the test level reported for the child for the level 3-5 tests, or the test outcome for the child for the level 6 tests. The 2012 Key Stage 2 test review fees remained unchanged from 2011 at £5 for a clerical review and £9 for an individual review. These fees applied to both the level 3-5 and level 6 test reviews.

Schools were able to request a process review if they are not satisfied that the correct procedures have been followed in the conduct of an individual review. The outcome of a process review is final and there is no right of appeal. At the time of writing, no process review applications had been received for the 2012 Key Stage 2 tests at level 3-5 or level 6.

Comparisons with previous years

Valid comparisons between the 2012 statistics and previous years are difficult to make for a number of reasons. Since 2008, the marking process has differed slightly each year; these variances make direct comparisons with previous years difficult. The range of reviews services offered in 2012 differed from that offered in 2011 with the removal of the reviews service for the level 3-5 English writing test, inclusion of reviews services for the level 6 English reading and mathematics tests and the variant clerical review service offered for the level 6 tests from that offered for the level 3-5 tests.

Up to 2011, the level 3-5 English reading and English writing tests reviews service had taken account of level changes not only at component subject level, but also for English overall (once the English reading and writing test results had been combined). The 2012 English reading reviews service considered only changes to the English reading test level, and thus the drivers for schools to make review applications in 2011 and 2012 are not directly comparable. In addition the aggregation of level 3-5 and level 6 test outcomes in the same subject, to generate an overall test level for that subject, could have meant a child's test outcome in one test influenced a school's decision as to whether to apply for a review for the other test. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that what incentivised a school to make a review application for the level 6 tests in 2012 may be influenced by this being the introductory year of level 6 being an externally marked test.

STA does not believe that the number of review applications received, or the outcomes of reviews of marking, can be used to draw conclusions about the quality of marking in any year due to the changing nature of the reviews services offered, the population of children sitting the tests and varying factors influencing application decisions made by schools.

Key figures for 2012

In 2012, 1,046,953 Key Stage 2 level 3-5 tests in English reading and mathematics were marked. Review applications were received for 2,949 level 3-5 tests in mathematics and English reading, representing 0.3 per cent of the total number of level 3-5 test scripts that were marked.

A total of 1,075 level 3-5 tests received an overall subject level change (to a higher or lower level) as a result of a review application, representing 0.1 per cent of the total number of level 3-5 test scripts. 36.5 per cent of review requests for level 3-5 tests resulted in a level change. The following tables show a breakdown of the figures for each of the level 3-5 tests.

Any review application(s) where the review outcome(s) has subsequently been annulled (due to evidence of malpractice following the initial return of test results to schools) have been excluded from the figures in tables 1 to 4 and 8 to 11.

| Level 3-5 English reading | Schools | Reviews requested † | Outcome: lower level ‡ | Outcome: higher level ‡ |
|---------------------------|---------|---------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Clerical review | 200 | 233 | 25 | 179 |
| | - | 0.0% | 10.7% | 76.8% |
| Individual review | 882 | 1,964 | 5 | 494 |
| | - | 0.4% | 0.3% | 25.2% |

Table 1: Key Stage 2 level 3-5 test in English reading – review requests and outcomes

| Level 3-5 mathematics | Schools | Reviews requested † | Outcome: lower level ‡ | Outcome: higher level ‡ |
|-----------------------|---------|---------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Clerical review | 180 | 224 | 15 | 162 |
| | - | 0.0% | 6.7% | 72.3% |
| Individual review | 417 | 528 | 1 | 194 |
| | - | 0.1% | 0.2% | 36.7% |

Table 2: 2012 Key Stage 2 level 3-5 tests in mathematics – review requests and outcomes

Key to tables (1 and 2):

† The percentage figures given in the 'Reviews requested' column use the cohort as the denominator in the calculation.

‡ The percentage figures given in the 'Outcome' columns use the value in the 'Reviews requested' column as the denominator in the calculation.

- Not applicable.

In 2012, 101,528 level 6 tests in English reading and mathematics were marked. Review applications were received for 146 level 6 tests in mathematics and English reading, representing 0.1 per cent of the total number of level 6 test scripts that were marked.

A total of 26 level 6 tests received an overall subject level change (to a higher or lower level) as a result of a review application, representing less than 0.1 per cent of the total number of level 6 test scripts marked. 17.8 per cent of review requests resulted in a level change. The following tables show a breakdown of the figures for each test.

Schools were guided that an appropriate entry to the level 6 tests would be for a child demonstrating attainment above level 5. To be awarded a level 6 in either English reading or mathematics, a child would have to achieve both a level 5 in the level 3-5 test, and pass the corresponding level 6 test in the same year. If the child did not pass the level 6 test they would be awarded the level achieved in the level 3-5 test. Reviews for both of the level 3-5 and level 6 tests were processed independently, and so it was possible for a school to request a review for both tests in the same subject for the same child. There were however no cases of this in 2012.

| Level 6 English reading | Schools | Reviews requested † | Outcome: lower level ‡ | Outcome: higher level ‡ |
|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Clerical review* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | - | 0.0% | - | - |
| Individual review | 39 | 93 | 0 | 12 |
| | - | 0.2% | 0.0% | 12.9% |

Table 3: 2012 Key Stage 2 level 6 tests in English reading – review requests and outcomes

| Level 6 mathematics | Schools | Reviews requested † | Outcome: lower level ‡ | Outcome: higher level ‡ |
|----------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Clerical review* | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| | - | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100% |
| Individual review | 43 | 52 | 0 | 13 |
| | - | 0.1% | 0.0% | 25.0% |

Table 4: 2012 Key Stage 2 level 6 tests in mathematics – review requests and outcomes

Key to tables (3 and 4):

† The percentage figures given in the 'Reviews requested' column use the cohort as the denominator in the calculation.

‡ The percentage figures given in the 'Outcome' columns use the value in the 'Reviews requested' column as the denominator in the calculation.

- Not applicable

* The clerical review service for the level 6 tests was available for schools to highlight any instances of test results being incorrectly assigned to the wrong child.

Technical information

Population of interest

The population of interest, or cohort, for each of the level 3-5 and level 6 tests includes all schools in England with children participating in the relevant Key Stage 2 test. Also included are a small number of Service Children's Education schools that are located overseas and have children eligible for the tests.

Children are not included if they did not sit the tests because they were:

- absent;
- working below the level of the test (level 3-5 test only);
- working at the level of the test but unable to access them (level 3-5 test only); or
- not entered for the test (level 6 only).

Cohort numbers

The calculations of the types of review as a percentage of the cohorts given in tables 1 to 4 (above) and 8 to 11 (below) are based upon the following denominators in table 5:

Level 3-5 tests: a count of children with National Curriculum level 2, 3, 4, 5 or an award of 'N', i.e. the number of children who sat the test.

Level 6 tests: a count of children with a pass or fail result, i.e. the number of children who sat the test.

| Test | English reading | Mathematics |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| 2008 Level 3-5 | 569,650 | 573,505 |
| 2009 Level 3-5 | 554,774 | 557,841 |
| 2010 Level 3-5 | 399,371 | 395,622 |
| 2009-10 Single level tests (SLTs) | 5,510 | 12,056 |
| 2011 Level 3-5 | 531,036 | 533,295 |
| 2012 Level 3-5 | 522,264 | 524,689 |
| 2012 Level 6 | 46,499 | 55,029 |

Table 5: Cohort numbers for Key Stage 2 tests 2008–2012

The number of children for each subject/test for each year may vary for a number of reasons, including:

- take up of the tests by independent schools (Key Stage 2 tests only);
- school entry decisions (for SLTs in December 2009 and June 2010 and level 6 tests in 2012 only);
- absenteeism;
- rates at which children make progress and complete the relevant programme of study;
- for 2010, schools not participating in the Key Stage 2 tests due to industrial action; or
- for 2010, schools not participating in the Key Stage 2 tests in mathematics due to involvement in the SLT pilot.

Data sets

The data sets used are given to STA by the test operations agency and by the onscreen marking supplier for the December 2009 and June 2010 SLTs. For the level 6 tests, the data was supplied to STA by the onscreen marking supplier, then merged with the level 3-5 data by the test operations agency and provided back to STA. The data sets analysed in this report are the datafeeds referenced in tables 6 and 7 below.

| Year | Data feed reference | Date the data was provided |
|------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| 2008 | 4k | 6 October 2008 |
| 2009 | 6 | 16 October 2009 |
| 2010 | 6 | 7 September 2010 |
| 2011 | 6 | 25 October 2011 |
| 2012 | 6 | 29 October 2012 |

Table 6: Data sets for Key Stage 2 tests level 3-5 2008–2012, and level 6 2012

| Year | Data feed reference | Date the data was provided to QCDA |
|---------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|
| December 2009 | 6 | 17 March 2010 |
| June 2010 | 6 | 30 September 2010 |

Table 7: Data sets for single level tests in December 2009 and June 2010

Reviews upheld

For the Key Stage 2 level 3-5 tests, only reviews where the level for the subject changed as a consequence of the review are included in the totals for outcomes in tables 1-2 (above) and 8-11 (below). For the level 6 tests, only reviews where the overall test outcome changed as a consequence of the review are included in the totals for outcomes in tables 3-4 and 8-11.

Rounding

Any percentages given in this report are given to one decimal place. The rounding convention is as follows: any fractions of 0.05 and above will be rounded up, anything less than 0.05 will be rounded down. For example, 4.483 will be rounded to 4.5, and 4.445 will be rounded to 4.4. As a result of rounding, figures that are less than 0.05 per cent are rounded down and recorded as 0.0 per cent.

Appendix A

Historical reviews data 2008-2012

Key to tables (8 to 11):

2009 was the last year a group review service was offered.

* In 2010, due to industrial action, 4,005 of the 15,515 maintained schools expected to administer the Key Stage 2 level 3-5 tests, did not do so. Therefore, the population of schools from which review applications was submitted was 74.2 per cent of the expected national cohort of schools. Furthermore, Year 6 children in 225 schools who were participating in the SLT pilot did not sit a Key Stage 2 mathematics test, but did sit Key Stage 2 tests in English. This further reduced the mathematics cohort from which review applications could have been received, in comparison to 2011 and 2012. Finally, in 2010 the individual review service was widened to include a review of the child's entire test script.

+ The data reported for SLTs includes Year 6 children only. However, test entries and review applications were also permitted from children in Years 3, 4 and 5 as part of the SLT pilot.

~ From 2011 schools had the option to highlight specific concerns about the marking of their test scripts. The entire test script was still reviewed but this slightly altered the nature of the individual review service offered.

Any review application(s) where the review outcome(s) has subsequently been annulled (due to evidence of malpractice following the initial return of test results to schools) have been excluded from the figures in tables 1 to 4 and 8 to 11.

| | 2008 Level 3-5 | 2009 Level 3-5# | 2010 Level 3-5* | 2009/10 SLT + | 2011 Level 3-5~ | 2012 Level 3-5 | 2012 Level 6 |
|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| English reading | | | | | | | |
| Clerical review | 227 | 522 | 201 | - | 371 | 200 | 0 |
| Individual review | 2,343 | 2,724 | 1,798 | 5 | 2,477 | 882 | 39 |
| Group review | 43 | 17 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Group review | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mathematics | | | | | | | |
| Clerical review | 262 | 238 | 127 | - | 208 | 180 | 1 |
| Individual review | 1,235 | 956 | 525 | 27 | 797 | 417 | 43 |
| Group review | 4 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Group review | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Table 8: Number of schools requesting reviews

| | 2008 Level 3-5 | 2009 Level 3-5# | 2010 Level 3-5* | 2009/10 SLT + | 2011 Level 3-5~ | 2012 Level 3-5 | 2012 Level 6 |
|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| English reading | | | | | | | |
| Clerical review | 343 (0.1%) | 916 (0.2%) | 273 (0.1%) | - | 519 (0.1%) | 233 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Individual review | 6,452 (1.1%) | 8,336 (1.5%) | 5,890 (1.5%) | 13 (0.2%) | 6,657 (1.3%) | 1,964 (0.4%) | 93 (0.2%) |
| Group review | 2,940 (0.5%) | 1,034 (0.2%) | - | - | - | - | - |
| Group review | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mathematics | | | | | | | |
| Clerical review | 359 (0.1%) | 277 (0.0%) | 141 (0.0%) | - | 237 (0.0%) | 224 (0.0%) | 1 (0.0%) |
| Individual review | 1,720 (0.3%) | 1,201 (0.2%) | 760 (0.2%) | 49 (0.4%) | 1,065 (0.2%) | 528 (0.1%) | 52 (0.1%) |
| Group review | 126 (0.0%) | 96 (0.0%) | - | - | - | - | - |
| Group review | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Table 9: Number of reviews requested

| | 2008 Level 3-5 | 2009 Level 3-5# | 2010 Level 3-5* | 2009/10 SLT + | 2011 Level 3-5~ | 2012 Level 3-5 | 2012 Level 6 |
|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| English reading | | | | | | | |
| Clerical review | 21 (6.1%) | 48 (5.2%) | 13 (4.8%) | - | 34 (6.6%) | 25 (10.7%) | - |
| Individual review | 13 (0.2%) | 3 (0.0%) | 111 (1.9%) | 0 (0.0%) | 70 (1.1%) | 5 (0.3%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Group review | 60 (2.0%) | 44 (4.3%) | - | - | - | - | - |
| Group review | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mathematics | | | | | | | |
| Clerical review | 22 (6.1%) | 5 (1.8%) | 3 (2.1%) | - | 7 (3.0%) | 15 (6.7%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Individual review | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (0.1%) | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Group review | 1 (0.8%) | 2 (2.1%) | - | - | - | - | - |
| Group review | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Table 10: Number of levels lowered after review

| | 2008 Level 3-5 | 2009 Level 3-5# | 2010 Level 3-5* | 2009/10 SLT + | 2011 Level 3-5 ~ | 2012 Level 3-5 | 2012 Level 6 |
|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| English reading | | | | | | | |
| Clerical review | 84 (24.5%) | 433 (47.3%) | 155 (56.8%) | - | 274 (52.8%) | 179 (76.8%) | - |
| Individual review | 1,378 (21.4%) | 1,799 (21.6%) | 931 (15.8%) | 6 (46.2%) | 1,669 (25.1%) | 494 (25.2%) | 12 (12.9%) |
| Group review | 193 (6.6%) | 87 (8.4%) | - | - | - | - | - |
| Group review | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mathematics | | | | | | | |
| Clerical review | 235 (65.5%) | 236 (85.2%) | 127 (90.1%) | - | 191 (80.6%) | 162 (72.3%) | 1 (100%) |
| Individual review | 941 (54.7%) | 626 (52.1%) | 221 (29.1%) | 13 (26.5%) | 416 (39.1%) | 194 (36.7%) | 13 (25.0%) |
| Group review | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (1.0%) | - | - | - | - | - |
| Group review | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Table 11: Number of level increases after review



Standards
& Testing
Agency

© Crown copyright 2012

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or e-mail: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at assessments@education.gov.uk.

This document is also available from our website at: <http://www.education.gov.uk/researchandstatistics/statistics/allstatistics/a00215732/key-stage-2-national-curriculum-tests-review-outcomes-2012>.