



## About Wellcomm

Wellcomm is a tier 1 universal language screening toolkit, designed to be used by EY practitioners to:

- identify those pupils already/in danger of falling behind at the earliest possible stage
- put interventions in place
- rescreen
- track progress/make comparisons
- target those pupils for whom universal approaches will not be sufficient
- support the identification of a range of SEN and ensure appropriate pathways are followed

Wellcomm is embedded into practice in many schools nationally as well as here in Birmingham. It allows practitioners to take ownership of the development of speech and language skills within their schools and settings.

## Background at The Orchards

Wellcomm was first introduced into school in Spring 2016. Data is available for:

- Pre-school
- Nursery
- Reception

## Methodology

Where initial or rescreen data is incomplete or unavailable, this been excluded from comparisons as this skews the percentages. This does not mean that the child is forgotten – needs and progress are still tracked & interventions delivered.

## Comparisons

These can be found as appendices 1, 2 & 3 on pages 2, 3 & 4. At some point it would be a useful exercise to look at the ELG data alongside Wellcomm information. It should certainly be part of what happens during this next round (from Autumn 2) – do children make gains across the board as their language skills increase? There is some evidence for this in other settings.

## Things you did well

You identified one person whose role is to oversee Wellcomm

- scheduling the screening though not necessarily carrying it all out personally
- leading on grouping pupils
- data collection and interpretation
- Liaising with Soundswell for support as/if required

This has made your data much more robust and useful.

## Learning points

Rescreen the whole cohort including 'greens':

- you will have a much larger evidence-base
- will be able to show *added* value
- prove your theory (hope) that the greens stay green and don't regress - this will validate any decision you may make in the future to not rescreen greens (2 years worth of proving no regression should happen first though)

## Recommendations going forward

1. Do not assume that pupils who are age-appropriate or just below will continue to be so (i.e. rescreen everyone)
2. Continue to add narrative to scores – low scores are often for a variety of reasons
3. At rescreen: interrogate any score where a child has 'stayed the same' – ask why? Look for reasons which will sign-post you to additional/specialist help [identified SEN/EAL/absence hearing etc]
4. Follow your cohorts from Pre-school and Nursery as they move up a year
5. Screen any new arrivals into your **Nursery** not from Pre-school (will allow you to see whether your home-grown Nursery entrants start from a better position because they have been in your Pre-school)
6. Screen any new arrivals into your **Reception** not from your Nursery (will allow you to see whether your home-grown Reception entrants start from a better position because they have been in your Nursery)
7. Ongoing: look at ELGs and progress tracker data within the context of Wellcomm information

## Appendix 1

Pre-school Summary		Dec 2016		Feb 2017		May 2017	
Priority	Criteria	No	%	No.	%		
High	more than -15	1	5%	1	5%	1	5%
Medium	Between minus 10-15	2	11%	1	5%	1	5%
Low	Less than -10	11	61%	4	23%	3	18%
Age appropriate or above		4	23%	12	67%	13	72%
Total		18		18		18	

## Discussion

- The important observation from this cohort is that interventions have lifted a number of below average (grey) into age-appropriate – which will hopefully impact on ELG later
- You may also have lifted some children from age-appropriate (=) into above (+) but we can't evidence this as these children have not been rescreened (and we are making the assumption that they don't lose ground)

ry 1 whole Nursery cohort		Spring 2016		Dec 2016		Feb 2017		May 2017		Appendix 2
Priority	Criteria	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	
High	more than -15	6	30%	4	20%	1	5%	1	5%	
Medium	Between minus 10-15	2	10%	3	15%	1	5%	1	5%	
Low	Less than -10	7	35%	2	10%	6	30%	2	10%	
Age appropriate or above		5	25%	11	55%	12	60%	16	80%	
Total		20		20		20		20		

**Discussion:** 'reds' reduced from 30% to 5% and *no* child has regressed

Age appropriate or just below increased from 50% to an *enormous* 90%

Summary 2 Pupil premium		Spring 2016		Dec 2016		Feb 2017		May 2017	
Priority	Criteria	No	%	No	%	No.	%	No.	%
High	more than -15	3	20%	3	20%	1	7%	1	6.5%
Medium	Between minus 10-15	2	13%	2	13.5%	0	0	0	0
Low	Less than -10	6	40%	2	13.5%	5	33%	1	6.5%
Age appropriate or above		4	27%	8	53%	9	60%	13	87%
Total		15		15		15		15	

**Discussion:** 'reds' reduced from 20% to 6.5% [one child who has also regressed]

Age appropriate or just below increased from 67% to an impressive 93.5%

'blues' have disappeared altogether which is the expected pattern (so all good!)

Summary 1 - Reception whole cohort		Spring 2016		Dec 2016		Feb 2017		May 2017		Appendix 3
Priority	Criteria	No	%	No	%	No.	%	No.	%	
High	more than -15	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0		
Medium	Between minus 10-15	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0		
Low	Less than -10	6	24%	5	20%	1	4%	1	4%	
Age appropriate or above		16	64%	21	80%	24	96%	24	96%	
Total		25		25		25				

**Discussion:** 'reds' reduced to *none*

Age appropriate or just below increased from 88% to 100%

You may also have increased those age-appropriate children who are above age-appropriate but with no rescreen actual evidence we cannot evidence this

Summary 2 pupil premium		Spring 2016		Dec 2016		Feb 2017		May 2017	
Priority	Criteria	No.	%	No.	%	No	%	No	%
High	more than -15	0		0		0		0	
Medium	Between minus 10-15	0		0		0		0	
Low	Less than -10	4	40%	2	20%	1	10%	1	10%
Age appropriate or above		6	60%	8	80%	9	90%	9	90%
Total		10							

**Discussion:** an interesting profile of the disadvantaged group:

- no 'reds'
- 100% age-appropriate or just below at the beginning but the % balance of age-appropriate has increased from 60% to 90%