

**Review of the specification for Mandatory Qualifications for Specialist
Teachers of Pupils with Sensory Impairment – report of the consultation**

March 2008

Contents

Overview

- 1. Synopsis** page 3
- 2. Background** page 3
- 3. Response to the consultation** page 3

Annex A

Details of feedback from the consultation meetings and the web-based consultation page 6

Annex B

Review of the mandatory qualifications specification. Consultation pro forma page 40

1. Synopsis

- 1.1 This report relates to a review of the specification for mandatory qualifications (MQs) for specialist teachers of learners with hearing impairment (HI), visual impairment (VI), and multi-sensory impairment (MSI) carried out in 2007/08.
- 1.2 It provides a summary of the feedback collected from:
 - consultation events held with key stakeholders in mid-July 2007, supplemented by further relevant information gathered by the Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA)
 - a web-based consultation that ran from July 2007 to October 2007, and
 - a final consultation event with key stakeholders held on 17 January 2008.

2. Background

- 2.1 In June 2007, an overview plan for the review of the existing MQ specification followed by an exercise to reissue approvals for courses to run from September 2008 was agreed with the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF). Consultation plans were developed for the review and TDA approvals for sector consultation were obtained.
- 2.2 The consultation period began within six weeks of the overview plan being agreed. Three meetings were held with existing providers and other key stakeholders from the voluntary sector, local authorities and schools. Each meeting focused on one of the areas of sensory impairment covered by MQs. These meetings were complete by 19 July 2007.
- 2.3 The main focus of each meeting was group discussion about how to update and strengthen the existing specification. Delegates were also given the opportunity to raise wider issues in relation to MQs.
- 2.4 In addition, a 14-week web-based consultation was held (see consultation response form at annex B). The consultation period ended on 5 October 2007. Details of feedback from the consultation meetings and the web-based consultation are summarised in annex A.
- 2.5 The specification was redrafted in the light of the consultation responses and, following a further consultation meeting on 17 January 2008, involving existing providers and other key stakeholders from the voluntary sector, local authorities and schools, and further consultation with representatives from those with specialist expertise about sensory disability, three new specifications were produced – one for each MQ.

3. Response to the consultation

In response to the consultation, the specification was:

restructured to make it clearer and easier to use, with

- a separate specification for each MQ
- each specification written to be fit for purpose rather than reflecting the structure and content of the Teacher Training Agency (TTA) special educational needs (SEN) specialist standards

- a simplified structure that sets out the required professional attributes, knowledge and understanding and skills, and
- fewer training outcomes, but without loss of coverage

rewritten

- using clearer language
- with the revised purpose in which 'achievement' is defined in relation to the Every Child Matters (ECM) outcomes
- with criteria for assessing applications to deliver MQ courses revised in the light of consultation responses from existing MQ providers and other key stakeholders from the voluntary sector, local authorities and schools, that will ensure that MQs
 - raise achievement
 - meet the needs of participants
 - are delivered as flexibly as possible
 - are informed by stakeholders
 - are of a consistently high quality, and
 - meet minimum specified outcomes
- with outcomes reflecting the current role of qualified teachers of children and young people with HI, VI and MSI, as expressed by existing MQ providers and other key stakeholders from the voluntary sector, local authorities and schools, and cross-checked to ensure that only outcomes relevant to each particular MQ were included

broadened

- to make it relevant to qualified teachers working with children from birth to age five and beyond statutory school age, and peripatetic local authority-based specialist teachers

updated to reflect

- current legislation and government policy, including ECM, the SEN and Disability Act 2001, and the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA)
- general developments arising from government policy, eg. local authority integrated children's services, multi-agency working, pupil voice, working in partnership with families, provision mapping and other management tools, the explicit teaching of thinking skills, etc.
- use of terminology. After some discussion it was decided to continue to use the terms from the regulations, ie. 'visually impaired', 'hearing impaired' and 'with multi-sensory impairments', to describe sight loss, hearing loss and dual-sensory loss but to add a footnote to recognise that different terminology is also in common use

future-proofed

- by omitting the names of specific documents and initiatives, whenever possible, to keep the specification current

explained

- the consultation process revealed that the six overarching criteria were being interpreted differently and there was some misunderstanding of their intentions. To address this, the new specification provides a brief introduction to each criterion that clarifies its purpose and addresses misconceptions. The following

issues were raised during consultation but were not included in the final specification for the reasons stated:

– **core outcomes plus options.** Some respondents requested a core set of outcomes for each MQ accompanied by several sets of optional outcomes. They argue that this would give flexibility for specialist teachers working in different specialist areas. This idea is not reflected in the new specifications as they represent the minimum requirements for teachers of pupils with HI, VI and MSI. It is recognised that such teachers will require additional training to prepare them to work in specialist areas, eg. with babies and toddlers, but such training is outside the scope of the MQ

The specification encourages providers of MQ training to help participants consider the further professional development they will need following successful completion of the MQ. However, the MQ specification does not dictate how providers organise their training. It would be possible, therefore, for providers to organise MQ training in a modular form, reflecting different themes. So long as the minimum MQ specification is met, MQ providers are at liberty to add to the outcomes that participants will meet by completing the training successfully

– **BSL and Braille.** Some respondents wanted the required level of competence in British Sign Language (BSL) and Braille to be raised in the new MQ specifications for teachers of children and young people with HI and VI respectively. After much discussion during the consultation, it was decided to leave the levels unchanged but to add a footnote explaining that teachers working in some settings would be expected to have a higher level of competence than that specified for the MQ

– **academic level.** There was a request that the academic level at which the MQ should be accredited be specified. The MQ specification was written to be 'fit for purpose', ie. to equip teachers of children and young people with the knowledge, understanding and skills they need to carry out their specialist teaching roles, rather than with a particular academic level in mind. After discussion it was decided that providers should be left to accredit MQ provision at an appropriate level, but that this should not compromise the purposes or quality of the MQ and should be consistent with the expertise required to carry out the role of a qualified teacher of children and young people with HI, VI or MSI.

Annex A Details of feedback from the consultation meetings and the web-based consultation

1. Comments on the revision process

- 1.1 Original plans for revising the specification in time for approvals to be issued to providers in February 2008 for September 2008 starts were revised with DCSF agreement as providers were concerned about the time needed to enable them to revise their courses against the new specification before submitting an application for approval and recruit to courses. Recruitment usually starts in September of the previous year. The question of whether they were allowed to advertise their courses as leading to an MQ in advance of approval was raised.
- 1.2 A consistent message from all the meetings was the concern over the impact that increasing the number of MQ providers could have on the viability of all courses, particularly given the current low level of demand.

2. General comments on updating and strengthening the MQ specification

- 2.1 This section summarises the general comments made in relation to updating and strengthening the existing MQ specification at the consultation meetings and via the web-based consultation.
- 2.2 There was widespread agreement that the new specification should be updated to reflect
 - current legislation and government policy, including Every Child Matters, the Special Educational Needs and Disability Act (SENDA), the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA), accessibility planning and equality duties, Removing Barriers to Achievement, the Early Support Programme, etc. Some respondents felt that details (eg. the names of documents and initiatives) that might make the specification become out of date more quickly should be omitted
 - recent general developments arising from government policy, eg. local authority integrated children's services, national strategies, the outreach role of special schools, extended schools, workforce reforms, parental involvement, multi-agency working, provision mapping and other management tools, the explicit teaching of thinking skills, etc.
 - use of current terminology, reflecting ECM removing barriers to learning and participation, rather than a 'medical' model, and recent developments arising from government policy, eg. in relation to the national strategies, to integrated children's services – 'team around the child' (TAC), common assessment framework, lead professional/agency, key worker, family focused working, voice of the child, children's rights. One respondent, a school for deaf children, made a strong case for changing the 'negative, derogatory and old-fashioned' term 'hearing impairment' to 'deaf' throughout the specification and for changing 'visually impaired' to 'blind'
 - recent impairment-specific developments, eg. newborn hearing screening, digital hearing aids and cochlear implants, modernisation of children's hearing aid services (for HI), the most recent specialist technology.

In their response the British Association of Teachers of the Deaf (BATOD) gave a list of areas they felt would need to be addressed in the new specification, including

- working with families, especially following newborn screening where the deaf child is diagnosed very young
- multi-disciplinary working, including the 'team around the child'
- deaf children with additional difficulties
- In service training, particularly to mainstream schools
- the complexity of needs within maintained school classrooms
- the explicit teaching of thinking skills
- cochlear implants
- digital hearing aids
- links between special and mainstream schools
- unilateral hearing loss
- informed choice, and
- professional qualities.

2.3 All three consultation meetings and many respondents to the web-based consultation suggested that the new specification should be restructured and re-presented in a way which is more user-friendly for MQ providers, those taking MQs, parents/carers and pupils. Suggestions for restructuring included:

- – simplifying the specification. One organisation (BATOD) welcomed the detail contained in the specification as it gives a clear message of the range and depth of training required to achieve an MQ. However, many respondents thought the specification would benefit from simplification without losing coverage. Several respondents requested a 'succinct and contemporary' separate specification for each of the three MQs to avoid confusion and duplication. The MSI meeting in particular thought that the specification was too prescriptive and that the new specification should concentrate on principles rather than detail. This meeting suggested that the specification should start with a set of general principles that could be used as a self-assessment tool across MQs, followed by separate sections that would apply the general principles to the different impairment groups (MSI, HI and VI). This meeting thought that more detailed exemplification could be consigned to an annex. The HI meeting thought that fewer standards would allow providers to be more creative by, for example, introducing specialist options, such as 14-19. An MQ provider suggested that needing to meet so many standards was distracting candidates from areas in which they really needed to focus in some depth. Some respondents suggested that any standards now covered in the new qualified teacher status standards should be removed. Others suggested that all the core standards should be considered as assumed/required prior knowledge for the MQ and could, therefore, be omitted, with the MQ focusing only on the extension standards, but others stated that participants joining the course often did not yet meet the core standards. The MSI meeting felt that removing the core standards from the specification would improve MQs by making them more specialist.
- – reorganising the specification. A school for deaf children suggested that the specification needed to be completely reorganised to 'put the child in the centre'. They argued that this would make the nature and direction of the course much clearer. They suggested headings of
- communication

- social development and cognition
- curriculum
- classroom
- outside agencies/support workers
- training
- child development
- impact of deafness, and
- assessment, etc.

– as all these areas have an impact on the child. The HI meeting suggested a similar model, starting from the child in the context of their family and the community, which emphasised partnership working (among professionals and with the child and their family) to identify and assess needs and intervene early. Several respondents also suggested ways of reorganising the extension standards, which many felt should form the main body of the specification. These suggestions are discussed in detail in 7.3 below.

- – clarifying. The HI meeting thought that the terminology in the current standards was difficult to interpret, eg. the difference between ‘know’ and ‘understand’ and why a particular term been chosen in different standards. An MQ provider said that there was ‘no consistency between programmes about which standards were applied’. She questioned, for example, why only those taking the MSI MQ were required to know about ‘ways to adapt general and technical vocabulary’. She also felt that some standards were open to different interpretations, to be more or less demanding. This respondent and others called for the TDA to produce guidance to promote a consistent interpretation of the standards.

- 2.4 Some respondents requested more flexibility within the MQ. A local authority respondent pointed out that the role of the specialist teacher had changed so much that it might be more appropriate now to have a core curriculum supplemented by a choice of optional modules to enable participants to specialise in particular areas such as 14-19 or work with babies. The HI meeting advocated the same model as it would give scope for providers to be more creative. They suggested, for example, that different pathways/levels could be created within the MQ to cater for those specialist teachers teaching classes and those having more of a leadership/advisory role.

The HI meeting also felt that introducing options would help make MQ courses more sustainable/viable. One local authority response pointed out that the role of the specialist teacher was now so different in different contexts that an MQ with a core curriculum and a set of optional modules would allow some participants to study areas relevant to their particular area of work in more detail. The respondent argued that working with HI babies and young children requires a different skill set from working with HI children with additional needs or with children from 14-19. Her concern was that, beyond the MQ, there was no mandatory training for specialist teachers working in these areas. In support of this, a senior lecturer in deaf education stated that ‘there is a need for teachers of the deaf to have opportunities to develop specialisms (audiological, early years, complex needs, etc.) and if the updated specification could allow room for this, it would promote more vibrant and dynamic training opportunities’. Another respondent, an MQ trainer, argued however that participants should follow the whole programme rather

than just aspects that relate to their current interests or settings, as they may change the area/setting in which they work.

- 2.5 Some respondents felt the specification should be broadened to make it relevant to teachers working with children from 0-5 and beyond statutory school age, especially peripatetic local authority-based specialist teachers. The VI meeting suggested redrafting the standards, replacing 'pupils' with 'learners' throughout to make them relevant to this broader age range. The MSI meeting felt that MQ courses should be open to specialist teachers working in further education. One local authority response stated that MQ training should develop specialist teachers' knowledge, understanding and skills across all phases of education, pre-school to post-16 without compromising the core elements of MQ courses. This view was also given by a charity supporting teachers of the deaf which felt it was particularly important that MQs prepared teachers to work across the age range and in a range of settings, especially as many of those taking the MQ are peripatetic support workers. BATOD felt that the crucial area of communication and interaction should be covered in a broader birth-to-19 context.
- 2.6 Delegates at two of the consultation meetings discussed setting the academic level of the MQs. This is not presently a requirement within the specification. With many PGCE courses now being at M-level, some delegates thought it appropriate that the MQ should be at M-level. Others felt that requiring MQ courses to be at M-level would reduce flexibility and might cause recruitment to fall.

3. Updating and strengthening the purposes of the existing MQ

- 3.1 Most respondents were satisfied with the existing purposes of MQs and did not feel any changes were necessary. However, a number of key points were raised. Most debate concerned bullet 2¹. Many respondents felt that this needed to be redrafted to reflect the outcomes of Every Child Matters. A voluntary organisation suggested that 'impact on raising pupil achievement' should reflect the five outcomes of ECM. A local authority response suggested the wording should be 'have an impact on pupil outcomes in the five areas of the ECM agenda'. BATOD suggested that the wording of the second purpose should be changed from 'have an impact on raising pupil achievement' to 'promote raising pupil achievement'. One MQ provider highlighted the difficulty of documenting evidence for this purpose with its current wording. She suggested that increases in pupil achievement could be very difficult to attribute to a two-year programme. She suggested that changes in teachers' practice (which would by implication raise pupils' achievement) might provide an alternative and more easily quantified source of evidence.
- 3.2 There were other suggested changes to the purposes:

¹ Bullet 2 refers to one of the 3 purposes of the original MQ specification. These are:

- be of a consistently high quality
- have an impact on raising pupil achievement; and
- be easily accessible to teachers wishing to take them.

- a number of respondents felt that an additional purpose should be included relating to ‘pupil voice’ and the child’s well-being’. A response from a local authority said that the child’s needs should be at the centre of the MQ, and a school for deaf children suggested adding a fourth purpose – ‘taking into account the holistic and personalised needs of the pupils’.
- several organisations stated that one of the purposes of the MQ should be to prepare participants to work effectively in a variety of settings, including special schools, mainstream settings and support/advisory services. A school for deaf children suggested adding a fifth purpose – ‘be a prerequisite for teaching deaf children within any setting’. A local authority response suggested adding ‘be relevant to the educational environment in which most children learn’ to encourage MQ providers to focus more on inclusive mainstream education.

4. Updating and strengthening criteria 1-5 of the MQ

Comment on criterion itself	Comment on detailed criteria for assessing applications from providers
<p>1. Have as their main objective and outcome the raised achievement² of pupils with hearing impairment, visual impairment or multi-sensory impairment through the improvement of teachers’ professional knowledge, understanding and skills and their effectiveness in advising and supporting colleagues.</p> <p>There was broad agreement that the wording of this criterion remained relevant and useful and that it was placed correctly in the list, but some specific changes were suggested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there was a general feeling that the word ‘achievement’ should be updated to reflect the ECM outcomes • one of the consultation meetings suggested adding ‘collaborating with’ [colleagues] to reflect current practice • one special school suggested that ‘hearing impaired’ should be replaced by ‘deaf’ (see 4.1, bullet 3 above) • a voluntary organisation suggested adding ‘working in partnership with colleagues and the child’s family’ • a local authority response suggested rewording this criterion in line with ECM: ‘Effectiveness in working within 	<p>1.1 Have a clear focus on raising pupil achievement in course aims, objectives, content and assessment.</p> <p>It was argued by some respondents that ‘achievement’ should reflect the wider ECM outcomes that are broader than pupil achievement.</p> <p>1.2 Have strong links to effective school/classroom practice, including the use of ICT to support teaching and learning.</p> <p>It was argued at one of the consultation meetings and by a voluntary organisation that ‘have strong links with’ should be replaced by ‘promote’ or ‘actively promote’.</p> <p>This meeting also argued that this criterion should refer to the importance of assessment, and the effective use of data to identify the progress children are making. A school for the deaf said that this criterion should include the use of assessment to inform teaching.</p> <p>A local authority response suggested that this criterion should include ‘increasing schools’ capacity to meet the needs of pupils with sensory impairment’.</p>

² ‘Achievement’ in this context should be taken as broadly defined to include not just academic attainment, but the whole range of achievements of which pupils with these impairments are capable.

<p>a multi-agency team, with the needs of the family and children and young people at the centre. To improve outcomes for children and young people with'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the light of teachers of the deaf (ToDs) working with ever-younger children and children past compulsory school age, some respondents argued that 'pupils' should be changed to 'children in early years settings' or 'children and young people'. 	<p>Surrey Physical and Sensory Support Service and other respondents stated that 'school/classroom practice' was too limiting and that training should develop teaching and learning across all phases of education, including pre-school and post-16.</p> <p>A senior inclusion and achievement adviser suggested that this criterion should make reference to the national strategies.</p> <p>Several respondents suggested that the clause relating to the use of information and communications technology (ICT) should include 'the most recent specialist technology' as well as ICT to support teaching and learning'. A local authority response suggested that one of the biggest challenges for MQ providers is giving participants experience of new technologies to support access.</p> <p><i>1.3 Reflect recent research and inspection evidence relating to hearing impairment, visual impairment or multi-sensory impairment</i></p> <p>Most respondents felt that this criterion was suitable as written. BATOD agreed that MQs should be based upon a solid and current understanding of research. One of the consultation meetings felt that this criterion should also refer to MQ providers carrying out their own research to move practice on.</p> <p>A charity that supports teachers of deaf children felt that, in particular, MQ courses to support specialist teachers of pupils with hearing impairments should reflect the impact of the Newborn Hearing Screening Programme, the modernisation of children's hearing aid services, and early support on support services for deaf children and their families and the implications for participants.</p> <p><i>1.4 Develop participants' understanding of issues of inclusion as set out in the Government's Action Programme: Meeting Special Educational Needs (DfEE 1998), and</i></p>
--	---

develop participants' skills in supporting inclusion.

There was widespread agreement that this clause needed to be updated to reflect current policy (ECM, SENDA and other key documentation/initiatives). One of the consultation meetings suggested that the criterion should be phrased more generally as 'up-to-date national policy developments and legislative requirements' to help to future-proof the document. The National Deaf Children's Society also highlighted the need for those on MQs to keep up with medical developments.

1.5 Be available, as appropriate, for participants from the full range of contexts in which pupils with hearing impairment, visual impairment or multi-sensory impairment may be educated, and equip participants with the knowledge, understanding and skills to enable them to teach effectively in such contexts, including within specialist and mainstream provision.

Most respondents agreed with this criterion. Some amendments were suggested.

- Some respondents felt that this criterion should be expanded to include the diverse settings in which practitioners work, including early years settings. A local authority HI response stated that MQs ideally should give participants opportunities to develop skills beyond the context of their current workplace, especially in relation to the range of communication approaches.
- An HI voluntary organisation suggested that '... and enable them to transfer between these sectors during their careers' should be added to the end of this criterion.
- One respondent from a local authority support service recommended that 'especially' should be inserted before mainstream provision to emphasise the current inclusion agenda.

	<p>1.6 Enable participants to make an impact on practice by meeting the mandatory qualifications outcomes. There was general agreement with this criterion with no suggestions for amendment.</p> <p>1.7 Involve rigorous assessment of participants against the mandatory qualifications outcomes. There was general agreement with this criterion with no suggestions for amendment.</p>
<p>2. Respond to participants' identified training and development needs by offering flexible and differentiated provision. Provision should incorporate initial needs assessment in relation to the mandatory qualifications outcomes in order to ensure well-targeted and cost-effective professional development for participants. This should take full account of participants' prior achievement.</p> <p>Many respondents regarded this criterion as essential and were satisfied with the current wording, however one respondent felt that it was unclear. The HI meeting suggested that this criterion should refer to DDA and the disability equality duty. There was considerable debate around a number of issues, which are discussed under the relevant detailed criteria (opposite).</p>	<p>2.1 Initial assessment of participants' training and development needs in relation to the mandatory qualifications outcomes.</p> <p>2.2 Flexible delivery of mandatory qualifications provision to meet different training and development needs, without compromising appropriate progression and quality of outcome, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. needs assessment which will inform an individual training plan for each participant, tailoring provision – including teaching placements – to meet individual needs and circumstances, and enabling participants to set their own professional targets. b. arrangements for prior study and/or experience, where participants' needs are best met at that stage, eg. where a candidate needs to acquire a baseline of knowledge, skill or experience before starting training. c. provision for those completing the mandatory qualifications successfully to be helped to set further professional targets. <p><i>Comments on 2.1, 2.2 and 2.2a</i> There were some comments on the wording of criterion 2.2. One respondent thought that it was poorly worded and unclear. One local authority response asked for 'a range' to be added before 'teaching placements', however the MSI consultation meeting pointed out the difficulty of finding suitable placements</p>

for participants. One local authority response pointed out the importance of the phrase 'without compromising appropriate progression and quality of outcome' (in 2.2) and suggested that flexibility should not be used as a way to cut costs, eg. by cutting down on teaching placements beyond participants' normal place of work.

One local authority response stressed the importance of accurate needs assessment if provision is to be flexible and differentiated. However, an MQ course provider argued that it was very difficult to assess whether participants had already met some of the learning outcomes before the course and questioned the accuracy of participants' own self-assessment for a number of reasons, including the danger that their prior knowledge may be out of date or incomplete and they may not really appreciate what knowledge, understanding and skills lies behind the outcomes. Another MQ provider said that she was happy for prior achievement to be recognised but that once that was taken into account, participants needed to study the whole of the rest of the programme and not just those areas that reflected their current needs or interests. She felt that to do otherwise could have an impact on their overall skill levels and the transferability of those skills to different settings in the future. For example, teachers teaching pupils with severe learning difficulties while taking the MQ may not have the knowledge, understanding and skills to teach more able pupils later if they are allowed to opt to take only those parts of the programme relevant to their situation at that time. The HI meeting felt that the requirement for individual training plans was unnecessary as participants needed to do the entire course. A voluntary organisation also felt that participants should be required to complete the entire MQ regardless of their previous experience.

Comments on 2.2b

A voluntary organisation supported the requirement for participants to have the

	<p>required baseline of knowledge and experience before being admitted to MQ courses. They felt that offering flexible and differentiated provision must not result in the standards of those entering the course being lowered.</p> <p><i>Comments on 2.2c</i></p> <p>The HI and MSI meetings felt that although it was the responsibility of providers to conduct exit interviews, the responsibility for setting further objectives is best done by line managers and professional associations.</p>
<p>3. Be delivered flexibly to maximise access for participants. Since most mandatory qualifications candidates are part-time, provision should be as flexible as possible, without compromising appropriate progression and quality of outcome, to maximise access for participants.</p> <p>A voluntary organisation stressed that flexibility of delivery was essential to enable suitable candidates to take the MQ and to maximise access. A local authority respondent agreed, but thought that this criterion was the hardest for MQ providers to evidence.</p> <p>One school response advised that this criterion should include access for participants in line with the requirements of the DDA.</p> <p>One respondent raised concerns about the way the move towards locality working and integrated services was having a negative impact on continuing professional development because ToDs were becoming increasingly isolated, with less peer learning and support other than at conferences and meetings. Several respondents cautioned against individual programmes that might stop participants studying together and therefore being able to support each other and learn from each other. Some argued that smaller groups of participants studying together made it more difficult to run features that enhanced programmes, such as workshops.</p> <p>There was considerable debate about the notion of flexibility (ie. the way content is organised) that was not always directly</p>	<p>3.1 Although it is not expected that provision will include all the following features, successful bids will demonstrate how training is designed to increase access and flexibility, for example, through:</p> <p>a. opportunities, where appropriate, for participants to cover training provision in a different order</p> <p>b. opportunities to cover training provision content in different modes, eg. taught or distance learning, full-time and part-time, and</p> <p>c. in exceptional circumstances, opportunities for suitably experienced candidates, eg. experienced candidates from the independent sector, experienced teachers from SEN services, or those trained overseas, to present themselves for assessment without any training – in this case initial and final assessment against the mandatory qualifications outcomes (see section 6) could be the same.</p> <p><i>Comments on a</i></p> <p>Few respondents tackled this directly but the HI meeting wanted this criterion to be removed, stating that it was unrealistic to expect providers with such small numbers to cover training in a different order.</p> <p><i>Comments on b</i></p> <p>The MSI meeting felt that this criterion needed to reflect advances in technology (some respondents suggested that ‘e-learning’ be included in this clause) and requested that ‘distance learning’ be replaced by</p>

<p>relevant to the specific criteria (which focus on flexibility of delivery). For example, one local authority response noted that while flexibility should be a feature of course delivery, core elements of the course should not be compromised. Knowledge must be balanced with access to direct teaching opportunities across a range of settings and phases, eg. through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • regular educational experience – a sequence of day visits • extended educational experience – a period of sustained teaching in one setting, and • focused educational experience – opportunities for these wishing to practise in a particular phase, eg. post-16. <p>The respondent felt it essential for the MQ to give participants the breadth of experience to teach in a range of educational contexts. Another suggested delivery option was to combine ‘core elements of training from the course providers with more flexible models offered through local authority services and schools for the deaf and blind to enhance training through access to practitioners, with specialisms and skills, who are currently working in the field’.</p>	<p>‘flexible learning’. The HI meeting concluded that this clause should remain but wished to emphasise that not all providers will be able to offer all modes of learning. A small non-maintained special school made the case for MQs starting at a time other than the beginning of the academic year/terms to allow staff to access training in a ‘staggered’ way and the school to plan their budget more effectively, and to reduce the likelihood that staff would be absent from school for MQ training on school training days.</p> <p><i>Comments on c</i> Significant issues were raised in response to this criterion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The VI meeting questioned whether it should be MQ providers’ role to assess those with related qualifications against the MQ outcomes. They asked whether NARIC might have a role here. • The VI meeting also suggested that this criterion should be omitted from the new specification as nobody uses it. BATOD argued that even though MQ candidates knew that accreditation of prior learning was a possibility, it was rarely taken up as even well-qualified professionals welcomed the opportunity that MQs offered to update their knowledge and practice. • The HI meeting stated that there are never any occasions when participants can be exempt from the course in its entirety – the placement element, or at least the observation of the placement, will always be required. BATOD also argued that although some theoretical modules could be bypassed, they were concerned that MQ should not be awarded on the basis of prior study or experience, without further assessment. They drew particular attention to the necessity of the teaching placement, believing it so crucial that all MQ candidates should be required to complete it. • As discussed in relation to criterion 2 (above) many respondents felt that
---	--

	<p>all participants should complete all elements of the course.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where respondents were not concerned about this criterion being retained, there were concerns about monitoring moderation of accreditation of prior learning to ensure 'consistency and high standards against the MQ outcomes'. <p>BATOD argued that it was clearly not possible for an extensive range of options for delivery and content to be offered by each provider but felt that it should be possible to provide this level of diversity across the range of course providers. A voluntary organisation echoed this view but added the caveat that, for participants to choose an MQ course based on delivery mode, it is essential that all providers 'support the philosophy of informed choice' and are consistent in service delivery, with all participants meeting the same MQ outcomes.</p>
<p>3.2 Where distance learning is a feature of the provision, bids should demonstrate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> opportunities for participants to be supported through face-to-face contact with tutors and peers arrangements for supporting participants between face-to-face sessions that ICT will be used effectively in teaching and learning, and to facilitate effective communication between participants and tutors, between tutors, and between participants where 'distant' staff, eg. regional tutors, are used to support participants, successful bids will outline arrangements for training tutors, eg. to ensure consistency of assessment, and for supervising and updating tutors on developments in the training provision and in pedagogy for pupils with hearing impairment, visual impairment and multi-sensory impairment more generally. <p>Comments on a</p> <p>A number of responses stressed the value</p>	

<p>of face-to-face contact with tutors and peers. One respondent indicated that it may be possible to deliver the programme remotely and questioned whether this should continue to be a requirement.</p> <p><i>Comments on b</i> No specific comments were made.</p> <p><i>Comments on c</i> No specific comments were made.</p> <p><i>Comments on d</i> The VI and MSI meetings requested redrafting to read 'rigorous arrangements for training tutors' and felt that providers should be required to be explicit about the role of regional tutors. Reasons cited were the need for academic rigour and for participants to have full confidence in the support they receive. This was echoed by the MSI meeting. Several respondents recommended that this point should stress the need for regional tutors and mentors in placements to receive training and guidance so that participants gain maximum benefit from their support.</p>	
<p>4. Be informed by the needs of stakeholders and involve them in development, delivery, evaluation and improvement of the provision.</p> <p><i>It must be clear how provision has taken account of evidence about the needs of stakeholders, how evidence from teachers, schools, LEAs and others – eg. the relevant SEN associations, parents and pupils – has influenced the development of provision, and how they will be directly or indirectly involved in provision.</i></p> <p>Many responses stated their satisfaction with the existing wording of this criterion and stressed its importance as an integral part of provision.</p> <p>One respondent felt that it needed to be redrafted to reflect the DDA and the disability equality duty.</p> <p>One respondent pointed out that 'LEA' needed to be updated to 'local authority'.</p> <p>One MQ provider, while advocating the need for engagement with stakeholders, cautioned against the often restricted and limited view of stakeholders, noting that their views 'often relate to their own setting and do not appreciate the need for students to grasp the underlying broader</p>	<p>4.1 Clear evidence that provision reflects evidence about the needs of all stakeholders.</p> <p>4.2 Details of how stakeholders have influenced the development and improvement of provision.</p> <p>4.3 Details of how stakeholders will be involved in the evaluation and other aspects of provision.</p> <p>Comments on these individual points are covered opposite. The HI consultation meeting suggested the removal of 'all' from 'all stakeholders' on 4.1.</p>

<p>theoretical basis on which to base their practice'. She also pointed out that with very small numbers of participants, one stakeholder (eg. a school) might have disproportionate influence.</p> <p>Some respondents suggested a more detailed list, specifying who the stakeholders were. Several respondents thought that reference to pupils/children and young people and parents/carers should be made explicitly, rather than subsuming them in other stakeholders. One respondent referred to the need to take account of the views of ex-students and employers. One local authority respondent felt that participants themselves should be mentioned as stakeholders, especially where they are funding themselves.</p> <p>One local authority respondent felt that guidance for providers on consultation with stakeholders would be helpful. National deaf children's society (NDCS) stated that the requirement should be made more rigorous and explicit as to the minimum expectations to ensure that the needs of stakeholders inform course provision.</p>	
<p>4. Be of a consistently high quality and be subject to internal and external quality control and assurance procedures, and include mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating the impact of provision on professional practice in schools.</p> <p>There was general agreement about the wording and necessity of this criterion although some comments were made. A local authority response suggested a requirement for staff teaching on MQs to have recent and appropriate experience of practice in the relevant field.</p> <p>One respondent stated that it would be helpful to make specific reference to quality standards for sensory impairment and for multi-sensory impairment as produced by the South East Regional Partnership for SEN (SERSEN) and Sense for deafblind people. There was also a view that links should also be made to the forthcoming DCSF generic standards for local authority support and outreach services.</p> <p>NSDC argued that it should be made clear</p>	<p>5.1 Bids from those approved to run MQs should demonstrate that suitably qualified and experienced staff are available, and that participants have access to the necessary specialist resources and a range of appropriate, high-quality placements.</p> <p>Some drafting changes were suggested. The VI meeting suggested the addition of 'with the relevant specialism' after suitably qualified and experienced staff. The HI meeting suggested it should read 'suitably qualified and experienced staff with up-to-date knowledge and skills, including at least one member of staff with a mandatory qualification to teach children with the relevant sensory impairment'. One respondent suggested the addition of 'a range of speakers' is available, so as to include stakeholders where appropriate. Another respondent added that it would be helpful to ensure as far as possible that trainers have had recent experience in the field, noting</p>

who is responsible for ensuring consistency of quality across courses.

that 'some staff on MQ courses move straight into MQ training at an early stage in their career and lose touch with current issues around HI/VI/MSI management'.

5.2 Bids from those approved to run MQs should demonstrate mechanisms for ensuring that all those involved in delivery and assessment, including on teaching placements, understand their roles and responsibilities and have the knowledge, understanding and skills to carry them out to a high standard.

5.3 Bids from those approved to run MQs should demonstrate that means are in place to ensure that assessment judgements across provision are consistent, reliable and accurate and that these will be moderated.

No specific comments were made in relation to these criteria.

5.4 Bids from those approved to run MQs should demonstrate assurances that there are sufficient specialist teaching resources (including ICT), relevant to training teachers of pupils with hearing impairment, visual impairment or multi-sensory impairment, to enable all participants to reach the mandatory qualifications outcomes (see section 6).

One local authority response suggested that 'specialist teaching resources' should include recent specialist technology, some of which is covered by ICT but some of which is not.

5.5 Bids from those approved to run MQs should demonstrate specific evidence and explanation of the methods and measures to be used for evaluating the quality, standards and impact of provision on teacher competence and pupil achievement, eg. requiring participants to evaluate improvements in pupils' achievement as a result of particular aspects of their practice, and regularly

	<p>reinforcing this throughout training.</p> <p>The MSI meeting suggested that this clause should make reference to ECM outcomes and 'teacher competence and confidence'. There was also concern from the VI meeting as to whether the examples cited at the end of this clause were realistic given the diverse nature of needs of the pupils.</p> <p>5.6 Bids from those approved to run MQs should demonstrate the range of means of evaluation – internal and external – to the provider, including the range of stakeholders involved in the process and sources of evidence, and mechanisms for ensuring that information gleaned will affect future planning and development of the content and delivery of provision.</p> <p>One respondent suggested that this clause should appear as 5.1 to attach greater significance to it. Several respondents stated that the clause was unclear and that they did not understand it.</p> <p>A charity suggested that additional criteria be added relating to the selection of MQ candidates. They suggested that providers should ensure that those admitted to MQ courses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • are excellent classroom practitioners who have shown an aptitude towards teaching children with the relevant impairment, and • meet the necessary standards expected of a practitioner undertaking such a course. The issue of prior knowledge and experience was raised by many respondents.
--	--

5 Updating and strengthening criterion 6 of the existing MQ.

There was strong support for the use of the TTA SEN specialist standards to inform the revision of the specification. Respondents gave a huge range and variety of responses offering specific details of how those standards should inform the outcomes for the MQ in the new specification. These are discussed below under the appropriate headings. More general issues concerning the standards, relating to the structure of a revised specification, have already been discussed above.

Core standards	
General comment on standard	Comments relating to specific standards

<p>a. Strategic direction and development of SEN provision nationally and regionally.</p> <p>There was agreement that teachers need to understand the strategic direction and development of SEN provision nationally and regionally, and for the new MQ specification this needed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • be brought up to date in terms of content and language – the MSI meeting suggested that the names of specific policies/documents should be removed to keep the specification current • include the strategic direction and development of provision for children with HI, MSI or VI, depending on the specification • be broadened to cover provision for children from birth to 19. 	<p>ii. Possess a good working knowledge and understanding of definitions of terms such as ‘inclusion’, ‘whole-school approach’, ‘outreach support’, ‘multi-disciplinary co-operation’, ‘partnership’ and their current and possible application within various SEN contexts.</p> <p>The MSI meeting felt that ‘various SEN contexts’ should be replaced with ‘the continuum of SEN provision’.</p> <p>iv. Know how the local and regional development of special schools, support services and specialised provision relates to and supports the Government’s intention to increase the number of children with SEN educated in mainstream schools.</p> <p>The MSI meeting suggested adding, ‘...and the role of special schools in this process’ at the end of this standard.</p> <p>vi. Take account of changes in the expectations of parents/carers and the structure of the voluntary and advocacy agencies, and seek to secure early agreement with them about the use of specialised teaching strategies and resources.</p> <p>The MSI meeting felt that ‘expectations of parents’ should be replaced by ‘rights and expectations of parents’ to reflect current policy.</p>
<p>b. Identification, assessment and planning</p> <p>There was widespread agreement about the relevance of these standards to MQ outcomes but some discussion about revisions to the content.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MSI meeting concluded that the tone of the standards should be revised. • Both the MSI and VI meetings requested that the outcomes in this section should cover transition (transfer). • A local authority response felt that outcomes to do with planning should include personalised learning programmes and an understanding of 	<p>ii. Make effective use of more specialised informal and formal assessment techniques, and use the information gained to plan and deliver any special modes of teaching and support.</p> <p>The HI meeting and a local authority response advocated inserting the word ‘evaluate’, ie. ‘...the information gained to plan and evaluate the effectiveness of strategies’.</p> <p>iv. Use the prescribed targets in individual education plans (IEPs) to develop criteria by which to judge pupils’ progress, and to establish a timescale for review and evaluation, whenever possible, including pupils</p>

<p>provision mapping/management.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A local authority response argued that more emphasis should be placed on the ToD's role in monitoring pupil outcomes. • A sensory support service response endorsed outcomes related to competency in carrying out key formal assessments relating to the specialism. But also highlighted the need for the MQ to develop participants' skills in relation to on-going observational evidence gained through completion of monitoring protocols: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the development journal at pre-school level - the use of video to record and assess small steps of progress for children with complex needs. • One specific suggestion made by a school for the deaf concerned the need for specialist teachers to be able to use a 'formative assessment tracker' across the whole curriculum to assess a child's abilities and to identify any gaps in their learning in order to plan differentiated provision that will help 'close gaps'. This response stated that specialist teachers need to know the impact of gaps in children's learning on their longer-term learning and development. • The school for deaf children wanted the outcomes to mention 'holistic' profiling. • A school for deaf children felt that the MQ should equip specialist teachers to be able to interpret the data that they gain through assessment, and to understand how the data can be used to help children make progress. <p>One respondent said that participants should be familiar with special access arrangements related to assessments at key stages and for external examinations.</p>	<p>and parents/carers in the key processes and procedures, and ensuring all understand what targets have been set and why.</p> <p>The MSI meeting felt that the term 'judge' should be replaced by 'assess and evaluate' and that the phrase 'whenever possible' should be removed to reflect the changes in parental rights and expectations.</p> <p>vi. Are familiar with assessment procedures applying to externally validated qualifications and national curriculum assessment, and know how to access prescribed special arrangements for pupils with SEN.</p> <p>The MSI meeting wanted a reference to the foundation stage and the 14-19 curriculum inserted.</p> <p>vii. Prepare and write accurate assessment reports for reviews which can be understood and used by teachers, other professionals and parents/carers, and contribute to multi-professional assessment and placement decisions, where required.</p> <p>The MSI meeting argued that 'for reviews' should be omitted and that 'statutory assessment, transitional planning' should be inserted after 'multi-professional assessment'.</p>
<p>c. Effective teaching, ensuring maximum access to the curriculum</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents wanted a greater 	<p>i. Have a detailed knowledge of the school curriculum, including approaches to national curriculum</p>

<p>emphasis on ICT and pupil motivation, voice and choice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A school for the deaf and the HI meeting suggested that outcomes should include the development and assessment of generic thinking skills, not just curriculum (subject) based skills. They pointed out that deaf children are unlikely to pick these up incidentally. • The same school for the deaf also wanted the following content to be included in the HI MQ: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - knowing how to develop language explicitly with the deaf children - understanding the health and safety implications, eg. of using interactive whiteboards with children with cochlear implants, radio aids and the interference/impact of wireless technology, etc. - understanding different behaviour strategies for deaf children, including how to use and develop visual resources effectively - understanding and being able to use sign language within different settings. • A local authority response endorsed the standards but added that they should highlight the benefits of collaborative teaching alongside other specialists, eg. speech and language therapists and occupational therapists to ensure pupils have maximum access to the curriculum. • They also suggested that ToDs need to be familiar with different teaching methodologies, eg. oral and signing approaches, when working with pupils. • An HI specialist added that the MQs should enable teachers to encourage pupils to take increasing responsibility for their own learning and use of specialist equipment, including participation in decision-making about the types and levels of support they receive. <p>A local authority respondent suggested that these standards should focus not only on curricular access, but also on physical access. She argued that ToDs have an advisory role in terms of helping</p>	<p>requirements, and use of assessment criteria to develop, adapt and evaluate teaching strategies and content within the curriculum, and know how to maximise their benefit to pupils with SEN.</p> <p>The MSI meeting suggested replacing 'curriculum' with 'curriculum structures' to reflect the fact that there is not a single school curriculum.</p> <p>v. Explore ways of reducing the barriers to learning which arise from a major physical, intellectual, emotional, social or sensory impairment, and understand how these may change in childhood and adolescence or in response to learning experiences and opportunities.</p> <p>The MSI meeting suggested adding 'medical' to this list.</p> <p>vi. Encourage pupils to become more independent learners by sequencing and structuring learning experiences and the learning environment so pupils develop organisational, information processing and problem solving skills.</p> <p>The MSI meeting suggested adding 'as far as is possible' to the end of this standard.</p> <p>vii. Adapt and modify teaching and pupil resource materials to suit pupils' maturity levels and learning styles so that pupils are given every opportunity to understand concepts and ideas.</p> <p>The MSI meeting suggested adding 'as far as is possible' to the end of this standard.</p> <p>x. Work collaboratively with specialist and non-specialist staff to make effective use of teaching and learning environments, including specialised environments, eg. hydrotherapy pools or sensory rooms.</p> <p>The MSI meeting suggested that this standard should be split into two points. The first should just do with collaboration. The second should be about making best use of learning environments.</p> <p>The MSI meeting suggested two further</p>
--	--

<p>schools to create an effective physical learning environment and should therefore be looking at physical barriers to achievement as well as curricular, eg. for HI children and young people there are access considerations in relation to noise, acoustics, ability to see speakers, positioning and use of clinical social workers (CSWs) and teaching assistants.(TAs). A school for deaf pupils also thought that specialist teachers should be able 'to assess and review the classroom/school for accessibility'.</p>	<p>new points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • make effective use of learning environments, and • adapt and modify curriculum arrangements for pupils with very early levels of development and those with complex medical conditions, including degenerative conditions.
<p><i>c. Development of communication, literacy and numeracy skills and ICT</i> Although there was broad agreement about the standards in this section, there was debate around a number of issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MSI meeting felt that ICT should appear under a separate section. • This meeting also suggested that references to numeracy and literacy strategies be removed/updated. • The same meeting recommended that the section should be updated to reflect changes in technology, and a local authority response felt that augmented and alternative communication technologies should be included. • A voluntary organisation with HI specialism noted that 'participants will demonstrate knowledge of recent advances in technology (classroom ICT and audiological equipment) practice and educational philosophy and apply them'. • A response from a school for the deaf suggested that specialist teachers of the deaf also needed to understand and develop skills using kinaesthetic and visual methods, especially if they are working with profoundly deaf children. <p>A local authority response pointed out the need for specialist teachers to be able to take account of the impact of delayed/different language skills on access to the National Curriculum and to differentiate/modify provision accordingly.</p>	<p><i>v. Know and apply the effective pedagogy relating to the teaching of literacy, numeracy, ICT and study skills, and relate these to the needs of pupils with severe and/or complex forms of SEN.</i> The VI meeting suggested replacing 'pedagogy' with 'pedagogies' and a response from a local authority practitioner suggested adding a reference to an awareness of effective Wave 3 interventions and how to use/adapt where appropriate.</p>
<p><i>e. Promotion of social and emotional development, positive behaviour and</i></p>	<p>There were no comments about specific</p>

preparation for adulthood.

- A local authority response suggested that 'Many pupils...' in the preamble should be replaced by 'Some pupils....'
- Several respondents mentioned that this section should focus on the individual needs of children. The VI meeting suggested that this section should begin with the child's individual needs, the interaction between the child's needs and the learning environment, and the fact that teachers may need to remove barriers to learning to enable the child to make progress against the ECM outcomes. They stated that the knowledge and understanding section needs to have a greater emphasis on the voice of the child and their involvement in their own learning, changes in curriculum with social and emotional aspects of teaching (SEAL) and social cohesion and developments such as extended schools bringing services together.
- The HI meeting concurred that this section should 'be about pupil well-being and ECM'.
- A response from a local authority endorsed the importance of this area and stated that they wished to see incorporated an understanding that some pupils with SEN take longer to mature linguistically, socially and emotionally. They felt that MQs should also focus on pupils on post-16 courses and support that is available, eg. the disabled students allowance and disability living allowance'.
- Another local authority respondent with an HI specialism stated that the section needed to ensure that participants know and understand the key transition points for children and young people with HI and the TOD role/contribution to transition planning.

standards.

Extension standards	
General comments on the extension standards	Comments by area of need – specific comments
<p>Respondents discussed the extension standards in detail. In general terms, the structure of the standards was criticised heavily and many respondents argued for a radical overhaul. Suggestions for reorganising the standards are discussed above.</p> <p>The content of the standards generated less criticism with a predominant view that the extension standards (rather than the core standards) should be the main focus of the MQ. There was, however, a tension between respondents who praised the thoroughness of the standards and those who felt that they were too complex or prescriptive and not always relevant to teachers supporting pupils with particular impairments. Respondents made constructive impairment-specific amendments to the extension standards to strengthen the MQ outcomes and these are detailed below.</p> <p>Several respondents argued that the extension standards should be presented in a more integrated fashion to make the specification easier to use. For example, BATOD suggested that the aspects of knowledge and understanding and skills in each section of the extension standards should be integrated with those specific to each impairment group. One local authority response suggested that the extension standards might be presented in the same way as the document for professional standards for teachers.</p> <p>An alternative model for the extension standards was offered by an MQ provider. She felt that the requirements for each MQ were inconsistent and in her area, MSI, the number of extension standards to be met created an excessive burden on participants. She felt that some were too broad while others were too narrow and that although some were, in her view, more significant than others, all were given equal weighting. Her suggested model for the standards was based on a 'pattern of increasing depth, allowing for less detail</p>	<p><i>Communication and interaction Knowledge and understanding</i></p> <p><i>a. Ways to minimise long-standing communicative difficulties on pupils' cognitive, emotional and social development.</i> The MSI meeting argued that 'ways to minimise' should be replaced with 'impact of'.</p> <p><i>c. Strategies to enhance and promote non-verbal communication.</i> The VI meeting argued for the addition of 'including the use of ICT' after 'non-verbal communication'.</p> <p><i>d. The differences between normal communication and the specific or more unusual patterns of communication demonstrated by pupils with significant developmental delay, impairment or those having some form of communication or language disorder.</i> The VI meeting argued that 'normal communication' should be removed.</p> <p><i>e. The interaction between arrested language acquisition, cognitive development and sensory deficit.</i> The HI meeting stated that 'arrested' be replaced with 'delayed'.</p> <p><i>f. The language and communication needs of neurologically impaired pupils.</i> The MSI meeting argued for this standard to be omitted, stating that it was 'too difficult to show these needs and unpick them'.</p> <p><i>g. Visual and auditory teaching approaches that can enhance social/communicative interactions.</i> The MSI meeting asked for 'tactile' to be added after 'auditory'.</p> <p><i>h. Ways to adapt the general and technical vocabulary used by class and subject teachers, in order to</i></p>

and more flexibility'. According to this model, for each area, the extension standards would be reorganised into three levels. She offered two examples:

- emotional and behavioural difficulties: where meeting standards in the top level would indicate that participants had some basic knowledge, understanding and skills in this area and knew when to refer to others. Meeting standards in the next level would indicate knowledge of some particular techniques. Meeting standards at the third, deepest level would indicate a detailed knowledge of theory, other provision, etc.
- sensory and physical development: where meeting standards in the top level would include understanding the effects of sensory loss on learning, meeting them in the second level would indicate knowledge of a range of strategies, and meeting them in the third level would indicate a detailed knowledge of areas such as eye conditions, subtitling video, working with a mobility officer, etc.

She suggested that this model could be reproduced for each area of need and that this would enable a manageable level of detail to be determined for each MQ.

The HI meeting felt that their suggestion for the reorganisation of the core standards could equally be applied to the extension standards, ie. that this section should start with sensory needs, with knowledge and understanding and skills summarised in a general preamble, followed by slimmed-down versions of the specific standards under each heading for each impairment group. Many respondents took issue with the selection of extension standards required as outcomes for each MQ.

Communication and interaction

There were many detailed comments on these standards, including:

- **list of standards relevant to each MQ.**

Respondents felt that all the 'knowledge and understanding' extension standards should be

match the needs of pupils with communication difficulties.

The MSI meeting asked for this clause to be removed, but did not give reasons.

i. The roles and responsibilities of speech and language therapists, qualified teachers of the deaf, clinical audiologists, qualified teachers of the visually impaired and other relevant specialist services, including health, social services and relevant voluntary agencies.

The MSI meeting stated that there should be a specific reference to MSI practitioners. The VI meeting argued that the language be updated to reflect changes in local structures.

Deafblindness i. The potential impact of the combined effects of sensory loss on learning.

An MQ provider felt that this should be moved to cognition and learning.

Deafblindness iv. The use of objects of reference.

The MSI meeting asked for this clause to be removed. An MQ provider pointed out that objects of reference are part of the range/forms of communication used by pupils who are deafblind set out in standard ii, and thus should not be mentioned separately. The MSI meeting also commented that in vii 'reference to English should be reflected in the core'. It is unclear what this referred to as there is no vii.

Deafness i. How communication and language development are delayed or altered by the effects of mild to profound hearing loss.

The HI meeting asked for 'unilateral hearing loss' to be inserted here.

Deafness iii. Total communication approaches and the associated use of a range of sign communication systems, including signed English.

The HI meeting asked for 'including signed English' to be removed, but did not give reasons.

Visual impairment – all standards.

<p>required for HI and VI MQs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>preamble.</p> <p>BATOD argued that this section seemed rather ‘school oriented’ and suggested that ‘this crucial aspect of development’ should be presented in a broader birth-to-19 context. They felt that, for HI MQs, the specification should emphasise that the core of teaching deaf children is the development of language and communication alongside and in combination with audiological understanding and practice. The VI meeting argued that in the final paragraph ‘literacy skills’ should be replaced with ‘communication skills’ and that ‘including the use of ICT’ should be added to ‘augmented and alternative means of communication’.</p> <p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A charity that supports teachers of deaf children felt that the HI MQ should enable participants to acquire a firm understanding of the theory and application of current audiological practice and protocols, the ability to demonstrate knowledge of recent advances in technology (classroom ICT and audiological equipment) practice and educational philosophy and the ability to apply them. - A local authority response felt that a reference to working with deaf colleagues should be included in the knowledge and understanding (deafness) section. - A response from a school for deaf children felt that BSL should have more prominence in the specification. The respondent felt the current specification to be heavily oral/auditory focused. 	<p>The VI meeting argued that this whole section needed to be rewritten in language that more accurately reflects VI.</p> <p>Skills standards.</p> <p>There were no detailed comments on the specific general standards but two suggestions for additional standards were suggested.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The MSI meeting argued for an additional standard in relation to developing mechanisms to enable pupils to express their own choices and views, and another in relation to intervening to support children in communication with others. - A school for the deaf requested three additional standards in the specific skill standards for deafness: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a standard relating to ‘teachers being able to analyse/assess others’ (eg. TAs’) performance/communication skills - a requirement for BSL as ToDs are likely to have to support profoundly deaf children - that teachers should understand the sign bilingual model of teaching deaf children, including cultural understanding and history of its development. The respondent felt this had a very heavy influence on audio/auditory approaches. <p>Deafblindness i. Providing opportunities for pupils to have increased tactile, proprioceptive and kinaesthetic awareness during daily routines and planned activities.</p> <p>An MQ provider felt that this standard was in the wrong place.</p> <p>Deafblindness iii. Assessing functional hearing, vision, communication and general development.</p> <p>The MSI meeting felt that this standard should be divided and that ‘assessing functional hearing’ should be placed in section four yet this is unclear as there is no section four. An MQ provider argued that this standard is too broad, placing too many concepts in one standard. She</p>
--	---

felt that each is important and that they should be placed in separate categories, the first two in sensory and physical and the fourth in cognition and learning.

Deafblindness iv. Optimising the use of residual vision and/or hearing.

The MSI meeting asked for this standard to end with 'through adaptations to the environment and the use of appropriate aids and amplification'. An MQ provider argued that this should be moved to sensory and physical.

Deafness ii. Assessing the residual hearing of pupils and interpreting audiometric information competently.

The HI meeting argued that this should be replaced by 'contributing to the assessment of residual hearing and functional hearing'.

Deafness iii. Assessing the amplification needs of individual pupils.

The HI meeting argued for this standard to be changed to 'contributing to the assessment of amplification needs'. This was supported by a local authority response, which stated that assessing the amplification needs of individual pupils is usually the responsibility of a paediatric or educational audiologist, with the ToD contributing to the process of determining whether amplification and other aids are working effectively and optimally in the teaching and learning environment (and in the early years, in the home). The respondent felt that ToDs should have skills to ensure that amplification and other specialist technology (such as cochlear implants and sound field systems) are working to specification (where relevant) and to be able to check and ensure that equipment is functioning adequately.

Deafness iv. Assessing deaf pupils' language and communicative competence, both spoken and signed.

The HI meeting argued that this standard should end with 'as appropriate'.

	<p>Visual impairment iii. Employing appropriate techniques for teaching Braille.</p> <p>The VI meeting argued for the extension of this standard to ‘appropriate techniques for teaching literacy through alternative and non-sighted methods or other appropriate tactile media’.</p>
<p>Cognition and learning</p> <p>A local authority response argued that all the knowledge and understanding extension standards should be required for all MQs.</p>	<p>Cognition and learning</p> <p>Knowledge and understanding</p> <p>a. the continuum and complexity of moderate, specific, severe and profound learning difficulties, and how to provide curricular access through teaching that promotes active learning.</p> <p>The MSI meeting argued for the removal of the first part of this standard, leaving only ‘how to provide curricular access, through teaching that promotes active learning’ and that this standard be combined with b below.</p> <p>b. The difference between global learning difficulties which can affect all aspects of a pupil’s learning, and specific learning difficulties, eg. dyslexia, dyspraxia, specific language impairment, which can exist as an anomaly in the overall pattern of a pupil’s abilities.</p> <p>The MSI meeting asked for this standard to be combined with a above.</p> <p>c. The range of cognitive skills necessary for effective learning and the effects of single or multiple disabilities on functions such as perception, memory and information processing.</p> <p>The HI meeting argued that it is too ambitious to try to cover this standard within the MQ course.</p> <p>d. The range of visual, motor and linguistic channels available to promote cognitive potential.</p> <p>The MSI meeting argued for the inclusion of ‘auditory’ and ‘tactile’. The HI meeting argued that it is too ambitious to try to cover this standard within the MQ course.</p>

	<p><i>e. The importance of assessing how pupils process auditory and visual information.</i></p> <p>The MSI meeting suggested the addition of 'tactile'. The HI meeting argued that it is too ambitious to try to cover this standard within the MQ course.</p> <p><i>f. How cognitive difficulties impact upon the development of language and communication, and vice versa, and how this affects learning.</i></p> <p>The MSI meeting argued that this clause should address both cognitive and 'sensory' difficulties.</p> <p>A response from a school for deaf children argued that an additional standard should be added relating to teachers possessing a good understanding of cognitive development and being able to track and develop thinking skills explicitly for all children, not just those with learning difficulties. A specific comment was received on one standard:</p> <p><i>b. Using and applying a range of specialised assessment techniques, eg. diagnostic-prescriptive teaching.</i></p> <p>The MSI meeting argued for the removal of the example, while the HI meeting requested that 'prescriptive teaching' be removed.</p>
<p><i>Behavioural, emotional and social</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>List of standards relevant to each MQ</i> <p>A local authority response argued that the exceptions for MSI MQs should be removed.</p> <p>Another local authority respondent said that standard vi should also be included for HI MQs but it is unclear which standard she meant as there is no vi.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Preamble</i> <p>The MSI meeting made a number of recommendations for the revision of this section, arguing that it should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - be less negative and stress that all children's emotional well-being is important and that children must be seen 	<p><i>Behavioural, emotional and social</i></p> <p><i>Knowledge and understanding</i></p> <p>The standards attracted criticism.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The VI meeting commented that the standards in this section needed to relate more specifically to VI and should leave MQ providers room to tailor provision to suit local and individual needs. They recommended the inclusion of language relating to disability, rather than just social and emotional needs. They felt that that the logical sequence of the standards should be retained but felt that feedback from the specialists in the classroom should be sought. The MSI meeting suggested a thorough reworking of this section

<p>as individuals with individual needs</p> <p>- focus on the interaction between children's individual difficulties and the learning environment, which can present barriers to learning and challenges for schools in overcoming those barriers and enabling children to make progress with their learning.</p> <p>The VI meeting expressed a similar view, stating that the text should start from the learner and refer to the social and emotional needs of the learner that might impact on behaviour, then emphasise the need for starting with a sound assessment of need and identifying where to go for help and planning interventions, etc.</p>	<p>and offered the following as an alternative:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the interplay between a pupil's state of mind and sense of well-being and their learning and social environment and how this can impact on their learning b. appropriate intervention strategies and their likely benefits for the pupil, including how pupil grouping and teaching and learning contexts can affect learning outcomes c. the effects of specific types of adult verbal and non-verbal behaviour on pupils' emotional and behavioural responses, and how positive responses can improve pupils' self-esteem and social response d. the effective management of relationships in the classroom, including negotiation skills and positive strategies for improving emotional relationships between adults and pupils and between peers e. the benefits of specific support, including counselling, behavioural, therapeutic and cognitive interventions and how to apply these in different situations f. the impact of medical conditions and different types of medication on pupils' cognitive and physical abilities, behaviour and emotional responses g. a working knowledge of the roles of a range of services, including child mental health services, and when to refer to another professional. <p>A charity supporting deaf children suggested that the standards for the HI MQ should recognise the social and emotional impact of deafness, eg. that deaf children are more vulnerable to mental health/illness than hearing children. They thought that a link should be made with strategies for tackling bullying.</p> <p><i>f. The effects of specific types of adult verbal behaviour, eg. proximity, tone and gesture, and non-verbal behaviour, eg. body language, personal space and signalling, on</i></p>
---	--

	<p><i>pupils' emotional and behavioural responses, and how positive examples of these indicators can improve pupils' self-esteem and social response.</i></p> <p>The VI meeting suggested that the language in this standard should be refreshed.</p> <p><i>Skills</i> <i>Behavioural, emotional and social skills</i> Respondents only commented in detail on one of the standards:</p> <p><i>b. Developing safe and supportive fora, eg. 'circle time', to establish and sustain community-based rules and to develop social interaction.</i></p> <p>The MSI meeting suggested this standard should be reworded as follows: 'Developing safe and supportive conditions in which to establish and develop social interaction'.</p>
<p><i>Sensory and physical development Required standards</i></p> <p>A local authority response argued that all the exceptions should be removed. An MQ provider argued that these standards h and i in the skills section should not be required for HI.</p> <p><i>Preamble.</i></p> <p>The VI meeting suggested that the preamble should have a different emphasis and 'refer to these standards being the starting point for teachers of visually impaired pupils'. The meeting felt that current focus was medical and the language focused negatively on what a child cannot do when it should focus on teachers looking to overcome barriers to learning and participation. The meeting suggested, for example, replacing 'inability to participate fully in school life' with 'some pupils may need additional support to participate fully in school life...'. The meeting also suggested removing the phrase 'more likely' in the first paragraph.</p>	<p><i>Sensory and physical development Knowledge and understanding.</i></p> <p>Respondents only commented in detail on one standard:</p> <p><i>m. The principles and practice of motor education.</i></p> <p>The VI meeting suggested the addition of 'mobility, orientation and self-help'. A response from a school for the deaf suggested adding another standard relating to knowledge about sensory and physical development.</p> <p><i>Skills.</i></p> <p>Only one specific comment was received in relation to these standards:</p> <p><i>Visual impairment i. Checking and maintaining low-vision devices.</i></p> <p>The VI meeting suggested rewording this standard with 'maintaining the use of appropriate visual aids'. A school for the deaf suggested adding new standards relating to knowledge of the health and safety implications of using hearing aids or cochlear implants with wireless environments, interactive</p>

	whiteboards, etc' and in relation to reviewing the school/classroom for accessibility.
Standards relating to advisory roles and responsibilities	
General comments	Specific comments on particular standards
A general comment was made about the need to update the content and the terminology used in this section of the standards.	<p>Comments were received about the wording of particular standards.</p> <p><i>iv. Advise on the work being undertaken by other teachers, learning support assistants (LSAs), therapists and other support staff to ensure the integration of their specialist contributions.</i></p> <p>The VI meeting felt that this standard should include reference to the 'wider school workforce'.</p> <p><i>v. Demonstrate effective ways of working with parents/carers and other professionals to ensure maximum curricular access, challenge and progression for pupils with SEN.</i></p> <p>The HI meeting argued that 'demonstrate effective ways of working with' should be replaced by 'work effectively with'.</p> <p><i>viii. Lead training sessions for teachers, LSAs, parents/carers and others.</i></p> <p>The VI meeting suggested the addition of 'the wider children's workforce'. A local authority response argued that ToDs need to demonstrate the ability to produce/develop training packages/sessions, as well as to lead training sessions, especially for support staff. This requires an awareness of recent government initiatives in this area, eg. support worker in schools qualification, online training, etc. This point was also made in the response from a school for deaf children.</p> <p>One local authority response mentioned that some ToDs working in an advisory capacity may be asked to contribute to school access plans for HI children and young people, and to advise on a range of initiatives linked to access and disability discrimination. The respondent felt, therefore, that ToDs should be</p>

	<p>conversant with guidance on implementing the DDA in schools and other settings. She also mentioned the need for greater emphasis on multi-agency working in these standards, reflecting the move to 'team around the child'. ToDs working in an advisory capacity need to be familiar with the common assessment framework and family focused working/partnership with parents/carers and the involvement of the child or young person in making decisions.</p> <p>A response from a charity that supports teachers of deaf children suggested adding identified negotiation and management skills. The respondent thought that the standards relating to advisory roles should be flagged as essential outcomes for peripatetic specialist staff whose role extends beyond the classroom, and that MQs should prepare them for the range of their work in multi-agency teams and with children and families from the point of diagnosis.</p> <p>Another respondent from a local authority supported this. He stated that most teachers with the MQ will work with teachers and teaching assistants to ensure that the curriculum is accessible to pupils with sensory impairment. He argued the need for MQs to emphasise the advisory role and the ability to be able to model good practice. Another charity pointed to evidence that specialist teachers in an advisory role needed to be able to emphasise while challenging practice.</p> <p>A number of respondents argued that the specification should be modified to include much more about the specialist teacher's role in advising and supporting the child's family, as this has become an increasingly important part of their work. One local authority respondent felt that the specification should prepare participants for 'effective liaison with modern parents'.</p> <p>Reference was made to parents who were 'internet wise' but often confused by the mass of information available to them. He stated that parents are now more likely to wish to take a lead role in</p>
--	--

	organising the type, nature and amount of specialist support their child will receive. He felt, therefore, that working with parents in this 'modern' context to help children reach their potential should be a key part of the new MQ specification.
--	--

Standards relating to curricular roles and responsibilities

No specific changes to individual standards were requested but the HI meeting made some general points about the tone of this section. They stated that text read too much as though it was about subjects, rather than access to the curriculum for particular sensory impairments. They felt, instead, it should be about enabling children to develop as learners. They also argued it should be set in the context of ECM and partnership working with reference to:

- DDA disability equality duty and accessibility plans
- provision mapping and management instead of IEPs
- role of deaf adults, including as role models
- pupil voice
- early years foundation stage
- leadership and advocacy
- observing and modelling practice
- managing other adults (with a caveat about not all specialist teachers with MQs will have a leadership role)
- transition planning, and
- actively contributing to transition planning at each phase.

A response from a local authority also emphasised the role of the specialist teacher in contributing to provision mapping to ensure the needs of children and young people with sensory impairments are met.

Additional standards concerning Braille and BSL

Specific comments on the standards

Specific comments were made on each of these standards:

i. Participants successfully completing the mandatory qualification for teachers of pupils with visual impairment should have a minimum competence in grade II Braille.

The VI meeting stated that the specification should be more specific about the level of Braille competence required, arguing that 'minimum competence' can be interpreted differently.

ii. Participants successfully completing the mandatory qualification for teachers of pupils with hearing impairment should have a minimum competence in signing, equivalent to the CACDP (Council for the Advancement of Communication with Deaf People) stage 1 qualification.

BATOD suggests changing 'signing' to 'BSL' while responses from a school for the deaf and a local authority argued that the BSL requirement should be raised from a stage 1 CACDP qualification to a qualification at stage 2.

6. Other general issues raised during the consultation

Some issues beyond the primary business of reviewing the specification also arose during the consultation. These are detailed below.

6.1 **Funding and recruitment issues**

Respondents argued that there was strong anecdotal evidence to suggest that delegated funding to schools had led to a reduction in demand for MQ and this could have an impact on course quality. The impact of lack of funding on the quality of MQ courses had been identified as an issue, specifically for the quality of training and assessment in the workplace, in Ofsted's report on mandatory qualifications for teachers of pupils with sensory impairment (2004). Ofsted had recommended that sufficient funding be made available to remedy this. As schools may be responsible for only a small number of pupils with sensory impairment for a limited time, it was felt that they may be less willing to invest in the training than local authorities had been in the past. There was also a further, related concern about the impact that this would have on the national capacity to deliver MQ training in future.

6.2 Respondents suggested action that could be taken to ensure continued supply of specialist teachers for the future.

- Several respondents argued that local authorities and schools should have access to ring-fenced funding to train specialist teachers through the MQs. Some felt that a standards fund or equivalent for MQ training should be a key priority in order to ensure equality of opportunity for teachers of pupils with sensory impairments across the country.
- One local authority respondent believed that there should be a financial incentive attached to the MQ in order to attract mainstream teachers into the field. She pointed out that there was extreme concern about recruitment and highlighted that unless mainstream teachers have a specific interest, there is little to push them towards an MQ.
- Several respondents pointed out teachers with a teaching and learning responsibility (TLR) will often have to fund their own MQ training, and after two years will earn the same or less than they did before they gained the qualification. Issues relating to study time were also highlighted. One suggested solution to this was the development of a programme like the Graduate Teacher Programme whereby mainstream staff can be seconded to local authority services for training.
- The VI meeting suggested linking the specialist standards to the new standards framework for teachers and early years professionals (EYPs) so that the MQ could be seen as an opportunity for career progression.

6.3 Respondents were concerned about the ageing demographic profile of MQ teachers (BATOD figures indicate that 70 per cent of teachers of the deaf were over 46 years old) and the implications that impending retirement could have on the delivery of quality services to pupils with sensory impairment if there were no succession planning taking place in local authorities. Consequently, there was some support for reviving end-on training of specialist teachers and for exploring a fast-track route from initial teacher training for suitable teachers.

6.4 Similar concerns about the age profile of MQ teachers and the numbers taking up MQ training were raised in Wales following findings of audits of educational provision for children with sensory impairment in 2003/04. In an attempt to improve the picture in Wales, the assembly government decided to issue grants of £4,000 per student – split equally over the two years of the

course – for 24 students per year commencing MQs in 2006 and 2007. Delegates suggested that the DCSF consider a similar initiative in England. The intention was to ensure that the new criteria for postgraduate professional development (PPD) funding is reflected in the revised specification to enable MQ providers to apply for subsidy. The TDA works on the basis that one year's worth of funding (£652) should support a postgraduate certificate, half a postgraduate diploma, or a third of a Masters. However, the PPD subsidy goes directly to the HEI provider and is not necessarily passed on to the applicant by way of lower course fees.

- 6.5 As a result of the perceived decline in numbers of teachers with MQs, some respondents felt that schools and local authorities were using poorly-trained teaching assistants as a substitute for teachers holding MQs. Delegates wanted to see more specialist teachers with MQs working alongside suitably trained support staff.
- 6.6 Respondents felt that there was a growing need to demonstrate the importance of MQ teachers and the value that they add. The MSI meeting pointed out that parents were very satisfied with the courses. The HI meeting suggested research to identify this and publication of the outcomes to help encourage schools and local authorities to fund training of specialist teachers.

7. Other issues

7.1 Tracking the progress of different impairment groups

Pupil level annual school census data was limited and did not allow schools to break down data by impairment groups to track progress and achievement in a sufficiently targeted way. Some found the data difficult or impossible to obtain.

7.2 Concern about the viability of MQ courses if more providers are approved

The MSI, HI and VI meetings were concerned about the viability of current providers if open tender increased the number of approved providers. They pointed out that courses already had small numbers and if further providers entered the market without a national scheme to increase demand for MQs, some would be forced to close. The MSI meeting cautioned DCSF and the TDA to take note of what had happened in the USA.

7.3 The monitoring and evaluation of MQ programmes

One local authority response stressed the need for MQs to be monitored and evaluated frequently to promote continued high-quality provision that met the needs of stakeholders.

Annex B

Review of the mandatory qualifications specification. Consultation pro forma

As part of the current review of the specification for mandatory qualifications (MQs) for specialist teachers of pupils with hearing impairments (HI), visual impairments (VI) or multi-sensory impairments (MSI), the TDA is seeking views from interested parties. A copy of the current specification, including the relevant sections from the national special educational needs (SEN) specialist standards, can be accessed at <http://www.tda.gov.uk/teachers/currentconsultations/mqconsultation.aspx>

To submit your views please complete the form below by 5 October 2007 and send to mgreview@tda.gov.uk When saving the document, please remember to select 'save as' and save it to an accessible location on your computer, such as the desktop, before e-mailing the document as an attachment to the TDA. If you have any questions about this consultation contact Mark McKiernan on mgreview@tda.gov.uk or 020 7023 8216.

The TDA is committed to providing accessible information. To request this item in another language or format contact TDA corporate communications at corporatecomms@tda.gov.uk Please tell us what you require and we will consider with you how to meet your needs.

Section 1

Please provide the following information which will help us analyse the responses we receive.

1. Name and type of organisation (eg. school, local authority, SEN association)

If from a school, please state the type of school (eg. special, primary, secondary)

2. Your position within the organisation (if applicable)
3. Whether the response is individual or on behalf of the organisation

Section 2

Purposes

The current specification has three purposes. These are that mandatory qualifications should:

- be of a consistently high quality
 - have an impact on raising pupil achievement, and
 - be easily accessible to teachers wishing to take them.
4. Do you think these purposes should be added to or amended? If so, please say how.

Section 3

The six main criteria for assessing MQ provision

The specification lists six main criteria against which the current providers of MQ courses were assessed.

5. Please comment on the suitability of these criteria as a basis for assessing bids to run MQ provision from September 2008. Should other criteria be included? Should any be omitted? Please give reasons for your suggestions.

Criterion 1:

Criterion 2:

Criterion 3:

Criterion 4:

Criterion 5:

Criterion 6:

Detailed criteria for assessing bids

Under each main criterion are more detailed selection criteria against which the current providers of MQ courses were assessed.

6. Please comment on the suitability of each list for use by the TDA as a basis for assessing bids to run MQ provision from September 2008. What changes would you propose to update and improve these? Please give reasons for your suggestions.

List of features for criterion 1:

List of features for criterion 2:

List of features for criterion 3:

List of features for criterion 4:

List of features for criterion 5:

List of features for criterion 6:

Section 4

Outcomes of MQ provision

7. Currently the majority of the outcomes of MQs are related to the SEN specialist standards. How would you amend or add to the existing outcomes to update and improve those required of MQ courses from September 2008?

HI:

MSI:

VI:

Section 5

Further comments

8. Use the below space for any further comments that you think would help us in producing an updated and improved specification.

Please submit your completed form to mqreview@tda.gov.uk

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation in contributing to this review.