



Eligibility Framework for Scoring Support Levels

Summer 2015 Edition

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Summer 2015 edition of the *Eligibility Framework for Scoring Support Levels* (previously known as the *Eligibility Criteria for Scoring Support Levels*) was prepared by a NatSIP task group comprising:

Vanessa Barry	Specialist Lead for Hearing and (Acting) Vision, North Yorkshire CC
Mary Bowles	Advisory Teacher for Hearing Impairment, Sensory Support Team, West Sussex CC
Janice Bramhall	Team Leader, Hearing Support Team, Somerset CC
Andrew Burgess	Head of Sensory Service, RB Greenwich
Elizabeth Clery	Team Leader, Sensory Support Service, LB Brent
David Couch	Principal, Hamilton Lodge School and College, Brighton
Bob Denman	NatSIP Associate
Gail Deuce	Principal MSI Consultant, Children's Specialist Services, SENSE
Claire Djali	Head of Service, Vision Support Service, LB Wandsworth
Beverley Eastwood	Specialist Teacher Adviser for Hearing Impairment, Hampshire CC
Helen Forbes-Low	Team Manager, Children's Sensory Team, LB Harrow
Lesley Gallagher	Sensory Partnership Co-ordinator, Integrated Sensory Support Service, East Riding of Yorkshire Council
Cheryl Gray	Team Leader, Sensory and Physical Team, Inclusive Education Service, Nottingham
Elaine Harlin	Hearing Impairment Team Manager, Specialist Support Service, Staffordshire CC
Janet Harwood	Sensory Needs Service, Brighton and Hove City Council
Tonia Harris	Teacher of the Deaf and Area Team Manager - Central, SEN Support Services, Oxfordshire CC
Sue Keil	National Research Officer, (Education, Transition and Employment), RNIB
David Jackson	Specialist Advisory Teacher for Vision Impairment and the Tactile Curriculum, Physical and Sensory Support Service, Surrey CC
Julie Jennings	Manager, Children, Young People and Families, Evidence and Service Impact, RNIB
Anne-Marie McGrath	Head of Education Support Services for Deaf and HI Pupils, Northamptonshire CC
Ian Noon	Head of Policy and Research, National Deaf Children's Society (NDCS)
Wendy Pallant	MSI Support Teacher, Specialist Sensory Support Team, Wigan MBC
Brian Perry	NatSIP Associate
Dr. Joao Roe	Head of Sensory Support Service, Bristol
Lindsey Rousseau	NatSIP Facilitator
Paul Ryan	Advisory Teacher for the Visual and Multi-Sensory Impaired, LB Camden
Judy Sanderson	VIEW
Paula Scott	Co-ordinator Vision Impairment Team, Berkshire Sensory Consortium Service and VIEW
Joyce Sewell-Rutter	Education Consultant for Ewing Foundation and Burwood Park Foundation
Paul Simpson	National Executive Officer, British Association of Teachers of the Deaf (BATOD)
Stuart Whyte	Specialist Teacher: Educational Audiology; Advisory Teacher for Hearing Impairment, Physical and Sensory Support Service, Surrey CC
Pam Todd	Strategic Manager, Physical and Sensory Support Service, Surrey CC

Thanks are also expressed to the Department for Education for their funding support under contract with NatSIP.

CONTENTS

1. GUIDANCE	Page
1.1 Introduction	4
1.2 Purpose	4
1.3 Operation	5
1.3.1 Applying the NatSIP Eligibility Framework	5
1.3.2 Additional Considerations	7
1.3.3 Support Allocation Matrices	8
1.4 Glossary	
1.4.1 Abbreviations	15
1.4.2 Definition of terms	15
1.4.3 Classification of sensory loss	16
2. IMPAIRMENT FORMS	Page
2.1 Hearing Impairment Form	18
2.2 Vision Impairment Form	25
2.3 Multi-Sensory Impairment Form	33
2.4 Appendix: Learning environment	43
3. RECORD SHEETS	Page
3.1 CYP with HI	45
3.2 CYP with VI	46
3.3 CYP with MSI	47
4. CD CONTENTS	Page
	50

1. GUIDANCE

1.1 Introduction

The NatSIP Eligibility Framework for Scoring Support Levels document (previously known as the Eligibility Criteria for Scoring Support Levels) has been developed for use by local authority (LA) Sensory Support Services offering outreach support to children, young people and their families and educational settings (except for SI specialist provisions). NatSIP's 2015 revised version updates and supersedes the 2012 (Revised) edition and embraces changing legislation with recognition of the need for coverage of the 0-25 years age range in a multi-agency context and in a variety of educational settings. These range from home and Early Years settings at the pre-school stage, where early intervention is of such importance, to schools, including Academies and Free Schools, through to post-16 further educational placements.

The Eligibility Framework is a tool for Sensory Services to use to guide decision-making over support allocation for individual children and young people with hearing impairment (HI), vision impairment (VI) or multi-sensory impairment (MSI) through systematic consideration of a wide range of relevant factors. Although devised by experienced practitioners and extensively used, with updating through three revisions since the initial version was published in 2005, the Eligibility Framework is intended as a guide to good practice for the allocation of appropriate levels of support and not as a rigid set of criteria.

The revised framework was commissioned using funding provided by the Department for Education under contract with NatSIP.

1.2 Purpose

The NatSIP Eligibility Framework is intended to fulfil several purposes in relation to service support for children and young people (CYP) and their families:

- to facilitate **benchmarking** across LA Sensory Support Services;
- enable services to provide an **equitable allocation** of their resources;
- to provide services with **entry and exit criteria** for support;
- to provide a means of **identifying the levels of support** required;
- to provide a means of **justifying the support** provided;
- to inform the **local offer** – the LA's information on the services it expects to be available locally;
- to inform **education, health and care plans (EHC Plans)** – the multi-agency need assessments and plans for CYP;
- to inform **staffing level** considerations, the nature of support and allocation of caseloads;
- to support the development of **Service Level Agreements**;
- to support service **quality assurance and self-evaluation**;¹
- to reflect compliance with **The Equality Act (2010)**.

With respect to benchmarking, it is argued that meaningful comparisons of Sensory Support Services across different LAs will only be feasible once a common set of eligibility criteria is in use, coupled with transparency over the associated support allocation matrices operated by individual services.

Whilst the NatSIP Eligibility Framework is designed to provide the basis for a fair allocation of available resources, **it relies on professional judgement and should only be used as part of a full assessment by a qualified specialist SI teacher**. For example, a detailed language profile may be used alongside the Eligibility Framework to support an adjustment in levels of provision. Professionals will know that use of the NatSIP Eligibility Framework is leading to effective identification of support when children are making good progress and achieving good outcomes.

¹For example, the NatSIP Eligibility Framework could be used in evidence for the DCSF Quality Standards for SEN and Outreach Services (2008), e.g. Standard 16 - Finance and resources are managed effectively to support the performance and operational requirements of the service.

1.3 Operation

There are three sets of eligibility criteria within the Eligibility Framework document:

- Hearing Impairment (pp 18-24)
- Vision Impairment (pp 25-32)
- Multi-Sensory Impairment (pp 33-42)

Abbreviations, definitions of terms and the classification of sensory loss used within the NatSIP Eligibility Framework are provided in the Glossary (see 1.4).

1.3.1 Applying the NatSIP Eligibility Framework

To apply the NatSIP Eligibility Framework, SI specialist teachers should follow the steps below:

- **Step 1:** Select the appropriate NatSIP Eligibility Framework Form (i.e. HI, VI or MSI) according to the CYP's type of SI. For ease of use, each form can be downloaded separately from the enclosed CD or the NatSIP Website. (Documents are available from https://www.natsip.org.uk/index.php/doc-library-login/cat_view/54/88
To access the documents you will need to be registered and logged in on the NatSIP Website. Registration is free and open to all. If you need help with registration, a guide/walkthrough can be found at <https://www.natsip.org.uk/files/howtos/Website%20registration%20howto%20Mar%202015.pdf>
Interactive Eligibility Framework Forms with automatic maths functions embedded in them are also available. If you wish to use these they can be downloaded from the NatSIP Website. (These interactive Forms will automatically transfer the selected scores to the Scoring Summary Sheets and calculate the Total Score).
- **Step 2:** Enter the CYP's details on the appropriate NatSIP Eligibility Framework Form.
- **Step 3:** Work through the criterion tables, selecting only **one** of the options within each table and enter the CYP's score into the appropriate box at the base of the table. The 'Comments' box allows the SI specialist teacher to enter any information or evidence that was taken into account when making the option selection within the criterion table.

Example - Hearing Impairment Criterion 3.1:

Criterion 3.1: Impact of HI on language and communication development		Score
a	Expected/better than expected progress in language without the need for further management strategies or service monitoring	0
b	Expected progress given appropriate management strategies and service monitoring and advice	4
c	Language and communication require targeted support from the service in order for the learner to make expected progress and to access the curriculum	8
d	Learner is making less than expected progress, or is at risk of making less than expected progress, and requires a high level of intensive support from the service curriculum	14
Comments Option (d) selected given the major impact of EAL at this stage on the pupil's functional language and communication		CYP Score 14

1.3 Operation continued

- **Step 4:** Enter the CYP's scores for each of the criterion tables in the CYP Score Table on the Scoring Summary Sheet at the end of the NatSIP Eligibility Framework Form and add to calculate the CYP's Total Score. This will be performed automatically when an interactive version of the Eligibility Framework Form, available on the NatSIP Website, is used. NB the maximum score for each of the three sets of eligibility criteria is 100. An individual's Total Score can therefore be expressed as a percentage without additional calculation.
- **Step 5:** Use the Total Score as a basis for support allocation decisions according to service policy. In determining the support allocation, each service will need to agree its **support allocation matrix** according to what it considers to be the support levels required to meet needs. Implicit within the support allocation will be the CYP's ability to access the curriculum, to make good progress and to achieve good outcomes.

Using the downloadable NatSIP Eligibility Framework Forms on the CD or on the NatSIP Website, services can add their own matrix to the Scoring Summary Sheet or use the form version that includes a pre-prepared matrix. The evidence for the pre-prepared matrix can be found in subsection 1.3.3 Support Allocation Matrices pp 10-14.

In the case of the MSI support allocation matrix it is anticipated that an appropriate combination of specialist sensory professionals would be included. It is envisaged that the NatSIP Eligibility Framework Form would be completed together by the specialist teachers for HI/VI and where available MSI. Following this a professional decision could then be made regarding which teacher should deliver specified elements of the allocated support.

Once a service has decided upon its support allocation matrix, the CYP's Total Score can be translated into the associated level/category of support on the matrix. It is suggested that a final decision upon the actual support allocation should then be made through whatever moderation processes are established within the service. Apart from professional judgement considerations, temporary issues such as staffing vacancies and long term illness cover may also need to be taken into account. It is stressed that the support allocation derived from the CYP's Total Score should be treated as a starting point for consideration/discussion with the potential for the level of support to be increased or lowered.

- **Step 6:** Review - the intention is that the completion of the NatSIP Eligibility Framework exercise should inform an ongoing review around the support for a CYP's needs. The consultation undertaken during the 2009 revision indicated that, in the majority of cases, a review was carried out annually, typically towards the end of the academic year or to correspond with a CYP's statutory Annual Review, unless changes in circumstances called for earlier action.

To provide a comparative record over time, the Record Sheets in Section 3 allow a CYP's scores from three applications of the NatSIP Eligibility Framework to be entered on a single form. The Record Sheets can be downloaded from the CD or the NatSIP Website.

For user-friendliness, two versions of each of the Record Sheets have been prepared for the CD and Website: one includes the blank support allocation matrix for completion by the service as appropriate, the other includes the pre-prepared support allocation matrix developed for the Eligibility Framework Summer 2015 edition.

²Although a separate criterion table was not adopted for **Voice of the Child**, Specialist SI Teachers may wish to take account of this in deciding upon the final support allocation. Similarly, the **impact of poverty** is known to be highly significant and Specialist SI Teachers may wish to recognise this in deciding upon the final allocation of resources to a CYP.

1.3 Operation continued

1.3.2 Additional Considerations

Early Years

In considering the application of the NatSIP Eligibility Framework within the Early Years context, services are expected to pursue the Early Support ethos of keeping families at the heart of discussion and decision-making about their children. Details can be found on both the DfE Website (www.education.gov.uk) and the Early Support Website (www.ncb.org.uk/earllysupport). This ethos is also embedded within the quality assurance programme associated with Newborn Hearing Screening, which carries an expectation that the support offered to families of infants with a newly confirmed hearing loss will be responsive to the families' concerns and wishes.

Clearly, many factors influence the level and type of support that a family may request in the early stages and these can change within a relatively short time frame.

Developmental factors

Whilst specific developmental and educational stages are not specified within the criterion tables, the impact of a sensory impairment will vary according to such stages and will of course need to be recognised where appropriate in completing the Eligibility Framework. For example, a mild VI may have more significant impact on younger children who are in the early stages of literacy than in older children whose literacy skills are more secure.

Additional SEND

All services involved in the education and support for CYP with SI will need to ensure a co-ordinated approach for CYP with additional SEND/complex needs. Although additional SEND in conjunction with SI may impact upon a CYP's learning and development, it should be remembered that the prime focus of the Eligibility Framework concerns the appropriate contribution of support to be provided by LA Sensory Support Services and not the total package of provision and support for the CYP.

With respect to CYP with learning difficulties, whilst it is understood that the interaction of learning difficulties with SI may, in certain cases, call for increased Sensory Service support it has also been argued that CYP with significant learning difficulties can often receive a high level of educational support in their settings which in fact calls for less Sensory Service input than might otherwise be required. In this circumstance it was considered that any adjustments to the contribution of support by Sensory Services on account of learning difficulties should be made at the support allocation moderation stage.

Post-16

The nature of the different settings which young people within the 16-25 age group may attend is of a breadth that may have a greater influence on the allocation of support needed than is the case for Early Years settings and schools.

Specialist provision

The NatSIP Eligibility Framework has been developed for LA Sensory Support Services offering outreach support to non-SI specialist educational settings. These settings may include Special Schools, Units and Resource Bases which are not SI specialist provisions but which have CYP with SI on roll.³

The NatSIP Eligibility Framework was not developed for SI specialist provisions such as Special Schools, Units and Resource Bases for CYP with HI, VI or MSI which, it is assumed, offer the staffing expertise and resources to meet the needs of learners with SI. Support from a Sensory Service may however need to be considered in the circumstance of a CYP with MSI being placed in a specialist provision for HI or VI only which does not specifically have the MSI expertise.

³NB Feedback has indicated that the Eligibility Framework could also usefully inform internal support arrangements within Special Schools (non-SI) whose staff include sensory qualified teachers, with a wider role beyond their class, where external specialists do not have a role within the school.

1.3 Operation continued

1.3.3 Support Allocation Matrices

As already stated in Step 5, each service will need to agree its support allocation matrix according to what it considers to be the support levels required to meet needs. However, since the initial development of the tool attempts have been made to provide services with appropriate matrices. In this section, details are provided of a survey of support allocation matrices carried out during the last revision and the evidence gathered for the development of the pre-prepared matrix in the 2015 Eligibility Framework.

Survey

In the 2012 revision, Sensory Support Services were invited to submit the support allocation matrices they employed to investigate the range being used.

In the 2009 version of *Eligibility Criteria for Scoring Support Levels* two examples of a matrix were provided (see below) and the majority of the survey responses could be classified in terms of these examples or adaptations of them.

Examples of Support Allocation Matrices (2009 version)

Example 1

Total Score Range	Support Category	Support Allocation
75% and above	Support Plus	Active caseload/very high level of support/probably includes pupils seen twice or more each week/may include SI Early Years children who have one visit but high level of multi-agency liaison required/reports required.
50 – 74%	Support	Active caseload/specialist SI teachers decide on frequency and timing of visits/flexibility required/may include pupils seen for blocks of time/must let school know time and date of next visit/reports required.
25 – 49%	Monitor	Active caseload/one or two visits annually/troubleshooting for radio aids, CCTVs etc. may generate additional visit/single report giving advice specific to pupil/report on request from Senior Teacher/Team Leader for specific reason.
24 and below	Advice	Not on active caseload/lists held centrally/advice sent to schools following referral/advice by telephone following request by school/no reports provided.

1.3 Operation continued

Example 2

Total Score Range	Support Category	Support Allocation
70% and above	A1	2 or more visits per week
50 – 69%	A2	Weekly
40 – 49%	A3	Fortnightly
30 – 39%	B1	Monthly
25 – 29%	B2	Twice termly (3 term year)
20 – 24%	C1	Termly (3 term year)
15 – 19%	C2	Twice yearly visit
Less than 15%	NFA	Off caseload

The table below provides an analysis of the survey returns. Responses were received from 26 Services covering 37 LAs (i.e. approximately 24% of all LAs).

Whilst there was no evidence base to support the adoption of a particular matrix as one which would be the more effective in promoting good pupil progress and the achievement of good outcomes, it was perhaps worth noting that approximately 65% of the services surveyed based their support allocation on Example 2, though not all fully matched their levels of support to those specified. From this standpoint it might be considered that the matrix in Example 2 was one which reflected the aspirations of many services.

Matrix	Number of Services	Comment
Example 1	4	
Example 1 adapted	2	In both of these adaptations the total score range threshold for each of the support allocation categories was lowered. In this respect the support provided was comparatively more generous.
Example 2	9	
Example 2 adapted	8	Overall, the support allocations were less generous (to varying degrees) in each of the adapted matrices when compared to the original.
Other	3	The total score ranges and associated support allocations within each of these matrices differed so significantly from both Examples 1 & 2 that they could not be considered as adaptations. Overall, the support allocations were less generous in each of the matrices than those in Examples 1 & 2.
Total	26	

Table: Analysis of survey returns

1.3 Operation continued

Evidence for the pre-prepared 2015 Support Allocation Matrix

Building upon the findings of the 2012 survey, as part of the 2015 revision process the Eligibility Framework was field tested by six Sensory Support Services on a total of 450 CYP with SI using the Support Allocation Matrix Example 2 shown above.

Overall the sample provided good coverage in terms of the type and degree of SI and Key Stages. The MSI and Post-16 cohorts were limited however.

Details of the trial sample are provided in the table below:

SI TYPE: HI	COHORT SIZE			KEY STAGE							
	CLASSIFICATION	M	F	Total	EYFS	KS1	KS2	KS3	KS4	Post-16	Unspecified
Normal - Improved/APD/Conductive	5	1	6	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0
Normal - Unilateral	16	12	28	4	3	14	5	2	0	0	0
Mild	56	50	106	9	24	42	28	3	0	0	0
Moderate	76	48	124	21	22	39	29	11	2	0	0
Severe	14	16	30	7	7	6	5	5	0	0	0
Profound	30	20	50	14	9	10	8	9	0	0	0
Total	197	147	344	55	67	113	77	30	2	0	0
SI TYPE: VI											
Unspecified	3	3	6	0	1	3	1	0	1	0	0
Mild	20	9	29	7	5	7	8	2	0	0	0
Moderate	10	5	15	1	4	5	2	2	1	0	0
Severe	15	16	31	8	8	4	6	4	1	0	0
Profound	10	3	13	6	3	1	2	1	0	0	0
Total	58	36	94	22	21	20	19	9	3	0	0
SI TYPE: MSI											
Unspecified	?	?	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Mild		2	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Moderate	1	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Severe		3	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Profound	2	2	4	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
Total	3 + ?	8 + ?	12	3	3	2	2	1	0	0	1
SI TYPE: ALL SI											
Total	258 + ?	191 + ?	450	80	91	135	98	40	5	0	1

Table: Trial sample

1.3 Operation continued

In order to evaluate the fitness for purpose of the Eligibility Framework and Support Allocation Matrix Example 2, Services were asked:

- to calculate each CYP's total score from the application of the Eligibility Framework
- to identify the CYP's Support Allocation from their total score as specified in the Support Allocation Matrix Example 2
- to rate the appropriateness of the identified Support Allocation for the CYP according to the following Rating Scale (regardless of the support actually being delivered by the Service to the CYP):

Rating Scale	Description
1 - less than needed	From knowledge of the CYP, the actual support provided by the Service and the rate of progress being made it is considered that the Eligibility Framework calculated Support Allocation would be less than the CYP needs to make satisfactory progress/achieve satisfactory outcomes
2 - adequate	From knowledge of the CYP, the actual support provided by the Service and the rate of progress being made it is considered that the Eligibility Framework calculated Support Allocation would be adequate for the CYP to make satisfactory progress/achieve satisfactory outcomes
3 - most appropriate	From knowledge of the CYP, the actual support provided by the Service and the rate of progress being made it is considered that the Eligibility Framework calculated Support Allocation would be most appropriate for the CYP to make good progress/achieve good outcomes
4 - more than needed	From knowledge of the CYP, the actual support provided by the Service and the rate of progress being made it is considered that the Eligibility Framework calculated Support Allocation would be more than the CYP needs to make good progress/achieve good outcomes

- in cases where the rating made was other than 3 (most appropriate), to attempt to identify any changes to the Eligibility Framework that would rectify the situation and lead to a 'most appropriate' rating. These changes could involve adjustments to the statements and/or scoring in the draft criterion tables as well as amendments to the Support Allocation Matrix.

The results of this rating exercise are summarised in the table below. It will be noted that the 'most appropriate' (71.8%) and 'more than needed' (10.0%) support allocation ratings accounted for approximately four fifths of CYP. This was considered to be a reasonable baseline upon which to build the Eligibility Framework's fitness for purpose.

From analysis of the support allocation data and the associated comments provided by the six Sensory Support Services which participated in the trial, as well as feedback on the draft Eligibility Framework document from others within the wider NatSIP task group, a small number of amendments were made to both the draft criterion tables and the Support Allocation Matrix Example 2 to form the 2015 revised Eligibility Framework. These changes led to a significant overall reduction in the number of CYP in the combined 'less than needed' and 'adequate' support allocation rating categories i.e. a reduction from 18% to 10%. Considering the 'less than needed' category alone, the reduction was from 12.2% to 6.4%.

1.3 Operation continued

The implication of these findings is that the application of the revised Eligibility Framework and 'Pre-prepared 2015 Support Allocation Matrix', prior to any Service moderation process, would lead to:

- 9 out of 10 CYP being allocated a 'most appropriate' or higher level of support
- nearly 19 out of 20 CYP being allocated an 'adequate' or higher level of support

With respect to the 10% of CYP originally rated in the 'more than needed' category of support allocation, analysis of the total scores assigned to the CYP in this cohort and the associated comments made by Sensory Service personnel indicated that the support allocation in many of the cases would be relatively straightforward to resolve at the moderation process stage.

SI TYPE: HI	COHORT SIZE	RATING OF SUPPORT ALLOCATION				
CLASSIFICATION		1 Less than needed	2 Adequate	3 Most appropriate	4 More than needed	Uncertain
Normal - Improved/APD/Conductive	6	0	0	5	1	0
Normal - Unilateral	28	2	1	24	1	0
Mild	106	15	7	76	8	0
Moderate	124	18	7	82	17	0
Severe	30	4	1	24	1	0
Profound	50	9	5	34	2	0
Total	344	48 (14.0%)	21 (6.1%)	245 (71.2%)	30 (8.7%)	0 (0.0%)
SI TYPE: VI						
Unspecified	6	0	0	6	0	0
Mild	29	4	0	24	1	0
Moderate	15	0	0	12	3	0
Severe	31	1	4	18	8	0
Profound	13	1	1	10	0	1
Total	94	6 (6.4%)	5 (5.3%)	70 (74.5%)	12 (12.8%)	1 (1.1%)
SI TYPE: MSI						
Unspecified	1	0	0	1	0	0
Mild	2	1	0	1	0	0
Moderate	2	0	0	2	0	0
Severe	3	0	0	3	0	0
Profound	4	0	0	1	3	0
Total	94	6 (6.4%)	5 (5.3%)	70 (74.5%)	12 (12.8%)	1 (1.1%)
SI TYPE: ALL SI						
Total	450	55 (12.2%)	26 (5.8%)	323 (71.8%)	45 (10.0%)	1 (0.2%)

Table: Trial rating of support allocation

1.3 Operation continued

Pre-prepared 2015 Support Allocation Matrix

The 'Pre-prepared 2015 Support Allocation Matrix', presented below, has been derived from the evidence gathered through the trialling of the Eligibility Framework.

Total Score Range	Support Category	Support Allocation
70% and above	A1	2 or more visits per week
50 – 69%	A2	Weekly
40 – 49%	A3	Fortnightly
30 – 39%	B1	Monthly
25 – 29%	B2	Twice termly (3 term year)
20 – 24%	C1	Termly (3 term year)
15 – 19%	C2	Twice yearly visit
5 – 14%	C3	Annual check or visit
Less than 5%	NFA	Off caseload
Evidence underpinning any professional adjustment made to the CYP's matrix support allocation:		

The classification of support allocation in terms of 'visits' has been used in the matrix as this is commonly adopted by Sensory Support Services in their overall management of staffing resources. Some flexibility in the timing of visits is accepted e.g. it may be considered appropriate to increase or reduce the frequency of visits to certain CYP for particular periods during the year.

Feedback from Sensory Support Services would indicate that the contact time duration of a visit was usually one to one and a half hours although instances of both shorter and longer sessions were reported.

1.3 Operation continued

The nature of the support offered during a visit would clearly be dependent upon assessed need. Whilst the following list is by no means exhaustive, activities from the range summarised would typically be included:

Activity category	Activity examples
Assessment	Carrying out: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Functional assessment of hearing and vision relating to access to information ■ Language and communication assessment ■ Assessment of social interaction with peers/adults ■ Assessment of movement, mobility and orientation ■ Assessment of independence ■ Standardised assessments e.g. reading, vocabulary, non verbal ability ■ Non standardised assessments e.g. observations in class, use of developmental journals/profiles ■ Statutory assessment related work ■ Acoustic evaluation of the setting
Direct teaching/ CYP support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 1:1 direct teaching e.g. reading, general vocabulary, skills that peers learn incidentally ■ Pre- and post-tutoring of curriculum related concepts/vocabulary ■ Teaching to use technology e.g. low vision aids ■ Touch typing tuition ■ Braille tuition ■ Signing tuition ■ Support to assist management of hearing/visual loss ■ Support in class ■ Personal interview ■ Small group work e.g. to promote social skills
Equipment	Provision of specialist equipment when needed: e.g. video magnifiers, personal amplification systems Carrying out: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ FM/soundfield trial ■ Checks on technological aids/trouble shooting
Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Awareness sessions - training for staff, peers, parents/carers, governors ■ Training for staff/parents on use of equipment
Advice	Advising staff on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Inclusive classroom practices ■ Curriculum differentiation, lesson planning, resources, strategies and provision management ■ Special arrangements for examination concessions and modifications ■ Audiological management/technological aids (in addition to any training) ■ Provision of a safe environment ■ Support for families
Meetings and reviews	Planning and review meetings for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Parents to offer advice and support ■ IEP, EHCP, Annual Review ■ Early years ■ TAF, CAF, LAC ■ Transition ■ Inter-agency liaison

1.4 Glossary

1.4.1 Abbreviations

AV	Audio-Visual
APD	Auditory Processing Disorder
BSL	British Sign Language
CAF	Common Assessment Framework
CCTV	Closed Circuit Television
CI	Cochlear Implant
CVI	Cerebral Vision Impairment
CRS	Congenital Rubella Syndrome
CYP	Child or Young Person/Children and Young People - all learners in the target group (0-25 years)
EAL	English as an Additional Language
EHCP	Education Health and Care Plan
HI	Hearing Impairment or Deafness
IEP	Individual Education Plan
LA	Local Authority
LAC	Looked After Children
LVA	Low Vision Aid
MSI	Multi-Sensory Impairment/Dual Sensory Impairment/Deafblindness
NatSIP	National Sensory Impairment Partnership
QTVI	Qualified Teacher for Vision Impairment
QTMSI	Qualified Teacher for Multi-Sensory Impairment
SEND	Special Educational Needs and Disabilities
SI	Sensory Impairment
TA	Teaching Assistant
TAF	Team around the Family
ToD	Teacher of the Deaf
VI	Vision Impairment

1.4.2 Definition of terms

Cerebral Vision Impairment	Cerebral Vision Impairment (CVI), sometimes referred to as Cortical Vision Impairment, is a deficiency in the functions of vision due to damage or malfunction of visual pathways and visual centres in the brain. CVI can lead to a reduction in visual acuity, a reduction in visual field and an impaired ability to make sense of visual images. Visual difficulties may also be accentuated by associated disorders of the control of eye movements
CHARGE	CHARGE syndrome is a recognisable genetic pattern of birth defects. Historically the letters in CHARGE stand for: C oloboma of the eye, H ear defects, A tresia of the choanae, R etardation of growth and/or development, G enital and/or urinary abnormalities, and E ar abnormalities and deafness. However, the clinical diagnosis is now made on a combination of major and minor features

Glossary 1.4 Definition of terms continued

Complex needs	Needs are often described in terms of severity and multiplicity. 'Complex needs' typically refers to needs which span more than one of the four main areas of need i.e. communication and interaction; cognition and learning; behaviour, emotional and social development; sensory and/or physical
Early Years	Birth to statutory school age
Habilitation Specialist	A person qualified to provide mobility and independent living skills training for CYP in educational settings
Nystagmus	A condition which varies throughout the day, can affect time to see, depth perception, field of vision, the ability to see motion and scan, and can also cause temporary oscillopsia (sense that the world is moving) among other impacts
Oculomotor Disorders	Disorders that feature impairment of eye movements. There are various reasons for oculomotor disorders depending on the underlying cause
Parents/carers	All those who have responsibility for the care of CYP

1.4.3 Classification of sensory loss

Hearing loss

The British Society of Audiology descriptors have been adopted for hearing loss. These descriptors are based on the average hearing threshold levels at 250, 500, 1000, 2000 and 4000Hz in the better ear. No response is taken to have a value of 130 dBHL.

Mild hearing loss	Unaided threshold 20-40 dBHL
Moderate hearing loss	Unaided threshold 41-70 dBHL
Severe hearing loss	Unaided threshold 71-95 dBHL
Profound hearing loss	Unaided threshold in excess of 95 dBHL

Vision loss

- From a functional standpoint a CYP can be considered to have VI if this interferes with optimal development, learning and achievements, unless adaptations are made in the methods of presenting learning experiences, the nature of the materials used and/or the learning environment (ref. Barragan's definition cited in Flanagan et al, 2003, p 497). This definition includes children and young people with other disabilities/impairments in addition to VI, including those with profound and complex needs. NB The term 'learning' includes not just academic learning but the acquisition of mobility, life and social skills that in the case of a CYP with VI would be provided through habilitation education.
- The following classification applies to corrected vision with both eyes open.
- **Acuity criteria are for guidance purposes only.** The professional judgement of a QTVI should be applied as necessary to decide on the classification. For example, a CYP may have a mild reduction in visual acuity but be functioning within a different visual category due to an additional ophthalmic condition, e.g. an oculomotor disorder such as nystagmus, visual field reduction, cerebral vision impairment, and/or additional learning difficulties).
- In the case of a CYP undergoing a patching programme, the framework can be applied whilst the CYP is patched with further vision assessment carried out following the programme.

Distance vision

Mild vision loss	Within the range 6/12 - 6/18 Snellen/Kay (LogMAR 0.3 – 0.48)
Moderate vision loss	Less than 6/19 - 6/36 Snellen/Kay (LogMAR 0.5 – 0.78)
Severe vision loss	Less than 6/36 - 6/120 Snellen/Kay (LogMAR 0.8 – 1.3)
Profound vision loss	Less than 6/120 Snellen/Kay (LogMAR 1.32+)

Near vision

Refer to standardized tests such as Kays, BUST, Maclure at 33 cms. Please use professional judgement and note any additional factors such as crowding or processing.

Mild vision loss	N14-18
Moderate vision loss	N18-24
Severe vision loss	N24-36
Profound vision loss	Educationally blind/Braille user/can access small quantities of print larger than N36

Multi-sensory loss

For the purposes of the Eligibility Framework, multi-sensory impairment applies where a child or young person has combined vision and hearing impairments, which may include a functional loss in one or both of these senses, that create difficulty in accessing the curriculum and engaging in daily life experiences.

The Policy Statement ‘Pupil Level Annual School Census Definitions (PLASC)’, published by the DfES (2005), states that: “(pupils with multi-sensory impairment) have a combination of visual and hearing difficulties. They are sometimes referred to as deaf blind but may have some residual sight and or hearing. Many also have additional disabilities but their complex needs mean that it may be difficult to ascertain their intellectual abilities.”

NB As a unilateral loss has significant implications for CYP with MSI (i.e. they are unable to rely on the other distance sense to compensate for/support access to information as would be the case for a child with a single sensory impairment) the MSI criteria within the Framework apply to unilateral as well as bilateral CYP.

Mild multi-sensory loss	Dual impairment with a mild loss in both modalities
Moderate multi-sensory loss	Dual impairment with a moderate loss in both or the most affected modality
Severe multi-sensory loss	Dual impairment with a severe loss in both or the most affected modality
Profound multi-sensory loss	Dual impairment with a profound loss in one modality and a mild/moderate loss in the other
	Educationally blind and severe/profound hearing loss

Please refer to the HI and VI tables for clarification of the terms mild, moderate, severe and profound.

Unilateral sensory loss

Unilateral loss refers to either a hearing loss affecting only one ear or a vision loss affecting only one eye.

2. NatSIP ELIGIBILITY FRAMEWORK FOR SCORING SUPPORT LEVELS

2.1 Hearing Impairment Form

Name:	Date of Birth:	ToD:
Educational placement:		Date:

Hearing loss reference table

The British Society of Audiology descriptors have been adopted for hearing loss. These descriptors are based on the average hearing threshold levels at 250, 500, 1000, 2000 and 4000Hz in the better ear where no response is taken to have a value of 130 dBHL. 4000Hz in the better ear where *no response* is taken to have a value of 130 dBHL).

Mild hearing loss	Unaided threshold 20-40 dBHL
Moderate hearing loss	Unaided threshold 41-70 dBHL
Severe hearing loss	Unaided threshold 71-95 dBHL
Profound hearing loss	Unaided threshold in excess of 95 dBHL

Please use the MSI form if a CYP also has vision impairment.

NB In the following criterion tables the 'Comments' box allows the entry of any information which may have guided the option selection.

Criterion 1: Degree of HI (using British Society of Audiology descriptors)		Score
a	Does not meet the minimum unaided threshold for classification of hearing loss. (Do not continue with the completion of this form)	0
b	Unilateral/Fluctuating conductive HI	3
c	Mild HI/CI functioning as mild HI	6
d	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Moderate longstanding conductive HI/Moderate HI/CI functioning as moderate HI ■ Mild HI with conductive overlay/Unilateral HI with conductive overlay ■ Neo-natal conductive HI and throughout early years/Functional moderate loss due to auditory neuropathy 	8
e	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Severe HI (including significant high frequency)/CI functioning as severe HI ■ Moderate HI with conductive overlay/Functional severe loss due to auditory neuropathy 	10
f	Profound HI/Profound functional loss due to auditory neuropathy/CI functioning as profound HI	12
Comments		CYP Score

2.1 Hearing Impairment Form continued

Criterion 2: Additional factors relating to HI		Score
a	No relevant additional factors	0
b	Late diagnosis of presumed congenital, permanent HI which continues to impact on language development – period from presumed onset: 6 mths – 2 yrs	2
	– period from presumed onset: over 2 years	5
c	Continuing assessment of HI required e.g. fluctuating condition, deteriorating/degenerative/progressive loss	5
d	Recently acquired permanent HI (within the last 6 months)	5
Comments		CYP Score

Criterion 3.1: Impact of the CYP's HI on language and communication development		Score
a	Expected/better than expected progress in language without the need for further management strategies or service monitoring	0
b	Expected progress given appropriate management strategies and service monitoring and advice	4
c	Language and communication require targeted support from the service in order for the learner to make expected progress and to access the curriculum	8
d	Learner is making less than expected progress, or is at risk of making less than expected progress, and requires a high level of intensive support from the service	14
Comments		CYP Score

Criterion 3.2: Impact of the CYP's HI on access to learning and the curriculum (particularly English, mathematics and science)		Score
a	Expected/better than expected progress that does not need additional input	0
b	Less than expected progress	4
c	Significantly less than expected progress	6
Comments		CYP Score

2.1 Hearing Impairment Form continued

Criterion 4: Use of personal hearing aids or cochlear implant		Score
a	No additional assistive listening technology required	0
b	Learner uses personal aids/CI/other technology at home and/or in educational placement in a way that enables the child or young person to make good progress and achieve good outcomes	2
c	Learner uses personal aids/CI/other technology effectively and consistently but does not independently manage personal aids/CI/other technology	4
d	Learner uses personal aids/CI/other technology reluctantly/ineffectively/inconsistently or does not use prescribed amplification and this affects access to the curriculum	6
e	Learner recently issued with personal aids; use of equipment still being assessed/established	8
f	Learner has received CI within the last two years	8
Comments		CYP Score

Criterion 5.1: Training and mentoring requirement		Score
a	Key staff/parents/carers have knowledge and understanding of the impact of HI on all key areas	0
b	Key staff/parents/carers require additional or continuing training and/or mentoring on HI and use of specialist equipment	6
c	Key staff/parents/carers new to HI and require initial intensive training and/or mentoring	8
d	Key staff/parents/carers need a high level of ongoing intensive training from the service e.g. to develop signing/note taking skills	10
Comments		CYP Score

2.1 Hearing Impairment Form continued

Criterion 5.2: Transition support (i.e. change of placement)		Score
a	Transition not currently relevant to the CYP	0
b	Low contribution required as the service is confident that the learner can make a successful transition with minimal additional support	3
c	Moderate contribution requiring enhanced transition arrangements	5
d	High contribution required as a high level of training is needed and the learner requires a high level of support from the service to make a successful transition	8
Comments		CYP Score

Criterion 6: Support for effective use of specialist equipment by the learner and key staff (e.g. radio aid/soundfield systems)		Score
a	No additional assistive listening technology required	0
b	Low level of support needed to check and support the independent use of specialist equipment and awareness of functioning e.g. 3 x per year	2
c	Moderate level of support needed to check and support the independent use of specialist equipment and awareness of functioning e.g. hearing aid testing 6 x per year	6
d	High level of support needed e.g. at least monthly equipment checks and support for the independent use of equipment and for combining the technologies required, or for a new user of equipment	8
Comments		CYP Score

2.1 Hearing Impairment Form continued

Criterion 7: Physical learning environment (following a learning environment audit by ToD). NB factors affecting the quality of the acoustic and visual environment are outlined in the Appendix at 2.4		Score
a	Learning environment which meets appropriate acoustic and visual standards for HI pupils and supports inclusive learning for the HI learner	0
b	Learning environment which supports inclusive learning for the HI learner and which will include reasonable adjustments in relation to acoustics, lighting and visual reinforcement (e.g. audio-visual multimedia support)	2
c	Learning environment which supports aspects of inclusive learning for the HI learner and which will include some reasonable adjustments in relation to acoustics, lighting and visual reinforcement (e.g. interactive whiteboards; visual reinforcement to help the learner to adapt to different learning environments e.g. in secondary settings)	5
d	Learning environment which needs considerable improvement to meet acoustic standards (e.g. highly reverberant, high level of noise – background and external, poor lighting and inadequate technology for visual/sound reinforcement)	8
Comments		CYP Score

Criterion 8: Impact of the CYP's HI on personal, social and emotional learning		Score
a	No/minimal impact on personal, social and emotional learning	0
b	Low level of impact upon the development of personal, social and emotional learning skills	2
c	Moderate level of impact upon the development of personal, social and emotional learning skills	4
d	High level of impact upon the development of personal, social and emotional learning skills (e.g. CYP displays a low level of emotional resilience requiring a high level of additional support; long term support required for emotional/personal/social learning needs)	6
Comments		CYP Score

2.1 Hearing Impairment Form continued

Criterion 9: Additional factors relating to family support (e.g. acceptance of HI; family speaks English as an additional language; LA as corporate parent)		Score
a	No additional factors relating to family support	0
b	Family requires a low level of additional support	2
c	Family requires a moderate level of additional support	4
d	Family requires a high level of additional support	6
Comments		CYP Score

Criterion 10: Multi-agency liaison/role (including Safeguarding)		Score
a	Minimal multi-agency liaison/role requirement	0
b	ToD contributes to multi-agency working for learner	2
c	ToD contributes to multi-agency working for learner with complex support needs	4
d	ToD is the keyworking professional identified for EY/school aged/post-16 learner	6
e	ToD is the keyworking professional for learner with complex support needs requiring a high level of liaison and joint working with other professionals	9
Comments		CYP Score

SCORING SUMMARY SHEET

CYP SCORE TABLE

Criterion	Score
1	
2	
3.1	
3.2	
4	
5.1	
5.2	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
Total Score	

SERVICE SUPPORT ALLOCATION MATRIX

Total Score Range	Support Category	Support Allocation

Evidence underpinning any professional adjustment made to the CYP's matrix support allocation:

2.2 Vision Impairment Form

Name:	Date of Birth:	QTVI:
Educational placement:		Date:
Registration: yes/no/don't know Certification: yes/no/don't know		

Vision loss reference tables

Acuity criteria are for guidance purposes only. The professional judgement of a QTVI should be applied as necessary to decide on the classification. For example, a CYP may have a mild reduction in visual acuity but be functioning within a different visual category due to an additional ophthalmic condition, e.g. an oculomotor disorder such as nystagmus, visual field reduction, cerebral vision impairment, and/or additional learning difficulties).

Distance vision

Mild vision loss	Within the range 6/12 - 6/18 Snellen/Kay (LogMAR 0.3 – 0.48)
Moderate vision loss	Less than 6/19 - 6/36 Snellen/Kay (LogMAR 0.5 – 0.78)
Severe vision loss	Less than 6/36 - 6/120 Snellen/Kay (LogMAR 0.8 – 1.3)
Profound vision loss	Less than 6/120 Snellen/Kay (LogMAR 1.32+)

Near vision

Refer to standardized tests such as Kays, BUST, Maclure at 33 cms. Please use professional judgement and note any additional factors such as crowding or processing.

Mild vision loss	N14-18
Moderate vision loss	N18-24
Severe vision loss	N24-36
Profound vision loss	Educationally blind/Braille user/can access small quantities of print larger than N36

Please use the MSI form if a CYP also has hearing impairment.

NB In the following criterion tables the 'Comments' box allows the entry of any information which may have guided the option selection.

2.2 Vision Impairment Form continued

Criterion 1.1: Degree of VI - distance (corrected vision with both eyes open – see Vision loss reference table above)		Score
a	Does not have a vision impairment	0
b	Monocular/Mild/Fluctuating VI (with reasonable vision for a considerable amount of time)/ Functional mild loss due to CVI or other visual factors such as visual field loss or nystagmus	2
c	Moderate/Fluctuating VI/Functional moderate loss due to CVI or other visual factors such as visual field loss or nystagmus	4
d	Severe/Fluctuating VI/Functional severe loss due to CVI or other visual factors such as visual field loss or nystagmus	6
e	Profound VI/Functional profound loss due to CVI or other visual factors such as visual field loss or nystagmus	7
Comments		CYP Score

Criterion 1.2: Degree of VI - near (corrected vision with both eyes open - see Vision loss reference table above)		Score
a	Does not have a vision impairment	0
b	Monocular/Mild/Fluctuating VI (with reasonable vision for a considerable amount of time)/ Functional mild loss due to CVI or other visual factors such as visual field loss or nystagmus	2
c	Moderate/Fluctuating VI/Functional moderate loss due to CVI or other visual factors such as visual field loss or nystagmus	4
d	Severe/Fluctuating VI/Functional severe loss due to CVI or other visual factors such as visual field loss or nystagmus	6
e	Profound VI/Functional profound loss due to CVI or other visual factors such as visual field loss or nystagmus	8
Comments		CYP Score

2.2 Vision Impairment Form continued

Criterion 2: Additional factors relating to VI		Score
a	No relevant additional factors	0
b	Late referral of permanent VI (more than 12 months from presumed onset)	5
c	Continuing assessment of VI required e.g. fluctuating condition, deteriorating/degenerative/progressive loss	5
d	Recently acquired permanent VI (within the last 6 months)	5
Comments		CYP Score

Criterion 3: Impact of the CYP's VI on language and communication development and on access to learning and the curriculum (particularly English, mathematics and science)		Score
a	Expected/better than expected progress that does not need additional input	0
b	The learner requires assessment and advice from a QTVI	4
c	The learner requires a short-term programme delivered by a QTVI to develop skills that enable access to the curriculum e.g. touch-typing, developing independence and self-advocacy	8
d	The learner requires a long-term programme delivered and maintained by a QTVI e.g. Braille	14
Comments		CYP Score

2.2 Vision Impairment Form continued

Criterion 4: Development of habilitation skills		Score
a	The learner has no issues affecting independent mobility or daily living skills	0
b	The learner requires assessment and advice by a Habilitation Specialist qualified to work with CYP	2
c	The learner needs a structured approach to develop independence, self-organisational skills and functional life skills	3
d	The learner requires a short-term programme delivered by a Habilitation Specialist	4
e	The learner has CVI/complex needs/is non-ambulant (wheelchair)/has developmental mobility or balance and co-ordination issues affecting independent mobility. Requires support from a Habilitation Specialist and liaison with an Occupational Therapist or Physiotherapist	6
f	The learner requires a long-term programme delivered and maintained by a Habilitation Specialist	8
Comments		CYP Score

Criterion 5.1: Training and mentoring requirement		Score
a	Key staff/parents/carers have knowledge and understanding of the impact of VI on all key areas	0
b	Key staff/parents/carers require additional or continuing training and/or mentoring on VI	6
c	Key staff/parents/carers new to VI and require initial intensive training and/or mentoring	8
d	Key staff need tuition in Braille/use of specialist equipment	10
Comments		CYP Score

2.2 Vision Impairment Form continued

Criterion 5.2: Transition support (i.e. change of placement)		Score
a	Transition not currently relevant to the CYP	0
b	Low contribution required as the service is confident that the learner can make a successful transition with minimal additional support	3
c	Moderate contribution due to enhanced transition arrangements	5
d	High contribution required as a high level of training is needed and the learner requires a high level of support from the service to make a successful transition	10
Comments		CYP Score

Criterion 6: Support for effective use of specialist equipment by learner and key staff (may include CCTVs, LVAs, Braille, tactile and speech access and adaptation of print materials)		Score
a	No additional assistive technology required	0
b	Low level of support including short-term programme	2
c	Moderate level of support including short-term programme and some regular monitoring	4
d	New user of equipment requiring longer-term programme and refresher programmes	6
e	High level of support including Braille equipment	8
Comments		CYP Score

2.2 Vision Impairment Form continued

Criterion 7: Physical learning environment. NB factors affecting the quality of the acoustic and visual environment are outlined in the Appendix at 2.4		Score
a	Learning environment which meets appropriate acoustic and visual standards for VI pupils and supports inclusive learning for the VI learner	0
b	Learning environment which supports inclusive learning for the VI learner and which will include reasonable adjustments in relation to acoustics, lighting, carpets and blinds and minimal reflections off surfaces	2
c	Learning environment which supports aspects of inclusive learning for the VI learner and which will include some reasonable adjustments in relation to acoustics, lighting and visual contrast. (Educational placement requires an informal audit by QTVI)	5
d	Learning environment which needs considerable improvement to meet appropriate acoustic and visual standards (e.g. highly reverberant, high level of noise interference, inconsistent room layout, inappropriate lighting, physical hazards). Environment will need to accommodate physical and learning access needs of a Braille user. Educational placement requires a full environmental audit by a Habilitation Specialist. A referral to an audiologist may also be needed	8
Comments		CYP Score

Criterion 8: Impact of the CYP's VI on personal, social and emotional learning		Score
a	No/minimal impact on personal, social and emotional learning	0
b	Low level of impact upon the development of personal, social and emotional learning skills	2
c	Moderate level of impact upon the development of personal, social and emotional learning skills	4
d	High level of impact upon the development of personal, social and emotional learning skills (e.g. CYP displays a low level of emotional resilience requiring a high level of additional support; long term support required for emotional/personal/social learning needs)	6
Comments		CYP Score

2.2 Vision Impairment Form continued

Criterion 9: Additional factors relating to family support (e.g. acceptance of VI; family speaks English as an additional language; LA as corporate parent)		Score
a	No additional factors relating to family support	0
b	Family requires a low level of additional support	2
c	Family requires a moderate level of additional support	4
d	Family requires a high level of additional support	6
Comments		CYP Score

Criterion 10: Multi-agency liaison/role (including Safeguarding)		Score
a	Minimal multi-agency liaison/role requirement	0
b	QTVI contributes to multi-agency working for learner	2
c	QTVI contributes to multi-agency working for learner with complex needs	4
d	QTVI is the keyworking professional identified for EY/school aged/post-16 learner	6
e	QTVI is the keyworking professional for learner with complex support needs requiring a high level of liaison and joint working with other professionals	10
Comments		CYP Score

SCORING SUMMARY SHEET

CYP SCORE TABLE

Criterion	Score
1.1	
1.2	
2	
3	
4	
5.1	
5.2	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
Total Score	

SERVICE SUPPORT ALLOCATION MATRIX

Total Score Range	Support Category	Support Allocation

Evidence underpinning any professional adjustment made to the CYP's matrix support allocation:

2.3 Multi-Sensory Impairment Form

Name:	Date of Birth:	QTMSI/VI/ToD:
Educational placement:		Date:

Multi-sensory loss reference table

Mild multi-sensory loss	Dual impairment with a mild loss in both modalities
Moderate multi-sensory loss	Dual impairment with a moderate loss in both or the most affected modality
Severe multi-sensory loss	Dual impairment with a severe loss in both or the most affected modality
Profound multi-sensory loss	Dual impairment with a profound loss in both or the most affected modality
	Educationally blind and severe/profound hearing loss

NB As a unilateral loss has significant implications for CYP with MSI (i.e. they are unable to rely on the other distance sense to compensate for/support access to information as would be the case for a child with a single sensory impairment) the MSI criteria within the Framework apply to unilateral as well as bilateral CYP.

For clarification of the terms mild, moderate, severe and profound the HI and VI loss reference tables are presented below for ease of reference:

Hearing loss reference table

The British Society of Audiology descriptors have been adopted for hearing loss. These descriptors are based on the average hearing threshold levels at 250, 500, 1000, 2000 and 4000Hz in the better ear where no response is taken to have a value of 130 dBHL.

Mild hearing loss	Unaided threshold 20-40 dBHL(0.48)
Moderate hearing loss	Unaided threshold 41-70 dBHL(0.78)
Severe hearing loss	Unaided threshold 71-95 dBHL
Profound vision loss	Unaided threshold in excess of 95 dBHL

Vision loss reference table

Acuity criteria are for guidance purposes only. The professional judgement of a QTVI should be applied as necessary to decide on the classification. For example, a CYP may have a mild reduction in visual acuity but be functioning within a different visual category due to an additional ophthalmic condition, e.g. an oculomotor disorder such as nystagmus, visual field reduction, cerebral vision impairment, and/or additional learning difficulties).

2.3 Multi-sensory Impairment Form continued

Distance vision

Mild vision loss	Within the range 6/12 - 6/18 Snellen/Kay (LogMAR 0.3 – 0.48)
Moderate vision loss	Less than 6/19 - 6/36 Snellen/Kay (LogMAR 0.5 – 0.78)
Severe vision loss	Less than 6/36 - 6/120 Snellen/Kay (LogMAR 0.8 – 1.3)
Profound vision loss	Less than 6/120 Snellen/Kay (LogMAR 1.32+)

Near vision

Refer to standardized tests such as Kays, BUST, Maclure at 33 cms. Please use professional judgement and note any additional factors such as crowding or processing.

Mild vision loss	N14-18
Moderate vision loss	N18-24
Severe vision loss	N24-36
Profound vision loss	Educationally blind/Braille user/can access small quantities of print larger than N36

NB In the following criterion tables the 'Comments' box allows the entry of any information which may have guided the option selection.

2.3 Multi-sensory Impairment Form continued

Criterion 1: Degree of MSI (see Multi-sensory loss reference table above)		Score
a	Does not meet the minimum threshold for classification of multi-sensory impairment. (Do not continue with the completion of this form)	0
b	Mild MSI - dual impairment which has an impact on access and function. Clinical level of hearing and/or vision is uncertain and requires functional observational assessment to feedback to all agencies including parents/carers. Observational assessment indicates functional mild MSI	4
c	Moderate MSI - dual impairment which has an impact on access and function. Clinical level of hearing and/or vision is uncertain - observational assessment indicates functional moderate MSI	5
d	Severe MSI - dual impairment, with severe loss in one modality, which has a considerable impact on access and function. Clinical level of hearing and/or vision is uncertain - observational assessment indicates functional severe MSI	6
e	Profound MSI - dual impairment, with mild/moderate loss in one modality, which has a substantial impact on access and function. Clinical level of hearing and/or vision is uncertain - observational assessment indicates functional profound MSI as described above	7
f	Profound MSI - Educationally blind and severe/profound hearing loss. Clinical level of hearing and/or vision is uncertain - observational assessment indicates functional profound MSI as described above	8
Comments		CYP Score

Criterion 2: Additional factors relating to MSI		Score
a	No additional factors	0
b	Additional physical/vestibular needs/learning difficulty/executive dysfunction which reduce(s) ability to use compensatory/adaptive strategies	5
c	Continuing assessment of MSI required e.g. fluctuating conditions, deteriorating/degenerative/progressive loss (e.g. metabolic disorders, Usher's Syndrome)	5
d	Recently acquired secondary sensory loss of hearing or vision	5
e	Late diagnosis of permanent MSI	5
Comments		CYP Score

2.3 Multi-sensory Impairment Form continued

Criterion 3.1: Impact of MSI on language and communication development		Score
a	Language and communication skills in English are within an age/development appropriate range	0
b	Language and communication skills in English are broadly within an age/development appropriate range but require additional input around curriculum-related vocabulary/concepts	2
c	Language and communication skills are delayed and require targeted support to consolidate emerging communication Or The child communicates effectively in sign (BSL, SSE) or another augmentative mode e.g. symbols, objects of reference etc	6
d	Language and communication needs a high level of targeted support by specialist teacher at individual learner level to establish and develop a mode of communication appropriate to the learner	8
Comments		CYP Score

Criterion 3.2: Impact of the CYP's MSI on access to learning and the curriculum (particularly English, mathematics and science)		Score
a	Expected/better than expected progress that does not need additional input	0
b	Compensatory strategies and adaptations well developed. Learner requires monitoring to ensure access to learning	2
c	Compensatory strategies and adaptations require targeted intervention to ensure access and achieve learning outcomes	5
d	Frequent intervention required to maximize sensory function, develop compensatory strategies and ensure adaptations are effectively implemented to ensure access and achieve learning outcomes	8
Comments		CYP Score

2.3 Multi-sensory Impairment Form continued

Criterion 4.1: Use of personal hearing aids or cochlear implant		Score
a	No personal amplification	0
b	Personal hearing aids/CI are used effectively and consistently	2
c	Personal hearing aids/CI are used effectively and consistently but needs support (to check them and put them in/on)	3
d	Personal hearing aids/CI are not worn consistently and adults need training and support to establish effective use of residual hearing	4
e	Personal hearing aids recently issued and effective use of residual hearing is still being established	6
f	A cochlear implant has been recently issued and effective listening skills are still being established	6
Comments		CYP Score

Criterion 4.2: Development of movement and orientation		Score
a	The learner is independently mobile in familiar and unfamiliar environments and requires no intervention	0
b	The learner is independently mobile in a familiar environment but needs support from a specialist teacher to develop skills in unfamiliar environments	2
c	The combined impact of the visual/hearing impairment requires intervention to structure the environment to motivate the CYP's movement and learning about their immediate environment	4
d	The learner requires intervention in collaboration with a physiotherapist and OT to develop independent mobility and orientation within familiar environments	5
e	The learner is independently mobile (by walking or wheelchair). Learner receives input from a Habilitation Specialist and requires advice and support from a Specialist SI Teacher (MSI/HI/VI) to embed the skills in a range of contexts	6
Comments		CYP Score

2.3 Multi-sensory Impairment Form continued

Criterion 4.3: Independence, self-organisational skills and functional life skills		Score
a	The learner has age/development appropriate skills in all areas	0
b	The learner has acquired some skills but needs planned intervention to generalise these to a range of contexts	2
c	The learner needs a structured approach to develop skills in independence and personal hygiene	3
d	The learner requires some intervention from a specialist teacher to develop and apply their self-organisational skills	5
Comments		CYP Score

Criterion 5.1: Training and mentoring requirement		Score
a	Key staff/parents/carers have knowledge and understanding of the CYP's diagnosis (e.g. CRS, CHARGE, Usher etc.) and the impact of MSI on all key areas	0
b	Key staff/parents/carers require additional or continuing training on MSI and the CYP's diagnosis	2
c	Key staff/parents/carers new to MSI	4
d	Key staff/parents need tuition in Braille/mobility/augmentative or alternative communication/use of specialist equipment	6
Comments		CYP Score

Criterion 5.2: Transition support (i.e. change of placement)		Score
a	No additional training required	0
b	Low contribution (front loaded input) required as the service is confident that the learner can make a successful transition with minimal additional support	2
c	Moderate contribution (front loaded input) requiring enhanced transition arrangements	4
d	High contribution required (front loaded input) as a high level of training is needed and the learner requires a high level of support from the service to make a successful transition	6
Comments		CYP Score

2.3 Multi-sensory Impairment Form continued

Criterion 6.1: Support for effective use of HI specialist equipment by the learner and key staff (e.g. radio aid/soundfield systems)		Score
a	No additional assistive listening technology required	0
b	Low level of support needed to check and support the independent use of specialist equipment and awareness of functioning e.g. 3 x per year	2
c	Moderate level of support needed to check and support the independent use of specialist equipment and awareness of functioning e.g. hearing aid testing 6 x per year	5
d	High level of support needed e.g. at least monthly equipment checks and support for the independent use of equipment and for combining the technologies required, or for a new user of equipment	6
Comments		CYP Score

Criterion 6.2: Support for effective use of specialist VI equipment by learner and key staff (may include CCTVs, LVAs, Braille, tactile and speech access and adaptation of print materials)		Score
a	No equipment or modification required	0
b	Monitoring of modifications of printed materials and access to whiteboards and other AV technology	2
c	Low level of support including short-term programme	2
d	Moderate level of support including short-term programme and some regular monitoring	4
e	New user of equipment requiring longer-term programme and refresher programmes	6
f	High level of support including Braille equipment	8
Comments		CYP Score

2.3 Multi-sensory Impairment Form continued

Criterion 7: Physical learning environment (following a learning environment audit by Specialist SI Teacher [MSI/Hi/VI]). NB factors affecting the quality of the acoustic and visual environment are outlined in the Appendix at 2.4		Score
a	Learning environment which meets appropriate acoustic and visual standards for MSI pupils and supports inclusive learning for the MSI learner	0
b	Learning environment which supports inclusive learning for the MSI learner. This will include a distraction-free learning environment with reasonable adjustments in relation to acoustics, lighting and visual reinforcement, as well as opportunities built into the day to address the learner's sensory integration needs	2
c	Learning environment which needs some improvements to support aspects of inclusive learning for the pupil with MSI and which will include some reasonable adjustments in relation to acoustics, lighting, visual contrast and visual reinforcement (e.g. interactive white boards)	5
d	Learning environment which needs considerable improvement to meet appropriate acoustic and visual standards (e.g. high ambient noise levels, inappropriate lighting and visual clutter)	8
Comments		CYP Score

Criterion 8: Impact of the CYP's MSI on personal, social and emotional learning		Score
a	The level of impact on personal, social and emotional learning is such that support from a specialist teacher is not required	0
b	Low level of impact upon the development of personal, social and emotional learning skills	2
c	Moderate level of impact upon the development of personal, social and emotional learning skills	4
d	High level of impact upon the development of personal, social and emotional learning skills (e.g. CYP displays a low level of emotional resilience requiring a high level of additional support; long term support required for personal, social and emotional learning needs)	6
Comments		CYP Score

2.3 Multi-sensory Impairment Form continued

Criterion 9: Additional factors relating to family support (e.g. acceptance of SI; family speaks English as an additional language; LA as corporate parent)		Score
a	No additional factors relating to family support	0
b	Family requires a low level of additional support	2
c	Family requires a moderate level of additional support	4
d	Family requires a high level of additional support	6
Comments		CYP Score

Criterion 10: Multi-agency liaison/role (including Safeguarding)		Score
a	Minimal multi-agency liaison/role requirement	0
b	Specialist SI Teacher (MSI/HI/VI) contributes to multi-agency working for learner	2
c	Specialist SI Teacher (MSI/HI/VI) contributes to multi-agency working for learner with complex support needs	4
d	Specialist SI Teacher (MSI/HI/VI) is the keyworking professional identified for EY/school aged/post-16 learner	6
e	Specialist SI Teacher (MSI/HI/VI) is the keyworking professional for learner with complex support needs requiring a high level of liaison and joint working with other professionals	8
Comments		CYP Score

SCORING SUMMARY SHEET

CYP SCORE TABLE

Criterion	Score
1	
2	
3.1	
3.2	
4.1	
4.2	
4.3	
5.1	
5.2	
6.1	
6.2	
7	
8	
9	
10	
Total Score	

SERVICE SUPPORT ALLOCATION MATRIX

Total Score Range	Support Category	Support Allocation

Evidence underpinning any professional adjustment made to the CYP's matrix support allocation:

2.4 Appendix: Learning Environment

The following guidance is provided when considering scoring in the Criterion 7 table within the Framework

Hearing Factors

Acoustics

It should be remembered that early diagnosis of hearing loss, good pre-school guidance, cochlear implants and consistent and appropriate hearing aid fitting are making it possible for most deaf pupils to be educated in mainstream classes.

It is therefore important to have realistic targets for acoustic conditions in schools in order to influence either existing provision or new building regulations. Good acoustic conditions benefit all learners and are one of many factors which will support or inhibit successful inclusion.

The impact of background noise levels and reverberation can be mitigated by:

- acoustic treatment: carpets, curtains, doors (and closing doors), soft covers on display tables, ceilings etc..
- INSET to mainstream teachers re management of hearing loss and use of Radio Aids
- good classroom management as it impacts on the acoustic environment
- provision of quiet areas
- monitoring and evaluating the use of personal amplification
- use of visual clues and access through text
- use of Soundfield system
- skilled use of Radio Aids by deaf learners i.e.
 - knowing when they are working correctly
 - being able to assist in fault finding
 - being able to decide the situations when personal amplification is useful
 - using additional leads and adaptors with TVs, computers, etc
 - having the confidence to explain their use to other pupils and teachers

Visual/Tactile Factors

The following factors should be taken into account:

- Materials in appropriate format for the learner
- Learner having the confidence to explain their use to other learners and teachers
- Skilled use of equipment/resources by learners, such as being able to access the whiteboard by knowing the best position to sit, having accessible plugs for equipment use
- Inset to mainstream teachers on management of vision impairment and the use of specialist equipment i.e. video magnifiers, Braille technology

2.4 Appendix: Learning Environment continued

Visual environment

General principles in the provision of an inclusive visual learning environment

Consideration of the quality of:

- Signage - clear and well positioned, easily visible, including tactile symbols or Braille
- Steps, edges, pillars and other transition points highlighted with yellow paint
- Handrails to help with mobility
- Clear panels on doors so people can be seen approaching from the other side
- Attention to lighting – provision of blinds to reduce glare
- Good classroom management – walkways clear, layout of classroom consistent, resources kept in the same place and appropriately marked with print or tactile markers
- Cloakrooms and corridors free of clutter
- A distinction between quiet and active areas in the playground and shaded areas for learners with light sensitivity
- Well-maintained grounds, free of obstructions

Tactile environment

General principles in the provision of an inclusive tactile learning environment

Consideration of the quality of:

- ‘Tactile trails’ – dado rails or other textured material at hand height that learners can follow to find the route to a particular location in the school i.e. toilets, dining hall.
- Differentiation of floor coverings and areas within the school to indicate a change of environment
- Wall displays accessible to touch at child height

3. RECORD SHEETS

3.1 CYP with HI

Name of CYP:	Date of Birth:
--------------	----------------

Date:	Score
1	
2	
3.1	
3.2	
4	
5.1	
5.2	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
TOTAL SCORE	
CATEGORY	

Date:	Score
1	
2	
3.1	
3.2	
4	
5.1	
5.2	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
TOTAL SCORE	
CATEGORY	

Date:	Score
1	
2	
3.1	
3.2	
4	
5.1	
5.2	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
TOTAL SCORE	
CATEGORY	

SERVICE SUPPORT ALLOCATION MATRIX

Total Score Range	Support Category	Support Allocation

Evidence underpinning any professional adjustment made to the CYP's matrix support allocation:

4. CD CONTENTS

Eligibility Framework (Revised 2015) (pdf)

Hearing Impairment Form (WORD)

- Version 1 – Support Allocation Matrix: Blank
- Version 2 – Pre-prepared Support Allocation Matrix

Vision Impairment Form (WORD)

- Version 1 – Support Allocation Matrix: Blank
- Version 2 – Pre-prepared Support Allocation Matrix

Multi-Sensory Impairment Form (WORD)

- Version 1 – Support Allocation Matrix: Blank
- Version 2 – Pre-prepared Support Allocation Matrix

Record Sheet: CYP with HI (WORD)

- Version 1 – Support Allocation Matrix: Blank
- Version 2 – Pre-prepared Support Allocation Matrix

Record Sheet: CYP with VI (WORD)

- Version 1 – Support Allocation Matrix: Blank
- Version 2 – Pre-prepared Support Allocation Matrix

Record Sheet: CYP with MSI (WORD)

- Version 1 – Support Allocation Matrix: Blank
- Version 2 – Pre-prepared Support Allocation Matrix

Please note: The **interactive Forms** for HI, VI and MSI, which automatically enter the CYP's selected scores onto the Scoring Summary Sheet and calculate the Total Score, are not available on the CD but can be downloaded from the NatSIP Website
https://www.natsip.org.uk/index.php/doc-library-login/cat_view/54/88

To access the documents you will need to be registered and logged in on the NatSIP Website. Registration is free and open to all. If you need help with registration, a guide/walkthrough can be found at
<https://www.natsip.org.uk/files/howtos/Website%20registration%20howto%20Mar%202015.pdf>

Any amendments required to the Summer 2015 Edition of the Eligibility Framework and forms will be made to the NatSIP Website versions and dated accordingly.



Lindsey Rousseau
National Sensory Impairment Partnership
(NatSIP) Facilitator
lindsey.rousseau@natsip.org.uk
www.natsip.org.uk



Department
for Education

