



Consortium for Research in Deaf Education

CRIDE report on 2012 survey on educational provision for deaf children in England

INTRODUCTION

In 2012, the Consortium for Research into Deaf Education (CRIDE) carried out its second annual survey on educational staffing and service provision for deaf children in the 2011/12 financial year¹. This report sets out the results of the survey for England and is intended for heads of services, policy makers in local and central government and anyone with an interest in deaf education.

SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

- There are at least 37,414 deaf children in England; a reported increase of 7% since 2011. This is likely to be due to improved reporting.
- 82% of deaf children attend mainstream schools (of which 7% are in mainstream schools with specialist resource provisions for deaf children).
- 21% of deaf children are recorded as having an additional special educational need. The most common additional need appears to be moderate learning difficulties.
- Around 7% of deaf children have at least one cochlear implant.
- 78% of deaf children communicate using spoken English only. 14% speak another spoken language, either on its own or in combination with English. 8% use sign language in some form, either on its own or alongside spoken English.
- Less than a quarter of school aged deaf children (23%) identified by CRIDE have a statement of special educational needs.
- There are at least 1,136 Teachers of the Deaf in employment. Though the reported number of deaf children has increased, the number of Teachers of the Deaf in employment has declined by 2% since last year.
- Across England, on average, each peripatetic Teacher of the Deaf is working with around 46 deaf children. In 15% of services, the ratio is over 80 to 1.
- Teachers of the Deaf in resource provisions are proportionally less likely to have the mandatory qualification in teaching deaf children, compared to peripatetic Teachers of the Deaf.
- There are at least 1,270 other specialist support staff working with deaf children in England, a 2% increase since last year.

¹ Reports from 2011 can be found on the BATOD website at <http://www.batod.org.uk/index.php?id=publications/survey> or on the NDCS website at www.ndcs.org.uk/data.

Responses were received from 127 services in England, covering 146 local authority areas. At the time of writing, no response was received at all from 6 services. This means that this CRIDE survey achieved a response rate of 95%. The overall response rate is slightly down on last year (98%). However, our perception is that the survey has been completed more consistently this year and the quality of the data provided by services has considerably improved, year on year. CRIDE would like to take the opportunity to thank all services for taking the time in responding, despite the considerable time constraints many services are subject to.

Using the results

The CRIDE survey has impact for all its users. This report is disseminated via the websites of NDCS and BATOD thus making the findings easily available to all users: professionals and researchers, deaf people and parents of deaf children. These users can take advantage of uniquely current data in different ways:

- Heads of schools and services for deaf children can draw on comparable demographic findings when preparing for internal and external audits of local provision. Having access to annual data can assist in ensuring that deaf children are identified and provided for effectively.
- For managers, the data set can reliably inform strategic planning relating to staffing and staff training matters - trends can be identified that inform these concerns.
- Researchers into deaf education who contribute to evidence-based practice will have access to relevant, useful information about the population being studied.
- Parents of deaf children and deaf children will find the report interesting and informative in establishing what national provision for deaf children looks like.

Interpreting the results

Though we believe the quality of the data has improved, many services still report difficulties in extracting data about deaf children in their area and there remain inconsistencies in how different questions are completed throughout the survey. **Therefore, the results should continue to be used with caution.**

Throughout the report, we have highlighted any notable differences between the findings from this survey and that of the CRIDE 2011 survey. **Again, caution is needed in making comparisons due to slight improvements to how questions were phrased from year to year and also differences in response rates between the two surveys.**

For the purpose of this survey, deaf children was defined as of all children with sensorineural and **permanent** conductive deafness, using the descriptors provided by the British Society of Audiology and BATOD. We used the word 'deaf' to include all levels of deafness, from mild to profound.

Contents

This note has 6 parts, as set out below:

| | |
|---|----|
| PART 1: Overall number of deaf children in England (“belonging”)..... | 3 |
| PART 2: Number of deaf children supported..... | 9 |
| PART 3: Teachers of the Deaf | 14 |
| PART 4: Other specialist staff | 19 |
| PART 5: Eligibility criteria and funding arrangements | 22 |
| PART 6: Concluding thoughts | 30 |
| PART 7: Background and methodology | 31 |

PART 1: Overall number of deaf children in England (“belonging”)

Services were asked to give details of deaf children “belonging” to the service. “Belonging” was defined as: all deaf children who live in the local authority².

How many deaf children are there?

When giving figures for numbers of deaf children belonging, services were first asked to give an overall figure and then asked to provide a breakdown by level of deafness and educational setting. We found that some services did not always provide this data consistently; for example, a small number of services did not give an overall figure but went on to give breakdowns. Separately, several services gave broken-down figures where the sum generated a different total than that given elsewhere in the survey. Only 39% of services were able to give a figure for the total number of deaf children that was consistent through a series of key questions on numbers of deaf children belonging.

Furthermore, 38 services later gave a figure for the number of children being supported that was the same as the number belonging. While it is possible that some services are providing support more than once a year to *all* deaf children in their area, CRIDE continues to be concerned that some services may only be providing figures for children belonging that they actively support – i.e. children who do not receive support are not being recorded as belonging in the area as they are unknown to the service.

Coming up with a clear answer to the question of how many deaf children there are is therefore not straightforward and figures need to be used with caution. For this report, we have taken the approach of using the highest figure given from either the overall total or the total generated through the sum of the broken-down figures. We do this because we want to ensure we’ve captured as many deaf children as possible³. Where we have done this, we refer to this as the “adjusted total” throughout this report.

Based on responses from 126 services covering 145 local authorities, the adjusted total number of deaf children in England is **37,414**. Given that we are missing responses from 5% of services, the true figure is likely to be higher. This is up from 34,927 in 2010/11. Unadjusted figures are set out below.

Table 1: Figures generated when calculating how many deaf children there are

| | Total generated |
|--|-----------------|
| Adjusted total | 37,414 |
| Total given when asked how many children overall | 36,392 |
| Total given when asked about number of children, broken down by level of deafness | 35,895 |
| Total given when asked about number of children, broken down by educational setting | 33,545 |

² This includes deaf children who live within the local authority boundary but attend schools outside of the local authority. It excludes deaf children who live outside of the local authority but attend schools within the authority.

³ This does of course create a risk that overall figures have been inflated through inclusion of over-estimates by services of numbers of deaf children. But given what we know about similarities between the number of deaf children recorded as belonging and supported, the alternative risk that we are under-estimating the overall number of deaf children seems more acute.

What the survey tells us about the population of deaf children in England

The tables below provide breakdowns by age, level of deafness and region.

Table 2: Number of children belonging, by age

| Age group | Number of deaf children reported | Percentage of total (unadjusted) |
|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Preschool | 5,236 | 15% |
| Primary | 15,612 | 43% |
| Secondary | 12,275 | 34% |
| Young people in maintained sixth forms (years 12 to 13) | 1,744 | 5% |
| Young people in education who have completed year 11 but not in maintained sixth forms (e.g. in FE, apprenticeships, other) | 1,028 | 3% |
| Total (unadjusted) (n=124) | 35,895 | |

Proportionally, the above figures are consistent with those from the CRIDE 2011 survey though the proportion of secondary aged pupils has dipped slightly from 36% to 34%.

Looking at the number of reported 'post 16' deaf young people, 19 services (15% of services) do not report having any deaf young people in maintained sixth forms. In terms of other post 16 deaf young people in education (i.e. in FE, apprenticeships, etc.) 60 services (48% of services) do not report having any other deaf young people in this category in their area. CRIDE believes that this reflects the difficulties that some services have in identifying these deaf young people rather than a complete absence of deaf young people in post 16 education in these areas.

Table 3: Number of children belonging, by level of deafness

| Level of deafness | Number of deaf children reported | Percentage of total (unadjusted) |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Unilateral⁴ | 5,390 | 16% |
| Mild | 9,701 | 29% |
| Moderate | 10,541 | 31% |
| Severe | 3,639 | 11% |
| Profound | 4,238 | 13% |
| Total (unadjusted) (n=124) | 33,509 | |

Again, proportionally, the above figures are broadly consistent with those from the CRIDE 2011 survey with proportions only differing by no more than 1 percentage point.

⁴ Unilateral refers to a hearing loss in just one ear.

Table 4: Number of children, belonging by educational setting

| Type of educational provision | | Number of deaf children | Percentage of total (unadjusted) |
|-----------------------------------|--|-------------------------|----------------------------------|
| In local authority | Supported at home – pre school children | 4,343 | 13% |
| | Supported at home – of school age and home educated | 85 | 0.3% |
| | Mainstream state funded schools (including academies and free schools) | 20,584 | 61% |
| | Independent (non state funded) mainstream schools | 571 | 2% |
| | Resource provision in mainstream schools | 2,147 | 6% |
| | Special schools for deaf pupils – maintained by local authority | 110 | 0.3% |
| | Special schools for deaf pupils – non maintained | 43 | 0.1% |
| | Other special schools, not specifically for deaf children | 3,097 | 9% |
| Out of local authority | All post 16 provision (e.g. FE, apprenticeships, etc. excluding those in mainstream stated funded sixth forms) | 794 | 2% |
| | Mainstream state funded schools (including academies and free schools) | 320 | 1% |
| | Independent (non state funded) mainstream schools | 118 | 0.4% |
| | Resource provision in mainstream schools | 212 | 0.6% |
| | Special schools for deaf pupils - maintained by LA | 230 | 0.7% |
| | Special schools for deaf pupils – non-maintained | 425 | 1.3% |
| | Other special school, not specifically for deaf children | 158 | 0.5% |
| | Other independent school | 12 | 0.04% |
| Other | All post 16 provision (e.g. FE, apprenticeships, etc. excluding those in mainstream stated funded sixth forms) | 88 | 0.3% |
| | NEET (Not in education, employment or training) (Post 16 only) | 19 | 0.1% |
| | Other (e.g. Pupil referral units) | 78 | 0.2% |
| | Not known | 111 | 0.3% |
| Total (unadjusted) (n=126) | | 33,545 | |

Table 5: Breakdown of types of educational provision, by whether in or out of home local authority

| Type of educational provision (excluding 'other' and 'not known') | Number of deaf children | Percentage of total |
|---|-------------------------|---------------------|
| In home local authority | 31,774 | 95% |
| Out of home local authority | 1,563 | 5% |
| Total (n=126) | 33,337 | |

Table 6: Breakdown of types of educational provision (regardless of whether in or out of local authority)

| Type of educational provision (regardless of whether in or out of local authority) | Number of deaf children | Percentage of total | Percentage of total school-aged children (i.e. excluding pre-school children) |
|---|-------------------------|---------------------|---|
| Supported at home – pre-school | 4,343 | 13% | - |
| Mainstream provision (including academies and independent schools) | 21,605 | 64% | 74% |
| Mainstream provision: resource provision | 2,359 | 7% | 8% |
| Special schools for deaf pupils | 808 | 2% | 3% |
| Other special schools | 3,255 | 10% | 11% |
| All post 16 provision (e.g. FE, apprenticeships, etc. excluding those in mainstream stated funded sixth forms) | 882 | 3% | 3% |
| Other (e.g. Pupil referral units, NEET, home educated, not known) | 293 | 1% | 1% |
| Total (n=126) | 33,545 | | |
| Total (excluding pre-school children) | 29,202 | | |

The CRIDE 2011 survey asked about educational provision in the context of deaf children receiving support, rather than all those who live in a particular area, so direct comparisons between the two surveys are not straightforward. In addition, the categories were changed to allow for more sophisticated analysis. However, it is striking to note that the proportion of deaf children in special schools for deaf children has fallen from 6% to 3% since 2010/11. One possible or partial explanation for this is that the previous survey grouped together special schools for deaf

children with independent schools. This survey has more clearly split the two. In addition, the previous survey did not specifically ask about deaf young people in post 16 provision.

The CRIDE 2012 results show that 82% of school aged deaf children appear to be in mainstream settings (of which 8% are in resource provisions). This proportion is very slightly up from 81% in 2011.

The smallest service reported 56 deaf children belonging in their boundaries. The largest reported 1,096 deaf children. The average number of deaf children belonging in each service was 294.

Table 7: Number of deaf children belonging, by region

| Region (Proportion of services who responded) | Number of deaf children reported (adjusted) | Percentage of total (adjusted) |
|---|---|--------------------------------|
| East England (10/11) | 3,291 | 9% |
| East Midlands (8/8) | 2,436 | 7% |
| London (28/32) | 5,642 | 15% |
| North East (9/9) | 2,056 | 5% |
| North West (21/23) | 5,346 | 14% |
| South East (14/14) | 5,750 | 15% |
| South West (10/10) | 3,318 | 9% |
| West Midlands (13/13) | 4,751 | 13% |
| Yorkshire & Humber (13/13) | 4,824 | 13% |
| Total (adjusted) (126/133) | 37,414 | |

Given the different response rates by different regions, the above figures should be used with particular caution in making conclusions about the prevalence of deaf children in different regions. In terms of year on year changes, the only region reporting a shift of more than 1 percentage point is East England – up from 7% in 2010/11.

Incidence of Auditory Neuropathy Spectrum Disorder (ANSD)

102 services gave a figure in response to a question on how many deaf children had ANSD in their area. It was not always clear whether other services did not give a figure because they do not have any children with ANSD or because they do not know whether they do. However, based on these responses, there are 410 deaf children in England with this condition, 1% of all deaf children (adjusted total).

The highest percentage of ANSD in a single service was 4.4%. The average number of children with ANSD in each service that responded to the survey was around 4.

Due to newborn hearing screening protocols, ANSD is only reliably diagnosed following test procedures undertaken in those children who have spent time in Neonatal Intensive Care Units (NICU) and is not diagnosed following the screen used in the 'well baby' population. Universal newborn hearing screening has been in place in England since 2006. Figures provided through the newborn hearing screening programme indicate that around 1 in 10 congenitally deaf children have ANSD. This suggests therefore some underreporting by services. This is probably due to under-identification of ANSD in older deaf children – those who did not receive newborn screening because they were born before the roll-out of universal screening in 2006, those 'well babies' who passed screening and were identified later, and those with acquired/progressive deafness who have not been tested for ANSD.

Incidence of additional special educational needs (SEN)

110 services were able to tell us how many deaf children had an additional SEN. The figures show that the adjusted total number of deaf children with an additional SEN is 7,897. This is 21% of the adjusted total of deaf children, up from 19% in 2010/11.

Services were then asked to give a breakdown by type of additional special educational need. For this question, many services were not able to give a breakdown so the adjusted total is somewhat larger than the unadjusted total comprising the sum of the broken-down figures (6,985). Services were asked to breakdown this figure by type of SEN, using the classification set out in the SEN Code of Practice. In some cases, it is apparent that some individual deaf children have been reported twice where they have more than one additional need. We will look to address this in future versions of the survey.

Table 8: Number of deaf children with an additional SEN, by type of SEN

| | Number of deaf children | Percentage of deaf children with an additional SEN (where type of additional SEN known) | Percentage of all deaf children (adjusted total) |
|---|-------------------------|---|--|
| Specific Learning Difficulty | 273 | 4% | 1% |
| Moderate Learning Difficulty | 1,488 | 22% | 4% |
| Severe Learning Difficulty | 1,141 | 17% | 3% |
| Profound & Multiple Learning Difficulty | 532 | 8% | 1% |
| Behaviour, Emotional & Social Difficulties | 401 | 6% | 1% |
| Speech, Language and Communications Needs | 798 | 12% | 2% |
| Visual Impairment | 379 | 6% | 1% |
| Multi-Sensory Impairment | 649 | 10% | 2% |
| Physical Disability | 691 | 10% | 2% |
| Autistic Spectrum Disorder | 351 | 5% | 1% |
| Other Difficulty/Disability | 424 | 6% | 1% |
| Not known | 313 | - | |
| Total (unadjusted) (n=111) | 6,985 | | |
| Total excluding those "not known" (unadjusted) | 6,672 | | |

The figures suggest that the most common additional SEN is moderate learning difficulty, followed by severe learning difficulty and visual impairment (including those categorised as having a multi-sensory impairment).

Research⁵ from 1996 suggested that 40% of deaf children have additional needs. However, this research uses a wide definition of additional needs (including, for example, eczema and cerebral palsy) whereas SEN is normally understood, through the SEN Code of Practice, to refer to where children have a learning difficulty which calls for special educational provision to be made for them. The definition of learning difficulty includes where children have a disability which prevents or hinders them from making use of educational facilities of a kind generally provided for children of the same in age in schools within the local authority area. In addition, this research may also have been based on a small cohort of deaf children, excluding those with mild and unilateral deafness.

⁵ Fortnum et al. (1996) *Health service implication of changes in aetiology and referral patterns of hearing impaired children in the Trent region.*

Deaf children with cochlear implants

121 services were able to provide information about how many deaf children had a cochlear implant⁶. Based on these responses, there are 2,709 deaf children across England with cochlear implants (adjusted total). This is 7% of the adjusted total of deaf children.

Table 9: Number of deaf children belonging with cochlear implants, by age group

| Age | Total with cochlear implants | Total deaf children within each age category | Percentage of total within each age category |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
| Pre-school | 491 | 5,236 | 9% |
| Primary aged | 1,289 | 15,612 | 8% |
| Secondary aged | 715 | 12,275 | 6% |
| Post 16 | 144 | 2,772 | 5% |
| Not known | 21 | - | - |
| Total (unadjusted) (n=121) | 2,685 | 35,895 | 7% |

Proportionally, there has been no change in the number of deaf children with cochlear implants – remaining at 7% since 2010/11.

Additional languages

Table 10: Number of deaf children, by main language spoken in family

| Language | Total | Percentage of responses (where known) |
|--|---------------|---------------------------------------|
| Spoken English | 21,725 | 78% |
| British Sign Language | 456 | 2% |
| Other sign language | 253 | 1% |
| Spoken English together with sign language | 1,446 | 5% |
| Spoken English and other spoken language | 2,062 | 7% |
| Other spoken language | 2,048 | 7% |
| Total known (n=113) | 27,990 | |
| Reported “not known” | 1,025 | |

113 services provided information for at least some part this question. Of those that did respond, many were unable to identify the language of all deaf children in their area. There are around 8,000 deaf children who are unaccounted for in the above figures, so these figures should be used with caution. That said, the number of deaf children reported in this question has increased from 23,603 since the last survey.

Notable differences in language spoken since the CRIDE 2011 survey include:

- Higher proportion of deaf children only communicating using spoken English (up from 73% to 78%)
- Decline in deaf children communicating using spoken English together with sign language (from 8% to 5%) – though the proportion using sign language in part or in full has remained around the same (from 9% to 8%).

At the end of part 2, we compare how these figures for the number of deaf children compare with other sources.

⁶ Though not all services gave a figure for each age group.

PART 2: Number of deaf children supported

Earlier, we looked at the number of deaf children who “belong” or live in a local authority. We also asked about deaf children who are supported⁷ by the service; this section sets out our analysis of these figures. Similar issues around given totals differing from each other also occurred here and we have taken the same approach in calculating an adjusted total. In particular, a significant change since the 2011 survey is that CRIDE sought to tighten up the definition of ‘support’ by specifying that only children who received support more than once a year should be included in this section of the survey.

Based on responses from 126 services, our survey indicates that at least **31,425** deaf children receive support from their local service (adjusted total). This is a 1% increase from last year where 31,067 deaf children were reported as receiving support.

Table 11: Figures generated when calculating how many deaf children are being supported

| | Total generated |
|--|-----------------|
| Adjusted total | 31,425 |
| Total given when asked how many children overall | 31,199 |
| Total given when asked about number of children, broken down by age | 29,274 |
| Total given when asked about number of children, broken down by level of deafness | 28,337 |

The smallest number of children being supported by a service was 42 and the largest was 818. The average was 247.

What do we know about the population of deaf children being supported?

The below tables breakdown the results by age, type of educational provision and region.

Table 12: Number of deaf children being supported, by age group

| Age group | Number of deaf children | Percentage of total (where known) |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Preschool children | 4,705 | 16% |
| Primary aged children | 12,786 | 44% |
| Secondary aged children | 9,923 | 34% |
| Young people in maintained sixth forms (years 12 to 13) | 1,299 | 4% |
| Young people in education who have completed year 11 but not in maintained sixth forms (e.g. in FE, apprenticeships, other) | 440 | 2% |
| Total (where known) (unadjusted) | 29,153 | |
| Not known | 121 | |
| Total (including where not known) (unadjusted) (n=122) | 29,274 | |

⁷ Examples of support given were direct teaching, visits to the family or school, liaison with the family, school, teachers, provision of hearing aid checks, etc.

Table 13: Number of deaf children being supported, by level of deafness

| Level of deafness | Number of deaf children reported | Percentage of total (where known) (unadjusted) |
|---|----------------------------------|--|
| Unilateral | 3,425 | 13% |
| Mild | 7,538 | 28% |
| Moderate | 9,474 | 35% |
| Severe | 3,333 | 12% |
| Profound | 3,558 | 13% |
| Total (where known) (unadjusted) | 27,328 | |
| | | |
| Not known | 1,009 | |
| Total (including where not known) (unadjusted) (n=119) | 28,337 | |

Table 14: Number of deaf children supported, by region

| Region (Proportion of services who responded) | Number of deaf children | Percentage of total |
|---|-------------------------|---------------------|
| East England (10/11) | 2,818 | 9% |
| East Midlands (8/8) | 2,541 | 8% |
| London (28/32) | 4,236 | 13% |
| North East (9/9) | 1,917 | 6% |
| North West (21/23) | 4,965 | 16% |
| South East (14/14) | 4,237 | 13% |
| South West (10/10) | 2,986 | 10% |
| West Midlands (13/13) | 3,472 | 11% |
| Yorkshire & Humber (13/13) | 4,253 | 14% |
| Total (125/132) | 31,425 | |

Assuming the figures are broadly comparable, if there are 37,414 deaf children (adjusted total) who live in England, there are at least 5,989 deaf children who are not being supported. In other words, the figures suggest that 84% of deaf children receive support from their local service. It does not necessarily follow that 16% of deaf children are not receiving support; many may be receiving support elsewhere from, for example, special schools for deaf children.

The table below compares the percentage difference between each age group to see if any particular age groups appear less likely to receive support. Proportionally, deaf young people over 16 appear less likely to receive support than other age groups, particularly where they are not in maintained sixth forms; 75 services reported that they did not have any post 16 deaf young people outside of sixth forms receiving support from their service.

Table 15: Comparison between number of deaf children belonging and supported by age

| Age group | Number of deaf children belonging | Number of deaf children supported | Proportion of deaf children being supported as a percentage of deaf children belonging |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Preschool | 5,236 | 4,705 | 90% |
| Primary | 15,612 | 12,786 | 82% |
| Secondary | 12,275 | 9,923 | 81% |
| Young people in maintained sixth forms (years 12 to 13) | 1,744 | 1,299 | 74% |
| Young people in education who have completed year 11 but not in maintained sixth forms (e.g. in FE, apprenticeships, other) | 1,028 | 440 | 43% |
| Total (unadjusted) | 35,895 | 29,153 | 82% |

Table 16: Comparison between number of deaf children belonging and supported by level of deafness

| Level of deafness | Number of deaf children belonging | Number of deaf children supported | Proportion of deaf children being supported as a percentage of deaf children belonging |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Unilateral | 5,390 | 3,425 | 64% |
| Mild | 9,701 | 7,538 | 78% |
| Moderate | 10,541 | 9,474 | 90% |
| Severe | 3,639 | 3,333 | 92% |
| Profound | 4,238 | 3,558 | 84% |
| Total (unadjusted) | 33,509 | 28,337 | 82% |

The above table suggests that profoundly deaf children are less likely to receive support from their local service than moderately or severely deaf children. Differences in the way questions were phrased mean we do not have comparable figures from last year. This raises some interesting questions about what is happening with profoundly deaf children. It could be that a number of profoundly deaf children do not receive support from the service because they may be more likely to be placed in specialist provision. Alternatively, and assuming that profoundly deaf children are more likely than other children to have cochlear implants, it may be that many of these deaf children are receiving Teacher of the Deaf support from a cochlear implant centre rather than from their local service. It is also possible, for example, that deaf children with cochlear implants may now be receiving less support compared to children without, due to apparent changes in their individual needs.

Table 17: Number of deaf children supported, by region

| Region | Number of deaf children belonging | Number of deaf children supported | Proportion of deaf children being supported as a percentage of deaf children belonging |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| East England | 3,291 | 2,818 | 86% |
| East Midlands | 2,436 | 2,541 | 104% |
| London | 5,642 | 4,236 | 75% |
| North East | 2,056 | 1,917 | 93% |
| North West | 5,346 | 4,965 | 93% |
| South East | 5,750 | 4,237 | 74% |
| South West | 3,318 | 2,986 | 90% |
| West Midlands | 4,751 | 3,472 | 73% |
| Yorkshire & the Humber | 4,824 | 4,253 | 88% |
| Total | 37,414 | 31,425 | 84% |

The above table again suggests some strong regional differences between the proportion of deaf children being supported. One region apparently has more deaf children in the area receiving supporting than who actually live there. However, it is important to continue to bear in mind that these differences may be a reflection of how services have recorded the number of deaf children in their area – services with poor data on all deaf children, excluding those who do not receive support, may appear to be supporting more.

How do CRIDE's 2012 figures compare to figures from other sources?

As set out below, caution needs to be used when comparing CRIDE's figures with other sources given the differences in how data has been collected and the different definitions used. CRIDE recommends that these figures be used as a basis for further debate and analysis, rather than to reach firm conclusions.

CRIDE 2011

As set out in the introduction, comparisons with the CRIDE 2011 report should be made with caution due to differences in the response rates between the two surveys.

The number of deaf children belonging being recorded by CRIDE is up markedly since the 2011 survey, from 34,927 to 37,414. This amounts to a 7% increase. It is interesting that the number of deaf children given when asked about support is also up but by a lower proportion of 1% from 31,067 to 31,425. This could suggest that the increase in the number of deaf children belonging is due to services getting better at identifying children who are deaf but who may not be eligible for support.

Of the 121 services which provided data on number of deaf children belonging in 2010/11 and 2011/12, 85 (70%) have reported larger numbers of deaf children than in the previous year. 35 (29%) of services reported a decrease in the number of deaf children.

Table 18: Changes in number of deaf children belonging in 2010/11 and 2011/12 (where known in both years)

| Region (Proportion of services who responded in both years) | Number of deaf children in 2010/11 | Number of deaf children in 2011/12 | Percentage change between 2010/11 and 2011/12 |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| East England (10/11) | 2,572 | 2,795 | 9% |
| East Midlands (7/8) | 2,130 | 2,436 | 14% |
| London (26/32) | 5,004 | 5,352 | 7% |
| North East (9/9) | 1,949 | 2,056 | 5% |
| North West (20/23) | 4,757 | 4,962 | 4% |
| South East (13/14) | 5,624 | 5,523 | -2% |
| South West (10/10) | 3,348 | 3,318 | -1% |
| West Midlands (13/13) | 4,290 | 4,751 | 11% |
| Yorkshire & Humber (13/13) | 4,502 | 4,824 | 7% |
| Total (119/132) | 34, 176 | 36, 017 | 5% |

School Census

School Census figures for 2012 indicate there are 16,130 children of school age where deafness is the primary SEN and who have been placed at School Action Plus or have a statement of SEN. This is a 1% increase from 2011 when the corresponding figure was 15,975

The CRIDE survey reports there are 27,887 deaf children of school age. This includes deaf children where deafness is not a primary need. But, based on this figure, the School Census continues to significantly under-report the number of deaf children – by around 58%. This is likely to be due to the fact that the School Census only records whether a child is deaf, whether the deafness is the primary need and if they have a statement or have been placed at School Action Plus.

The corresponding figure from last year was 62%. This suggests that the proportion of deaf children being identified by the School Census has declined by 4 percentage points. It is difficult to be certain whether this is because CRIDE has got better at identifying deaf children or whether fewer deaf children are now being formally recorded under the School Census as having a special

educational need. This is something that will need further investigation given the potential risk that deaf children are receiving less specialist support than in previous years.

Of the 16,130 deaf children recorded by the School Census, 6,375 have a statement. This is marginally down on last year when 6,495 were recorded as having a statement. This amounts to a 2% decrease in the number of deaf children with a statement. It is surprising that while deaf children seem to be slightly more likely to be formally recorded as having a special educational need, they are less likely to have a statement of need.

Not every deaf child with a statement will be of school age. However, comparing this figure with the number of school aged children identified by the CRIDE survey, this would indicate that only around 23% of deaf children have a statement⁸, less than a quarter and down from last year. The corresponding figure from last year was 25%.

The School Census indicates there are 1,500 children (where deafness is the primary SEN) in special schools in 2012, slightly down from 1,530 in 2011. The corresponding figure from the CRIDE survey is 808. As set out earlier, CRIDE suspects that a number of deaf children in specialist Further Education colleges for the deaf would previously have been reported as being in a special school in previous CRIDE surveys. Future CRIDE surveys will look to tease this out further.

The Department for Education does not currently publish details on children where deafness is a secondary need and who may attend other special schools not primarily for deaf children.

Prevalence data

NDCS estimates there are between 34,000 and 42,000 deaf children in England. This estimate has been calculated using known data on the prevalence of deafness and population estimates from mid 2010 from the Office of National Statistics. The estimates include deaf children with all types and levels of permanent hearing loss, including unilateral.

⁸ In addition, research from NCB, funded by the Department for Education, shows that there are wide variations in how schools apply the SEN Code of Practice. This means that children of similar levels of need, receiving support from a Teacher of the Deaf may be at School Action only in some areas, whilst issued with a statement in others.

PART 3: Teachers of the Deaf

Our survey asked how many Teachers of the Deaf there are working in different settings, including those in a peripatetic role and working in resource provisions. Figures are expressed as Full Time Equivalent (FTE) posts; a 0.5 Teacher of the Deaf FTE post could, for example, indicate that a person spent half of the standard “working week” as a Teacher of the Deaf.

In total, there are at least 1,136 Teachers of the Deaf in England. Of these 94% are fully qualified. In addition, at the time the survey was completed, there were an additional 44.5 vacant posts. In 54% of these cases, these vacant posts were frozen.

If the vacant posts are added to the total number of Teachers of the Deaf in employment, this would indicate there are at least 1,180 Teacher of the Deaf posts, of which 4% are vacant.

According to the General Teaching Council (now subsumed into the Department for Education), there were 896 active teachers who hold the mandatory qualification for teaching pupils with a hearing impairment in 2011⁹. CRIDE’s figures suggest that this figure is likely to be an underestimate.

Table 19: Number of Teachers of the Deaf in employment overall

| | Number of Teacher of the Deaf posts (FTE) | Percentage of Total |
|---|---|---------------------|
| Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification | 1,063.7 | 94% |
| Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years | 61.9 | 5% |
| Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training | 10.8 | 1% |
| Total (n=127) | 1,136.4 | |

Table 20: Number of Teacher of the Deaf vacancies overall

| | Number of Teacher of the Deaf posts (FTE) | Percentage of Total | |
|----------------------|---|---------------------|-----|
| Vacancies | Post frozen | 24.3 | 54% |
| | Currently advertised | 18.6 | 42% |
| | Advertised but no suitable candidate | 1.6 | 3% |
| Total (n=127) | 44.5 | | |

Comparing with figures from the CRIDE 2011 survey, there appears to have been a 1% decline in the number of Teacher of the Deaf posts (i.e. including vacant posts) and a 2% decline in the number of Teachers of the Deaf actually employed at the time of survey completion. Given, as this report showed earlier, there has been no corresponding decrease in the number of deaf children being reported, these figures are of concern.

The below sections look in more detail at the numbers of Teachers of the Deaf employed in a peripatetic role or in resource provisions.

Teachers of the Deaf in a peripatetic role

Our survey asked how many Teachers of the Deaf were working in the specialist peripatetic service as of January 2011. In other words, how many “visiting” Teachers of the Deaf were working in each service. Visiting Teachers of the Deaf normally visit deaf children in “non-specialist” provision – i.e. pre-school deaf children, deaf children in mainstream schools or in a special school for disabled (rather than deaf) children.

⁹ http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201011/cmhansrd/cm111122/text/111122w0003.htm#111122w0003.htm_sbhd12

Table 21: Number of visiting Teachers of the Deaf in employment

| | Number of Teacher of the Deaf posts (FTE) | Number of services with staff in relevant category |
|--|---|--|
| Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification | 665.3 | 127 |
| Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years | 18.1 | 19 |
| Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training | 0.4 | 1 |
| Total (n=127) | 683.8 | |

Table 22: Number of visiting Teacher of the Deaf vacancies

| | Number of Teacher of the Deaf posts (FTE) | Number of services with staff in relevant category |
|----------------------|---|--|
| Vacancies | Post frozen | 15.3 |
| | Currently advertised | 13.3 |
| | Advertised but no suitable candidate | 0.6 |
| Total (n=127) | 29.2 | |

In terms of fully qualified visiting Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification, the numbers within each service ranged from 0.2 at the smallest to 22 in the largest. The average number of visiting Teachers of the Deaf (with the mandatory qualification) per service is 5.2 (FTE).

23 (18%) of services employ 2 or fewer visiting Teachers of the Deaf, of which 10 services (8%) employed 1 or fewer visiting Teachers of the Deaf . Both these figures are down since the 2011 survey (22% and 10% respectively). Given the complex nature of deafness and the diverse needs of deaf children, it remains of concern that some services are attempting to meet the needs of all deaf children with relatively low numbers of visiting Teachers of the Deaf. CRIDE supports the recommendation in the Department for Education green paper on special educational needs and disabilities that local authorities should seek to join forces to plan and commission services for deaf children.

12 services – 9% of those that responded - reported that they had frozen vacancies for Teachers of the Deaf, amounting to 15.3 full time equivalent posts. The service with the biggest freeze had frozen 3 full time equivalent posts. The number of frozen posts is down slightly on last year from 17.6 full time equivalent posts. However, the number of posts being ‘currently advertised’ is up sharply from 3 last year.

We asked if services had sought to recruit Teachers of the Deaf over the past 12 months. Of the 63 services that had, 14 (22%) indicated that they had experienced difficulties in recruiting for a permanent post. We also asked if services had sought to secure supply cover over the past 12 months. Of the 57 services that indicated yes, 22 (39%) said they had experienced difficulties in securing supply cover.

Peripatetic Teachers of the Deaf ratios

This section looks at the average number of deaf children being supported by each visiting Teacher of the Deaf. There are a range of views on both the usefulness of this and how best to calculate this ratio. Points to take into consideration include:

- Areas that are large or rural may, by necessity, have more visiting Teachers of the Deaf than areas that are small and urban because of the need to allow for travel time.

- Areas in which there is a specialist unit or special school may have fewer visiting Teachers of the Deaf because it has been assessed that deaf children with most need are already in specialist provision.
- Services that are better able to reliably record and identify how many deaf children, including those over 16, there are in their area may appear to have worse ratios than services which have only given a figure for the number of deaf children they ‘know’ about.
- It does not reflect investment in other specialist staff¹⁰.

In simple terms and for consistency across all parts of England, NDCS calculates the ratio (the “visiting TOD ratio”) by dividing the number of deaf children belonging in any given area and in non-specialist provision¹¹ by the number of qualified visiting Teachers of the Deaf¹². This will include some deaf children in some areas who are not being actively supported by the service. However, to exclude these children would obviously produce an incentive to improve the visiting TOD ratio by cutting support. In addition, even where a service is simply monitoring a deaf child, this still requires time and resource from the visiting Teacher of the Deaf. Responses were excluded where there were gaps in either the number of Teachers of the Deaf or numbers of deaf children belonging.

The CRIDE survey results show that the average number of deaf children being supported by each visiting Teacher of the Deaf is just under 46:1. The highest ratio was 143:1.

There are 17 services (15%) where each visiting Teacher of the Deaf is supporting, on average, 80 or more deaf children, of which there are 8 services (7%) where each visiting Teacher of the Deaf is supporting, on average, 100 or more deaf children. These proportions are slightly up on the corresponding figures from 2011/12 (14% and 5% respectively).

Table 23: Ratio of deaf children being supported by each visiting Teacher of the Deaf, by region

| Region | Average ratio | Highest ratio |
|----------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| East England (11/11) | 45.4:1 | 60.3:1 |
| East Midlands (7/8) | 35.7:1 | 120.8:1 |
| London (26/32) | 52.9:1 | 143:1 |
| North East (9/9) | 42:1 | 77.8:1 |
| North West (20/23) | 30.8:1 | 101:1 |
| South East (12/13) | 55.4:1 | 99.6:1 |
| South West (10/10) | 45.8:1 | 96:1 |
| West Midlands (10/13) | 48.8:1 | 67.5:1 |
| Yorkshire & Humber (11/13) | 65.1:1 | 121.5:1 |
| England (116/132) | 45.8:1 | 143:1 |

Teachers of the Deaf in resource provisions

The survey asked how many Teachers of the Deaf were employed in resource provisions for deaf children and whether employed centrally by the local authority or directly by the school. Respondents were asked to exclude time spent on other school duties (such as time as the school’s SEN co-ordinator, for example).

¹⁰ However, it is worth noting that evidence from Ofsted indicates that children with special educational needs do better when supported by specialist teachers, compared to any other form of support, including teaching assistants. Source: Ofsted (2006) Inclusion: does it matter where pupils are taught?

¹¹ This includes deaf children reported as being: supported at home (e.g. home educated), in mainstream state funded schools, other special schools (i.e. those for disabled children more generally) or in other provision (e.g. pupil referral units). This excludes deaf children reported as being in independent schools, resource provision or special schools for deaf children.

¹² This includes Teachers of the Deaf who are not yet qualified but who are in training. It excludes any teachers who are working as Teachers of the Deaf but who are not qualified nor in training.

Table 24: Number of Teachers of the Deaf in resource provisions employed by the local authority or the school

| | Number of teachers (FTE) in resource provision employed by the local authority | Number of services with staff in relevant category | | Number of teachers (FTE) in resource provision employed by the school | Number of services with staff in relevant category |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification | 252.8 | 70 | | 145.6 | 38 |
| Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years | 25.3 | 24 | | 18.5 | 14 |
| Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training | 6.6 | 4 | | 3.8 | 3 |
| Total (n=101) | 284.7 | | | 167.9 | |

There are some quite striking differences between the above table and the corresponding figures from last year. In a nutshell, at face value, the results indicate more Teachers of the Deaf in resource provisions employed by the local authority in 2011/12 (up from 192.5). Conversely, the results indicate fewer Teachers of the Deaf in resource provisions employed by the school (down from 251.8).

One possible explanation for this lies in differences in reporting from services. The number of services who gave a figure for staff in resource provisions employed by the school is down last year (from 56 to 38). Anecdotally, some services were unable to provide these staffing figures because of the independence of the resource provisions from the service. There has also been an increase in the number of services reporting on resource provisions within local authority control (from 44 to 70), though the reason for this is not clear.

Future CRIDE surveys will look to unpick these changes in more detail.

Table 25: Number of Teacher of the Deaf vacant posts in resource provisions employed by the local authority or the school

| | Number of teachers (FTE) in resource provision employed by the local authority | Number of services with staff in relevant category | | Number of teachers (FTE) in resource provision employed by the school | Number of services with staff in relevant category |
|----------------------|--|--|---|---|--|
| Vacancies | Post frozen | 7 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| | Currently advertised | 5.3 | 5 | 0 | - |
| | Advertised but no suitable candidate | 1 | 1 | 0 | - |
| Total (n=101) | 13.3 | | | 2 | |

CRIDE again analysed the figures to examine the ratio in the number of deaf children supported by each Teacher of the Deaf in resource provisions. Based on usable results from 91 services, the CRIDE survey results show that the average number of deaf children in resource provision being supported by each Teacher of the Deaf is 4.9:1. Guidelines by BATOD state that each Teacher of the Deaf in a resource provision should be working with no more than 6 deaf children each, and fewer where deaf children with additional needs are being supported. 27 services had a ratio that was higher than 6:1. Of these, 3 services had a ratio that was higher than 10:1.

The table below seeks to explore whether there are any proportional differences in the status of teachers. The figures suggest that there is a slightly higher incidence of unqualified teachers working as Teachers of the Deaf in resource provisions, where the teachers are employed by the school (as opposed to by the local authority). This is consistent with findings from last year.

Table 26: Proportional differences in level of qualification of “Teachers of the Deaf”

| | Percentage of all peripatetic teachers | Percentage of all teachers in resource provision, employed by local authority | Percentage of all teachers in resource provision, employed by school |
|--|---|--|---|
| Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification | 97% | 89% | 87% |
| Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years | 3% | 9% | 11% |
| Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training | 0.06% | 2% | 2% |

PART 4: Other specialist staff

Our survey suggests that there are at least 1,270 specialist support staff, other than Teachers of the Deaf, supporting deaf children in England in either a peripatetic role or working in resource provisions. The most common role is teaching assistant followed by communication support worker.

Table 27: Number of specialist support staff overall, by role

| | Number of staff (FTE) | % of Total |
|--|-----------------------|------------|
| Teaching assistants / Classroom support assistants etc | 738.3 | 58% |
| Communication support workers / Interpreters / Communicators etc | 325.1 | 26% |
| Deaf instructors / Deaf role models / Sign language instructors etc | 82.1 | 6% |
| Educational audiologists / Technicians etc | 65.9 | 5% |
| Speech and language therapists | 25.5 | 2% |
| Family support workers / Liaison officers | 21.2 | 2% |
| Social workers / Social workers for deaf children | 9.6 | 1% |
| Language instructors / Language support tutors | 3.1 | 0.2% |
| Total (n=126) | 1,270.5 | |

A range of roles, with different full time equivalents, were cited when asked about other specialist staff, including admin staff, nursery workers, intervenors and transition co-ordinators. As not all respondents gave a full time equivalent figure for all of the other roles, it was not possible to calculate a total for this.

The number of specialist staff overall is up from 1,249.5 in 2010/11, amounting to a 2% increase.

The next table breaks down the number of other specialist staff according to how they are employed.

Numbers of other specialist staff

The survey asked about numbers of other specialist support staff, by whether they were employed in a peripatetic role or employed by the school directly to work in a resource provision.

Table 28: Number of peripatetic specialist support staff, by role

| | Peripatetic role | | | Resource provisions | | |
|---|--|--|---------------------|--|--|---------------------|
| | Number of staff (full time equivalent) | Number of services with staff in relevant category | Percentage of Total | Number of staff (full time equivalent) | Number of services with staff in relevant category | Percentage of Total |
| Teaching assistants / Classroom support assistants etc | 170 | 61 | 41% | 568.3 | 73 | 66% |
| Communication support workers / Interpreters / Communicators etc | 105.8 | 25 | 26% | 219.3 | 35 | 25% |
| Deaf instructors / Deaf role models / Sign language instructors etc | 37.2 | 37 | 9% | 44.9 | 25 | 5% |
| Educational audiologists / Technicians etc | 57.2 | 59 | 14% | 8.7 | 10 | 1% |
| Speech and language therapists | 13 | 20 | 3% | 12.5 | 19 | 1% |
| Family support workers / Liaison officers | 16.8 | 18 | 4% | 4.4 | 6 | 0.5% |
| Social workers / Social workers for deaf children | 8.1 | 6 | 2% | 1.5 | 2 | 0.2% |
| Language instructors / Language support tutors | 1.8 | 2 | 0.4% | 1.3 | 2 | 0.2% |
| Total (n=126) | 409.7 | | 100% | 860.8 | | 100% |

The above table confirms that over half as many other specialist staff are now employed directly by schools directly. This is particularly the case for teaching assistants and communication support workers, though educational audiologists, speech and language therapists and family support workers continue to be predominantly employed in peripatetic roles.

Services were also asked if they directly managed teaching assistants or other support staff based in schools to support named pupils. The majority of services confirmed they no longer do so.

Table 29: Services still directly managing teaching assistants or other support staff in schools

| Response | Number | Percentage of those who responded |
|--------------------------------|------------|-----------------------------------|
| Yes | 30 | 24% |
| Some but not all | 15 | 12% |
| No | 80 | 64% |
| Total responses (n=125) | 125 | |

Since the 2011 CRIDE survey, there appears to have been a proportional decline in the number of services with mixed arrangements; 17% of services reported they directly managed some but not all teaching assistants and other specialist support staff in 2010/11, down to 12% this year.

Resource provisions

When asked if the resource provision provided outreach support to other schools, 12 (13%) replied yes and 83 (87%) replied no. 18% of services indicated that outreach support was provided in 2010/11, suggesting a decline.

Where outreach support was provided, this amounted to 5.7 full time equivalent staffing time total across all of the services who responded, down from 9.2 in 2010/11. The actual figure may be higher; some services reported that provided outreach services “as required” without giving a rough figure for much this was in 2011/12.

PART 5: Eligibility criteria and funding arrangements

Eligibility criteria

The majority of services continue to use the NatSIP criteria as a vehicle to help determine what support deaf children receive. The proportion of services using the NatSIP criteria is down slightly from 75% in 2010/11, though there are slight differences in the way this question was phrased so caution should be used in interpreting this. CRIDE understands that the NatSIP criteria will be reviewed and updated later this year.

Table 30: Criteria used to help determine the level of support for deaf children

| | Number of services | Percentage of total |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| “NatSIP” criteria ¹³ | 88 | 71% |
| Criteria is mostly developed locally | 30 | 24% |
| Other | 6 | 5% |
| Total (n=124) | 124 | |

Services were asked to specify what other criteria they used. In these cases, services tended to indicate that they were using a variant of NatSIP’s criteria.

The survey also sought general information about the type of service provided for different categories of deaf children and young people. It was recognised that this could only be a crude estimate of services offered and the amount of support provided to an individual child would be determined by a range of factors, including professional judgement, and not just the degree and type of deafness. Services were able to tick more than one option for each group of deaf children.

Table 31: Type of support provided by type of deafness

| Type of need | Type of deafness | Number of services that provide no direct support | Number of services that provide annual, one-off or occasional visit | Number of services that provide allocated ToD and regular visits (i.e. more than once a year) | Number of services that gave no response |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|
| Primary and permanent need | Bilateral severe or profound sensorineural deafness | 0 | 0 | 123 | 4 |
| | Bilateral moderate sensorineural deafness | 1 | 10 | 119 | 4 |
| | Bilateral conductive deafness | 10 | 39 | 93 | 4 |
| | Bilateral mild or high frequency only sensorineural deafness | 5 | 45 | 90 | 4 |
| | Unilateral deafness (sensorineural or conductive) | 20 | 88 | 38 | 4 |
| Additional and permanent need | Bilateral severe or profound sensorineural deafness | 1 | 9 | 119 | 5 |
| | Bilateral moderate sensorineural deafness | 0 | 25 | 107 | 5 |
| | Bilateral conductive deafness | 12 | 54 | 78 | 5 |
| Other | With temporary conductive deafness as a primary or additional need | 38 | 71 | 35 | 5 |
| | In special schools other than schools for the deaf | 8 | 45 | 95 | 6 |
| | With auditory neuropathy | 12 | 35 | 94 | 8 |
| | With auditory processing difficulty/disorder | 56 | 47 | 25 | 10 |
| n=123 | | | | | |

¹³ Commonly known as the NatSIP criteria, this is more accurately described as the SESIP/SERSEN Revised Eligibility Criteria (2009), which itself is based on the SERSEN Eligibility Criteria (2005)

Table 32: Changes in eligibility criteria in the service between 2010/11 and 2011/12

| | Number of services | Percentage of services |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|
| Thresholds for some / all children have increased | 9 | 7% |
| Thresholds for some / all deaf children have decreased | 7 | 6% |
| No changes | 105 | 87% |
| Total (n=121) | 121 | |

Though there were differences in the way the question was phrased, the results indicate less variation in eligibility criteria since the 2011 CRIDE survey was conducted. In 2010/11, 16% of services indicated that changes had been made for the better whilst 20% for the worse. The proportion reporting no change has increased from 64% in 2010/11.

Where thresholds had changed, services were asked to indicate what had changed. Where thresholds had been raised, services referred to challenges around staffing reductions and changes to eligibility criteria. Illustrative quotes include:

- *“The reduction in TOD time... is due to Voluntary Redundancy and is currently ‘frozen’. It may not be a permanent reduction in the service but the situation is currently not clear. Due to the reduction in staffing (caused by delays in the recruitment process, sickness absence and the ‘frozen’ post) and the increase in referrals we have had to reduce the frequency of visits for all children.”*
- *“We no longer automatically see every child prescribed hearing aids, or referred from ENT with glue ear or unilateral loss. There has to be additional evidence from school or setting that there is a significant impact on development or learning.”*
- *“We have reduced weekly visits in preschool to fortnightly as a maximum.”*

Other services also referred to taking steps to ‘rationalise’ their service, sometimes after introducing NatSIP eligibility criteria or following a move to traded services.

- *“We decided that our 3 x a year monitoring visits have been changed to twice a year. Some who were once a year are now written advice only or seen on request only This is to ensure those who have most need actually receive TOD time.”*
- *“The children receiving a non-costed service from the team are babies and preschoolers, children and young people in mainstream with a statement for hearing loss, children and young people who have 50% or more in relation to NatSIP criteria.”*

Use of quality standards for service provision

Services were asked to report which quality standards they used to review service development. Services were able to tick more than one option.

Table 33: Use of quality standards to reflect on the service provided or to look at service development

| | Number of services |
|--|--------------------|
| BATOD, NDCS and RNID (now Action on Hearing Loss): Quality standards: Specialist teaching and support services for deaf children and young people (2009)¹⁴ | 88 |
| Department for Children, Schools and Families (now Department for Education): Quality standards for special educational needs (SEN) support and outreach services (2008)¹⁵ | 73 |
| Other standards. | 32 |
| n=108 | |

¹⁴ See: <http://www.ndcs.org.uk/document.rm?id=4350>

¹⁵ See: <https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/standard/publicationDetail/Page1/DCSF-00582-2008>

Services were asked to specify what other standards they used. The most common other standards referred to were:

- Other NDCS quality standards (such as on FM systems) – 7 services
- Newborn Hearing Screening Programme quality standards – 6 services
- Early Support Audit Tool – 4 services
- Services' own quality standards – 3 services

Funding arrangements – peripatetic services

In terms of funding arrangements, the majority of peripatetic specialist support services appear to be funded centrally by the local authority, as shown below. There appears to have been a small increase from 82% in 2010/11.

Table 34: Funding arrangements for peripatetic specialist support services

| Funding is... | Number of services | Percentage of all services who responded |
|--|--------------------|--|
| Held centrally by the local authority¹⁶ | 107 | 85% |
| Delegated to a special or mainstream school with a resource provision that then provides outreach to other schools | 5 | 4% |
| Delegation in full to individual schools in the local authority who decide whether to purchase specialist support from the local authority | 0 | 0% |
| Delegated in part to individual schools in the LA who decide whether to purchase specialist support from the LA (i.e. “traded services” for non statemented children) | 3 | 2% |
| Other | 11 | 9% |
| Total (n=126) | 126 | 100% |

Responses in the ‘other’ category generally indicated some form of combination of the previous options. One service noted that had now been subcontracted to a private contract; something which may prove to be an emerging trend in years to come.

Funding arrangements – impact of academies programme

In light of considerable concern over the impact of academies on the funding of specialist peripatetic services, the survey asked whether funding for support for non-statemented¹⁷ deaf children in academies had been retained by the local authority.

Table 35: Funding arrangements for peripatetic specialist support services where there are academies

| Has funding been retained? | Number of services | Percentage of services that responded, with academies and where funding arrangements known |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|--|
| Yes | 111 | 97% |
| No | 3 | 3% |
| No academies in local authority | 3 | - |
| Don't know | 5 | - |
| Total | 122 | |

¹⁶ Respondents were asked to include funding held by the local authority to purchase hearing support services from other local authorities or external agencies

¹⁷ Local authorities have a statutory responsibility for statemented children and so funding for this cannot be delegated.

The response to this question shows the most dramatic change since last year. Then 27% of services (who had academies in their area) reported that funding had not been retained, raising questions over how specialist support for deaf children was being funded and met, if at all. At the time the 2011 survey was conducted, the Department for Education had not yet announced that funding for specialist SEN provision would not be recouped from local authorities, explaining the sharp decline in services reporting that funding is not being retained. Indeed, it is of small concern that 3 services still say that funding is not retained.

In the last survey, 16 services (14% of respondents) reported that there were no academies in their area. This has now fallen to just 3 (2%).

Services made a range of comments in response to this question. Some noted the issues around 'old' academies which have different funding and contractual funding arrangements compared to more recent academies.

"One academy, established before, is under different arrangements. Support is provided but they receive a bill."

"The continuing confusion about 'old style' academies and funding is a national one. We continue to support HI pupils in these schools at present."

Other noted challenges around working with academies:

"There are a number of academies with resourced provision for hearing impaired pupils and there is some concern about the mechanisms to monitor this provision particularly where the TOD is not replaced when they retire or move to a new position."

"There is an ongoing query over the funding of equipment for children in Academies - whether LA or school should be providing this."

Some services set out a strong view that they should continue to be funded centrally:

"The CYP are able to have consistent planned support from the beginning of the financial year when the funding is held centrally. For a period of time when funding was delegated to academies and in an academy that was funded prior to 2008 the support is dependent on the budget holder understanding the role of TOD and the implication of deafness. We experienced reluctance to buy in support and delays in the CYP having access to a TOD and specialist equipment."

"The lack of long term clarity over the government funding of specialist services for HI is making for considerable uncertainty and stress. The delegation of funds in some authorities to non-specialist Heads and the divorcing of our highest needs children from a wider specialist service is a massive retrograde step in terms of meeting the specialist needs of deaf children. This will "water down" the wider specialist support of these children and fracture deaf education into small silos. Not only will children be isolated, but their support staff will also be cut off from the wider support and advice available from larger services."

"Strongly believe that the LA should retain central funding for SEN support services. Academies are unlikely to buy in services for low incidence need and CYP will suffer as a result."

"Provision for non stated deaf children will only be secure if some retention of funding in respect of any schools with academy or free status."

Finally, other services expressed anxiety around the implications of wider SEN and school funding reform.

“There is an urgent need for the Government, when revising the DSG funding from April 2013, to make an exception for deaf CYP by enabling LAs to secure ringfenced budgets to provide for this low-incidence need both strategically and free at the point of contact to all schools, academies and free schools.”

“Personal budgets are likely to become a relevant issue where families may be given a budget to spend as the wish to meet the Health, Education and Social Care Needs of Children – this is being piloted in [local authority]. No Deaf children are currently involved but they may well be in the near future. This may affect the sustainability of services. The joining together of the assessment process is leading to interesting and challenging questions as to who should fund provision for Deaf children.”

The Department for Education’s current proposals for school funding reform, including the creation of a new ‘High Needs Block’ will have significant implications for future funding arrangements. Equally, the impending Children and Families Bill will be keenly watched by services to establish the impact on how they support deaf children. Future versions of this survey will seek to monitor the impact of these changes.

Funding arrangements – resource provisions

CRIDE also sought information on the funding arrangements for resource provisions. 101 services (80%) indicated that they had resource provisions in their area.

Table 36: Funding arrangements for resource provisions

| Funding for resource provision is... | Number of services | Percentage of those where applicable |
|---|---------------------------|---|
| Held centrally by the local authority | 38 | 38% |
| Delegated to schools | 50 | 50% |
| Both central and delegated | 12 | 12% |
| Total responses | 100 | |

The majority of resource provisions continue to be delegated to schools though there appears to be a small increase in the number of services where funding is held centrally (up from 36% in 2010/11 to 38% in 2011/12)

Table 37: Use of service level agreements by resource provisions

| Where funding is delegated, does a contract / service level agreement exist? | Number of services | Percentage of those where applicable |
|---|---------------------------|---|
| Yes | 36 | 61% |
| No | 23 | 39% |
| Total | 59 | |

Again, the majority of services continue to have service level agreements with resource provisions where funding is delegated. The proportion doing so is up slightly up from 59% in 2010/11.

78 (61%) of services reported that they have used the NDCS “Quality Standards: Resource provisions for deaf children and young people in mainstream schools”¹⁸ to reflect on the service provided within the resource provision or to look at service development. There were a wide range of responses when asked about other standards, including references to: Ofsted frameworks, template service level agreements, BATOD documents, Ear Foundation training / advice and other NDCS quality standards.

¹⁸ See: <http://www.ndcs.org.uk/document.rm?id=5765>

Staffing changes

In the context of concerns over spending reductions, the survey asked about budgeted staff levels over the past three years. We asked about staffing levels for Teachers of the Deaf and other specialist staff in 2010/11, 2011/12 and proposed staffing levels for 2012/13. The results were difficult to analyse as a large number of services did not provide consistent information for each year. This meant it was difficult to identify whether any changes were due to genuine staffing changes or just inconsistent reporting.

For the purpose of this report, we have therefore looked at changes from 2010/11 to 2011/12; from 2011/12 to 2012/13; and from 2010/11 to 2012/13 (over a two year period). The tables below set out the number of services that have reported changes to staffing. Our analysis has excluded services that did not provide consistent information, so the results should be used with particular caution. In particular, there is a risk that the results have been skewed through the omission or exclusion of some services.

Table 38: Teachers of the Deaf: staffing changes

| | Between 2010/11 and 2011/12: number of usable responses | Between 2011/12 and 2012/13: number of usable responses | Between 2010/11 and 2012/13 (over two years): number of usable responses |
|-----------------------------|---|---|--|
| Increase in staffing | 18 (16%) | 10 (11%) | 23 (24%) |
| No change | 74 (67%) | 72 (77%) | 53 (57%) |
| Decrease in staffing | 19 (17%) | 11 (12%) | 17 (18%) |
| Total | 111 (100%) | 93 (100%) | 93 (100%) |

Table 39: Other specialist staff: staffing changes

| | Between 2010/11 and 2011/12: number of usable responses | Between 2011/12 and 2012/13: number of usable responses | Between 2010/11 and 2012/13 (over two years): number of usable responses |
|-----------------------------|---|---|--|
| Increase in staffing | 12 (11%) | 6 (7%) | 14 (15%) |
| No change | 89 (80%) | 79 (86%) | 66 (71%) |
| Decrease in staffing | 10 (9%) | 7 (8%) | 13 (14%) |
| Total | 111 (100%) | 92 (100%) | 93 (100%) |

The figures are not straightforward to interpret. Whilst it is clear there have been staffing cuts in a sizeable minority of services from year to year, other services have made increases. Some have made cuts in one year and then increased in the next. Again, it appears there was more stability in 2011/12 than there was in 2010/11 with an increase in the number of services reporting no change. Looking over a two year period, of particular concern though is that nearly 1 in 5 services (18%) have reported a net reduction in the number of Teachers of the Deaf since 2010/11.

Other changes

The survey also looked at any changes between 2010/11 and 2011/12 to non staffing budgets, in particular, any budgets for training and equipment

Table 40: Changes to non staffing budgets

| | Number of services reporting change in budget for training | Number of services reporting change in budget for equipment |
|--|--|---|
| Increase in budget | 8 | 9 |
| Decrease in budget | 15 | 13 |
| No change in budget | 68 | 75 |
| Don't know / can't separate budget for HI team | 30 | 27 |
| Total | 121 | 124 |

It is surprising that between 20 to 25% of services cannot identify whether there have been changes to their non-staffing budgets.

Table 41: Proportion of services reporting any changes to non staffing budgets (where changes known)

| | Training | Equipment |
|---------------------|----------|-----------|
| Increase in budget | 9% | 9% |
| Decrease in budget | 16% | 13% |
| No change in budget | 75% | 77% |

Whilst the number of services reporting decreases in budgets is of concern, the number of services doing so is down on last year when around 30% reported cuts to non staffing budgets in 2010/11.

Where cuts are being made, a number of services commented on how cuts were being made. Some referred to where departing staff were not being replaced:

"We have a member of staff retiring this year who will not be replaced and another with a long term absence who is unlikely to return and will not be replaced. A TA will be going on maternity leave and cover will not be provided."

"Lead ToD retires on 30.03.12 and succession planning yet to be decided / agreed... Realistically looks like HI element of service will be left with no ToD after Easter 2012."

One service noted the impact that reductions had on ability to manage and improve services:

"The management side has had to come second to direct teaching and has been fitted in around existing caseloads. Changes to staffing levels have not been related to service provision planning or a redesign structure in any way. It has been a case of get on with it. I have prioritised teaching and learning for the team."

A number of services also reported on the continuing impact of the closure of the Schools Access Initiative and the ongoing difficulties in securing funding for equipment.

"All equipment including FM Systems and other Audiological resources were funded via the Schools Access Initiative which ceased on 31 March 2012. No funding stream has yet been identified to replace this as yet."

“In terms of equipment, schools now expected to fund anything under £500 themselves. Requests made to SEN panel for equipment are more likely to be questioned or turned down than previously.”

Where services have reported cuts, this information has been used by the NDCS campaigns team to ensure the impact of any cuts is minimised or reversed as part of their Save Services for Deaf Children campaign¹⁹.

¹⁹ See www.ndcs.org.uk/save.

PART 6: Concluding thoughts

In this section we reflect on some of the findings from the 2012 as well as our observations on the survey itself.

1. Services continue to experience a range of challenges in providing reliable data. This is not to discredit services but to recognise their limited capacity and the complexity of the task and the lack of appropriate and current tools available to services (e.g. databases) to handle such requests. However, we know that many services agree that it is important this data set is collected nationally and that it serves a useful purpose in terms of benchmarking, to influence national debates but also to improve what we know about deaf children and changes over time. The Government also continues to stress the importance of open data and transparency. The proposed creation of a 'local offer' is likely to see greater demands of more information to be collated and published. CRIDE will continue to explore with services ways in which the survey could be made easier to complete. CRIDE also encourages local authorities to review their own data systems.
2. Changing structures in the education system is making it harder for some services to track deaf children in their area. For example, some services did not provide us with information on deaf children in specialist resource provisions. CRIDE suspects that where the host school is independent from the local authority (i.e. because it is an academy), such difficulties become more challenging. Whilst CRIDE recognises this challenge, the Department for Education has been clear that local authorities have strategic responsibility for all children with special educational needs and disabilities and thus we expect local authority services to be able to provide information on all deaf children in their area.
3. The CRIDE 2012 survey reports a 7% increase in the number of deaf children. Improvements in reporting by services is likely to be a key part of the explanation for this reported increase. Nevertheless, it is concerning that this accompanies a reported decline in the number of Teachers of the Deaf (though not apparently in teaching assistants). This could reflect the impact of reductions in education spending. CRIDE is naturally concerned that such changes will not be in the best interests of deaf children.
4. The CRIDE survey does not ask about attainment of deaf children; this is done through the National Sensory Impairment Partnership (NatSIP) survey. CRIDE will continue to work with NatSIP on how we can join up the two surveys in the future. This will be a challenging task and potentially involves asking services to submit individual pupil data. However, there is a wide consensus that this is something that should be explored further and piloted.
5. Carrying out the CRIDE survey and analysing the results is not an easy task. As with all surveys, caution must be exercised in how the results are interpreted. However, it remains the most comprehensive survey of its kind in England. It is also the only known complete census of all deaf children in England (rather than just those formally recorded as having a special educational need, as with the School Census). In the context of significant reform to the educational system for children with special educational needs and disabilities, we hope the findings will be used to ensure that any reform carried out is done so with a firm and sound understanding of the impact it will have on all deaf children.

PART 7: Background and methodology

CRIDE is a consortium bringing together a range of organisations and individuals with a common interest in improving the educational outcomes achieved by deaf children through research. Representatives include: the [British Association of Teachers of the Deaf \(BATOD\)](#), the [Ewing Foundation](#), the [National Deaf Children's Society \(NDCS\)](#), [National Sensory Impairment Partnership \(NatSIP\)](#), [Frank Barnes School for Deaf Children](#), [Mary Hare School](#), [London Borough of Barnet](#), [UCL](#) and the [University of Bedfordshire](#).

The survey was designed and created by members of CRIDE. Feedback from services on the 2011 survey and lessons learnt from the analysis were used to inform improvements to the previous survey. The England survey was then disseminated to services in England in the first week of February 2012 by NDCS's team of Regional Directors on behalf of CRIDE. Services were asked to respond by the 16th March 2012. Where there was no response by this time, NDCS's Regional Directors and members of CRIDE contacted services by email and telephone. Following this, as a last resort, Freedom of Information requests were sent out to the remaining services who had not responded around the 19th April 2012. No further responses were accepted for inclusion in the analysis for this note after the end of June. 6 services had failed to respond to the CRIDE survey by this date.

The below table sets out the response rate at each stage.

Table 42: Response rate by services to CRIDE survey

| | Number of responses | Cumulative total |
|---|---------------------|------------------|
| First deadline – 16 th March 2012 | 47 | 47 |
| Second deadline following chasers – 18 th April 2012 | 40 | 87 |
| Final deadline – end May 2012 | 40 | 127 |

Services were able to respond by completing an online survey or a word document of the survey.

Analysis of the results using Excel and drafting of this report was largely completed by NDCS with guidance and clearance from members of CRIDE. NDCS has taken every step to ensure this report accurately reflects what services have told us. Any errors are the responsibility of NDCS alone.

We would like to thank all services for taking the time to complete this survey and for their valuable comments and feedback, which will be used to inform the design of future surveys. The results from this survey will be used for research purposes, to influence government policy and to campaign to protect funding and services for deaf children.

If you have any feedback or questions on the results, please contact professionals@ndcs.org.uk.