



Consortium for Research in Deaf Education

2013 report for Scotland

CRIDE report on 2013 survey on educational provision for deaf children in Scotland

Introduction

In 2013, the Consortium for Research into Deaf Education (CRIDE) carried out its third annual survey on educational staffing and service provision for deaf children in the 2012/13 financial year¹. This report sets out the results of the survey for Scotland 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 around 2,842 deaf children known to specialist support services in Scotland; a reported increase of 11% since 2011.
- Around 79% of school aged deaf children attend mainstream schools (where there is no specialist provision).
- 22% of deaf children are recorded as having an additional support need. The most common additional need appears to be moderate learning difficulties.
- Around 10% of deaf children have at least one cochlear implant.
- Around 84% of deaf children communicate using spoken English only. Around 1% speak another spoken language, either on its own or in combination with another language. Around 14% use sign language in some form, either on its own or alongside another language.
- There are at least 208.5 (full time equivalent) Teacher of the Deaf posts in services or resource provisions. Though the reported number of deaf children has increased, the reported number of posts has declined by 7% in 2 years.
- There are at least 109.6 other specialist support staff working with deaf children in Scotland, a 3% increase since 2011.

Responses were received from 30 services in Scotland, covering 32 local authority areas. This means that this CRIDE survey achieved a response rate of 100%. However, one or two of the responses contained very little information and so therefore not all of the questions received a 100% response rate.

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

Using the results

The CRIDE report is disseminated via the websites of NDCS and BATOD thus making the findings easily available to professionals, 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 discussions.
- 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 young people will find the report useful and informative in establishing what national provision for deaf children looks like.

Data generated from previous CRIDE surveys has been used within Government to aid their own understanding of deaf children in Scotland. CRIDE would like to take the opportunity to thank all services for taking the time to respond, despite the considerable time constraints many services are subject to.

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 2011 survey. **Again, caution is needed in making comparisons due to slight changes to how some questions were phrased from the 2011 survey and also differences in response rates between surveys.**

For the purpose of this survey, 'deaf children' were defined as all children and young people up to the age of 19 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.

Please note that where the number of deaf children for any category is fewer than 5, we have shown '<5'. This is to avoid any risk of individual children being identified. '**' indicates that the total for that service has also been rounded up to the nearest 5 to prevent any calculation of the figures indicated as less than 5.

Contents

This report has six parts with two annexes, as set out below:

PART 1: Overall number of deaf children in Scotland ("belonging").....	3
PART 2: Number of deaf children supported	9
PART 3: Specialist staff	163
PART 4: Eligibility criteria and funding arrangements	18
PART 5: Concluding thoughts.....	22
PART 6: Background and methodology.....	24
Annex A: Numbers of deaf children 'belonging' by service	25
Annex B: Provision and support for children with temporary deafness	26

PART 1: Overall number of deaf children in Scotland (“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; 13% of services gave broken-down figures where the sum generated a different total from that given elsewhere in the survey.

CRIDE continues to be concerned that some services may only be providing figures for children belonging that they actively support. This means that children who do not receive support are not being recorded as they are unknown to the service. 57% of services later gave a figure for the number of children being supported that was the same as the number belonging.

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 29 services covering 31 local authorities, the adjusted total number of deaf children in Scotland is 2,842. This is up from 2,526 in 2010/11. This amounts to a 11% increase over the past two years. It is difficult to be certain on the extent to which this increase is due to changes in demography or improvements in reporting. Unadjusted figures are set out below.

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

	Total generated
Adjusted total	2,842
Total given when asked how many children overall	2,837
Total given when asked about number of children, broken down by age group	2,829
Total given when asked about number of children, broken down by level of deafness (including ‘Level of deafness not known’)	2,747
Total given when asked about number of children, broken down by educational setting	2,803

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 Scotland

The tables below provide breakdowns by age, level of deafness and region. In most cases, there are very few significant changes in the proportions of children belonging to different categories from year to year, suggesting a core stability within the data set. However, the number of young people at S6 has dropped from 8% in 2011 to 3% in 2013. The reasons for this are unclear.

Table 2: Number of children belonging, by age

Age group	Number of deaf children reported	Percentage of total
Preschool	444	15.6%
Primary	1,315	46.3%
Secondary	979	34.4%
Young people (at S6)	86	3%
Young people in education / who have completed S5 but who are not in school (e.g. they are in a General Further Education College, enrolled with a private training provider, in employment etc.)	5	0.2%
Total (n=28)	2,829	

Looking at the number of reported young people who have completed S5, 6 services (20% of services) do not report having any deaf young people at S6. In terms of other young people in education / who have completed S5 but who are not in school (e.g. they are in a General Further Education College, enrolled with a private training provider, in employment etc.) 27 services (90% 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 this category in these areas. It is also possible that some deaf young people leave school with unknown post-school destinations, or that services are unable to confirm whether a young person has maintained their initial post-school destination at the time of completing the CRIDE survey.

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

Level of deafness	Number of deaf children reported	Percentage of total (where known)
Unilateral	339	12%
Mild	581	21%
Moderate	810	29%
Severe	379	14%
Profound	482	18%
Total not including 'Not known' (n=28)	2,591	
Not known	156	
Total including those 'Not known'	2,747	

Annex A lists individual responses to this question by services.

Table 4: Number of children, belonging by educational setting

Type of educational provision		Number of deaf children	Percentage of total
In local authority	Supported at home – pre school children	282	10.1%
	Supported at home – of school age and home educated	33	1.2%
	Mainstream state funded schools	1,964	70.1%
	Mainstream independent (non state funded) schools	5	0.2%
	Resource provision in mainstream schools	195	7%
	Special schools for deaf pupils (maintained and non-maintained)	40	1.4%
	Other special schools, not specifically for deaf children	228	8.1%
	All other non-school post 16 provision	<5	<0.2%
Out of local authority	Mainstream state funded schools	7	0.2%
	Mainstream independent (non state funded) schools	<5	<0.2%
	Resource provision in mainstream schools	14	0.5%
	Special schools for deaf pupils (maintained and non-maintained)	28	1%
	Other special school, not specifically for deaf children	<5	<0.2%
	All other non-school post 16 provision	0	0%
Other	NEET (Not in education, employment or training) (Post 16 only)	0	0%
	Other (e.g. Pupil referral units)	0	0%
	Not known	<5	<0.2%
Total (n=29)		2,803	

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

Type of educational provision (excluding 'other' and 'not known')	Number of deaf children	Percentage of total
In home local authority	2,749	98%
Out of home local authority	53	2%
Total (not including 'Not known') (n=29)	2,802	

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 and young people post 16 and other)
Supported at home – pre school children	282	10.1%	-
Supported at home – of school age and home educated	33	1.2%	1.3%
Mainstream provision (including independent schools)	1,979	70.6%	78.5%
Resource provision in mainstream schools	209	7.5%	8.3%
Special schools for deaf pupils (maintained and non-maintained)	68	2.4%	2.7%
Other special schools, not specifically for deaf children	229	8.2%	9.1%
All other non-school post 16 provision	<5	<0.2%	-
Other (e.g. Pupil referral units, NEET, not known)	<5	<0.2%	-
Total (n=29)	2,810		
Total (excluding pre-school children and young people post 16 and 'other')	2,518		

New categories⁴ were added this year with small changes to some of the other categories to allow for more sophisticated analysis, so it is not possible to directly compare this data with the data from the 2011 survey. It remains a challenge to establish discrete categories without overcomplicating the survey.

⁴ The categories that were added are 'In LA: Supported at home – of school age and home educated', 'In LA: School sixth forms (including special schools)' and 'Out of LA: School sixth forms (including special schools)'

The CRIDE 2013 results suggest that 78.5% of school aged deaf children are in mainstream settings without specialist provision.

The smallest service reported 7 deaf children belonging in their boundaries. The largest reported 421 deaf children. The average number of deaf children belonging in each service was 95.

Incidence of Auditory Neuropathy Spectrum Disorder (ANSD)

11 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 22 deaf children in Scotland with this condition, 0.4% of all deaf children (adjusted total), which is the same as in 2010/11.

Due to newborn hearing screening protocols, ANSD is only reliably diagnosed in babies following test procedures undertaken in those 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 Scotland since 2005. Research indicates 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 2005, 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 support needs (ASN)

26 services were able to tell us how many deaf children had an ASN. The figures show that the adjusted total number of deaf children with an ASN is 637. This is 22.4% of the adjusted total of deaf children, which is the same as in 2010/11.

Services were asked to give a breakdown by type of ASN. For this question, some services gave breakdowns that amounted to totals greater than the total they gave, so the adjusted total is lower than the unadjusted total comprising the sum of the broken-down figures. Services were asked to breakdown this figure by type of ASN, using the classification set out in the Supporting Children's Learning Code of Practice.

Table 7: Number of deaf children with an ASN, by type of ASN

	Number of deaf children	Percentage of deaf children with an ASN (where type of ASN known)	Percentage of all deaf children (adjusted total)
Specific Learning Difficulty	30	5.3%	1.1%
Moderate Learning Difficulty	187	32.7%	6.6%
Severe Learning Difficulty	23	4%	0.8%
Profound & Multiple Learning Difficulty	84	14.7%	3%
Behaviour, Emotional & Social Difficulties	22	3.9%	0.8%
Speech, Language and Communications Needs	42	7.4%	1.5%
Visual Impairment	30	5.3%	1.1%
Multi-Sensory Impairment	28	4.9%	1%
Physical Disability	41	7.2%	1.4%
Autistic Spectrum Disorder	30	5.3%	1.1%
Other Difficulty/Disability	54	9.5%	1.9%
Not known	64	-	2.3%
Total (n=26)	635		22.3%
Total excluding those reported "not known"	571		

The figures suggest that the most common ASN is moderate learning difficulty, followed by profound & multiple learning difficulty. We continue to use separate categories for deaf children with an additional need of visual impairment and multi-sensory impairment on the advice of those who work with children with multi-sensory impairments though we continue to be conscious of the confusion this potentially causes.

According to data provided by the Pupil Census, 19.5% of all pupils have an identified ASN. According to this data 2,441 pupils have a hearing impairment which is equal to 3.6 in every 1000 pupils in Scotland. NDCS is unaware of any published information from the Pupil Census on the proportion of deaf children with an additional need.

Deaf children with cochlear implants

27 services were able to provide information about how many deaf children had a cochlear implant⁵. Based on these responses, there are 279 deaf children across Scotland with cochlear implants (adjusted total). This is 10% of the adjusted total of deaf children.

Table 8: 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	63	444	14%
Primary aged	138	1,315	10%
Secondary aged	77	979	8%
Young people who have completed S5	<5	91	<5%
Total (n=27)	285**		10%

Proportionally, there has been a slight decrease in the number of deaf children with cochlear implants from 11% in 2010/11.

⁵ Though not all services gave a figure for each age group.

Additional languages

Table 9: Number of deaf children, by languages mainly used with the child

Language	Total	Percentage of responses (where known)
Spoken English	1,598	83.6%
British Sign Language	58	3%
Other sign language	11	0.6%
Other spoken language	17	0.9%
Spoken English together with sign language	216	11.3%
Spoken English and other spoken language	9	0.5%
Other spoken language together with sign language	<5	<0.3%
Total known (n=25)	1,915**	
Reported "not known"	292	

28 services provided information for at least some part this question. Of those that did respond, some were unable to identify the language of all deaf children in their area. There are around 640 deaf children who are unaccounted for in the above figures, so these figures should be used with caution. The results suggest that around 15% of deaf children use sign language as their main language or in some combination with another language. 1.2% use a spoken language other than English, again as their main language or in some combination with another language.

It should be noted that the wording of this question was changed from previous surveys, from asking about the language used at home, to language used with the child. The wording was changed due to feedback from services suggesting that they did not routinely record information on languages used at home. It should also be noted that some new categories were added this year, based on feedback from services last year, so it is difficult to directly compare the languages that are affected by these changes. Both of these changes may have an impact on any changes in proportions compared with the last two years.

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

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 supported⁶ by the service. This section sets out our analysis of these figures on children being supported. Similar issues around given totals differing from each other also occurred here and we have taken the same approach in calculating an adjusted total.

Based on responses from 28 services, our survey indicates that at least **2,629** deaf children receive support from their local service (adjusted total). This is an increase from 2010/11 of 11% where 2,343 deaf children were reported as receiving support.

Table 10: Figures generated when calculating how many deaf children are being supported by the service

	Total generated
Adjusted total	2,629
Total given when asked how many children overall	2,481
Total given when asked about number of children, broken down by age	2,621
Total given when asked about number of children, broken down by level of deafness	2,454

The smallest number of children being supported by a service was 7 and the largest was 303. The average was 88.

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

The table below breaks down the results by age, and type of educational provision.

Table 11: Number of deaf children being supported by the service, by age group

Age group	Number of deaf children	Percentage of total
Preschool	426	16%
Primary	1,240	47%
Secondary	877	34%
Young people (at S6)	72	3%
Young people in education / who have completed S5 but who are not in school (e.g. they are in a General Further Education College, enrolled with a private training provider, in employment etc.)	0	0%
Total (where known)	2,615	
Not known	6	
Total (including where not known) (n=25)		

Table 12: Number of deaf children being supported by the service, by level of deafness

Level of deafness	Number of deaf children	Percentage of total (where known)
Unilateral	316	13%
Mild	529	23%
Moderate	795	34%
Severe	305	13%
Profound	398	17%
Total (where known)	2,343	
Not known	111	
Total (including where not known) (n=25)		

⁶ Examples of support given were direct teaching, visits to the family or school, liaison with the family, school and teachers, provision of hearing aid checks, etc.

Assuming the figures are broadly comparable, if there are 2,829 deaf children (adjusted total) who live in Scotland, there are at least 214 deaf children who are not being supported by the service. In other words, the figures suggest that 92% of deaf children receive support from their local service. It does not automatically follow that 8% of deaf children are not receiving any support at all; many may be receiving support elsewhere from, for example, special schools for deaf children or resource provisions not managed by the service. Overall, the proportion of children who receive support from the service has decreased slightly from 93% to 92% since 2010/11.

The table below compares the percentage difference between each age group to see if any particular age groups appear less likely to receive support from the service.

Table 13: Comparison between number of deaf children belonging and supported by age

Age group	Number of deaf children belonging	Number of deaf children supported by the local service	Proportion of deaf children being supported as a percentage of deaf children belonging
Preschool	444	426	96%
Primary	1,315	1,240	94%
Secondary	979	877	90%
Young people (at S6)	86	72	84%
Young people in education / who have completed S5 but who are not in school (e.g. they are in a General Further Education College, enrolled with a private training provider, in employment etc.)	5	0	0%
Total not including 'not known'	2,829	2,615	92%

Table 14: 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 by the local service	Proportion of deaf children being supported as a percentage of deaf children belonging
Unilateral	339	316	93%
Mild	581	529	91%
Moderate	810	795	98%
Severe	379	305	80%
Profound	482	398	83%
Total	2,591	2,343	90%

The above table suggests that severely and profoundly deaf children are less likely to receive support from their local service than mild or moderately or children. 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 also 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 fewer deaf children with cochlear implants may now be receiving support compared to children without, due to apparent changes in their individual needs. There is no clear answer to this point though services will have made their own observations.

Children with temporary conductive deafness

We asked services if they also separately supported children who have temporary conductive hearing loss. Of the 29 services that responded to this question, 16 (55%) did, and 13 services (45%) did not. We then asked those services that did, how many they supported. Only 13 services gave a number. There are at least 196 children with temporary conductive deafness supported by services that services were able to tell us about. Annex B lists individual responses to this question by services.

How do CRIDE's 2013 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, the different definitions used and the different numbers of areas data has been collected from. CRIDE recommends that these figures be used as a basis for further debate and analysis, rather than to reach firm conclusions.

Estimates based on prevalence figures

NDCS estimates there are between 2973 - 3599 deaf children in Scotland. This estimate has been calculated using known data on the prevalence of deafness and population estimates from 2012 from the Office of National Statistics. The estimates include deaf children with all levels of hearing loss, including unilateral, and who have a permanent loss.

Pupil Census

*Pupils in Scotland*⁷, the Scottish Pupil Census, is the only source of routinely-published information on numbers of pupils with a hearing loss in Scotland. This data is published in accordance with the Additional Support for Learning (Scotland) Act and since 2010 has included pupils with Co-ordinated Support Plans, Individualised Education Plans, Child Plans, those declared as disabled as well as those receiving 'other' types of support including temporary.

The latest available data for deaf pupils in Scotland recorded **2,441**⁸ deaf children in primary, secondary and special schools as at September 2013.

This represents an increase of 8.4% from the previous year's Pupil Census, when 2,253 deaf pupils were recorded⁹. However it represents an increase of almost 142% since 2009's official figures (1,007 deaf children)¹⁰. This is indicative of improvements in education data collection mechanisms within the Scottish Government since the revision of the Additional Support for Learning Act in 2009.

The Scottish Government does not collect data on pupils with ASN in independent schools.

There are clear disparities between CRIDE and Pupil Census data. In 2013 the Pupil Census data indicates 1,039 pupils in primary school with a hearing loss compared to 1,240 indicated by CRIDE in the same year. Similarly, at secondary school level the Pupil Census showed 886 pupils with a hearing loss compared to the 949 indicated in this CRIDE study for the same year.

In 2010, NDCS worked with HM Inspectorate of Education (HMIe) on a report for Scottish Ministers assessing the impact of the Additional Support for Learning legislation on specified groups of children and young people, including deaf children and young people. As part of this

⁷ Published annually in *Pupils in Scotland* by the Scottish Government

⁸ <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/Browse/School-Education/dspupcensus> 2013, Table 1.8

⁹ <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/Browse/School-Education/PubPupilCensus>, 2012, Table 1.8

¹⁰ <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/Browse/School-Education/PubPupilCensus>

research, HMle approached schools directly to ask them to report on the number of children with a hearing loss being educated locally. This survey recorded **2,438** deaf children known to education authorities.

The Scottish Sensory Centre (SSC), 2012

The Education of Children and Young People with a Sensory Impairment in Scotland in Scotland Report contains data from the results of a survey to Heads of Service sent to all 32 Scottish local authorities responsible for the support of children and young people with a hearing impairment.

As 6 local authorities did not respond to this survey, data should be treated with caution. The survey found a total of 1,596 children and young people with a hearing impairment across mainstream, resource provision and specialist school settings. When combining Pupil Census data for missing local authorities it brings the survey's total to 2,106. This is significantly lower than the CRIDE adjusted total of 2,842.

Summary of currently available information on numbers of deaf children in Scotland

Source	Number of deaf children in Scotland
CRIDE (2013)	2,842
Scottish Pupil Census (2013)	2,441
UNHS (2008/9)	2,226 approx (who were diagnosed at birth)
SSC (2012)	1,596
NDCS (2012)	2973 to 3599
HMle Survey (2010)	2,438

Whilst all of the above figures must be used with caution due to some difference in age ranges included in the data, this summary analysis suggests that the CRIDE data is broadly representative of the number of deaf pupils currently known to specialist education services in Scotland.

PART 3: Specialist Staff

Teachers of the Deaf

Our survey asked how many Teachers of the Deaf there are who are employed by the local service, 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. We did not ask about Teachers of the Deaf in special schools, cochlear implant centres and other settings and therefore the figures below do not provide a complete picture of the total population of Teachers of the Deaf in Scotland.

In total, there are at least 208.5 (FTE) Teachers of the Deaf posts in employment in Scotland. Of these 66% are occupied by a fully qualified Teacher of the Deaf. In addition, at the time the survey was completed, there were 6.0 FTE vacant posts.

If the vacant posts are added to the total number of Teachers of the Deaf in employment, this would indicate there are at least 214.5 Teacher of the Deaf posts, of which 3% are vacant.

Table 15: 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	140.6	67%
Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years	58.5	28%
Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training	9.5	5%
Total (n=27)	208.5	

Table 16: Number of Teacher of the Deaf vacancies overall

	Number of Teacher of the Deaf posts (FTE)	Percentage of total	
Vacancies	Post frozen	0	0%
	Currently advertised	5.4	90%
	Advertised but no suitable candidate	0.6	10%
Total (n=27)	6.0		

Table 17: Changes in numbers of Teachers of the Deaf from year to year

	2010/11	2012/13	Change over 2 years
Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification in employment	165.3	140.6	-15%
Number of teachers working as Teachers of the Deaf in employment	218.1	208.5	-4%
Number of Teacher of the Deaf posts (including vacancies)	230.5	214.5	-7%

Comparing with figures from the CRIDE 2011 survey, depending on which measure is used, there appears to have been a decline of between 4 and 15% of the number of Teachers of the Deaf working in services and resource provision in the past 2 years. 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. It is possible that there has been an increase in numbers of Teachers of the Deaf working in other settings (such as special schools) which is not captured within this survey but it is CRIDE’s view that this is unlikely.

The following 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 2013. 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 (where there is no resource provision) or in a special school not designated for deaf children.

Table 18: 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	84.5	25
Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years	25	15
Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training	5.9	7
Total (n=27)	115.4	

Table 19: 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	0
	Currently advertised	2.9
	Advertised but no suitable candidate	0.6
Total (n=3)	3.5	

In terms of fully qualified visiting Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification, the numbers within each service ranged from 0.5 at the smallest to 11.9 in the largest. The average number of visiting Teachers of the Deaf (with the mandatory qualification) per service is 3.1 (FTE).

14 (47%) of services employ 2 or fewer visiting Teachers of the Deaf, of which 5 services (17%) employed 1 or fewer visiting Teachers of the Deaf. 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.

We asked if services had sought to recruit Teachers of the Deaf over the past 12 months. Of the 18 services that had, 4 (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 15 services that indicated yes, 11 (73%) said they had experienced difficulties in securing supply cover.

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 ASL co-ordinator, for example). Again, we did not ask about other specialist staff in special schools, cochlear implant centres and other settings and therefore the figures below do not provide a complete picture of the total population of specialist staff in Scotland.

Table 20: 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	55.9	11		0.2	1
Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years	33.5	7		0	0
Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training	3.6	3		0	0
Total (n=11)	93			0.2	

There is an overall increase in numbers of those employed by the local authority between the above table and the corresponding figures from 2010/11, and an decrease in numbers of those employed by the school between the above table and the corresponding figures from 2010/11. Overall there has been a slight increase in total from 88.2 to 93.2 FTE.

Table 21: 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	0	0		0	0
	Currently advertised	2.5	1		0	0
	Advertised but no suitable candidate	0	0		0	0
Total (n=1)		2.5			0	

The following table seeks to explore whether there are any proportional differences in the status of teachers. In the case of resource provisions, the figures suggest that there is a higher incidence of unqualified teachers working as Teachers of the Deaf in resource provisions and employed by the local authority compared with those teachers employed by the school.

Table 22: 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	71%	59%	100%
Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years	21%	35%	0%
Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training	5%	4%	0%

Other specialist staff

Our survey suggests that there are at least 109.6 specialist support staff, other than Teachers of the Deaf, supporting deaf children in Scotland in either a peripatetic role or working in resource provisions. The most common role is teaching assistant followed by communication support worker, and then speech and language therapist.

Table 23: Number of specialist support staff overall, by role

	Number of staff (FTE)	Percentage of total
Teaching assistants / Classroom support assistants etc	51.7	47%
Communication support workers / Interpreters / Communicators etc	20	18%
Deaf instructors / Deaf role models / Sign language instructors etc	8.8	8%
Educational audiologists / Technicians etc	7.8	7%
Speech and language therapists	15.3	14%
Family support workers / Liaison officers	4	4%
Social workers / Social workers for deaf children	2	2%
Total	109.6	

A few other, with different full time equivalents, were cited when asked about other specialist staff, 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 106.8 in 2010/11, amounting to a 3% increase.

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 24: Number of 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	12.3	6	23%	39.4	8	71%
Communication support workers / Interpreters / Communicators etc	14.4	6	27%	5.6	3	10%
Deaf instructors / Deaf role models / Sign language instructors etc	2.6	5	5%	6.2	3	11%
Educational audiologists / Technicians etc	5.6	7	10%	2.1	3	4%
Speech and language therapists	12.8	3	24%	2.5	2	4%
Family support workers / Liaison officers	4.0	2	7%	0	0	0%
Social workers / Social workers for deaf children	2.0	2	4%	0	0	0%
Total	53.7			55.8		

We also asked if services manage teaching assistants or other support staff based in schools to support named pupils. Of the 29 services that responded to this question, 7 (24%) said yes, 17 (59%) said they manage some, but not all, and 5 (17%) said they did not.

Resource provisions

When asked if the resource provision provided outreach support to other schools Of the 9 services that responded to this question, 3 (33%) said yes, and 6 (67%) replied no. Where outreach support was provided, this amounted to 11 full time equivalent staffing time total across all of the services who responded, up slightly from 10.2 in 2010/11.

PART 5: Eligibility criteria and funding arrangements

Eligibility criteria

The majority of services continue to use locally developed criteria as a vehicle to help determine what support deaf children receive.

Table 25: Criteria used to help determine the level of support for deaf children

	Number of services	Percentage of total
NatSIP criteria ¹¹	6	20%
Criteria are mostly developed locally	22	73%
Other	2	7%
Total (n=30)		

Services were asked to specify what other criteria they used. In these cases, services reported that criteria were matched to *Getting it right for every child* (GIRFEC) and other standards, or focused around individual assessments of children. Annex B lists how individual services responded to this question.

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 26: 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	1	29	0
	Bilateral moderate sensorineural deafness	0	1	30	0
	Bilateral conductive deafness	1	9	19	0
	Bilateral mild or high frequency only sensorineural deafness	0	14	19	0
	Unilateral deafness (sensorineural or conductive)	2	18	12	0
Additional and permanent need	Bilateral severe or profound sensorineural deafness	0	3	26	1
	Bilateral moderate sensorineural deafness	0	4	26	1
	Bilateral conductive deafness	3	10	17	1
Other	With temporary conductive deafness as a primary or additional need	9	14	9	2
	In special schools other than schools for the deaf	3	12	13	4
	With auditory neuropathy	6	5	13	8
	With auditory processing difficulty/disorder	7	9	9	4
n=30					

¹¹ The NatSIP criteria were updated during the time this survey was launched. The document builds on the SESIP/SERSEN Revised Eligibility Criteria (2009), which are in turn based on the SERSEN Eligibility Criteria (2005)

Table 27: Changes in eligibility criteria in the service between 2011/12 and 2012/13

	Number of services	Percentage of services
Changes resulting in some / all deaf children now receiving more support	3	12%
Changes resulting in some / all deaf children now receiving less support	3	12%
No changes	20	77%
Total (n=26)		

Where changes were indicated, services were asked to provide information on what had changed. Reasons given for reducing support included increases in numbers of pupils but no corresponding increase in staff. Reasons given for increasing support included specialist staff being employed to support named pupils, and Teacher of the Deaf posts being re-established and recruited to. Other factors influencing changes included increase in numbers of early years children referred to the service and service increasing focus on early intervention.

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 28: 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) ¹²	21
Frameworks provided by Her Majesty's Inspectorate for Education (now Education Scotland) such as Count Us In: Achieving success for deaf pupils (jointly published with NDCS) or How Good is Our School: Journey to Excellence.	28
Newborn Hearing Screening Programme Quality Standards	14
Other standards.	
N=29	

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 Cochlear implants, FM systems, Bone anchored hearing aids)
- NDCS Acoustics toolkit
- Services' own local standards
- Local authority priorities for improvement
- Council frameworks for the whole Visiting Teaching & Support Services
- SSC Scottish Standards for Deaf Children 0-3
- Paediatric audiology
- Early years framework
- HGIOS 3 Language and Communication Friendly Establishment (GCC)
- Nurturing Principles (GCC)

¹² See: <http://www.ndcs.org.uk/document.rm?id=4350>

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. This was also reported in 2010/11 but the categories have been changed slightly, with an additional category being added in, so direct comparisons are difficult to make.

Table 29: Funding arrangements for peripatetic specialist support services

Funding is...	Number of services	Percentage of all services who responded
held centrally by the LA (including funding held by the LA to purchase hearing support services from other LAs, or external agencies e.g. SENSE)	18	60%
delegated to a special or mainstream school with a resource provision that then provides outreach to other schools	5	17%
delegated in full to individual schools in the LA who decide whether to purchase specialist support from the LA	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)	0	0%
Other	7	23%
Total (n=30)		

Responses in the 'other' category generally indicated:

- Budget being delegated to the Sensory Support Service which manages it for the Hearing Support
- Budget being delegated to the service.
- Delegated to Sensory Support Service
- A mixture of the options, e.g. some of the budget is held centrally, and some is managed by the head of the service.
- A 'host authority' holding the budget and other authorities contributing according to population size.

Funding arrangements – resource provisions

CRIDE also sought information on the funding arrangements for resource provisions. 11 services indicated that they had resource provisions in their area.

Table 30: Funding arrangements for resource provisions

Funding for resource provision is...	Number of services	Percentage of those where applicable
held centrally by the local authority	7	70%
delegated to schools	1	10%
both central and delegated	2	20%
Total responses	10	

The majority of resource provisions continue to be held centrally by the local authority. This is broadly in line with findings from 2010/11. The service where the funding was delegated to schools stated that a service level agreement was used

10 (91%) of services reported that they have used the NDCS “Quality Standards: Resource provisions for deaf children and young people in mainstream schools”¹³ 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:

- Achieving Success for Deaf Children and Young People in Glasgow (2010)
- Count Us in: Achieving Success for Deaf Pupils
- HGIOS 3, Glasgow TACLE materials – Meeting Learning Needs
- CFE Journey to excellence

Staffing changes

In the context of concerns over spending reductions, the survey asked about budgeted changes between 2011/12 and 2012/13 such as training or equipment.

Table 31: Budget changes

	Increase in budget	Decrease in budget	No change in budget	Don't know / can't separate budget for HI team
Staffing	1 (3%)	2 (7%)	20 (69%)	6 (21%)
Training	1 (4%)	5 (18%)	17 (61%)	5 (18%)
Equipment	4 (14%)	1 (3%)	19 (66%)	5 (17%)
Other	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Services were also asked if there were any proposed changes to the budget for our service between 2012/13 and 2013/14.

Table 32: Proposed budget changes

	Increase in budget	Decrease in budget	No change in budget	Don't know / can't separate budget for HI team
Staffing	1 (5%)	3 (14%)	18 (82%)	0 (0%)
Training	0 (0%)	5 (24%)	16 (76%)	0 (0%)
Equipment	1 (5%)	4 (20%)	15 (75%)	0 (0%)
Other	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)

¹³ See: <http://www.ndcs.org.uk/document.rm?id=5765>

PART 6: Concluding thoughts

In this section we reflect on some of the findings from the 2012/13 survey as well as our observations on the survey itself.

1. The CRIDE survey continues to show a wide discrepancy between the numbers of deaf children being supported by services and the number who are being recorded in the Pupil Census Scottish Government data. Despite the improvements that have been made in capturing deaf children in this data set since 2010, the CRIDE survey illustrates there are still inconsistencies. We also know that services, particularly larger services, continue to experience a range of challenges in providing reliable data, in response to this survey. This is not to discredit services but to recognise their limited capacity, the complexity of the task and the lack of appropriate and current tools available to services (e.g. databases) to handle such requests. Given the importance of reliable data sets to inform planning and commissioning, this is a concern. CRIDE believes there is need for national government action to support local authority data collection and ensure the availability of reliable data sets that capture all deaf children and young people aged 0 to 25 in each area. There is a consensus within CRIDE that greater central co-ordination and improvement of data-sets would support local authorities in being able to respond to requests such as those from CRIDE more readily and easily. This would in time reduce the bureaucratic burden on services.
2. The survey reports a decline over two years of 7% in the number of Teachers of the Deaf posts in Scotland. While this should be viewed within the national context of increasing priority of support in the early years and mainstream settings, further investigation is required to understand the impact of this shift on deaf children and young people.
3. This is particularly important given anecdotal concerns that a large number of Teachers of the Deaf are due to retire in coming years and numbers of Teachers of the Deaf posts has already declined by 7% over two years. At the same time as the number of Teachers of the Deaf is declining, there appears to be an increase in the number of other specialist support staff. While this increase may benefit some deaf children, there is a need to assess the impact this has had on deaf children's ability to access specialist Teacher of the Deaf support. CRIDE intends that the 2014 survey will look in more detail at this.
4. The survey continues to demonstrate that deaf children are a heterogeneous group of children including in terms of languages used, levels of deafness, other special educational needs, cochlear implants and so on. This highlights the demand on Teachers of the Deaf to be able to meet such a diversity of needs.
5. The CRIDE survey does not ask about attainment of deaf children. This is published in the Scottish Government Attainment and School Leavers' Destinations data set. Compared to hearing young people, this data continues to illustrate gaps for deaf young people in their levels of academic attainment and access to post-school destinations. A consideration for the future is how attainment data for deaf children can be routinely reported on and the role of the CRIDE survey in Scotland as a vehicle for this.
6. Many of the figures generated by the CRIDE survey are in line with those from previous years suggesting a core stability to the data. In light of the many demands on services, we do not intend to run a full survey next year, but to ask a series of 'core' questions and a small number of thematic questions on specific topics including language support, age profile of Teachers of the Deaf and post-16 transitions of deaf young people.

7. 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 Scotland. It is also the only known complete census of all deaf children in Scotland (rather than just those formally receiving support under ASL, as with the Pupil Census). In the context of increasing financial pressure on the educational system, we hope the findings will be used to ensure that any impact on deaf children is being routinely monitored and addressed.

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. AT the time the 2013 survey was issued, representatives include: the [British Association of Teachers of the Deaf](#) (BATOD), the [Ear Foundation](#), 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 [City University London](#).

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 2013 survey.

The Scotland survey was disseminated to services in Scotland between 21 and 28 March 2013 by NDCS on behalf of CRIDE. Services were asked to respond by the 17 May 2013. Where there was no response by this time, 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, mostly on 20 June 2013.

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

Table 33: Response rate by services to the CRIDE survey

	Number of responses	Cumulative total
First deadline – 17 May 2013	9	9
Second deadline following chasers	6	15
Freedom of Information requests	15	30

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.

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.

Annex A: Numbers of deaf children ‘belonging’ by service

The tables shown in Annex A and B set out some individual data from services. CRIDE’s intention to publish this data was indicated when services were first asked to complete the survey. It is CRIDE’s intention to expand the publication of individual service data in the future.

Service	Level of deafness						TOTAL
	Unilateral	Mild	Moderate	Severe	Profound	Not known	
Aberdeen City	5	51	34	12	16	0	118
Aberdeenshire	13	33	35	11	16	0	108
Angus	11	16	28	23	19	0	97
Argyll and Bute	5	12	8	8	5	8	46
Clackmannanshire	*	14	6	6	*	16	50**
Dumfries and Galloway	5	13	33	7	15	*	80**
Dundee City	13	*	29	11	21	*	85**
East Dunbartonshire	8	10	6	12	9	0	45
East Lothian	11	7	14	5	7	*	50**
East Renfrewshire	24	18	23	6	6	16	93
East, North and South Ayrshire	*	15	46	29	30	0	125**
Edinburgh City	0	34	48	12	24	0	118
Falkirk	31	35	30	9	13	6	124
Fife	82	58	98	28	37	0	303
Glasgow City	14	41	139	78	85	64	421
Highland	23	44	54	21	38	0	180
Inverclyde	19	15	21	*	11	*	75**
Midlothian	*	8	11	6	9	6	45**
Moray	9	9	9	*	*	0	35**
North Lanarkshire	7	16	45	49	57	20	194
Orkney Islands	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Perth and Kinross	17	19	11	6	5	0	58
Renfrewshire	22	73	50	10	21	9	185
Scottish Borders	5	13	7	12	7	0	44
Shetland Islands	0	9	7	0	0	0	16
South Lanarkshire	0	0	0	0	22	0	22
Stirling	9	13	12	8	*	0	50**
West Dunbartonshire	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
West Lothian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Western Isles (Comhairle nan Eilean Siar)	*	*	6	*	0	0	15**

Notes:

- ‘*’ indicates that the number of children who fall into the specified category is fewer than 5. The actual figure has been substituted by an asterisk to avoid any risk of individual children being identified. ‘**’ indicates that the total for that service has also been rounded up to the nearest 5 to prevent any calculation of the asterisked figures.
- ‘-’ indicates that no response to the relevant question was received.

Annex B: Provision and support for children with temporary deafness

Service	Eligibility criteria used	The number of children with temporary deafness supported by the service
Aberdeen City	Criteria are mostly developed locally	N/a
Aberdeenshire	Criteria are mostly developed locally	13
Angus	NatSIP criteria	9
Argyll and Bute	Criteria are mostly developed locally	N/a
Clackmannanshire	Criteria are mostly developed locally	*
Dumfries and Galloway	Criteria are mostly developed locally	N/a
Dundee City	Criteria are mostly developed locally	36
East Dunbartonshire	Criteria are mostly developed locally	*
East Lothian	Criteria are mostly developed locally	*
East Renfrewshire	NatSIP criteria	10
East, North and South Ayrshire	Criteria are mostly developed locally	N/a
Edinburgh City	Criteria are mostly developed locally	N/a
Falkirk	Other (please specify):	19
Fife	Criteria are mostly developed locally	N/a
Glasgow City	NatSIP criteria	10
Highland	NatSIP criteria	13
Inverclyde	Criteria are mostly developed locally	N/a
Midlothian	Criteria are mostly developed locally	-
Moray	Criteria are mostly developed locally	N/a
North Lanarkshire	Criteria are mostly developed locally	40
Orkney Islands	Criteria are mostly developed locally	-
Perth and Kinross	NatSIP criteria	8
Renfrewshire	Criteria are mostly developed locally	N/a
Scottish Borders	Criteria are mostly developed locally	N/a
Shetland Islands	Criteria are mostly developed locally	-
South Lanarkshire	Criteria are mostly developed locally	N/a
Stirling	Criteria are mostly developed locally	32
West Dunbartonshire	Other (please specify):	N/a
West Lothian	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Western Isles (Comhairle nan Eilean Siar)	Criteria are mostly developed locally	-

Notes:

- ‘-’ indicates that no response to the relevant question was received.
- ‘NatSIP criteria’ refers to NatSIP Revised Eligibility Criteria (2012), SESIP/SERSEN Revised Eligibility Criteria (2009) or SERSEN Eligibility Criteria (2005).
- ‘N/a’ indicates that a response was not applicable because, for example, the service does not support children with temporary deafness.