



Consortium for Research in Deaf Education

## 2014 report for England

### CRIDE report on 2014 survey on educational provision for deaf children in England

#### Introduction

In 2014, the Consortium for Research into Deaf Education (CRIDE) carried out its fourth annual survey on educational staffing and service provision for deaf children in the 2013/14 financial year<sup>1</sup>. 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.

Following the third survey, CRIDE decided that future surveys would alternate between a shorter survey with a smaller number of core questions and the full survey. CRIDE also decided that in the years of a shorter survey, a small number of thematic questions on topical issues or concerns would be included. The 2014 survey is a shorter survey and includes thematic questions on the age profile of Teachers of the Deaf in light of concerns over capacity gaps in the future. It also includes thematic questions around sign language provision.

#### Summary of key findings

- There are over 40,000 deaf children in England, a reported increase of 7% over the past year.
- 15% of deaf children identified by CRIDE have a statement of special educational needs.
- 87% of deaf children communicate only using spoken English in their school or other education setting. Around 9% use sign language in some form, either on its own or alongside another language.
- There are 1,080 teachers employed as Teachers of the Deaf in England. Of these, just under 1,000 are qualified as Teachers of the Deaf.
- The number of qualified Teachers of the Deaf has declined by 3% in the past year, and by 6% since the first CRIDE survey in 2011.
- Over half of all Teachers of the Deaf are due to retire within the next 10 to 15 years.
- 9% of visiting Teachers of the Deaf hold at least a Level 3 qualification in British Sign Language. Most services (59%) do not have a Teacher of the Deaf within the team who holds this qualification.

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

Responses were received from 133 services in England, covering 150 local authority areas. This means that this CRIDE survey achieved a response rate of 99%. However, as the remaining two local authorities were not contacted on the understanding that there are no or very few deaf children living in those areas, the survey has effectively reached a 100% response rate. The overall response rate is the same as last year, when there was a 99% response rate.

## Using the results

The CRIDE report can be used in the following 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.

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 previous CRIDE surveys. **Again, caution is needed in making comparisons due to slight changes to how some questions were phrased from year to year 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.

## Contents

This report has seven parts and one annexe, as set out below:

PART 1: Overall number of deaf children in England.....	3
PART 2: Communication and language .....	6
PART 3: Teachers of the Deaf .....	8
PART 4: Other specialist staff .....	12
PART 5: The impact of CRIDE reports .....	14
PART 6: Concluding thoughts.....	16
PART 7: Background and methodology .....	17
Annex A: Numbers of deaf children by service .....	18

## PART 1: Overall number of deaf children in England

### How many deaf children are there known to ‘belong’?

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 authority. 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.

Based on responses from 132 services covering 149 local authorities, the total number of deaf children in England is **40,614**. This is up from 37,948 in 2012/13 amounting to a 7% increase over the past year and 16% over the past three years (when 34,927 were reported as belonging in 2010/11). It is difficult to be certain about the extent to which this increase is due to changes in demography, increase in numbers of deaf children being diagnosed or improvements in reporting. The smallest number of children belonging was 66 and the largest was 1,250. The average was 308. Figures for each region are set out below.

Table 1: Number of deaf children belonging, by region

Region	Number of deaf children	Percentage of total
East England	3,598	9%
East Midlands	3,737	9%
London	6,247	15%
North East	2,110	5%
North West	5,900	15%
South East	5,859	14%
South West	3,158	8%
West Midlands	4,883	12%
Yorkshire & Humber	5,122	13%
<b>Total</b>	<b>40,614</b>	

Services were asked to give an overall figure of deaf children known to ‘belong’ to the service. 19% of services later gave a figure for the number of children being supported that was the same as the number belonging. 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 they are unknown to the service.

### Deaf children receiving support from services

We also asked about deaf children who are supported by the service. 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. Based on responses from 132 services, our survey indicates that at least 33,139 deaf children receive support from their local service, amounting to an increase from last year of 4% where 32,011 deaf children were reported as receiving support, and 7% over three years (when 31,067 were reported as supported in 2010/11).

It is interesting to note that the number of deaf children belonging has increased 7% in the past year whilst the number of deaf children being supported has increased by 4%.

The smallest number of children being supported by a service was 24 and the largest was 993. The average was 251.

Table 2: Number of deaf children supported by the service, by region

Region	Number of deaf children	Percentage of total
East England	3,018	9%
East Midlands	2,433	7%
London	4,966	15%
North East	1,833	6%
North West	5,283	16%
South East	4,755	14%
South West	2,595	8%
West Midlands	3,869	12%
Yorkshire & Humber	4,387	13%
<b>Total</b>	<b>33,139</b>	

Assuming the figures are broadly comparable, if there are 40,614 deaf children who live in England, there are at least 7,475 deaf children who are not being supported by the service. In other words, the figures suggest that 82% of deaf children receive support from their local service. It does not automatically follow that 18% 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.

Table 3: Number of deaf children supported, by region

Region	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
East England	3,598	3,018	84%
East Midlands	3,737	2,433	65%
London	6,247	4,966	79%
North East	2,110	1,833	87%
North West	5,900	5,283	90%
South East	5,859	4,755	81%
South West	3,158	2,595	81%
West Midlands	4,883	3,869	79%
Yorkshire & the Humber	5,122	4,387	86%
<b>Total</b>	<b>40,614</b>	<b>33,139</b>	<b>82%</b>

The previous table again suggests some regional differences between the proportion of deaf children being supported, ranging from 65% in some regions to 89% in one region. 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. It may also reflect differences in the availability of specialist provision in different regions.

### How do CRIDE's 2014 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.

#### *School Census*

School Census figures for 2013 indicate there are 16,470 children where deafness is the primary SEN and who have been placed at School Action Plus or have a statement of SEN. This is a small increase from 2012 when the corresponding figure was 16,270. School Census figures do not

include information on deaf children where deafness is a secondary need. It is clear that the School Census continues to significantly under-represent the number of deaf children in England.

Of the 16,470 deaf children recorded by the School Census, 6,180 have a statement. This is marginally down on last year when 6,285 were recorded as having a statement; it appears that while deaf children seem to be slightly more likely to be formally recorded as having a SEN, they are less likely to have a statement of need.

Comparing this figure with the number of children identified by the CRIDE survey, this would indicate that only around 15% of deaf children have a statement. The corresponding figure in last year's survey was 17%.

#### *Prevalence data*

NDCS estimates that 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.

## PART 2: Communication and language

The 2014 CRIDE survey included a series of questions about sign language provision. The questions were suggested to CRIDE by representatives from the BSL Consortium.

### Languages mainly used at school or other education setting

128 services provided information for at least some part this question. Of those that did respond, 20% were unable to identify the languages used by all of the deaf children in their area.

Table 4: Number of deaf children, by languages mainly used at school / other education setting

Language	Total	Percentage of responses (where known)
<b>Spoken English</b>	30,324	86.9%
<b>British Sign Language (BSL)</b>	641	1.8%
<b>Other sign language</b>	147	0.4%
<b>Other spoken language</b>	243	0.7%
<b>Spoken English together with sign language</b>	2,545	7%
<b>Spoken English and other spoken language</b>	735	2.1%
<b>Other spoken language together with sign language</b>	62	0.2%
<b>Other combination</b>	276	0.8%
<b>Total known (n=128)</b>	<b>34,882</b>	
Reported "not known"	1,359	

There are around 5,700 deaf children who are unaccounted for in the above figures, so these figures should be used with caution. The results suggest that around 9% of deaf children use sign language as their main language or in some combination with another language at school or other education setting. 3% use a spoken language other than English, again as their main language or in some combination with another language within the education setting.

Last year's survey asked about languages "mainly used with the child". In addition, it should also be noted that one new category was added this year, based on feedback from services last year (that of 'Other combination'). These differences mean that it is difficult to directly compare the use of different languages from year to year.

### Provision to support deaf children's development of BSL

Services were asked what provision was available within their service to support deaf children's development of BSL.

Table 5: Provision to support development of BSL

Provision	Number of services	Percentage of services providing this provision
<b>Access to deaf role models</b>	88	66%
<b>Direct one to one tuition</b>	67	50%
<b>Designated BSL lessons</b>	65	49%
<b>After school clubs</b>	46	35%
<b>Home School communication Projects</b>	24	18%
<b>Direct payment support workers</b>	9	7%
<b>Other</b>	72	54%

Many services cited 'Other', and when asked to specify the answers included:

- Family sign language courses / groups (including the NDCS Family Sign Language Curriculum)
- Networking and social events for families
- Where services referred children and young people and their families to other services - this might include social care and specialist local services for deaf people.

A few services said that they did not have provision for supporting deaf children's development of BSL, and that when children used BSL, they were supported by other specialist services or provisions, such as a local school for deaf children, a specialist resource provision, or an out of borough placement.

## Assessments used to measure children's progress in BSL

Table 6: Assessments used by services to measure children's progress in BSL

Assessment	Number of services	Percentage of services providing this provision
Herman et al's BSL Receptive Skills Test	55	41%
Signature BSL Level 1 Award in British Sign Language	46	35%
Herman et al's BSL Expressive Skills Test	33	25%
Signature BSL Level 2 Certificate in British Sign Language	28	21%
Signature BSL Level 3 NVQ Certificate in British Sign Language	3	2%
Signature BSL Level 6 NVQ Certificate in British Sign Language	1	1%
Not known	1	1%
Other	34	26%
No BSL assessments used by the service (for example, because carried out in special schools or elsewhere)	54	41%

When services cited 'Other' they were asked to specify, answers included:

- Early support monitoring protocol
- Locally developed assessments
- Herman et al's Assessing British Sign Language BSL Development Production Test (Narrative Skills).
- Brimsdown
- Speech and language therapy tools
- Informal assessment by deaf BSL users
- MacArthur Inventory of Communicative Behaviours
- BSL narrative assessment.

## PART 3: 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 England.

Based on information from 131 services, in total, there are at least 1,079.9 (FTE) Teachers of the Deaf posts in employment in England. Of these 93% are occupied by a fully qualified Teacher of the Deaf. In addition, at the time the survey was completed, there were 45.8 FTE vacant posts. In 18% 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 1,125.7 FTE Teacher of the Deaf posts, of which 1% 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 2011<sup>2</sup>. CRIDE’s figures suggest that this figure is likely to be an underestimate.

Table 7: Number of Teachers of the Deaf in employment overall

	Number of Teacher of the Deaf posts (FTE)	Percentage of total
<b>Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification</b>	999.2	93%
<b>Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years</b>	72.1	6.7%
<b>Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training</b>	8.6	0.8%
<b>Total (n=131)</b>	<b>1079.9</b>	

Table 8: Number of Teacher of the Deaf vacancies overall

	Number of Teacher of the Deaf posts (FTE)	Percentage of total	
<b>Vacancies</b>	<b>Post frozen</b>	8.4	18%
	<b>Currently advertised</b>	25.3	55%
	<b>Advertised but no suitable candidate</b>	12.1	26%
<b>Total (n=131)</b>	<b>45.8</b>		

Table 9: Changes in numbers of Teachers of the Deaf from year to year

	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14		Change since last year	Change over 4 years
<b>Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification in employment</b>	1,062.1	1,063.7	1,031.9	999.2		-3%	-6%
<b>Number of teachers working as Teachers of the Deaf in employment</b>	1,162.5	1,136.4	1,117.5	1079.9		-3%	-8%
<b>Number of Teacher of the Deaf posts (including vacancies)</b>	1,196.5	1,180	1,158.2	1125.7		-3%	-6%

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201011/cmhansrd/cm111122/text/111122w0003.htm#111122w0003.htm\\_sbhd12](http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201011/cmhansrd/cm111122/text/111122w0003.htm#111122w0003.htm_sbhd12)



The previous figures are extremely worrying. Looking solely at numbers of the Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification, there has been a decline of over 30 Teachers of the Deaf in each of the past 2 years. In addition, the number of qualified Teachers of the Deaf has now dropped below the 1,000 mark. As this report showed earlier, there has been no corresponding decrease in the number of deaf children being reported. 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.

### Age profile of Teachers of the Deaf

The CRIDE 2014 included a question on the age profile of Teachers of the Deaf. This was in response to concerns that over the past few years the number of newly recruited Teachers of the Deaf is significantly lower than the number of Teachers of the Deaf retiring from the profession. If true, this could potentially lead to a ‘capacity crunch’ where there are insufficient numbers of Teachers of the Deaf to meet the needs of future deaf children.

Table 10: Age ranges of Teachers of the Deaf (in employment or in training)

	Number of teachers (FTE)	Percentage of total
Aged 49 or under	505.7	48.7%
Aged between 50 and 59	461.85	44.5%
Aged between 60 and 64	67.4	6.5%
Aged 65 or over	2.9	0.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,037.85</b>	

The figures include Teachers of the Deaf in peripatetic (visiting) services, and resource provisions (both managed by the local authority and managed directly by schools). Not all services were able to provide totals equalling their total number of qualified Teachers of the Deaf in employment or in training - there are around 33.45 FTE Teachers of the Deaf unaccounted for in these figures.

### 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 2014. 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 not designated for deaf children.

Table 11: 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	657.5	131
Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years	30.9	33
Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training	1.0	1
<b>Total (n=131)</b>	<b>689.4</b>	

Table 12: 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	3.8	5
	Currently advertised	15.3	16
	Advertised but no suitable candidate	5.1	4
<b>Total (n=16)</b>		<b>24.2</b>	

In terms of fully qualified visiting Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification, the numbers within each service ranged from 0.8 at the smallest to 22 in the largest. The average number of visiting Teachers of the Deaf (with the mandatory qualification) per service is 5.0 (FTE).

26 (20%) of services employ 2 or fewer visiting Teachers of the Deaf, of which 9 services (7%) 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.

### Sign language qualifications of peripatetic Teachers of the Deaf

CRIDE 2014 also asked about the sign language qualifications of visiting Teachers of the Deaf.

Table 13: Sign language qualifications of visiting Teachers of the Deaf (in employment or in training)

	Number of teachers (FTE)	Percentage of total	Number of services with staff in relevant category
No qualification	57.0	8%	32 (24%)
BSL Level 1	242.3	35%	92 (69%)
BSL Level 2	334.5	48%	117 (88%)
BSL Level 3 or above	61.5	9%	54 (41%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>695.2</b>		

The total of the figures provided for this question is slightly higher than the numbers of Teachers of the Deaf in employment or in training, it therefore appears that some services were not able to provide FTE figures and instead provided numbers of individuals.

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 resource provisions

The survey asked how many Teachers of the Deaf were employed in resource provisions for deaf children, both where resource provisions were managed centrally by the local authority and where managed 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). 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 England.

Table 14: Number of Teachers of the Deaf in resource provisions managed by the local authority or the school

	Number of teachers (FTE) in resource provision managed by the local authority	Number of services with staff in relevant category		Number of teachers (FTE) in resource provision managed by the school	Number of services with staff in relevant category
Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification	170.1	52		171.7	51
Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years	18.2	19		23.0	18
Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training	2.0	2		5.6	6
<b>Total (n=94)</b>	<b>190.3</b>			<b>200.3</b>	

There is an overall reduction in numbers between the above table and the corresponding figures from last year (overall down from 414.4 to 390.6). The results indicate fewer Teachers of the Deaf in resource provisions managed by the local authority in 2012/13 (down from 268.7), but more Teachers of the Deaf in resource provisions managed by the school (up from 145.7).

Table 15: Number of Teacher of the Deaf vacant posts in resource provisions managed by the local authority or the school

		Number of teachers (FTE) in resource provision managed by the local authority	Number of services with staff in relevant category		Number of teachers (FTE) in resource provision managed by the school	Number of services with staff in relevant category
Vacancies	Post frozen	2.6	2		2.0	3
	Currently advertised	6.0	5		4.0	4
	Advertised but no suitable candidate	1.0	1		6.0	6
<b>Total (n=18)</b>		<b>9.6</b>			<b>12.0</b>	

The following table 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 managed by the school (as opposed to by the local authority). This is consistent with findings from the last two years. Paragraph 6.61 of the new SEND Code of Practice states that teachers of classes of deaf children must be taught by a qualified Teacher of the Deaf.

Table 16: 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	95.4%	89%	86%
Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years	4.5%	10%	11%
Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training	0.1%	1%	3%

## PART 4: Other specialist staff

Our survey suggests that there are at least 1,317.1 specialist support staff, other than Teachers of the Deaf, supporting deaf children in England in either a peripatetic role or working in resource provisions. This is slightly down from last year when 1.325.2 were reported. The most common role is teaching assistant followed by communication support worker.

Table 17: Number of specialist support staff overall, by role

	<b>Number of staff (FTE)</b>	<b>Percentage of total</b>
<b>Teaching assistants / Classroom support assistants etc</b>	747.8	56.8%
<b>Communication support workers / Interpreters / Communicators etc</b>	364.6	27.7%
<b>Deaf instructors / Deaf role models / Sign language instructors etc</b>	93.4	7.1%
<b>Educational audiologists / Technicians etc</b>	65.2	5.0%
<b>Speech and language therapists</b>	23.9	1.8%
<b>Family support workers / Liaison officers</b>	12.2	0.9%
<b>Social workers / Social workers for deaf children</b>	10.0	0.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1317.1</b>	

A range of roles, with different full time equivalents, were cited when asked about other specialist staff, including outreach workers, early years workers, sensory support / deaf blind support workers, counsellors, specialist or higher level teaching assistants, midday supervisors, bilingual support workers, audiologists, transition coordinators, and social inclusion coordinators . 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 following table breaks down the reported 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 18: 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	181.1	67	44%	566.7	72	62.6%
Communication support workers / Interpreters / Communicators etc	105.4	23	26%	259.2	39	28.6%
Deaf instructors / Deaf role models / Sign language instructors etc	41.8	42	10%	51.6	32	5.7%
Educational audiologists / Technicians etc	56.2	65	14%	9.1	14	1.0%
Speech and language therapists	8.8	13	2%	15.1	20	1.7%
Family support workers / Liaison officers	10.1	14	2%	2.1	4	0.2%
Social workers / Social workers for deaf children	8.9	6	2%	1.1	3	0.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>412.2</b>			<b>904.8</b>		

### Services managing support staff based in schools to support named pupils

We also asked if services manage teaching assistants or other support staff based in schools to support named pupils. Of the 132 services that responded to this question, 16 (12%) said yes, 13 (10%) said they manage some, but not all, and the majority, 103 (78%) said they did not. Fewer services manage support staff based in schools to support named pupils this year compared with 22% than did in 2012/13.

### Resource provisions providing outreach support to other schools

When asked if the resource provision provided outreach support to other schools, 17 (18%) replied yes, and 75 (82%) replied no. 16% of services indicated that outreach support was provided in 2012/13, suggesting a slight increase.

Where outreach support was provided, this amounted to 19.3 full time equivalent staffing time total across all of the services who responded, up from 10 in 2012/13. The actual figure may be higher; some services reported that they provided outreach services without giving a rough figure.

## PART 5: The impact of CRIDE reports

This is the fourth CRIDE survey, so we wanted to find out if and how services have been using the reports, and what impact the CRIDE reports have.

We asked services if they had read reports of previous CRIDE surveys. Of the 125 services that answered, 86% had read previous reports, and 14% had not.

If services had read the reports, we asked them to tell us if they agreed or disagreed with a series of statements about the reports and then how they had used the reports:

Table 19: CRIDE report statements

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
The reports are clear and easy to understand	21 (19%)	85 (76%)	4 (4%)	2 (2%)
The results provide information that is useful in informing discussions on <b>local provision</b> for deaf children	21 (19%)	73 (66%)	12 (11%)	4 (4%)
The results provide information that is useful in understanding <b>provision across England</b> for deaf children	28 (25%)	79 (71%)	2 (2%)	3 (3%)

Table 20: How services have used previous CRIDE reports:

	Number of services
To draw on comparable demographic findings when preparing for internal and external audits of local provision	53 (40%)
To inform strategic planning relating to staffing and staff training	42 (32%)
For research purposes.	25 (19%)
Other	20 (15%)

When services answered 'Other', they were asked to specify. Answers included:

- In presentations and reports
- In training for staff
- To inform parents
- To understand general trends across England
- To consider how their service compares with other services
- To contribute to service reviews
- To make the case for higher staffing levels.

Some services made suggestions for future changes:

- The survey could start to include outcomes data
- More regional data / statistical neighbour data could be made available to support strategic planning
- Data could be presented in a similar way to the Government statistical releases, which would help comparison and interrogation

Finally we asked services if they had any further comments on the value of the CRIDE survey and reports. Answers included:

- That they provide valuable and important information and data
- Completing the CRIDE survey ensures services audit their own data
- They are / would be useful for service reviews
- They are important for providing benchmarking information

- It identifies the changing face and future challenges of maintaining a highly qualified profession
- It monitors numbers of Teachers of the Deaf and other staff in the current climate
- They are more valuable when there is a specific focus, as there is in the 2014 survey
- It is the only survey of its kind that covers every local authority
- The survey and reports contribute to the arguments to ensure the standard of educational provision for deaf children and young people can be maintained

Some of the comments were around issues with the CRIDE survey, including:

- The timing of the survey, which is at around the same time as several other requests for information
- Services need support with setting up and maintaining their own databases to better equip them to efficiently deal with requests for information such as the CRIDE survey
- The CRIDE survey is largely based on quantitative data, and therefore may not reflect the full picture and the complexity of provision
- Previous surveys have taken considerable work and time, the 2014 survey was shorter and this was appreciated by services
- Different services collect and record data in different ways, which can impact on the data they provide to the CRIDE survey
- CRIDE reports could be better and more widely promoted
- Data on post-16 young people can only be reliably captured if they are in education
- The survey doesn't include children with temporary deafness, and therefore can miss important aspects of service provision
- A small number of services commented that they are unsure of the reliability of the data.

## **PART 6: Concluding thoughts**

In this section we reflect on some of the findings from the 2013/14 survey as well as our observations on the survey itself.

1. The 3% decline in the number of qualified Teachers of the Deaf in the past year is of considerable concern, particularly given that the number of deaf children being reported by CRIDE is increasing by 7%. This raises concerns about the quality of support that deaf children are receiving across England.
2. In the next 10 to 15 years, significant numbers of Teachers of the Deaf will be retiring. Members of CRIDE are concerned that insufficient steps are being taken to ensure an adequate supply of new Teachers of the Deaf to replace them.
3. It is clear that the School Census continues to significantly under-represent number of deaf children. CRIDE calls on the Government to take action to improve data collection.
4. Most Teachers of the Deaf have a sign language qualification. However, few have level 3 or above – equivalent to an A-Level. And most services - just under 60% - do not employ Teachers of the Deaf with a level 3 qualification. This means there are relatively few Teachers of the Deaf who could directly teach in sign language to deaf children who are sign language users.
5. It is pleasing and reassuring to see that most services see the CRIDE survey and reports as useful and valuable. It is clear that the decision to move to alternating shorter / full surveys has been welcomed.
6. A number of services commented on the desirability of combining the NatSIP outcomes survey with the CRIDE survey to explore linkages with provision and outcomes. A pilot is expected to take place in autumn 2014, with at least 10 participating local authorities, to explore the feasibility of this.



## 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 2014 survey was issued, representatives included: the [British Association of Teachers of the Deaf](#) (BATOD), [City University London](#), the [Ear Foundation](#), the [Ewing Foundation](#), [Frank Barnes School for Deaf Children](#), [Kent County Council](#), [London Borough of Barnet](#), the [National Deaf Children's Society](#) (NDCS), [National Sensory Impairment Partnership](#) (NatSIP), [Mary Hare School](#), [Sheffield City Council](#), and [UCL](#).

The survey was designed and created by members of CRIDE. Following feedback from services, it was decided to move to a shorter survey in 2014, with short / full surveys alternating in future years.

The survey was disseminated to services in England in February 2014 by NDCS on behalf of CRIDE. Services were asked to respond by 25 March 2014. 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 8 May 2014.

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

Table 21: Response rate by services to the CRIDE survey

	Number of responses	Cumulative total
First deadline	106	106
Second deadline following chasers	18	124
Freedom of Information requests	9	133

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](mailto:professionals@ndcs.org.uk).

## Annex A: Numbers of deaf children by service

The table shown in Annex A sets out some individual data from services when originally provided in spring 2014. 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.

Please note that figures for Teachers of the Deaf include vacant posts.

Service	Number of deaf children belonging	Number of deaf children supported	Number of full time equivalent (fte) Teachers of the Deaf in the specialist peripatetic service	Number of full time equivalent (fte) Teachers of the Deaf in resource provisions managed centrally by the LA	Number of full time equivalent (fte) Teachers of the Deaf in resource provisions managed directly by the school
<b>Eastern England</b>					
Bedford	118	118	3.1	0.7	0
Cambridgeshire	433	325	10	2.1	0
Central Bedfordshire	144	140	0.9	2.8	0
Essex	548	543	7.2	0	16
Hertfordshire	550	500	8.1	0	2.5
Luton	162	75	0	0	4.8
Norfolk	582	456	15.6	2	0
Peterborough	193	179	6	1	1
Southend on Sea	102	88	0.8	n/a	n/a
Suffolk	634	478	6.6	0	3.4
Thurrock	132	116	3.3	0	5
<b>East Midlands</b>					
Derby City	431	127	3	n/a	n/a
Derbyshire	664	624	8	0	4.6
Leicester City	429	293	11	2	0
Leicestershire and Rutland	754	430	10	1.6	0
Lincolnshire	666	245	11	1.5	1
Northamptonshire	360	308	9	2	4
Nottingham City	190	184	5.4	0	3
Nottinghamshire	243	222	7.35	n/a	n/a
<b>London</b>					
Barking and Dagenham	129	121	2	0	7.5
Barnet	300	143	3.2	0	5.8
Bexley	220	220	1	0	3
Brent	192	142	3.8	0	3
Bromley	214	204	4.1	6.2	0
Camden	178	163	2	n/a	n/a
Croydon	285	154	5	5	0
Ealing	85	85	1.6	n/a	n/a
Greenwich	274	124	4.4	0	10
Hackney	241	142	3	n/a	n/a
Hammersmith and Fulham and Kensington & Chelsea	191	186	3.6	n/a	n/a
Haringey and Enfield	369	368	5	1	0.8
Harrow	180	176	3.3	2.9	2
Havering	208	180	1.4	5	4.5
Hillingdon	210	186	2	0	3.1
Hounslow	204	148	2.5	0	8.5
Islington	106	24	2	n/a	n/a
Kingston Upon Thames	86	63	0.9	0	1
Lambeth	200	153	3.2	0	1
Lewisham	175	147	2.3	0	4.5
Merton	142	135	2.4	n/a	n/a
Newham	287	287	7	0	8
Redbridge	245	193	3.7	6.9	0
Richmond	91	85	1.6	n/a	n/a
Southwark	226	137	3.8	0.5	1

Sutton	138	120	1	2	1.6
Tower Hamlets	357	274	6.5	0	8.9
Waltham Forest	189	137	3.4	-	-
Wandsworth	399	399	6.8	6.8	0
Westminster	126	70	1.5	0	0.8
<b>North East</b>					
Darlington	101	98	1	n/a	n/a
Durham	364	297	5.1	1.9	0
Gateshead	164	163	3.1	0	1
Middlesbrough, Hartlepool, Stockton-on-Tees, Redcar and Cleveland	518	455	8.6	0	6.6
Newcastle Upon Tyne	239	169	2.8	5.8	0
North Tyneside	154	108	3.85	0.8	0
Northumberland	208	196	10.2	n/a	0
South Tyneside	162	162	3.6	2	0
Sunderland	200	185	3	0	3
<b>North West</b>					
Blackburn with Darwen	140	126	2.5	1	2
Blackpool	127	97	2.2	0	1
Bolton	330	330	22	5	0
Bury	162	122	6.2	-	-
Cheshire East	247	184	6.1	0	4
Cheshire West & Chester	248	245	4.7	n/a	n/a
Cumbria	249	240	5.8	0.4	0
Halton	108	70	1.4	0	2
Knowsley	127	78	1.4	n/a	0
Lancashire	993	993	14.6	10	0
Liverpool	341	323	5.6	0	5
Manchester	598	557	9.3	9	0
Oldham	193	141	6.5	2	0
Rochdale	185	175	4.7	2	0
Salford	282	244	5.6	n/a	n/a
Sefton	183	140	4.4	n/a	n/a
St Helens	-	-	2	n/a	n/a
Stockport	253	253	9	4.6	0
Tameside	131	131	2.7	2.7	0
Trafford	256	254	7.1	n/a	n/a
Warrington	232	120	1.6	n/a	n/a
Wigan	222	167	7	n/a	n/a
Wirral	293	293	0	n/a	n/a
<b>South East</b>					
Berkshire Consortium <sup>3</sup>	760	557	11.1	12.9	0
Brighton & Hove	232	229	4.2	1.32	0
Buckinghamshire	301	301	6.3	n/a	n/a
East Sussex	287	287	4.7	4.95	0
Hampshire	932	497	10.8	0	7.5
Isle of Wight	79	79	2.5	n/a	n/a
Kent	579	550	11.6	0	8.5
Medway	216	180	2	0	4
Milton Keynes	230	226	3.4	0	2
Oxfordshire	440	423	13.85	2.95	0
Portsmouth	150	112	2.7	0.2	0
Southampton	197	109	1.8	0	3
Surrey	846	846	12.8	n/a	n/a
West Sussex	610	359	4.6	n/a	n/a
<b>South West</b>					
Bristol, South Gloucestershire, Bath & NE Somerset, North Somerset	458	347	11.3	0	7.3
Cornwall	222	222	16.6	n/a	0
Devon	590	353	5.6	0	5.2
Dorset, Poole, Bournemouth	501	385	9.2	n/a	n/a
Gloucestershire	365	364	5.3	0	1.5
Plymouth	192	143	2	0	4

<sup>3</sup> Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead, Bracknell Forest, Slough, Reading, Wokingham and West Berkshire

Somerset	338	327	9.1	2.8	0
Swindon	127	127	3.5	0	3.4
Torbay	85	59	1	0	1
Wiltshire	280	268	6.3	0	3
<b>West Midlands</b>					
Birmingham	1250	798	13.4	7.6	4.7
Coventry	341	334	4.5	3	0
Dudley	331	332	3.9	5	0
Herefordshire	186	186	4.6	n/a	n/a
Sandwell	313	232	5.6	1.5	0
Solihull	186	165	4.2	1	0
Staffordshire	527	382	10.6	n/a	n/a
Stoke on Trent	250	228	4	1	0
Telford & Wrekin and Shropshire	430	308	11.3	n/a	n/a
Walsall	248	224	4.5	0	1.6
Warwickshire	258	258	6.8	n/a	n/a
Wolverhampton	241	241	3.9	0	4.2
Worcestershire	322	181	8.8	n/a	n/a
<b>Yorkshire and the Humber</b>					
Barnsley	203	201	3	3	0
Bradford	754	751	7.9	15.8	0
Calderdale	230	230	4.8	1.5	0
Doncaster	295	261	5.2	0	1
East Riding of Yorkshire	224	203	4.6	n/a	n/a
Hull	235	235	3	8.1	0
Kirklees	433	196	3.5	0	5.5
Leeds	661	414	9.5	6.5	0
North East Lincolnshire	66	66	2	n/a	n/a
North Lincolnshire	114	109	1.6	0.9	0
North Yorkshire	321	321	6.6	n/a	n/a
Rotherham	283	258	3.45	3.75	0
Sheffield	841	727	6.8	13.9	0
Wakefield	287	286	6	3	0
York	175	129	3.25	n/a	n/a

Notes:

- ‘-’ indicates that no response to the relevant question was received.
- ‘n/a’ indicates that the service does not have resource provisions.