

CRIDE report on 2011 survey on educational provision for deaf children in England

INTRODUCTION

In 2011, the Consortium for Research into Deaf Education (CRIDE) conducted a UK-wide survey on educational staffing and service provision for deaf children in the 2010/11 financial year. This report summarises the results of the survey for England¹ and is intended for heads of services, policy makers in local and central government and anyone with an interest in deaf education.

Responses were received from 130 services in England, covering 148 local authority areas. No response was received at all from 4 services; a response rate of 97%. Whilst this response rate appears high, not all services consistently gave responses to all the questions, as set out throughout this note. As such, the results should be used with caution.

SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

- There at least 34,927 deaf children in England.
- Around 19% have some form of additional special educational need (SEN).
- Around 6% of deaf children have at least one cochlear implant.
- 15% of deaf children communicate in part using a spoken language other than English. 9% use sign language to some extent to communicate.
- 81% of school aged children are in mainstream settings (of which 8% are in mainstream schools with resource provision). 6% attend special schools for deaf children or independent schools. 12% attend other special schools.
- Around 75% of deaf children identified by CRIDE do not have a statement of SEN.
- There at least 1,160 “Teachers of the Deaf” in England, of which 91% are fully qualified to work with deaf children. The majority of Teachers of the Deaf work in a peripatetic role.
- There are at least 1,249 other specialist staff working with deaf children in England. The majority of these are specialist teaching assistants.
- There has been a 3% decline of at least 16.5 peripatetic Teachers of the Deaf between 2009/10 and 2011/12.
- 30% of services have seen a decrease in their non-staffing budget in the past year. 20% report that their eligibility criteria and/or overall quality of service has worsened.

This note has 6 parts, as set out below:

PART 1: Overall number of deaf children in England (“belonging”).....	2
PART 2: Number of deaf children supported	6
PART 3: Teachers of the Deaf	11
PART 4: Other specialist staff	15
PART 5: Allocation of resources	17
PART 6: Background and methodology	23

¹ A separate report for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland will be published in due course.

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

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

Services were also asked to include details of all children with sensorineural and **permanent** conductive deafness³, using the descriptors provided by the British Society of Audiology and BATOD.

How many deaf children are there?

When giving figures for numbers of deaf children belonging, services were asked to break this down by level of deafness and age group.

Not all respondents gave complete figures. Some services gave a “total” figure which differed from the sum of their component figures. In most cases, this was because the service could not provide a complete age breakdown. Other services did not give a figure in this section but later gave a figure for the number of deaf children on caseloads in their area. Where this has happened and as appropriate, we have used the higher figure, or any figures given in the notes or elsewhere in the response to avoid underestimating the number of deaf children and to ensure that our figures are as accurate as possible. We refer to this as the “adjusted total”.

Based on responses from 126 services covering 143 local authorities, the adjusted total number of deaf children in England is **34,927**. Unadjusted figures are set out below.

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

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

Table 1: Number of children belonging, by age

Age group	Number of deaf children reported	Percentage of total
Preschool	4,672	14%
Primary	13,996	43%
Secondary	11,763	36%
Post 16 in school	1,571	5%
Post 16 not in school but in education	652	2%
Total	32,654⁴	

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 We are aware that a number of services also support include children with temporary deafness and will consider inclusion in the next survey.

⁴ This does not match the grand adjusted total of 34,927 because some services did not or were unable to break down the number of deaf children by age

Table 2: Number of children belonging to, by level of deafness

Level of deafness	Number of deaf children reported	Percentage of total
Unilateral ⁵	4,955	16%
Mild	9,301	30%
Moderate	10,078	32%
Severe	3,226	10%
Profound	3,703	12%
Total	31,263	

A number of services were unable to consistently provide information on the level of deafness of the deaf children belonging to the service, particularly for deaf children over the age of 16.

Table 3: Number of deaf children, by region

Region (Proportion of services who responded)	Number of deaf children reported (adjusted)	Percentage of total
East England (10/11)	2,572	7%
East Midlands (8/8)	2,334	7%
London (29/33)	5,271	15%
North East (9/9)	1,949	6%
North West (21/23)	5,037	14%
South East (13/14)	5,624	16%
South West (10/10)	3,348	10%
West Midlands (13/13)	4,290	12%
Yorkshire & Humber (13/13)	4,502	13%
Total (126/134)	34,927	

Given the different response rates by different regions, the above figures should be used with particular caution in making conclusions about the prevalence of deaf children in different regions.

Table 4: Regional differences in the proportion of deaf children of different age groups

Region	Percentage of pre-school deaf children	Percentage of primary aged deaf children	Percentage of secondary aged deaf children	Percentage of post 16 deaf children in school	Percentage of post 16 deaf children not in school but in education
England (all)	14%	43%	36%	5%	2%
East England	15%	42%	36%	4%	2%
East Midlands	20%	41%	32%	3%	3%
London	16%	41%	35%	6%	2%
North East	13%	41%	39%	7%	0%
North West	16%	44%	37%	3%	1%
South East	12%	44%	35%	5%	4%
South West	13%	44%	37%	6%	0%
West Midlands	12%	42%	35%	6%	5%
Yorkshire & Humber	13%	45%	38%	4%	0%

⁵ Unilateral refers to a hearing loss in just one ear.

Incidence of auditory neuropathy

93 services gave a figure in response to a question on how many deaf children had auditory neuropathy in their area. It is not always clear whether other services did not give a figure because they do not have any children with auditory neuropathy or because they do not know whether they do. Based on these responses, there are 391 deaf children in England with this condition, 1% of all deaf children (adjusted total).

The highest incidence of auditory neuropathy in a single service was 35 deaf children. The average number of children with auditory neuropathy in each service that responded to the survey was around 4.

Incidence of additional special educational needs (SEN)

112 services were able to tell us how many deaf children had an additional SEN. Based on these responses, there are 6,618 deaf children with an additional SEN. This is 19% of the adjusted total of deaf children. The incidence of additional SEN varies between services but the average number of children with additional SEN in each service that responded to the survey was 59.

Research⁶ from 1996 suggested that 40% of deaf children have additional needs. However, this research uses a wide definition of additional needs (including, for example, eczema and cerebral palsy) whereas SEN is normally understood, through the SEN Code of Practice, to refer to where children have a learning difficulty which calls for special educational provision to be made for them. The definition of learning difficulty includes where children have a disability which prevents or hinders them from making use of educational facilities of a kind generally provided for children of the same in age in schools within the local authority area.

Deaf children with cochlear implants

115 services were able to provide information about how many deaf children had a cochlear implant⁷. Based on these responses, there are 2,184 deaf children across England with cochlear implants. This is 6% of the adjusted total of deaf children.

Table 5: Number of deaf children belonging with cochlear implants, by age group

Age	Total with cochlear implants	Total deaf children	Percentage of total within each category
Pre-school	409	4,672	9%
Primary aged	1066	13,996	8%
Secondary aged	571	11,763	5%
Post 16	138	2,223	6%
Total	2,184	32,654⁸	7%

According to the Ear Foundation, 5,000 deaf children have received a cochlear implant since the procedure was introduced in 1989. Although, some of these children may no longer be of school age, it appears that the figure given by services is an under estimate.

⁶ Fortnum et al. (1996) *Health service implication of changes in aetiology and referral patterns of hearing impaired children in the Trent region.*

⁷ Though not all services gave a figure for each age group.

⁸ This does not match the adjusted total of 34,927 because some services did not or were unable to break down the number of deaf children with cochlear implants by age. Correspondingly, the percentage of total deaf children is higher than for the adjusted figure in the paragraph above.

Additional languages

Table 6: Number of deaf children, by main language spoken in family

Language	Total	Percentage of responses (where known)
English only	16,229	73%
Sign language only	317	1%
English and sign language	1,695	8%
English and other spoken language	3,327	15%
Other ⁹	609	3%
Total known	22,177	
Reported "not known"	1,426	

106 services provided information for at least some part this question¹⁰. Of those that did respond, many were unable to identify the language of all deaf children in their area. There are around 11,000 deaf children who are unaccounted for in the above figures, so these figures should be used with caution.

Of the services that responded, only 1 stated that they had no deaf children who communicated using sign language, either on its own or alongside English. 20 services stated that they had did not have any deaf children who communicated only in sign language.

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

⁹ Respondents were not asked to state what other languages were spoken.

¹⁰ Though not all services gave a figure for each language.

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 supported¹¹ by the service; this section sets out our analysis of these figures. As before, figures were adjusted to accommodate any anomalies with the submitted figures (i.e. where the sum of component figures were higher than the given total). As before, response rates varied for each individual question within this section.

Based on responses from 123 services, our survey indicates that at least **31,067** deaf children receive support from their local service.

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

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

Table 7: Number of deaf children being supported, by age group

Age group	Number of deaf children	Percentage of total
Preschool children	4,564	15%
Primary aged children	13,227	43%
Secondary aged children	11,394	37%
16+ young people who are in school	1,420	5%
16+ young people who are not in school but in education (e.g. Further Education)	462	1%
Total	31,067	

Assuming the figures are broadly comparable, if there are 34,927 deaf children (adjusted total) who live in England, there are at least 3,860 deaf children who are not being supported. In other words, the figures suggest that 90% of deaf children receive support¹².

The below table compares the percentage difference between each age group to see if any particular age groups appear less likely to receive support. Proportionally, deaf young people over 16 appear less likely to receive support than other age group, particular where they are in Further Education.

Table 8: Comparison between number of deaf children belonging and supported

Age group	Number of deaf children belonging	Number of deaf children supported	Proportion of deaf children being supported as a percentage of deaf children belonging
Preschool	4,672	4,564	98%
Primary	13,996	13,227	95%
Secondary	11,763	11,394	97%
Post 16 in school	1,571	1,420	90%
Post 16 not in school but in education	652	462	71%
Total (unadjusted)	32,654	31,067	95%
Total (adjusted)¹³	34,927	31,067	90%

¹¹ Examples of support given were direct teaching, visits to the family or school, liaison with the family, school, teachers, provision of hearing aid checks, etc.

¹² This is higher than anticipated by CRIDE. We suspect that the number of deaf children belonging earlier is actually higher than earlier indicated. However, we have no easy way of confirming this from these results.

¹³ This total is higher because it includes deaf children for whom we do not have a breakdown figure.

Table 9: Number of deaf children, by type of educational provision

Type of educational provision		Number of deaf children	Percentage of total
In local authority	Supported at home (e.g. babies or home educated)	3,556	12%
	Mainstream state funded schools (including academies)	19,659	64%
	Independent (non state funded) mainstream schools	605	2%
	Resource provision in mainstream schools	1,968	6%
	Special schools for deaf pupils	138	0.4%
	Other special schools	3076	10%
Out of local authority	Resource provision in mainstream schools	204	0.7%
	Mainstream state funded schools (including academies)	275	0.9%
	Special schools for deaf pupils but maintained by LA	403	1%
	Independent or special schools (non state funded) ¹⁴	389	1%
	Other special school	124	0.4%
Other	Other (e.g. Pupil referral units)	315	1%
Total		30,712¹⁵	

Table 10: 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 children supported at home)
Supported at home (e.g. babies or home educated)	3,556	12%	-
Mainstream provision (including academies)	19,934	65%	73%
Mainstream provision: resource provision	2,172	7%	8%
Special schools for deaf pupils or independent schools	1,535	5%	6%
Other special schools	3200	10%	12%
Other (e.g. Pupil referral units)	315	1%	1%
Total	30,712		
Total (excluding children supported at home)	27,156		

If the figures for children supported at home (which we believe are likely to be mostly pre-school deaf children) are excluded, the results suggest that 81% of school-aged deaf children are educated in mainstream settings (of which 8% are in resource provision).

¹⁴ The survey question was ambiguous on whether the independent school is a school for deaf children. This will be rectified for future versions of this survey.

¹⁵ This total is different from the adjusted total of 31,067 given earlier because some services were not able to give a breakdown of the provision deaf children being supported were receiving.

Table 11: Number of deaf children supported, by region

Region (Proportion of services who responded)	Number of deaf children	Percentage of total
East England (9/11)	2,007	6%
East Midlands (7/8)	1,554	5%
London (29/33)	4,749	15%
North East (9/9)	1,901	6%
North West (21/23)	3,962	13%
South East (12/14)	4,998	16%
South West (9/10)	3,156	10%
West Midlands (12/13)	4,326	14%
Yorkshire & Humber (13/13)	4,414	14%
Total (121/134)	31,063	

Table 12: Proportion of deaf children in different types of educational provision, by region

Region	Supported at home	Mainstream stated funded schools	Mainstream provision: resource provision	Special schools for deaf children or independent schools	Other specials schools	Other
England (all)	12%	65%	7%	5%	10%	1%
East England	13%	63%	7%	5	11%	0.1%
East Midlands	18%	60%	4%	4%	13%	1%
London	13%	54%	12%	10%	10%	0.5%
North East	9%	70%	5%	3%	13%	0.4%
North West	13%	65%	8%	3%	11%	0.5%
South East	9%	63%	7%	7%	10%	3.8%
South West	12%	71%	4%	3%	9%	0.5%
West Midlands	12%	70%	2%	3%	12%	0.3%
Yorkshire & Humber	10%	69%	9%	3%	8%	0.6%

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

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

School Census

School Census figures for 2010 indicate there are 15,975 children of school age where deafness is the primary SEN and who have been placed at School Action Plus or have a statement of SEN. Compared to the 25,769 school-aged children reported by our survey, this indicates that the School Census significantly under-reports the number of deaf children – by around 62%. This is likely to be due to the fact that the School Census only records whether a child is deaf, whether the deafness is the primary need and if they have a statement or have been placed at School Action Plus.

There was a 3% increase in the number of children identified as deaf by the School Census between 2009 and 2010. This rises to 8% from 2008 to 2010. It is unclear whether this is due to improvements in the identification of deaf children requiring SEN support or an increase in the overall number of deaf children (or some combination).

Of the 15,975 children recorded by the School Census, 6,495 have a statement. Not every deaf child with a statement will be of school age. However, comparing this figure with the number of school aged children identified by the CRIDE survey, this would indicate that only around 25% of deaf children have a statement¹⁶.

The School Census indicates there are 1,530 children (where deafness is the primary SEN) in special schools. The Department for Education does not currently publish details on children where deafness is a secondary need and who may attend special schools for disabled children.

NDCS survey (2009)

In 2009, a NDCS survey which had usable responses from 124 services covering 135 local authorities¹⁷ found that there were 34,688 deaf children. The 2009 survey included responses from Jersey and Guernsey which have not been included in this survey. The 2011 survey (with usable responses to this question from 126 services covering 143 local authorities) has a slightly higher response rate. Therefore, the two figures are not comparable because of slight differences in the survey questions between 2009 and 2011 but, more importantly, due to differences in response rates from different local authorities. We have observed that these can skew the results. However, a comparison of the 2009 and 2011 figures suggest that the number of deaf children has remained broadly the same.

Estimates based on prevalence figures

NDCS estimates there are over 35,000 deaf children in England. This estimate has been calculated using known data on the prevalence of deafness and population estimates from mid 2007 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.

BATOD survey 2000

A BATOD survey in 2000 identified 25,000 deaf children with unilateral, mild, moderate and severe and profound deafness supported by special schools for the deaf, mainstream school resource provisions and/or local authority specialist services. Although this survey is not comparable with the CRIDE 2011 survey, clearly far more children are being identified as deaf in 2011 than 11 years previous. It is difficult to tell whether this is due to population growth in deaf children or improved identification of deaf children or some combination of both.

The below table compares the number of deaf children in different types of educational provision, compared to the 2009 NDCS survey and 2000 BATOD survey.

Table 13: Number of deaf children being supported, as reported by different sources

	CRIDE 2011	NDCS 2009	BATOD 2000
Mainstream settings (including pre-school deaf children)	23,490 (77%)	25,286 (73%)	16,747 (67%)
Mainstream schools with resource provisions	2,172 (7%)	3,070 (9%)	3,428 (14%)
Special schools for deaf children	1,535 (5%)	1,387 (4%)	1,929 (8%)
Other special schools	3,200 (10%)	3,727 (11%)	2,857 (11%)

¹⁶ In addition, research from NCB, funded by the Department for Education, shows that there are wide variations in how schools apply the SEN Code of Practice. This means that children of similar levels of need, receiving support from a Teacher of the Deaf may be at School Action only in some areas, whilst issued with a statement in others.

¹⁷ In 2009, there were 150 local authorities. There are now 152.

Although the different sources above are not strictly comparable because of differences in response rates and methodology¹⁸, they do indicate a trend to deaf children being educated in mainstream education. They also indicate a corresponding decline in the proportion of deaf children being education in resource provisions and special schools for deaf children. The proportion of deaf children in other special schools has remained broadly similar since 2000.

¹⁸ For example, the 2009 NDCS survey did not always have discrete categories for different types of educational settings.

PART 3: Teachers of the Deaf

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

In total, there are at least¹⁹ 1,162.5 “Teachers of the Deaf” in England. Of these 91% are fully qualified. In addition, at the time the survey was completed, there were an additional 34 vacant posts. In 66% of 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 1,196.5 Teacher of the Deaf posts, of which 3% are vacant.

According to the General Teaching Council, there are 896 active teachers who hold the mandatory qualification for teaching pupils with a hearing impairment²⁰. CRIDE’s figures suggest that this figure is likely to be an underestimate.

Table 14: Number of Teachers of the Deaf in employment overall

	Number of teachers (FTE)	Percentage of total
Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification	1062.1	91%
Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years	91.6	8%
Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training	8.8	1%
Total	1162.5	

Table 15: Number of Teacher of the Deaf vacancies overall

		Number of Teacher of the Deaf posts (FTE)	Percentage of total
Vacancies	Post frozen	22.6	66%
	Currently advertised	7.2	21%
	Advertised but no suitable candidate	4.2	12%
Total		34	

Teachers of the Deaf in a peripatetic role

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

¹⁹ CRIDE is also aware that a number of Teachers of the Deaf are employed by special schools for deaf children and cochlear implant centres, though the total number is unknown.

²⁰ http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201011/cmhansrd/cm111122/text/111122w0003.htm#111122w0003.htm_sbhd12

Table 16: Number of visiting Teachers of the Deaf in employment

	Number of teachers (full time equivalent)	Number of services with staff in relevant category
Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification	687.3	130
Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years	29.6	26
Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training	1.4	2
Total	718.3	

Table 17: Number of visiting Teacher of the Deaf vacancies

		Number of Teacher of the Deaf posts (full time equivalent)	Number of services with staff in relevant category
Vacancies	Post frozen	17.6	19
	Currently advertised	3.3	3
	Advertised but no suitable candidate	1.2	3
Total		22.1	

In terms of fully qualified visiting Teachers of the Deaf, the numbers within each service ranged from 0.5 at the smallest to 28.8 in the largest. The average number of visiting Teachers of the Deaf per service is 5.3.

28 (22%) of services employ 2 or fewer visiting Teachers of the Deaf, of which 13 services (10%) employed 1 or fewer visiting Teachers of the Deaf. Given the complex nature of the deafness and the diverse needs of deaf children, it is of concern that some services are attempting to meet the needs of all deaf children with relatively low numbers of visiting Teachers of the Deaf. CRIDE supports the recommendation in the Department for Education green paper on SEN and disabilities that local authorities should seek to join forces to plan and commission services for deaf children.

There are 18 services (14%) where each visiting Teacher of the Deaf is supporting, on average, 80 or more deaf children, of which there are 7 services (5%) where each visiting Teacher of the Deaf is supporting, on average, 100 or more deaf children. 5 of those services are in London.

19 services – 15% of those that responded - reported that they had frozen vacancies for Teachers of the Deaf, amounting to 17.6 full time equivalent posts. The service with the biggest freeze had frozen 2.2 full time equivalent posts.

We asked if services had sought to recruit visiting Teachers of the Deaf over the past 12 months. 6 indicated they had, of which 5 reported difficulties in recruiting. In 4 of these cases, references were made to a lack of suitably qualified candidates.

Teachers of the Deaf in resource provisions

The survey asked how many Teachers of the Deaf were employed in resource provisions for deaf children and whether employed centrally by the local authority or directly by the school.

Respondents were asked to exclude time spent on other school duties (such as time as the school's SEN co-ordinator, for example).

Table 18: 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	165.6	44		209.2	56
Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years	25.3	20		36.8	30
Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training	1.6	2		5.8	5
Total	192.5			251.8	

Table 19: 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	5	4		0	0
	Currently advertised	1	1		2.9	3
	Advertised but no suitable candidate	0	0		3	3
	Total	6			5.9	

The below 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 employed by the school (as opposed to by the local authority).

Table 20: 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	92.8%	83.4%	81.2%
Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years	4%	12.7%	14.3%
Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training	0.2%	0.8%	2.3%

NDCS again analysed the figures to examine the ratio in the number of deaf children supported by each Teacher of the Deaf in resource provisions. Based on usable results from 93 services²¹, the CRIDE survey results show that the average number of deaf children in resource provision being supported by each Teacher of the Deaf is 5:1. Guidelines by BATOD state that each Teacher of the Deaf in a resource provision should be working with no more than 6 deaf children each, and

²¹ CRIDE would expect the response rate to this question to be lower, given that many services may not have a resource provision for deaf children.

less where deaf children with additional needs are being supported. 38 services had a ratio that was higher than 6:1. Of these, 10 services had a ratio that was higher than 10:1.

Responses from 10 services indicated that deaf children were being educated in resource provision with support equivalent to less than 1 full time equivalent Teacher of the Deaf based in the resource provision. Of these, 4 appeared to have no Teacher of the Deaf based in the resource provision supporting them. Though it is possible that children in these units are being supported by a peripatetic Teacher of the Deaf, these figures are of some concern.

PART 4: Other specialist staff

Our survey suggests that there are at least 1,249 specialist support staff, other than Teachers of the Deaf, supporting deaf children in England. The most common role is teaching assistant followed by communication support worker.

Table 21: Number of specialist support staff overall, by role

	Number of staff (FTE)	% of total
Teaching assistants / Classroom support assistants etc	720.9	58%
Communication support workers / Interpreters / Communicators etc	337.1	27%
Deaf instructors / Deaf role models / Sign language instructors etc	86.1	7%
Educational audiologists / Technicians etc	65.4	5%
Speech and language therapists	29.4	2%
Family support workers	10.8	0.9%
Total (excluding "Others")	1249.5	

A range of roles, with different full time equivalents, were cited when asked about other specialist staff, including social workers, language tutors, inclusion workers, bilingual staff, admin assistants, transition staff and so on. 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 majority of services no longer directly manage teaching assistants or other support staff based in schools to support named pupils.

Table 22: Services still directly managing teaching assistants or other support staff in schools

Response	Number	Percentage of those who responded
Yes	23	22%
Some but not all	18	17%
No	65	61%
Total responses	106	

Numbers of other specialist staff

The survey asked about numbers of other peripatetic specialist support staff (excluding any teaching assistants or other support staff based in schools to support named pupils).

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

	Peripatetic role			Resource provisions		
	Number of staff (full time equivalent)	Number of services with staff in relevant category	Percentage of total (excluding "Others")	Number of staff (full time equivalent)	Number of services with staff in relevant category	Percentage of total (excluding "Others")
Teaching assistants / Classroom support assistants etc	173.8	61	44%	547.1	73	64%
Communication support workers / Interpreters / Communicators etc	98.9	18	25%	238.2	38	28%
Deaf instructors / Deaf role models / Sign language instructors etc	43.3	45	11%	42.8	26	5%
Educational audiologists / Technicians etc	61.8	58	15%	3.6	7	0.4%
Speech and language therapists	12.9	18	3%	16.5	17	2%
Family support workers	8.8	9	2%	2	2	0.2%
Other	-	38		-	10	
Total (excluding "Others")	399.4			850.1		

Resource provisions

When asked if the resource provision provided outreach support to other schools, 18 (18%) replied yes and 82 (82%) replied no.

Where outreach support was provided, this amounted to 9.2 full time equivalent staffing time. The average figure was 0.5 with 15 services providing less than 1 full time equivalent in outreach support.

PART 5: Allocation of resources

Use of standardised eligibility criteria

119 services use a standardised method for determining the level of support given to deaf children. 9 do not have a standardised method and 2 did not indicate whether they used a standardised method or not.

Services were asked to specify in an open-ended question what method was used. The answers have been categorised as follows:

- NatSIP²² (or largely based on) – 73 services
- Locally developed – 29 services
- SERSEN²³ – 12 services
- SESIP²⁴ – 5 services

The NatSIP criteria is largely based on SERSEN's, which in turn is largely based on SESIP's. The survey therefore indicates that, where a standardised method is being used, 90 or 75% of services are using NatSIP or similar as a basis on which to determine the level of support given to deaf children.

Application of eligibility criteria

The survey 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 an individual child would be determined by a range of factors, including professional judgement, and not just the degree of deafness.

Services were able to tick more than one option for each group of deaf children.

²² National Sensory Impairment Partnership: <http://www.natsip.org.uk/>

²³ South East Region Special Educational Needs Partnership

²⁴ South Eastern Sensory Impairment Partnership

Table 24: Type of support provided by type of deafness

Type of need	Type of deafness	Number of services that provide no direct support provided	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)	No response
Primary and permanent need	Bilateral severe or profound sensorineural deafness	0	1	127	3
	Bilateral moderate sensorineural deafness	0	9	124	3
	Bilateral conductive deafness	6	39	108	4
	Bilateral mild or high frequency only sensorineural deafness	14	58	87	5
	Unilateral deafness (sensorineural or conductive)	27	102	33	3
Additional and permanent need	Bilateral severe or profound sensorineural deafness	1	9	123	1
	Bilateral moderate sensorineural deafness	2	17	121	3
	Bilateral conductive deafness	8	50	96	5
Other	With temporary conductive deafness as a primary or additional need	50	86	27	4
	In special schools other than schools for the deaf	11	49	106	5
	With auditory neuropathy	14	37	93	11
	With auditory processing difficulty/disorder	52	46	36	12

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.

Table 25: Funding arrangements for peripatetic specialist support services

Funding is...	Number of services	Percentage of all services who responded
Held centrally by the local authority ²⁵	103	82%
Delegated to a special or mainstream school with a resource provision that then provides outreach to other schools	4	3%
Delegation to individual schools in the local authority who decide whether to purchase specialist support from the local authority	1	1%
Other	17	14%
Total	125	

Responses in the ‘other’ category generally indicated some form of combination of the previous options. Some of the alternative funding arrangements included:

- Delegation to a mainstream school
- Staff employed through schools but part of a unified “virtual” service
- Charging for post 16 services

²⁵ Respondents were asked to include funding held by the local authority to purchase hearing support services from other local authorities or external agencies

- Funding for children aged 0 to 2 funded by NHS
- Service contracted to external body to deliver

Funding arrangements – impact of academies programme

In light of considerable concern over the impact of academies on the funding of specialist peripatetic services, the survey asked whether funding for support for non-statemented²⁶ deaf children in academies had been retained by the local authority.

Table 26: Funding arrangements for peripatetic specialist support services where there are academies

Has funding been retained?	Number of services	Percentage of services that responded and with academies
Yes	73	73%
No	27	27%
No academies in local authority	16	
Total	116	

Services were asked to give comments on what arrangements were in place where funding has not been retained. The most common response given was that the academy is being charged for the service in some way. 3 services indicated that they were only providing a monitoring service for deaf children in academies. There were widespread concerns over future funding arrangements and the implications for deaf children.

“Schools are written to with the names of pupils who have been supported previously at the time of transition. Services are offered on a buy back basis but are rarely taken up... This is a concern as whilst the cases in the Academy in question have not been where the C&YP have had significant hearing loss there is no advice being provided to the school on how best to meet the needs of these young people to my knowledge.”

“Several giving strong consideration [to becoming academies] Concern that these children will fall through the net. Schools will not have the expertise to know when to seek specialist support. May rely on a letter from a doctor simply telling them that the pupils (e.g.) should sit at the front. The school will then assume it has met the pupil’s needs. If schools buy in support from outside agencies, who will monitor standards? Who will decide what is necessary?”

“I think it needs to be retained centrally to ensure appropriate support. In [name of local authority] C&YP who have quite severe losses or even profound may be supported at SAP medical needs to avoid reliance on statements.”

The above results should be treated with particular caution; after the survey was issued, the Department for Education announced that for 2011/12, funding for specialist SEN services would not be “recouped” from local authorities if schools in their area converted to academies. NDCS understands anecdotally that some services who at the time indicated that they would not retain funding, now in fact have done so. At the time of writing, the funding arrangements for 2012/13 remain unclear.

²⁶ Local authorities have a statutory responsibility for statemented children and so funding for this cannot be delegated.

Funding arrangements – resource provisions

CRIDE also sought information on the funding arrangements for resource provisions.

Table 27: Funding arrangements for resource provisions

Funding for resource provision is...	Number of services	Percentage of those where applicable
Held centrally by the local authority	38	30%
Delegated to schools	53	42%
Both central and delegated	13	10%
Not applicable	21	17%
Total responses	125	

Table 28: Use of service level agreements by resource provisions

Where funding is delegated, does a contract / service level agreement exist?	Number of services	Percentage of those where applicable
Yes	36	59%
No	25	41%
Not applicable	56	

Staffing changes

In the context of concerns over spending reductions, the survey asked about budgeted staff levels over the past three years. We asked how many Teachers of the Deaf were employed in 2009/10, 2010/11 and whether there are any proposed or planned changes for 2011/12. Some services were unable to give information for each year. To ensure meaningful comparisons can be made, we have excluded partial responses in the below tables.

Table 29: Staffing changes in each year between 2009/10 and 2011/12 (proposed), where known in each year

Staff	Year	Number of staff	Number of services who responded
Teachers of the Deaf	2009/10	479.9	85
	2010/11	467.8	85
	2011/12 (planned or proposed if known)	463.4	85
Other staff	2009/10	329.3	80
	2010/11	321.8	80
	2011/12 (planned or proposed if known)	316.6	80

There is a possibility that the above results are skewed through inclusion only of those services who were able and / or willing to give planned or proposed figures for 2011/12. The below table therefore only includes services that gave information for both 2009/10 and 2010/11.

Table 30: Staffing changes between 2009/10 and 2010/11, where known in both years

Staff	Year	Number of staff	Number of services who responded
Teachers of the Deaf	2009/10	653.9	110
	2010/11	638.2	110
Other staff	2009/10	412.5	98
	2010/11	406.5	98

Table 31: Changes in number of Teachers of the Deaf

Changes in number of Teachers of the Deaf	Number of Teachers of the Deaf	Percentage decline from earliest year		Number of other staff	Percentage decline from earliest year
Reduction between 2009/10 and 2010/11 (according to table 29)	15.7	2%		6	1%
Reduction between 2009/10 and 2010/11 (according to table 30)	12.1	2%		7.5	2%
Reduction between 2010/11 and 2011/12	4.4	1%		5.2	2%
Reduction between 2009/10 and 2011/12 (over three years)	16.5	3%		12.7	4%

The survey asked for details of planned or proposed reductions in 2011/12. Given the spending constraints that many services are facing, there is good reason to believe that some of the reductions cited for 2011/12 are, in reality, much higher.

Other changes

The survey also looked at any changes between 2009/10 and 2010/11 to a) non staffing budgets and b) eligibility criteria / overall quality of the service

Table 32: Changes to non staffing budgets

Changes to non staffing budgets	Number of services	Percentage of those who responded and who could separate budget figures
Increase	12	11%
Decrease	32	30%
No change	61	58%
Cannot separate budget figures for the Hearing Impairment team	17	
Total responses	122	

Table 33: Changes to eligibility criteria and overall quality

Changes to eligibility criteria / overall quality	Number of services	Percentage of those who responded
For the better	19	16%
For the worse	25	20%
No	78	64%
Total responses	122	

Where respondents highlighted any changes for the worse, they were asked to give more information. The responses varied but some common themes emerged:

- Increased referrals and / or reduced visits – 19 services. Examples given of deaf children no longer receiving as much support included deaf children with unilateral loss, non-hearing aid users, deaf children with mild hearing loss and deaf children in special schools for disabled children
- Cuts or reductions to the training budget – 14 services
- Staffing cuts or vacant posts not being filled – 13 services
- Cuts or reductions to the equipment budget – 13 services. Several services referred to funding from the now defunct Schools Access initiative not being replaced
- Comments around pooling of budgets – 3 services
- Cuts to travel budget – 2 services

Comments from services talked about the impact of these changes and some of the difficult decisions being made by professionals:

“With the reduction in staff..., it has greatly affected the quality of service on offer as the number of children are now seen by two members of staff; we are in the process of reducing the case list and having to make crucial judgements as to who we eliminate from receiving a service and who has access to radio aids / additional equipment.”

“We have a greater number of children who require high level input in the early years than we did 2 years ago. With one full time ToD down, we have to prioritise these young children at the expense of some school age children. We think carefully about the impact on the child`s progress if visits from a ToD are reduced.”

“As numbers have increased, some of the children who were previously seen monthly may now be seen half-termly. Some who were previously seen termly are now seen half-yearly.”

“Training and equipment budgets were looked at in relation to the LA savings. I was happy to take less in these budgets rather than lose staff.”

“Reduction in staff numbers has inevitably meant different ways of working, including reduction in number of weekly visits to high need children, fewer visits to half termly children, less developmental work. Levels of stress and illness amongst remaining staff has been high.”

PART 6: Background and methodology

CRIDE is a consortium bringing together a range of organisations and individuals with a common interest in improving the educational outcomes achieved by deaf children through research. Representatives include: the British Association of Teachers of the Deaf (BATOD), the Ewing Foundation, the National Deaf Children's Society (NDCS), the Ear Foundation, schools and services for deaf children, and university researchers.

The survey was designed and created by members of CRIDE. It was piloted on a small number of services and amended based on feedback from these services. The surveys were then disseminated to other services in the first week of February 2011 by NDCS's team of Regional Directors on behalf of CRIDE. Services were asked to respond by the 31st March 2011. Where there was no response by this time, NDCS's Regional Directors and members of CRIDE engaged in two rounds of "chasers" by email and telephone. Following this, as a last resort, Freedom of Information requests were sent out to the remaining services who had not responded around the 27th June 2011. No further responses were accepted for inclusion in the analysis for this note after the end of September.

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

Table 34: Response rate by services to CRIDE survey

	Number of responses	Cumulative total
First deadline – 31 st March	61	61
First round of chasing by NDCS Regional Directors	21	82
Second round of chasing by members of CRIDE	14	96
Freedom of Information request	34	130

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

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

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

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