



Consortium for Research in Deaf Education

## 2022 report for England

### Education provision for deaf children in England in 2021/22

#### Introduction

In 2022, we carried out the 12<sup>th</sup> Consortium for Research into Deaf Education (CRIDE) annual survey on educational staffing and service provision for deaf children.<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.

The survey alternates from year to year between a standard survey and a survey with a mix of core and thematic questions. The 2022 survey was the version with thematic questions, covering the 2021/22 academic year.<sup>2</sup> Thematic questions covered involvement of Teachers of the Deaf in the integrated review at age 2, support to families to learn sign language and the Pupil Premium.

The analysis in this report is based on responses from 131 services in England, covering 149 out of 152 authority areas and giving a response rate of 98%. One service did not respond to the survey, the remaining two local authorities<sup>3</sup> were not contacted on the understanding that they do not have any deaf children in their areas. Responses from a separate survey of special schools for deaf children are also included in parts of this report.

#### Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Summary of key findings.....                                  | 3  |
| PART 1: Deaf children in England .....                        | 5  |
| PART 2: Teachers of the Deaf and other specialist staff ..... | 12 |
| PART 3: Post-16 support .....                                 | 22 |
| PART 4: Support provided.....                                 | 23 |
| PART 5: Support following the identification of deafness..... | 25 |
| PART 6: Thematic questions: Integrated review.....            | 27 |
| PART 7: Thematic questions: Family sign language .....        | 29 |
| PART 8: Thematic questions: Pupil premium.....                | 34 |
| PART 9: Background and methodology .....                      | 35 |
| Annex: Information by local authority.....                    | 36 |

<sup>1</sup> For the purpose of this section of the survey, unless otherwise stated, we use the term 'deaf children' to include children and young people up to the age of 19 years, 11 months with sensori-neural or permanent conductive deafness. See footnote 4 for more detail.

<sup>2</sup> Reports from previous years can be found on the National Deaf Children's Society website at [www.ndcs.org.uk/CRIDE](http://www.ndcs.org.uk/CRIDE) or on the BATOD website at <https://www.batod.org.uk/information/cride-reports/>.

<sup>3</sup> Nottingham City did not respond to the survey. The City of London and the Isles of Scilly were not surveyed.

## Interpreting the results

Services were asked to give figures for the position as of 31<sup>st</sup> January 2022.

In the survey, we acknowledge that services and children do not always fit into the boxes or options provided. Services were able to leave comments or clarify where needed throughout the survey. This report notes particular issues that emerged in some areas.

As we see later, it is clear that some services still experience difficulties in extracting data about deaf children in their area and there remain inconsistencies in how different questions are completed throughout the survey. The response rates to individual questions may sometimes vary and anomalies occasionally appear. We make every effort to investigate any inconsistencies that appear particularly strange. However, services do not always respond to such queries. **Therefore, the results should continue to be used with caution.** Caution is also needed due to differences in response rates to individual questions and potential mistakes in data provision between surveys.

Please note that percentages in this report have been rounded up or down to the nearest whole number.

## Summary of key findings

### *Numbers of deaf children*

- There are at least 45,680 deaf children in England.
- 77% of school-aged deaf children attend mainstream schools. 6% attend mainstream schools with resource provisions, 3% attend special schools for deaf children whilst 14% attend special schools not specifically for deaf children. 1% are home educated.
- 78% of services report they provide support to deaf young people over the age of 19, these services are supporting 1,003 deaf young people over the age of 19.

### *Teachers of the Deaf and other specialist staff*

- There are at least 1,266 Teacher of the Deaf posts, of which 4% were vacant. Of the 1,218 fte working as Teachers of the Deaf, 84% held the mandatory qualification whilst 11% were in training, and 5% were qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and no immediate plans to begin training for this.
- The number of qualified Teachers of the Deaf in employment working in a peripatetic role, in a resource provision and/or in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children has fallen by 2% since 2021 and by 19% since we started the survey in 2011.
- Peripatetic Teachers of the Deaf have an average theoretical caseload of 63 deaf children, up from 62 in 2021.
- There are at least 732 other specialist support staff posts, of which 6% are vacant posts.

### *Resource provisions*

- There are a reported 230 resource provisions. This is down from 237 in 2021. Looking at the spread of resource provisions across England, on average, there is one resource provision for every 197 deaf children. This has risen from one for every 190 deaf children in 2021.

### *Referrals*

- 19% of referrals to services came from the newborn hearing screening programme in 2021. Of these, 89% were contacted by a Teacher of the Deaf within 2 working days.
- 22% of referrals to services came from outside the newborn hearing screening programme and before a child had started statutory education. Of these, 75% were contacted by a Teacher of the Deaf within 5 working days.
- 58% of referrals to services came from outside the newborn hearing screening programme and after a child had started statutory education. Of these, 66% were contacted by a Teacher of the Deaf within 5 working days.
- Regardless of how the referral was made, 55% of families were offered a visit (either face to face or virtual) within 10 working days of the referral.

### *Integrated reviews*

- 14% of services contribute to the integrated review at age 2 for all or nearly all deaf children, 10% for most deaf children, 22% for some deaf children, and 54% for none or very few children.

### *Family sign language*

- 75% of services directly provide informal opportunities for families to learn or practise sign language.
- 52% of services directly provide courses or 'training' in sign language to families. 13% of services fund or commission courses to families to enable them to learn sign language on a course delivered by an external provider.
- 43% of services neither provide, fund or commission any courses in sign language to families.

### *Pupil Premium*

- 11% of services record whether a school-aged child is eligible for the Pupil Premium.
- 4% of services said Teachers of the Deaf are involved in discussions in how the Pupil Premium is used for eligible deaf school-aged children for all or most deaf children, 22% for some deaf children, and 74% for none or very few deaf children.

## PART 1: Deaf children in England

### How many deaf children are there?

Services were asked to give details of deaf children living in the geographical area covered by their service<sup>4</sup>.

When giving figures for numbers of deaf children living in the area, we first asked for an overall figure and then asked for a breakdown by educational setting. We found that some services did not always provide this data consistently; some gave broken-down figures where the sum generated a different total from that given elsewhere in the survey.

Coming up with a clear answer to the question of how many deaf children there are is therefore not straightforward. 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 possible. Where we have done this, we refer to this as the "adjusted total".

131 services responded to this question<sup>5</sup>. Based on these responses, **the adjusted total number of deaf children in England is 45,680**. This is up from 45,060 in 2021 when 132 services responded and amounts to a reported 1% increase over the past year. However, it is still down from the pre-pandemic figure of 46,404 in 2019.

Unadjusted figures are provided in the table that follows.

*Table 1: Figures generated when calculating the number of deaf children*

|   | Total generated     |
|---|---------------------|
| Adjusted total  | 45,680              |
| Total when asked how many children overall                                    | 45,275 <sup>6</sup> |
| Total when asked about number of children, broken down by educational setting | 44,241 <sup>7</sup> |

Using the adjusted totals, the smallest number of children reported by a service was 67 deaf children living within their boundaries. The largest reported was 1,556 deaf children. The average number of deaf children living in each service was 349.

---

<sup>4</sup> Services were asked to include all children with permanent deafness who live in the geographical area covered by their service, including all children up to the age of 19 years, 11 months who have a unilateral or bilateral sensori-neural or permanent conductive deafness, at all levels from mild to profound, using BSA/BATOD descriptors, regardless of whether they receive support from the service. Services were also asked to include children who attended education provision outside of your area but who normally lived in their area. Under the definition of permanent deafness used in the survey, children with a syndrome known to include permanent conductive deafness, microtia/atresia, middle ear malformation, or those who have had middle ear surgery such as mastoidectomy were to be included. Our definition also included those children with glue ear who are not expected to 'grow out' of the condition before the age of 10 years, such as those born with a cleft palate, Down's syndrome, cystic fibrosis, or primary ciliary dyskinesia. Otherwise, services were asked not to include children with temporary deafness, including those children with glue ear who may have been fitted with hearing aids as an alternative to grommet surgery but who are expected to 'grow out' of the condition before the age of 10 years.

<sup>5</sup> Of these, one service did not provide a figure for the question on the number of deaf children with a permanent deafness. Data based on their caseload (minus the number of children with a temporary conductive deafness on their caseload) was used for the number of children living in the area, so the survey could capture as many deaf children as possible.

<sup>6</sup> See footnote above.

<sup>7</sup> 44,241 was the sum of the totals given by services. The sum of the broken-down figures given by services was 43,569. Figures were not provided by two services for this question.

The following table compares the total number of deaf children living in England with figures from previous years. As set out in the introduction, comparisons with earlier reports should be made with caution due to differences in the quality of the responses and response rates between the surveys.

*Table 2: Number of deaf children reported, over successive years*

|                             | <b>Number of children reported</b> |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| CRIDE 2022 (adjusted total) | 45,680                             |
| CRIDE 2021 (adjusted total) | 45,060                             |
| CRIDE 2020*                 | 37,340                             |
| CRIDE 2019 (adjusted total) | 46,404                             |
| CRIDE 2018                  | 43,467                             |
| CRIDE 2017 (adjusted total) | 45,631                             |
| CRIDE 2016                  | 41,261                             |
| CRIDE 2015 (adjusted total) | 41,377                             |
| CRIDE 2014                  | 40,614                             |
| CRIDE 2013 (adjusted total) | 37,948                             |
| CRIDE 2012 (adjusted total) | 37,414                             |
| CRIDE 2011 (adjusted total) | 34,927                             |

\*In 2020, there were 103 responses to this question.

The following table looks in more detail at the number of deaf children in different regions of England, and how this has changed since 2017. It should be noted that changes in response rates by some local authorities can sometimes have a significant impact on regional figures.

*Table 3: Number of deaf children in England, by region*

| <b>Region</b>      | <b>Number of deaf children in 2017 - adjusted totals (% of adjusted total)</b> | <b>Number of deaf children in 2018 (% of total)</b> | <b>Number of deaf children in 2019 - adjusted totals (% of adjusted total)</b> | <b>Number of deaf children in 2021 - adjusted totals (% of adjusted total)</b> | <b>Number of deaf children in 2022 - adjusted totals (% of adjusted total)</b> |
|--------------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| East England       | 4,430 (10%)  | 4,471 (10%)   | 4,666 (10%)  | 4,363 (10%)  | 4,405 (10%)  |
| East Midlands      | 3,765 (8%)   | 3,536 (8%)  | 3,503 (8%)   | 3,473 (8%)   | 3,558 (8%)   |
| London             | 7,358 (16%)  | 7,309 (17%)   | 7,554 (16%)  | 7,408 (16%)  | 7,570 (17%)  |
| North East         | 2,342 (5%)   | 2,393 (6%)  | 2,457 (5%)   | 2,409 (5%)   | 2,409 (5%)   |
| North West         | 5,945 (13%)  | 4,768 (11%)   | 6,219 (13%)  | 6,260 (14%)  | 6,354 (14%)  |
| South East         | 6,700 (15%)  | 6,279 (14%)   | 6,490 (14%)  | 5,759 (13%)  | 5,787 (13%)  |
| South West         | 3,823 (8%)   | 3,951 (9%)  | 4,303 (9%)   | 4,510 (10%)  | 4,508 (10%)  |
| West Midlands      | 5,711 (13%)  | 5,397 (12%)   | 5,532 (12%)  | 5,557 (12%)  | 5,722 (13%)  |
| Yorkshire & Humber | 5,557 (12%)  | 5,363 (12%)   | 5,680 (12%)  | 5,321 (12%)  | 5,367 (12%)  |
| <b>Total</b>       | <b>45,631 (100%)</b>   | <b>43,467 (100%)</b>                                | <b>46,404 (100%)</b>   | <b>45,060 (100%)</b>   | <b>45,680 (100%)</b>   |

(2020 data not included because of lower response rate to survey)

## Issues or gaps in the data

84 services (65%) indicated there were known issues or gaps in the data they provided for the number of children and young people. These included:

- services only having figures for children who are receiving support from the service (37% of all services)
- services not holding figures for children who have left school (24%)
- services not able to split out figures for children with permanent or temporary deafness (16%)
- services only having figures for children who are hearing-aid wearers (7%)
- the audiology service not referring children with a unilateral hearing loss to services (2%)
- the audiology service not referring children with a mild hearing loss to services (1%)
- other (36%). Many of the 'other' answers given were different ways of expressing the above set options, Other reasons given included:
  - data is only held where a child or young person's parents or carers have given consent
  - service only has referrals requesting support for young people up to age 18
  - data may be incomplete due to current lack of a database
  - data is not held or is only held for some children and young people educated out of the geographical area covered by the service
  - data only records some children and young people in independent schools
  - data includes some children with auditory processing data.

The extent of these issues and gaps is a reminder that the figures generated from the CRIDE survey need to be used with caution. The data in this report are only as good as the data held by and provided to us, by local authorities, and the above section raises questions about how we can improve the data collected on deaf children. At the same time, we believe that data generated through the CRIDE reports remain amongst the best sources of data available.

Table 4: Number of children, living in the area, by educational setting

| Type of educational provision                         |  | Number of deaf children | Percentage of total (where known) |
|---|--|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>In local authority</b>                             | Supported only at home – pre-school children   | 2,777                   | 6%                                |
|   | Early years setting – pre-school children  | 2,201                   | 5%                                |
|   | Supported at home – of school age and home educated  | 225                     | 1%                                |
|   | Mainstream state-funded schools (including academies and free schools)                             | 25,907                  | 60%                               |
|   | Mainstream independent (non-state-funded) schools (for example, Eton)                              | 557                     | 1%                                |
|   | Resource provision in mainstream schools <sup>8</sup>  | 1,902                   | 4%                                |
|   | Special schools for deaf pupils (whether state funded or non-maintained)                           | 438                     | 1%                                |
|   | Other special schools, not specifically for deaf children (whether state funded or non-maintained) | 4,614                   | 11%                               |
|   | All other post-16 provision ( <b>not</b> including school sixth form colleges)                     | 1,856                   | 4%                                |
| <b>Out of local authority</b>                         | Early years setting – pre-school children  | 53                      | 0%                                |
|   | Mainstream state-funded schools (including academies and free schools)                             | 625                     | 1%                                |
|   | Mainstream independent (non-state-funded) schools  | 156                     | 0%                                |
|   | Resource provision in mainstream schools   | 209                     | 0%                                |
|   | Special schools for deaf pupils (whether state funded or non-maintained)                           | 554                     | 1%                                |
|   | Other special school, not specifically for deaf children (whether state funded or non-maintained)  | 333                     | 1%                                |
|   | All other post-16 provision ( <b>not</b> including school sixth form colleges)                     | 374                     | 1%                                |
| <b>Other</b>  | NEET (Not in education, employment or in training) (post-16 only)                                  | 91                      | 0%                                |
|   | Other (e.g. Pupil referral units)  | 75                      | 0%                                |
| <b>Total of figures given (excluding ‘not known’)</b> |  | 42,947                  | 100%                              |
| <b>Not known</b>                                      |  | 622                     |                                   |
| <b>Total of figures given (including ‘not known’)</b> |  | 43,569                  |                                   |

The following table presents the same information as above but without splitting figures for whether in or out of the local authority, whilst also showing summary percentages for just school-aged deaf children.

<sup>8</sup> In the CRIDE survey, we use the term ‘resource provision’ to include all schools with any specialist resource provision, base or unit specifically for deaf children, regardless of whether staff in the resource provision are employed by the local authority or by the school.



Table 5: Breakdown of types of educational provision

| 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) |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Supported only at home – pre-school children                                       | 2,777                   | 6%                  |  |
| Early years setting - pre-school children  | 2,254                   | 5%                  |  |
| Supported at home - of school age and home educated                                | 225                     | 1%                  | 1%   |
| Mainstream provision (including state-funded and independent schools)              | 27,245                  | 63%                 | 77%  |
| Mainstream provision: resource provision   | 2,111                   | 5%                  | 6%   |
| Special schools for deaf pupils  | 992                     | 2%                  | 3%   |
| Other special schools, not specifically for deaf children                          | 4,947                   | 11%                 | 14%  |
| All other post-16 provision (not including school sixth forms)                     | 2,230                   | 5%                  |  |
| Other (e.g. Pupil referral units, NEET)  | 788                     | 2%                  |  |
| Total of figures given   | 43,569                  | 100%                |  |
| Total (excluding pre-school children and other post-16 provision and 'other')      | 35,520                  |                     |  |

Comparing with figures from 2021:

- The proportion of school-aged deaf children and young people in mainstream provision has fallen by one percentage point from 78% to 77% since 2021.
- The proportion of deaf children and young people in special schools for deaf pupils has increased by one percentage point from 2% to 3% since 2021.

Table 6: Breakdown of types of educational provision, by whether in or out of home local authority (where known)

| Type of educational provision                | Number of deaf children | Percentage of total |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------|
| In home local authority                      | 40,477                  | 95%                 |
| Out of home local authority                  | 2,304                   | 5%                  |
| Total (not including 'not known and 'other') | 42,781                  |                     |

### Number of deaf children on services' caseloads

By caseload, we mean children who receive some form of support **at least once a year**. Examples of support include direct teaching, visits to the family or school, liaison with the family, school, teachers, providing hearing aid checks, etc. We asked services to include children supported by the service but who do not live in the same geographical area as that service. Services could also include children with temporary deafness in their response to this question if they were on the service caseload.

Responses from 131 services indicated that at least 42,366 deaf children with permanent or temporary deafness were on services' caseloads. The smallest number of children on a caseload was 85 and the largest was 1,071. The average was 323 children.

The definition of 'caseload' within the CRIDE survey has changed over the years. When considering

changes to the 2021 survey, and in consultation with services, we decided to use ‘at least once a year’ going forward (rather than more than once a year). The following table sets out caseload figures over the years, alongside the definition used in that survey.

Please also note that in 2016, the survey question was changed to allow children with temporary deafness to be included in the response to this question; previously services were asked to include only children with permanent deafness.

*Table 7: Number of deaf children on caseloads reported over successive years*

| <b>Year</b> | <b>Number of children on caseload</b> | <b>Definition of caseload</b>              | <b>Number of services</b> |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| 2022        | 42,366                                | Some form of support at least once a year  | 131                       |
| 2021        | 42,353                                | Some form of support at least once a year  | 132                       |
| 2020        | 32,820                                | Some form of support more than once a year | 103*                      |
| 2019        | 40,217                                | Some form of support more than once a year | 131                       |
| 2018        | 42,058                                | Clear definition not provided              | 130                       |
| 2017        | 35,666                                | Some form of support more than once a year | 129                       |
| 2016        | 40,084                                | Some form of support at least once a year  | 131                       |
| 2015        | 32,773                                | Some form of support more than once a year | 129                       |
| 2014        | 33,139                                | Some form of support more than once a year | 132                       |
| 2013        | 32,011                                | Some form of support more than once a year | 131                       |
| 2012        | 31,425                                | Some form of support more than once a year | 126                       |
| 2011        | 31,067                                | Clear definition not provided              | 123                       |

*\*There was a lower number of responses to the survey in 2020 due to the covid-19 pandemic.*

We asked services to split out how many children on their caseloads had a temporary conductive hearing loss. 88 services reported that there were 3,933 children<sup>9</sup>. Caution is needed here given that some services stated that they were not always able to distinguish in their databases whether a child had temporary or permanent deafness or stated that they did not hold this data.

If there are 45,680 permanently deaf children living in England and 38,433 on services’ caseloads with permanent deafness, there are at least 7,247 deaf children (16%) who are not being supported by the service at least once a year. It does not automatically follow that 16% of permanently deaf children are not receiving any support at all; many may be receiving support less than once a year from a service, or elsewhere from, for example, special schools for deaf children or resource provisions not managed by the service.

We asked services if they provide support to deaf young people over the age of 19. 102 services (78%) said they did, and 29 services (22%) said they did not. There were 1,003 deaf young people over the age of 19 on the caseloads of services where they did provide this support. Where services commented on this, some comments indicated that young people over the age of 19 were supported if they had an Education, Health and Care (EHC) plan, or they would do if there were any young people over the age of 19 with an EHC plan in the area.

<sup>9</sup> 17 services stated there were no children or young people with a temporary conductive hearing loss on their caseloads.

## How do CRIDE's 2022 figures compare to School Census figures?

Because of the differences in how data have been collected and definitions used, we recommend the following figures be used as a basis for further debate and analysis, rather than to reach firm conclusions.

School Census figures for 2022<sup>10</sup> indicate there are 22,884 children where deafness is the primary special educational need (SEN) and who have been placed at SEN support or have an Education, Health and Care (EHC) plan. School Census figures also indicate that there are an additional 5,118 children where deafness is a secondary need. The School Census therefore records a total of 28,002 children where deafness is a primary or secondary need. The 28,002 deaf children identified by the School Census amount to 61% of the 45,060 deaf children identified by local authorities through CRIDE.

There was a total of 8,563 deaf children with an EHC plan (of whom 6,189 are children where deafness is a primary need and 2,374 a secondary need). Comparing this figure with the number of children identified by the CRIDE survey, this would indicate that around 19% of deaf children have an EHC plan.

We recognise that School Census figures mostly cover school-aged children whilst the above CRIDE figures are for children aged 0 to 19. In this report, we are not able to provide a comparison against CRIDE figures for school-aged children as this is only possible in the year that CRIDE runs the full survey. However, in 2021, our analysis indicated that 42% of school-aged deaf children were not captured by published Government data, compared to those identified by local authorities in their response to CRIDE.

---

<sup>10</sup> Source: <https://explore-education-statistics.service.gov.uk/find-statistics/special-educational-needs-in-england/2021-22>

## PART 2: Teachers of the Deaf and other specialist staff

In the 2022 survey, we used the terminology 'Teachers of the Deaf'. For completeness, we have used the same language when reporting on the findings from this survey. For the 2023 survey and going forward, we plan to use the terminology 'Teachers of Deaf Children and Young People (TODs)' instead.

We asked how many Teachers of the Deaf are working in different settings, including those in a peripatetic role, working in resource provisions<sup>11</sup> and/or working in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children or young people. Figures for numbers of Teachers of the Deaf in special schools for deaf children in England were collected in a separate survey which received responses from all 17 schools for deaf children<sup>12</sup>.

We asked services to provide 'Full Time Equivalent' (fte) figures for staffing. For example, an 0.5 figure for a Teacher of the Deaf would indicate they spent half of the standard 'working week' as a Teacher of the Deaf. We found that:

- overall, there are at least 1,218 fte teachers working as Teachers of the Deaf in England
- 84% of these posts (1,022 fte) are occupied by a fully qualified Teacher of the Deaf, with the remaining posts occupied by teachers in training (11%) or qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and no immediate plans to begin training for this (5%)
- at the time the survey was completed, there were at least 43 fte vacant posts reported by 34 services, and 5 fte vacancies reported by schools for deaf children
- if the vacant posts are added to the total number of Teachers of the deaf in employment, this would indicate that there are at least 1,266 fte Teacher of the Deaf posts, of which 4% are vacant.

The following table provides a breakdown of Teachers of the Deaf in employment by type of setting.

---

<sup>11</sup> In the CRIDE survey, we use the term 'resource provision' to include all schools with a resource provision, base or unit, regardless of whether staff in the resource provision are employed by the local authority or by the school.

<sup>12</sup> This is an increase in response rate since 2021 when responses were received from 12 out of 17 schools for deaf children and young people.

Table 8: Number of Teachers of the Deaf in employment overall

|  | <b>Working mainly as a peripatetic Teacher of the Deaf</b><br>(total and percentage) | <b>Working mainly in a resource provision</b><br>(total and percentage) | <b>Working mainly in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children or young people</b><br>(total and percentage) | <b>Working flexibly as a peripatetic Teacher of the Deaf, in a resource provision and/or in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children or young people</b><br>(total and percentage) | <b>Working mainly in a special school for deaf children</b><br>(total and percentage) | <b>Teacher of the Deaf posts overall</b><br>(total and percentage) |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification                      | 579.07<br>(93%)  | 258.67<br>(82%)   | 3.5<br>(95%)  | 19.1<br>(94%)  | 162.55<br>(63%)   | 1,022.89<br>(84%)  |
| Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years        | 40.2<br>(6%)   | 43.8<br>(14%)   | 0.2<br>(5%)   | 0.6<br>(3%)  | 52.48<br>(20%)  | 137.28<br>(11%)  |
| Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training | 3.5<br>(1%)  | 11.5<br>(4%)  | 0<br>(0%)   | 0.6<br>(3%)  | 42.59<br>(17%)  | 58.19<br>(5%)  |
| Total of figures given   | 622.77<br>(100%)   | 313.97<br>(100%)  | 3.7<br>(100%)   | 20.3<br>(100%)   | 257.62<br>(100%)  | 1,218.36<br>(100%)   |

The following table summarises the above by just showing the numbers of Teachers of the Deaf in employment by their role only.

Table 9: Number of Teachers of the Deaf in employment overall by role

|   | Total Teachers of the Deaf in post | Percentage |
|---|------------------------------------|------------|
| Working mainly as a peripatetic Teacher of the Deaf   | 622.77                             | 51%        |
| Working mainly in a resource provision  | 313.97                             | 26%        |
| Working mainly in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children or young people  | 3.7                                | 0%         |
| Working flexibly as a peripatetic Teacher of the Deaf, in a resource provision and/or in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children or young people | 20.3                               | 2%         |
| Working mainly in a special school for deaf children  | 257.62                             | 21%        |
| Total of figures given  | 1,218.36                           | 100%       |

Figures for Teachers of the Deaf in cochlear implant programmes across England were collected in a separate survey. Responses were received from 11 cochlear implant programmes<sup>13</sup>. There were at least 27.5 fte fully qualified Teachers of the Deaf reported in post, and 7.2 fte vacancies reported. This means there are 34.65 fte posts, of which 21% are vacant. There were no Teachers of the Deaf in training for the mandatory qualification or not in training reported. In 2021, we found that there were 29.2 fte fully qualified Teachers of the Deaf and 1.8 fte vacant posts. There were responses from 12 programmes in 2021.

### Changes in numbers of Teachers of the Deaf

The following table looks at changes in the number of qualified Teachers of the Deaf in employment and posts over successive years. Unless specified, these and other tables in the sections that follow **do not** include Teachers of the Deaf working in special schools for deaf children or cochlear implant programmes as this data, collected separately, has not been collected consistently by CRIDE over the past decade.

As set out earlier, when making year on year comparisons, anomalies can sometimes appear in the responses. We make every effort to investigate anomalies that appear particularly strange. However, services and schools do not always respond to such queries.

One key issue emerged this year that revealed some double-counting in previous reports. A service confirmed that in 2021 they reported 13 Teachers of the Deaf as working in special schools or colleges not specifically for deaf children in error, when they were actually working in a school for deaf children and young people. As those Teachers of the Deaf were also listed in the survey for schools for deaf children and young people, they were double counted in the overall figures. It appears that this group of Teachers of the Deaf were also reported in error as working in schools for deaf children or in resource provisions in previous years. In this report, we have retrospectively amended the figures for 2021 so that we can make a year-on-year comparison. However, given the complexities and uncertainties involved in correcting data going back several years, data from previous years have not been adjusted to reflect this issue<sup>14</sup>.

<sup>13</sup> There was one cochlear implant programme that did not respond to the survey, but it has been previously reported that this service does not have Teachers of the Deaf working for the service.

<sup>14</sup> In addition, figures for 2021 on Teachers of the Deaf in this report will not always match those shown in the 2021 reports due to this issue.

Table 10: Changes in numbers of Teachers of the Deaf from year to year<sup>1516</sup>

|      | Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification in employment | Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification in employment or in training | Number of teachers working as Teachers of the Deaf in employment | Number of vacant posts | Number of Teacher of the Deaf posts (including vacancies) |
|------|---|--|--|------------------------|---|
| 2022 | 860.34  | 945.14   | 960.74   | 43.1                   | 1,003.84  |
| 2021 | 874.82  | 962.92   | 974.52   | 44.65                  | 1,019.17  |
| 2019 | 903.41  | 1,007.77   | 1,019.37   | 34.8                   | 1,054.17  |
| 2018 | 898.82  | 1,020.62   | 1,027.87   | 30.8                   | 1,058.67  |
| 2017 | 913.75  | 1,037.35   | 1,050.75   | 44.65                  | 1,095.4   |
| 2016 | 932.38  | 1,047.18   | 1,059.28   | 60.9                   | 1,120.18  |
| 2015 | 995.75  | 1,117.85   | 1,126.35   | 45.6                   | 1,171.95  |
| 2014 | 999.2   | 1,071.3  | 1,079.9  | 45.8                   | 1,125.7   |
| 2013 | 1,031.9   | 1,097.3  | 1,104.5  | 40.8                   | 1,145.2   |
| 2012 | 1,063.7   | 1,125.6  | 1,136.4  | 44.5                   | 1,180.9   |
| 2011 | 1,062.11  | 1,153.71   | 1,162.51   | 34                     | 1,196.51  |

(2020 data not included because of lower response rate to survey)

Table 11: Percentage change in numbers of Teachers of the Deaf

|  | Percentage change over past 11 years (between 2011 and 2022) | Percentage change over past year (between 2021 and 2022) |
|--|--|--|
| Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification in employment                | -19%   | -2%  |
| Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification in employment or in training | -18%   | -2%  |
| Number of teachers working as Teachers of the Deaf in employment                   | -17%   | -1%  |
| Number of vacant posts   | 27%  | 0%   |
| Number of Teacher of the Deaf posts (including vacancies)                          | -16%   | -2%  |

We examined how many services had seen a change in the number of Teachers of the Deaf between 2021 and 2022 and found that 26% of services had seen an increase, 35% of services had seen no change while 39% of services had seen a decrease.

We asked whether services had experienced difficulties in recruiting Teachers of the Deaf or supply cover over the past 12 months:

- 30 services (23%) reported difficulties in recruiting for a permanent post
- 37 (28%) reported no difficulties
- 63 services (48%) stated that this question was not applicable to them.

<sup>15</sup> In 2017, we began to ask about Teachers of the Deaf in special schools or colleges not specifically for deaf children or young people. Figures from before/after are therefore not directly comparable. However, it is worth noting that the inclusion of these figures did not lead to a noticeable increase in the number of Teachers of the Deaf.

<sup>16</sup> One service (Nottingham City) did not reply to the survey this year, and one service (Bolton) reported that Teachers of the Deaf working in special schools for deaf children were included in their main CRIDE survey return in previous years.

- 20 services (16%) reported difficulties in recruiting for supply cover
- 23 (18%) reported no difficulties
- 85 services (66%) stated that this question was not applicable to them.

Combining the figures, 36 services (27%) reported difficulties in recruiting to either permanent or supply posts. Comments from services covered the following themes:

- a lack of qualified applicants
- a lack of supply cover
- services having to appoint teachers to undertake training for the mandatory qualification.

## Regional figures

The tables below provide a regional perspective on numbers of Teachers of the Deaf.

*Table 12: Number of qualified Teachers of the Deaf by region*

| Region                      | Number of Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification in 2011 | Number of Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification in 2021 | Number of Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification in 2022 | Percentage change between 2011 and 2022 | Percentage change between 2019 and 2021 |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| East England                | 97.6  | 91.74   | 89.59   | -8%                                     | -2%                                     |
| East Midlands <sup>17</sup> | 87.6  | 60.9  | 52.8  | -40%                                    | -13%                                    |
| London                      | 165.4   | 158.16  | 155   | -6%                                     | -2%                                     |
| North East                  | 57.5  | 49  | 46.4  | -19%                                    | -5%                                     |
| North West <sup>18</sup>    | 191.96  | 125.85  | 123.1   | -36%                                    | -2%                                     |
| South East                  | 142.15  | 119.12  | 122.1   | -14%                                    | 3%                                      |
| South West                  | 95.6  | 69.05   | 67.55   | -29%                                    | -2%                                     |
| West Midlands               | 98.15   | 91.6  | 88.7  | -10%                                    | -3%                                     |
| Yorkshire & Humber          | 126.15  | 109.4   | 115.1   | -9%                                     | 5%                                      |
| Total                       | 1062.11   | 874.82  | 860.34  | -19%                                    | -2%                                     |

<sup>17</sup> The service that did not respond to the survey this year (Nottingham City) is in the East Midlands. This will have an impact on the reported change.

<sup>18</sup> The 12 Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification that were inaccurately included by a service in 2021 have been removed from the 2021 figures for this report. They have not been removed from figures for years previous to that due to uncertainty about the exact nature of the double counting prior to 2021. The 2021 figures in this report will not match figures shown in the 2021 report



*Table 13: Number of qualified Teachers of the Deaf and teachers in training for the mandatory qualification by region*

| Region                      | Number of qualified or trainee Teachers of the Deaf in 2011 | Number of qualified or trainee Teachers of the Deaf in 2021 | Number of qualified or trainee Teachers of the Deaf in 2022 | Percentage change between 2011 and 2022 | Percentage change between 2021 and 2022 |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| East England                | 105.1   | 103.24  | 102.09  | -3%                                     | -1%                                     |
| East Midlands <sup>19</sup> | 95.4  | 66.9  | 58.8  | -38%                                    | -12%                                    |
| London                      | 183.7   | 179.66  | 177.8   | -3%                                     | -1%                                     |
| North East                  | 62.6  | 51  | 49  | -22%                                    | -4%                                     |
| North West <sup>20</sup>    | 209.66  | 129.85  | 127.5   | -39%                                    | -2%                                     |
| South East                  | 153.45  | 138.32  | 138   | -10%                                    | 0%                                      |
| South West                  | 98.6  | 79.35   | 76.75   | -22%                                    | -3%                                     |
| West Midlands               | 106.95  | 96.9  | 96  | -10%                                    | -1%                                     |
| Yorkshire & Humber          | 138.25  | 117.7   | 119.2   | -14%                                    | 1%                                      |
| Total                       | 1153.71   | 962.92  | 945.14  | -18%                                    | -2%                                     |

### Teachers of the Deaf in a peripatetic role

We asked how many Teachers of the Deaf were working in the specialist peripatetic or ‘visiting’ service. Peripatetic 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 specifically for deaf children.

*Table 14: Number of peripatetic Teachers of the Deaf in employment*

|  | Number of teachers | Percentage | Number of services with staff in relevant category |
|--|--------------------|------------|--|
| Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification                      | 579.07             | 93%        | 130  |
| Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years        | 40.2               | 6%         | 34   |
| Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training | 3.5                | 1%         | 4  |
| Total of figures given   | 622.77             |            |  |

29 services reported vacancies in the peripatetic service as of January 2022, amounting to 21.9 fte posts.

The total of 622.77 fte peripatetic Teachers of the Deaf has decreased from 625.14 in 2021. This amounts to a 4% decline. Since 2011, when there were 718.3 fte peripatetic Teachers of the Deaf, we have seen a 13% percentage decline.

<sup>19</sup> The service that did not respond to the survey this year (Nottingham City) is in the East Midlands. This will have an impact on the reported change.

<sup>20</sup> The 12 Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification and 1 Teacher of the Deaf in training that were inaccurately included by a service in 2021 have been removed from the 2021 figures for this report. They have not been removed from figures for years previous to that due to uncertainty about the exact nature of the double counting prior to 2021. The 2021 figures in this report will not match figures shown in the 2021 report.

One service indicated that they did not have any qualified peripatetic Teachers of the Deaf working for them at the time of the survey<sup>21</sup>. Of the 130 services that provided a figure for fully qualified peripatetic Teachers of the Deaf, the numbers within each service ranged from 0.4 to 12.2 fte. 29 services employ two or fewer peripatetic Teachers of the Deaf, of which four services employed one or fewer (e.g. 0.5 fte) fully qualified peripatetic Teachers of the Deaf. The average number of peripatetic Teachers of the Deaf (with the mandatory qualification) per service is 4.5 fte.

### **Peripatetic Teachers of the Deaf caseloads**

This section looks at the theoretical or notional caseloads of each visiting Teacher of the Deaf by looking at the number of deaf children living in an area who are not already in specialist provision (regardless of whether they are receiving support or not). There is a range of views on both the usefulness of this and how best to calculate this ratio. Points to consider include:

- areas that are large or rural may, by necessity, have more visiting Teachers of the Deaf than areas that are small and urban because of the need to allow for travel time
- areas in which there are specialist units or special schools may have fewer visiting Teachers of the Deaf because it has been assumed that deaf children with most need are already in specialist provision
- services that are better able to reliably record and identify how many deaf children, including those over 16, are in their area may appear to have heavier caseloads than services which have only given a figure for the number of deaf children they 'know' about
- the theoretical caseload does not tell us about the outcomes achieved by deaf children in the area.

In simple terms, and for consistency across all parts of England, we calculate the theoretical caseloads by dividing the number of permanently deaf children living in any given area and in non-specialist provision<sup>22</sup> by the number of visiting Teachers of the Deaf who are qualified or in training for the mandatory qualification. Responses have been excluded where there were obvious gaps or anomalies in either the number of Teachers of the Deaf or numbers of deaf children living in the area.

We found that:

- across the whole of England, each visiting (peripatetic) Teacher of the Deaf has a theoretical average caseload of 63 deaf children
- the highest caseload found (after anomalies were excluded) was 211 in one area
- there are 32 services (26%) where each visiting Teacher of the Deaf has a theoretical caseload of, on average, 80 or more deaf children, of which there are 17 services (14%) where there are, on average, 100 or more deaf children on the theoretical caseload.

The theoretical average caseload of 63:1 is up slightly from 2021 when the theoretical average caseload was 62:1.

The following table provides a breakdown of theoretical caseload figures by region. The annex provides figures for each local authority.

---

<sup>21</sup> This service did however report fully qualified Teachers of the Deaf working flexibly across the peripatetic service, resource provisions and/or in special schools not specifically for deaf children.

<sup>22</sup> This includes: "Supported only at home – pre-school children, Early years setting – pre-school children, Supported at home – of school age and home educated, Mainstream state-funded schools (including academies and free schools), Mainstream independent (non-state-funded) schools (for example, Eton), Other special schools, not specifically for deaf children (whether state funded or non-maintained), All other post-16 provision (not including school sixth form colleges), NEET (Not in education, employment or in training) (post-16 only), Other (e.g. Pupil referral units), Not known. This excludes deaf children reported as being in mainstream schools with resource provision or special schools for deaf children."

Table 15: Ratio of deaf children being supported by each visiting Teacher of the Deaf, by region

| Region             | Average ratio |
|--------------------|---------------|
| East England       | 64:1          |
| East Midlands      | 61:1          |
| London             | 66:1          |
| North East         | 64:1          |
| North West         | 56:1          |
| South East         | 60:1          |
| South West         | 65:1          |
| West Midlands      | 73:1          |
| Yorkshire & Humber | 63:1          |
| England            | 63:1          |

### Teachers of the Deaf in resource provisions

We asked how many Teachers of the Deaf were employed in resource provisions for deaf children. Respondents were asked to exclude time spent on other school duties (such as time as the school's special educational needs co-ordinator, for example).

Table 16: Number of Teachers of the Deaf in resource provisions

|  | Number of teachers | Percentage | Number of services with staff in relevant category |
|--|--------------------|------------|--|
| Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification                      | 258.67             | 82%        | 79   |
| Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years        | 43.8               | 14%        | 31   |
| Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training | 11.5               | 4%         | 7  |
| Total of figures given   | 313.97             |            |  |

There were 21.2 fte reported vacancies for Teachers of the Deaf in resource provisions as of January 2022.

The total of 313.97 Teachers of the Deaf in resource provisions has decreased from 320.48 in 2021. This amounts to a 2% percentage decline. Since 2011, when there were 444.3 fte Teachers of the Deaf working in resource provisions, we have seen a 29% percentage decline.

Four services stated there was a resource provision in their area but could not, or did not, tell us how many Teachers of the Deaf were employed in resource provisions<sup>23</sup>. This is despite the fact that local authorities have a strategic responsibility towards children with special educational needs and a duty to keep provision under review. In addition to this, there were two services that did not report Teachers of the Deaf in resource provisions, and commented that there were either no pupils or very low numbers of pupils in the resource provision. There were also two services that reported no Teachers of the Deaf in

<sup>23</sup> There were also 5 services that indicated that had a resource provision in their area but who did not report any Teachers of the Deaf working solely in a resource provision. However, they did indicate that Teachers of the Deaf were working flexibly as a peripatetic Teacher of the Deaf, in a resource provision and/or in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children or young people.

resource provisions and commented that Teachers of the Deaf working in the peripatetic service were supporting pupils in resource provisions.

### **Teachers of the Deaf working mainly in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children or young people**

Four services reported they had Teachers of the Deaf working mainly in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children or young people, with 3.7 fte Teachers of the Deaf working in this way. The majority (95%) were Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification, and 5% were in training.

Comparisons are not made with previous years due to a service reporting Teachers of the Deaf working in these settings in error in the past.

### **Teachers of the Deaf working flexibly across peripatetic services and other education settings**

14 services reported that they employed Teachers of the Deaf who worked flexibly across peripatetic services, resource provisions and special schools/colleges not specifically for deaf children or young people, with 20.3 fte Teachers of the Deaf working in this way. This is a 7% decrease from 21.8 in 2021.

The majority (94%) were Teachers of the Deaf holding the mandatory qualification, 3% were in training or intending to train within three years, and the remaining 3% were qualified teachers without the MQ and not in training or intending to train.

### **Teachers of the Deaf working in special schools for deaf children**

This data was collected through a short separate targeted directly at special schools for deaf children. 17 schools in England responded to the survey.

*Table 17: Number of Teachers of the Deaf in post in special schools for deaf children*

|   | <b>Number of teachers</b> | <b>Percentage</b> |
|---|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Teachers of the deaf with the mandatory qualification                           | 162.55                    | 63%               |
| Teachers of the deaf in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years | 52.48                     | 20%               |
| Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training      | 42.59                     | 17%               |
| Total of figures given  | 257.62                    |                   |

Additionally, 5 fte vacancies were reported. This means that there are 262.62 fte Teacher of the Deaf posts, of which 2% are vacant.

The total of Teachers of the Deaf in special schools for deaf children has increased from 144.83 in 2021. However, it should be noted that the 2021 figure is based on responses from 12 special schools.

### **Other specialist staff**

We found that there are at least 685 fte specialist support staff in post employed by services. There are at least 46 fte vacant posts reported. This means there are at least 732 fte specialist support staff posts, of which 6% are vacant posts.

Table 18: Number of specialist support staff, by role

|  | Number working in this role            |  | Vacant posts                           |  | Total         |
|--|--|--|--|--|---------------|
|  | Number of staff (full time equivalent) | Number of services with staff in relevant category | Number of staff (full time equivalent) | Number of services with staff in relevant category |               |
| Teaching assistants/ Classroom support assistants etc  | 411.2 (96%)                            | 83   | 18 (4%)                                | 16   | 429.2 (100%)  |
| Communication support workers/ Communicators etc   | 137.9 (91%)                            | 27   | 13.09 (9%)                             | 7  | 150.99 (100%) |
| NRCPD registered BSL/English interpreters  | 4.4 (100%)                             | 3  | 0 (0%)                                 | 0  | 4.4 (100%)    |
| Deaf instructors/Deaf role models/Sign language instructors etc  | 48.25 (89%)                            | 39   | 5.96 (11%)                             | 8  | 54.21 (100%)  |
| Educational audiologists/Audiologists in Education who do not also hold a qualification as a Teacher of the Deaf | 2.7 (84%)                              | 5  | 0.5 (16%)                              | 1  | 3.2 (100%)    |
| Technicians et al.   | 26.85 (91%)                            | 31   | 2.5 (9%)                               | 2  | 29.35 (100%)  |
| Speech and language therapists   | 9.3 (87%)                              | 15   | 1.4 (13%)                              | 2  | 10.7 (100%)   |
| Family support workers/Liaison officers  | 10.39 (79%)                            | 16   | 2.7 (21%)                              | 4  | 13.09 (100%)  |
| Social workers/Social workers for deaf children  | 1 (100%)                               | 1  | 0 (0%)                                 | 0  | 1 (100%)      |
| Other  | 33.74 (94%)                            | 30   | 2.26 (6%)                              | 4  | 36 (100%)     |
| Total of figures given   | 685.73 (94%)                           |  | 46.41 (6%)                             |  | 732.14 (100%) |

Other roles included:

- Nursery nurse
- Cued Speech early years practitioner
- Early years educator/Early years development worker/Early years specialist practitioner
- Hearing support specialist
- Qualified teacher in MSI
- MSI intervenors
- Specialist sensory learning mentor for HI and VI
- Audiology assistants
- Transition coordinator
- Lunchtime supervisors
- Wellbeing officer.

## PART 3: Post-16 support

We asked if peripatetic Teachers of the Deaf in services provided any of the support below in relation to careers advice and moving into employment.

Table 19: Support on careers advice and moving into employment

| Category   | Yes<br>(number and<br>percentage of<br>services) | No<br>(number and<br>percentage of<br>services) | Not sure<br>(number and<br>percentage of<br>services) | Total         |
|--|--|---|---|---------------|
| Engaging with careers advisors in <b>schools</b> on careers advice to deaf young people  | 92<br>(70%)                                      | 33<br>(25%)                                     | 6<br>(5%)   | 131<br>(100%) |
| Engaging with careers advisors in <b>colleges</b> on careers advice to deaf young people?  | 69<br>(53%)                                      | 56<br>(43%)                                     | 6<br>(5%)   | 131<br>(100%) |
| Provision of advice on the accessibility of work placements being undertaken by deaf young people                                  | 88<br>(68%)                                      | 34<br>(26%)                                     | 8<br>(6%)   | 130<br>(100%) |
| Provision of information to deaf young people about the support available through the Access to Work scheme for employment support | 101<br>(78%)                                     | 25<br>(19%)                                     | 3<br>(2%)   | 129<br>(100%) |
| Provision of information to deaf young people about their rights under the Equality Act to reasonable adjustments in the workplace | 101<br>(78%)                                     | 25<br>(19%)                                     | 4<br>(3%)   | 130<br>(100%) |

Comparing with figures from the 2021 report:

- there has been a decrease in the proportion of services engaging with careers advisors in schools (79% to 70%) and those providing advice on accessibility of work placements (71% to 68%)
- there has been an increase in the proportion of services engaging with careers advisors in colleges (48% to 53%), providing information on Access to Work (71% to 78%) and providing information on the Equality Act and reasonable adjustments (70% to 78%).

## PART 4: Support provided

Table 20: Where services are based

|  | Number of services | Percentage |
|--|--------------------|------------|
| Based in the local authority                                 | 111                | 85%        |
| Based in a school with a resource provision                  | 5                  | 4%         |
| Based in a special school for deaf children                  | 1                  | 1%         |
| Based in a special school not specifically for deaf children | 6                  | 5%         |
| Provided by another body or organisation                     | 3                  | 2%         |
| Other  | 5                  | 4%         |
| Total  | 131                |            |

Other arrangements included:

- dual-funded service part based in the local authority and part commissioned by the local authority and based in a special school not specifically for deaf children.
- service delegated to a primary school in the local authority
- joint arrangement between six local authorities hosted by a community interest company
- joint venture between a local authority and Babcock International. The local authority commission Babcock to deliver support for deaf children and young people.
- company wholly owned by the local authority.

### Number of resource provisions

In the CRIDE survey, we use the term 'resource provision' to include all schools (mainstream or special) with a resource provision, base or unit specifically for deaf children, regardless of whether staff in the resource provision are employed by the local authority or by the school.

Table 21: Number of resource provisions<sup>24</sup>

|   | Managed by the local authority | Managed by the schools | Total |
|---|--------------------------------|------------------------|-------|
| Resource provisions for primary-aged children   | 55.5                           | 76                     | 131.5 |
| Resource provisions for secondary-aged children | 42.5                           | 56                     | 98.5  |
| Total   | 98                             | 132                    | 230   |

We also found that:

- 88 services (67%) had at least one resource provision for primary-aged children in their area
- 79 services (60%) had at least one resource provision for secondary-aged children in their area.

The total of 230 resource provisions across England is a decrease from 2021 when the survey identified 237 resource provisions.

<sup>24</sup> One response indicated that there was a resource provision which supports children of both primary and secondary age. This resource provision has been recorded as 0.5 for each age group in the table.

Table 22: Number of resource provisions over time

| Year | Number of resource provisions |
|------|-------------------------------|
| 2022 | 230                           |
| 2021 | 237                           |
| 2019 | 246                           |
| 2018 | 240                           |
| 2017 | 251                           |
| 2016 | 260                           |

(2020 data not included because of lower response rate to survey)

We also looked at the number of resource provisions against the overall population of deaf children<sup>25</sup>. This is intended to indicate the spread of resource provisions across England, relative to the overall population of deaf children. We found that, on average, there is one resource provision for every 197 deaf children. This is up from 2021 when we found that there was one resource provision for every 190 deaf children.

This is **not** a measure of the number of places available in or individual deaf children enrolled at each resource provision; figures for places or deaf children enrolled will vary from provision to provision.

The following table provides a breakdown of the spread of resource provisions in each region. It should be noted that regional difference may be influenced by a range of different factors including, for example, the number of special schools in the area.

Table 23: Population of deaf children covered by each resource provision

| Region             | Average ratio |
|--------------------|---------------|
| East England       | 142:1         |
| East Midlands      | 375:1         |
| London             | 148:1         |
| North East         | 201:1         |
| North West         | 253:1         |
| South East         | 121:1         |
| South West         | 282:1         |
| West Midlands      | 381:1         |
| Yorkshire & Humber | 225:1         |
| England            | 197:1         |

The annex provides figures on the spread of resource provisions against the local population of deaf children in each area.

<sup>25</sup> The overall total given by services is used here.



## PART 5: Support following the identification of deafness

We asked services how many referrals they received over the calendar year of 2021.

Table 24: Referrals

|   | Number and percentage of referrals | Number of services |
|---|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| For children identified as deaf through the newborn hearing screening programme   | 1,011<br>(19%)                     | 127                |
| For children identified as deaf outside of the newborn hearing programme and <b>before</b> they had started statutory education | 1,161<br>(22%)                     | 114                |
| For children identified as deaf outside of the newborn hearing programme and <b>after</b> they had started statutory education  | 3,017<br>(58%)                     | 124                |
| Total of figures given  | 5,189<br>(100%)                    |                    |

We then asked how soon families were contacted and visited following the initial referral. These questions were drafted with reference to the [NatSIP Quality Standards for Sensory Support Services in England \(2016\)](#) – in particular, standards A1ii and A1iii.

We recognise there may be a range of reasons why initial contact or the first visit cannot take place within the timescales outlined by the quality standards (e.g. the family is not able to meet). However, we hope that these questions will help to build a national picture of how these quality standards are being met.

In response to these questions, we found that:

- of the referrals for children identified through the newborn hearing screening programme, 903 of the families were contacted by a Teacher of the Deaf within 2 working days. This amounts to 89% of the 1,011 children referred via this route<sup>26</sup>
- of the referrals for children identified as deaf outside of the newborn hearing screening programme and before they had started statutory education, 875 of the families were contacted by a Teacher of the Deaf within 5 working days. This amounts to 75% of the 1,161 children referred outside of the newborn hearing screening programme and before they had started statutory education<sup>27</sup>
- of the referrals for children identified as deaf outside of the newborn hearing screening programme and after they had started statutory education, 1,979 of the families were contacted by a Teacher of the Deaf within 5 working days. This amounts to 66% of the 3,017 children referred outside of the newborn hearing screening programme and after they had started statutory education<sup>28</sup>
- 2,834 families were offered a visit (either face-to-face or virtually) from a Teacher of the Deaf within 10 working days of any referral. This amounts to 55% of the 5,189 children referred either through or outside the newborn hearing screening programme.<sup>29</sup>

Where a referral is made during the summer holidays, services were asked what arrangements are made in terms of the first Teacher of the Deaf visit to the family.

<sup>26</sup> 7 services did not respond to this question.

<sup>27</sup> 19 services did not respond to this question.

<sup>28</sup> 23 services did not answer this question.

<sup>29</sup> 30 services did not respond to this question.

Table 25: Arrangements for referrals made during the summer holidays

|   | Number of services | Percentage of services |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|
| Cover arrangements are in place to enable a Teacher of the Deaf to provide a visit during the summer holidays within ten working days                     | 88                 | 67%                    |
| Cover arrangements are in place to enable a Teacher of the Deaf to provide a visit during the summer holidays but not necessarily within ten working days | 13                 | 10%                    |
| A Teacher of the Deaf visits as soon as possible after the school holidays  | 16                 | 12%                    |
| Other   | 14                 | 11%                    |
| Total   | 131                |                        |

Where services stated 'other' they were asked to specify the arrangements in place:

- Children referred via newborn hearing screening are contacted and visited. Other children (e.g. school-aged) would be seen once term has started, unless there are specific reasons for a visit during the school holiday.
- Line manager (not a Teacher of the Deaf) would deal with urgent requests during holidays.
- A visit may be offered during the holidays, but some referrals would be actioned after the holiday; there is no blanket policy.
- Contact is made by other staff (e.g. manager, portage worker, team admin) during the holiday when a Teacher of the Deaf is not available, and a Teacher of the Deaf visits when term has started.

A range of other comments about referrals were made:

- Some services stated they did not have the data to be able to respond to these questions on timescales
- For primary and secondary aged children, families have a phone call or email, and are then offered a face-to-face visit after the first school visit if appropriate.
- Occasionally contact with families is attempted but they cannot be reached easily.
- On occasion, a family might not want contact from the service.
- Where referrals are made by education agencies, first contact is made with the referrer (e.g. the school).
- Timescales were impacted by Covid-19 disruption.
- Incomplete referral information can cause delays with making contact or visits (services don't always provide all the information services need to be allowed to make contact with families). Referrals are not always done in the same way by audiologists.
- Not all referrals are routinely offered a visit from the service, depending on the circumstances (e.g. where a child has a unilateral hearing loss).

## PART 6: Thematic questions: Integrated review

An 'integrated review' takes place when a child is aged 2 to 2½. This integrated review brings together information from the Early Years Foundation Stage progress check at age 2 and the Healthy Child Programme Review at age 2 to 2½. We asked services if they contribute information to this review for a deaf child aged 2 to 2½.

*Table 26: Teacher of the Deaf contribution to the integrated review for deaf children aged 2 to 2½*

|   | Number of services | Percentage |
|---|--------------------|------------|
| All or nearly all deaf children               | 17                 | 14%        |
| Most deaf children – more than half the time  | 13                 | 10%        |
| Some deaf children – fewer than half the time | 28                 | 22%        |
| None or very few                              | 67                 | 54%        |
| Total   | 125                |            |

Comments specifically about when Teachers of the Deaf would not contribute included these themes:

- if it was not requested by the setting or health visitor
- if the service was requested not to contribute by a family
- if the service is waiting for a family to complete the referral form saying that they agree to the child being discussed at meetings
- if a child was not being seen frequently, although an annual report would be available each year
- if a child has not yet been referred to the service, or the service is awaiting confirmation of medical identification of need
- if parents have chosen not to be referred to the service
- if a child is not on the caseload
- if needs were met at the point of review

More general comments about this included:

- the service may not be aware of when the integrated review is due/they are not informed of when the review is happening
- Teachers of the Deaf are not routinely invited to contribute
- involvement during Covid-19 was reduced
- some children supported do not attend an early years setting until they are 3
- services share reports and updates with colleagues in health regularly
- services would be happy to contribute to reviews if they were asked to
- alternative local partnership arrangements are in place with audiology, paediatrician, speech and language therapy and Teachers of the Deaf
- service has some links with health visitors, but this is usually where a child has complex needs.

Some comments indicated that services contribute in some circumstances and not others:

- contribution is provided when requested.
- information would be contributed if a child is seen regularly enough to provide information at the appropriate time
- if Success from the Start is a parent held record it can be made available to professionals attending the Review

- if the child is in a setting, the service contributes information via the setting rather than in collaboration with the health visitor service
- Teachers of the Deaf speak with parents before the review if there are any concerns or questions
- if a Teacher of the Deaf is not able to attend a review, they would submit a report
- Teachers of the Deaf may be asked to contribute for children who have a severe or profound deafness but may not be asked for children who have lower levels of need
- Teachers of the Deaf would be involved in the reviews where children are not meeting developmental milestones
- a system called 'early support' means Teachers of the Deaf are usually included
- when an 'early help plan' is in place, Teachers of the Deaf contribute to the review
- service works with health visitors, early years settings and parents to share information as part of a review process but may not be present during a review or progress check.

## PART 7: Thematic questions: Family sign language

97 services (75%) said they directly provided informal opportunities (e.g. family groups or coffee mornings, ‘sign along’ sessions or through deaf role models) for families to learn or practise sign language, whilst 33 services (25%) said they did not.

68 services (52%) said they directly provide<sup>30</sup> courses or ‘training’ in sign language to families, whilst 62 services (48%) said they did not. More information on the courses provided are shown in the table below.

Table 27: Courses directly provided

|  | <b>Service provides course at no cost to family</b><br>(number of services, and percentage of all services) | <b>Service subsidises the cost; there is some cost to the family</b> (number of services, and percentage of all services) | <b>Service provides course but family must cover cost in full</b> (number of services, and percentage of all services) |
|--|---|---|--|
| The National Deaf Children’s Society Family Sign Language curriculum   | 32<br>(24%)   | 0<br>(0%)   | 0<br>(0%)  |
| Other courses supporting the use of sign language specifically in a family context                                 | 53<br>(40%)   | 0<br>(0%)   | 0<br>(0%)  |
| A course that seeks to improve knowledge of BSL but without necessarily leading to any of the below qualifications | 52<br>(40%)   | 1<br>(1%)   | 0<br>(0%)  |
| A course that leads to a BSL level 1 qualification   | 13<br>(10%)   | 5<br>(4%)   | 2<br>(2%)  |
| A course that leads to a BSL level 2 qualification   | 10<br>(8%)  | 4<br>(3%)   | 3<br>(2%)  |
| A course that leads to a BSL level 3 or higher qualification   | 2<br>(2%)   | 0<br>(0%)   | 0<br>(0%)  |
| Other  | 5<br>(4%)   | 0<br>(0%)   | 0<br>(0%)  |

Comments on other types of courses included:

- opportunity to learn basic sign supported English for families that wish to use sign alongside speech
- sibling sign
- home visits to model family sign.

17 services (13%) said they funded or commissioned courses to families to enable them to learn sign language on a course delivered by an external provider, whilst 113 services (87%) said they did not. More information on the courses provided are shown in the table below.

<sup>30</sup> In the survey, ‘directly provide’ was described as something that the service directly employs someone to provide.

Table 28: Courses commissioned or provided<sup>31</sup>

|   | <b>Commissioned and funded by the service at no cost to family</b> (number of services, and percentage of all services) | <b>Service subsidises the cost; there is some cost to the family</b> (number of services, and percentage of all services) | <b>Service commissions but family must cover cost in full</b> (number of services, and percentage of all services) |
|---|---|---|--|
| The National Deaf Children’s Society Family Sign Language curriculum  | 5<br>(4%)   | 0<br>(0%)   | 0<br>(0%)  |
| Other courses supporting the use of sign language specifically in a family context                          | 8<br>(6%)   | 0<br>(0%)   | 0<br>(0%)  |
| A course that focused on teaching of BSL but without necessarily leading to any of the below qualifications | 5<br>(4%)   | 0<br>(0%)   | 0<br>(0%)  |
| A course that leads to a BSL level 1 qualification  | 6<br>(5%)   | 2<br>(2%)   | 0<br>(0%)  |
| A course that leads to a BSL level 2 qualification  | 3<br>(2%)   | 1<br>(1%)   | 0<br>(0%)  |
| A course that leads to a BSL level 3 or higher qualification  | 0<br>(0%)   | 0<br>(0%)   | 0<br>(0%)  |
| Other   | 0<br>(0%)   | 0<br>(0%)   | 0<br>(0%)  |

Where services provide, fund or commission courses in sign language to families in their area, we asked how frequently those opportunities are available to families.

<sup>31</sup> Not all services selected options for each type of course.

Table 29: Frequency of courses provided, funded or commissioned<sup>32</sup>

|   | <b>On demand or at least weekly</b><br>(number of services, and percentage of all services) | <b>At least monthly</b><br>(number of services, and percentage of all services) | <b>At least termly</b><br>(number of services, and percentage of all services) | <b>At least once a year</b><br>(number of services, and percentage of all services) |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| The National Deaf Children's Society<br>Family Sign<br>Language curriculum                                  | 21<br>(16%)   | 2<br>(2%)   | 4<br>(3%)  | 8<br>(6%)   |
| Other courses supporting the use of sign language specifically in a family context                          | 35<br>(27%)   | 6<br>(5%)   | 6<br>(5%)  | 8<br>(6%)   |
| A course that focused on teaching of BSL but without necessarily leading to any of the below qualifications | 35<br>(27%)   | 5<br>(4%)   | 6<br>(5%)  | 8<br>(6%)   |
| A course that leads to a BSL level 1 qualification  | 9<br>(7%)   | 2<br>(2%)   | 1<br>(1%)  | 12<br>(9%)  |
| A course that leads to a BSL level 2 qualification  | 7<br>(5%)   | 1<br>(1%)   | 0<br>(0%)  | 9<br>(7%)   |
| A course that leads to a BSL level 3 or higher qualification  | 1<br>(1%)   | 0<br>(0%)   | 0<br>(0%)  | 1<br>(1%)   |
| Other   | 5<br>(4%)   | 0<br>(0%)   | 0<br>(0%)  | 1<br>(1%)   |

Comments on other arrangements included:

- a course developed and run by the local deaf specialists in the local authority is offered to families of deaf pre-schoolers
- sibling sign
- an eLearning package that is available to families.

Where services provide, fund or commission courses in sign language to families, they were asked whether criteria were in place to determine if families are eligible to access courses.

<sup>32</sup> Not all services selected options for each type of course.

Table 30: Eligibility criteria for courses provided, funded or commissioned<sup>33</sup>

|   | <b>No – there is no criteria, any family can access if they would like to</b><br>(number of services, and percentage of all services) | <b>Yes, we apply criteria before families can access</b><br>(number of services, and percentage of all services) |
|---|---|--|
| The National Deaf Children’s Society Family Sign Language curriculum  | 27<br>(21%)   | 7<br>(5%)  |
| Other courses supporting the use of sign language specifically in a family context                          | 41<br>(31%)   | 13<br>(10%)  |
| A course that focused on teaching of BSL but without necessarily leading to any of the below qualifications | 37<br>(28%)   | 11<br>(8%)   |
| A course that leads to a BSL level 1 qualification  | 14<br>(11%)   | 9<br>(7%)  |
| A course that leads to a BSL level 2 qualification  | 9<br>(7%)   | 9<br>(7%)  |
| A course that leads to a BSL level 3 or higher qualification  | 3<br>(2%)   | 0<br>(0%)  |
| Other   | 3<br>(2%)   | 1<br>(1%)  |

Table 31: Criterion<sup>34</sup>

|  | Number of services where criterion applies | Comments on types of courses this applies to   |
|--|--|--|
| Child must have severe or profound hearing loss                                  | 7  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All types of courses</li> <li>BSL Level 2 or above</li> <li>Family Sign – moderate or greater if language acquisition needs support</li> </ul>  |
| Family must fall below a certain income threshold                                | 1  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All types of courses</li> </ul>   |
| Family/child must undergo assessment of need by the specialist education service | 6  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All types of courses</li> <li>BSL Level 1 and BSL Level 2</li> <li>BSL Level 1 &amp; 2 courses are only currently available to deaf children. Our other BSL courses for families are available to all family members of any deaf child on our caseload.</li> <li>Other courses supporting the use of sign language specifically in a family context</li> <li>Home visits</li> </ul> |
| Family/child must undergo assessment of need by social care                      | 2  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All types of courses</li> </ul>   |
| Child has auditory neuropathy spectrum disorder                                  | 1  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All types of courses</li> <li>Family sign</li> </ul>  |

<sup>33</sup> Not all services selected options for each type of course.

<sup>34</sup> Not all services selected options for each type of course.



Our analysis indicates that 43% services neither provide, fund or commission any courses in sign language to families.

## PART 8: Thematic questions: Pupil premium

14 services (11%) said they record whether a school-aged child is eligible for the Pupil Premium, whilst 116 services (89%) said they did not.

These 14 services reported a total of 832 deaf children known to be eligible for the Pupil Premium in their areas. This represents 18% of deaf children and young people living in the areas covered by those 14 services (adjusted totals).

We also asked if Teachers of the Deaf are involved in any discussions in how the Pupil Premium is used for eligible deaf school-aged children.

*Table 32: Services where Teachers of the Deaf are involved in discussions in how the Pupil Premium is used for eligible deaf school-aged children.*

|   | Number of services | Percentage |
|---|--------------------|------------|
| All or nearly all deaf children               | 1                  | 1%         |
| Most deaf children – more than half the time  | 4                  | 3%         |
| Some deaf children – fewer than half the time | 27                 | 22%        |
| None or very few                              | 93                 | 74%        |
| Total   | 125                |            |

## PART 9: Background and methodology

CRIDE is a consortium bringing together a range of organisations and individuals with a common interest in using research to improve the educational outcomes achieved by deaf children. At the time the survey was sent out, representatives included: BATOD, Frank Barnes School for Deaf Children, Mary Hare, National Deaf Children’s Society, National Sensory Impairment Partnership (NatSIP), UCL, University of Edinburgh, consultants with expertise in deafness, and specialist education services for deaf children in Cambridgeshire, Camden, Kent, and Leeds.

The survey alternates from year to year between a standard survey and a survey with a mix of core and thematic questions. The 2022 survey was the version with thematic questions.

The survey was disseminated to services in England in February 2022 by National Deaf Children’s Society staff on behalf of CRIDE. Where there was no response by 4 March, members of CRIDE contacted services by email and/or telephone. Following this, as a last resort, Freedom of Information requests were sent out from the end of April 2022 to the remaining services who had not responded by then. The table below sets out the response rate at each stage.

*Table 33: Response rate by services to the CRIDE survey*

|   | <b>Number of responses</b> | <b>Cumulative total</b> |
|---|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| First deadline – 4 March 2022                             | 105                        | 105                     |
| Second deadline following chasers                         | 23                         | 128                     |
| Returned later following a Freedom of Information request | 3                          | 131                     |

Services were able to respond by completing a Word document of the survey. Analysis of the results using Excel and drafting of this report was largely completed by the National Deaf Children’s Society, 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 [cride@ndcs.org.uk](mailto:cride@ndcs.org.uk).

## Annex: Information by local authority

The table that follows sets out some individual data from services. Local authorities were asked to provide figures as of 31 January 2022.

Figures for Teachers of the Deaf include Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification (MQ) and Teachers of the Deaf in training for the MQ or intending to train within three years.

As set out earlier, theoretical caseloads for peripatetic Teachers of the Deaf are calculated by dividing the number of permanently deaf children living in any given area and in non-specialist provision by the number of visiting Teachers of the Deaf who are qualified or in training for the mandatory qualification. Responses have been excluded where there were obvious gaps or anomalies in either the number of Teachers of the Deaf or numbers of deaf children living in the area. Please see page 17 for more information. In some cases, where there was an obvious error or anomaly, we have not calculated a ratio.

Figures for the average population of deaf children covered by each resource provision are intended to show the spread of resource provisions across each area. It is calculated by dividing the number of children living in the area covered by a service and number of resource provisions in a service area. Where there is no resource provision in the area, this is indicated by a ratio of the population in the area to 0. Care should be used in interpreting these figures. In some cases, the ratio may be influenced by the presence of special schools in the area or other resource provisions in neighbouring areas. It should be noted that this is **not** a measure of the number of places available in or individual deaf children enrolled at each resource provision; figures for places or deaf children enrolled will vary from provision to provision.

*Table 34: Data by local authority*

|                               | Number of permanently deaf children living in the geographical area covered by the service | Number of children with permanent or temporary deafness on the caseload for the service | Number of children with temporary deafness on the caseload for the service | Teachers of the Deaf in the specialist peripatetic service | Teachers of the Deaf in resource provisions | Teachers of the Deaf mainly in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children and young people | Teachers of the Deaf working flexibly | Theoretical caseloads for peripatetic Teachers of the Deaf | Average population of deaf children covered by each resource provision |
|-------------------------------|--|---|--|--|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| <b><i>East of England</i></b> |  |   |  |  |   |  |                                       |  |  |
| Bedford Borough               | 193  | 208   | 29   | 2.5  | No resource provisions reported             | None reported  | None reported                         | 76:1   | 193:0  |
| Cambridgeshire                | 435  | 435   | None reported  | 9.2  | 2   | 0  | 0                                     | 45:1   | 218:1  |
| Central Bedfordshire          | 170  | 167   | None reported  | 1.6  | 2.8   | None reported  | None reported                         | 94:1   | 57:1   |
| Essex                         | 1001   | 875   | 8  | 10.8   | 17.5  | 0  | 0                                     | 79:1   | 111:1  |
| Hertfordshire                 | 764  | 595   | None reported  | 9.2  | 2   | None reported  | None reported                         | 71:1   | 382:1  |
| Luton <sup>i</sup>            | 183  | 90  | None reported  | 0.4  | 3.6   | None reported  | 0.8                                   | Not calculated   | 92:1   |
| Norfolk                       | 661  | 661   | None reported  | 11.5   | 3.7   | 0  | 0                                     | 54:1   | 165:1  |
| Peterborough                  | 315  | 233   | 11   | 3  | None reported <sup>ii</sup>                 | None reported  | 1.8                                   | 65:1   | 158:1  |
| Southend                      | 130  | 130   | 7  | 1  | No resource provisions reported             | None reported  | None reported                         | 114:1  | 130:0  |
| Suffolk                       | 425  | 437   | 5  | 7.02   | 4.92  | 0  | 0                                     | 53:1   | 85:1   |
| Thurrock                      | 125  | 125   | 0  | 1.8  | 4.95  | 0  | None reported                         | 56:1   | 63:1   |
| <b><i>East Midlands</i></b>   |  |   |  |  |   |  |                                       |  |  |
| Derby City                    | 585  | 125   | 0  | 3.3  | 3.3   | 0  | 0                                     | 145:1  | 293:1  |
| Derbyshire                    | 449  | 632   | 183  | 7.6  | None reported                               | 0  | 0                                     | Not calculated   | 112:1  |

|  |             |             |               |             |                                 |               |               |             |             |
|--|-------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|---------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|
| Leicester City                                   | 323         | 345         | 22            | 5           | No resource provisions reported | 0             | 0             | 63:1        | 323:0       |
| Leicestershire and Rutland                       | 691         | 421         | 20            | 8.6         | 0.8                             | 0             | 0.2           | 75:1        | 691:1       |
| Lincolnshire                                     | 183         | 183         | 0             | 8.8         | No resource provisions reported | 0             | 0             | 19:1        | 183:0       |
| North Northamptonshire and West Northamptonshire | 784         | 784         | None reported | 11.7        | 1.8                             | 0             | 0             | 65:1        | 392:1       |
| Nottingham City                                  | No response | No response | No response   | No response | No response                     | No response   | No response   | No response | No response |
| Nottinghamshire                                  | 360         | 532         | None reported | 7.7         | No resource provisions reported | None reported | None reported | 46:1        | 360:0       |
| <b>London</b>                                    |             |             |               |             |                                 |               |               |             |             |
| Barking and Dagenham                             | 145         | 128         | 27            | 2           | 7                               | 0             | 0             | 48:1        | 48:1        |
| Barnet   | 402         | 383         | None reported | 2.6         | 5                               | None reported | None reported | 139:1       | 201:1       |
| Bexley   | 271         | 271         | 0             | 1           | 1.6                             | 0             | 0             | 211:1       | 271:1       |
| Brent  | 149         | 224         | 24            | 3.4         | 3                               | None reported | None reported | 40:1        | 75:1        |
| Bromley  | 261         | 254         | 7             | 3.3         | 4.7                             | 0             | 0             | 57:1        | 131:1       |
| Camden   | 155         | 182         | 9             | 1.6         | No resource provisions reported | 0             | 0             | 74:1        | 155:0       |
| Croydon  | 409         | 241         | <5            | 5.4         | 1.6                             | 0             | 0             | 63:1        | 205:1       |
| Ealing   | 280         | 145         | 6             | 2.1         | 0                               | 0             | 0             | 106:1       | 140:1       |
| Greenwich  | 332         | 224         | 54            | 3.1         | 7.4                             | 0             | 0             | 97:1        | 111:1       |
| Hackney  | 349         | 352         | 8             | 4           | 2                               | 0             | 0             | 67:1        | 349:1       |

|                       |     |     |               |     |                                 |               |               |       |       |
|-----------------------|-----|-----|---------------|-----|---------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------|-------|
| Hammersmith & Fulham  | 89  | 92  | 0             | 1.4 | No resource provisions reported | None reported | None reported | 44:1  | 89:0  |
| Haringey and Enfield  | 479 | 351 | None reported | 4.8 | 1.8                             | 0             | 0             | 75:1  | 240:1 |
| Harrow                | 204 | 282 | 63            | 3.3 | 2                               | 0             | 0             | 50:1  | 102:1 |
| Havering              | 222 | 222 | 0             | 2   | 3                               | 0             | 0             | 95:1  | 222:1 |
| Hillingdon            | 329 | 205 | 12            | 2.4 | 1.8                             | 0             | 0             | 114:1 | 165:1 |
| Hounslow              | 232 | 239 | 7             | 2   | 7                               | None reported | None reported | 81:1  | 77:1  |
| Islington             | 174 | 131 | <5            | 1.6 | 7.6                             | 0             | 0             | 64:1  | 174:1 |
| Lambeth               | 243 | 179 | 0             | 2.9 | 1                               | None reported | 0.1           | 54:1  | 122:1 |
| Lewisham              | 245 | 119 | None reported | 3.1 | 2                               | None reported | 0             | 60:1  | 82:1  |
| Merton                | 148 | 157 | 30            | 2.1 | No resource provisions reported | 0             | None reported | 41:1  | 148:0 |
| Newham                | 356 | 305 | None reported | 4.6 | 2.2                             | 0             | 0             | 61:1  | 178:1 |
| Redbridge             | 302 | 262 | None reported | 3.7 | 7                               | None reported | None reported | 61:1  | 151:1 |
| Richmond and Kingston | 274 | 274 | 5             | 2.8 | 3                               | None reported | None reported | 81:1  | 137:1 |
| Southwark             | 297 | 324 | 0             | 3.7 | None reported                   | None reported | None reported | 59:1  | 297:1 |
| Sutton                | 173 | 220 | 22            | 1.4 | 1.4                             | None reported | None reported | 101:1 | 87:1  |
| Tower Hamlets         | 463 | 395 | 22            | 4   | 6.9                             | 0             | 1.8           | 61:1  | 154:1 |
| Waltham Forest        | 137 | 166 | 43            | 2.6 | 2                               | None reported | None reported | 47:1  | 69:1  |
| Wandsworth            | 289 | 367 | 79            | 6.3 | 5.6                             | 1.1           | 0             | 36:1  | 145:1 |

|   |     |     |               |     |                                 |               |               |       |       |
|---|-----|-----|---------------|-----|---------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------|-------|
| Westminster and Kensington & Chelsea                      | 160 | 194 | 9             | 4   | 1                               | None reported | None reported | 29:1  | 160:1 |
| <b>North East</b>   |     |     |               |     |                                 |               |               |       |       |
| Darlington  | 81  | 85  | 5             | 1.7 | No resource provisions reported | None reported | None reported | 46:1  | 81:0  |
| Durham  | 463 | 366 | None reported | 3.8 | 2.5                             | None reported | None reported | 114:1 | 232:1 |
| Gateshead   | 198 | 198 | None reported | 2.8 | 0 <sup>iii</sup>                | 0             | 0             | 64:1  | 198:1 |
| Middlesbrough, Stockton, Hartlepool, Redcar and Cleveland | 679 | 623 | 0             | 7.2 | 7.2                             | None reported | None reported | 87:1  | 170:1 |
| Newcastle upon Tyne                                       | 264 | 235 | <5            | 2   | 5                               | 0             | 0             | 110:1 | 88:1  |
| North Tyneside  | 104 | 139 | <5            | 3.2 | No resource provisions reported | None reported | None reported | 27:1  | 104:0 |
| Northumberland  | 257 | 189 | 7             | 7   | No resource provisions reported | 0             | 0             | 35:1  | 257:0 |
| South Tyneside  | 127 | 166 | 39            | 5   | No resource provisions reported | None reported | None reported | 23:1  | 127:0 |
| Sunderland  | 236 | 210 | 39            | 0   | None reported                   | None reported | 1.6           | 128:1 | 118:1 |
| <b>North West</b>   |     |     |               |     |                                 |               |               |       |       |
| Blackburn with Darwen                                     | 172 | 168 | 12            | 2.3 | 2                               | 0             | 0.8           | 47:1  | 86:1  |
| Blackpool   | 77  | 94  | 25            | 1.6 | No resource provisions reported | 1             | 0             | 47:1  | 77:0  |



|                           |                   |     |               |      |                                 |               |               |                |       |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-----|---------------|------|---------------------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|-------|
| Bolton                    | 368               | 293 | 17            | 4    | No resource provisions reported | 0             | 0             | 73:1           | 368:0 |
| Bury                      | 243               | 125 | 19            | 1.6  | 1.4                             | 0             | 0             | 141:1          | 243:1 |
| Cheshire East             | 305               | 420 | 76            | 4.95 | 2.6                             | 0             | 0             | 54:1           | 76:1  |
| Cheshire West and Chester | 216               | 216 | 0             | 5.3  | No resource provisions reported | 0             | 0             | 38:1           | 216:0 |
| Cumbria                   | 179 <sup>iv</sup> | 189 | 10            | 3.55 | 0 <sup>v</sup>                  | 0             | 0             | Not calculated | 90:1  |
| Halton                    | 124               | 159 | 28            | 3    | No resource provisions reported | 0             | 0             | 37:1           | 124:0 |
| Knowsley                  | 91                | 91  | 15            | 2    | No resource provisions reported | 0             | 0             | 40:1           | 91:0  |
| Lancashire                | 1090              | 742 | None reported | 9.4  | None reported <sup>vi</sup>     | None reported | None reported | 110:1          | 363:1 |
| Liverpool                 | 286               | 287 | <5            | 4.7  | 5                               | None reported | None reported | 57:1           | 143:1 |
| Manchester                | 579               | 651 | 54            | 6.9  | 7.6                             | None reported | None reported | 79:1           | 193:1 |
| Oldham                    | 302               | 366 | 64            | 5.6  | 1.6                             | 0             | 0             | 51:1           | 302:1 |
| Rochdale                  | 208               | 208 | None reported | 5.4  | 1                               | None reported | None reported | 34:1           | 104:1 |
| Salford                   | 290               | 290 | 62            | 5    | No resource provisions reported | 0             | 0             | 56:1           | 290:0 |
| Sefton                    | 207               | 218 | None reported | 3.6  | No resource provisions reported | 0             | 0             | 53:1           | 207:0 |
| St Helens                 | 144               | 104 | 17            | 2.6  | No resource provisions reported | 0             | 0             | 52:1           | 144:0 |
| Stockport                 | 266               | 266 | 0             | 3    | 0                               | 0             | 5.6           | 27:1           | 133:1 |

|  |     |      |               |      |                                 |               |               |                |       |
|--|-----|------|---------------|------|---------------------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|-------|
| Tameside   | 208 | 200  | None reported | 1.6  | None reported                   | None reported | 3             | 42:1           | 104:1 |
| Trafford   | 190 | 200  | None reported | 7.4  | No resource provisions reported | 0             | 0             | 25:1           | 190:0 |
| Warrington   | 161 | 197  | 36            | 1.6  | No resource provisions reported | None reported | None reported | 93:1           | 161:0 |
| Wigan  | 208 | 236  | 38            | 5.6  | No resource provisions reported | None reported | None reported | 35:1           | 208:0 |
| Wirral   | 416 | 278  | 36            | 4.8  | 0.4                             | None reported | None reported | 85:1           | 416:1 |
| <b>South East</b>  |     |      |               |      |                                 |               |               |                |       |
| Berkshire Consortium (West Berkshire, Reading, Bracknell Forest, Wokingham, Windsor and Maidenhead and Slough) | 748 | 665  | 7             | 11.3 | 8.4                             | 0.6           | 0             | 59:1           | 150:1 |
| Brighton and Hove  | 206 | 251  | 45            | 3.8  | 1.5                             | 0             | 0             | 51:1           | 206:1 |
| Buckinghamshire  | 348 | 382  | 58            | 5.9  | 2                               | 0             | 0             | 52:1           | 116:1 |
| East Sussex  | 462 | 331  | None reported | 4.4  | 5                               | None reported | None reported | Not calculated | 116:1 |
| Hampshire  | 671 | 1062 | 420           | 7.4  | 4.8                             | 0             | 0             | 87:1           | 96:1  |
| Isle of Wight  | 92  | 91   | 15            | 2.3  | No resource provisions reported | 0             | 0             | 40:1           | 92:0  |
| Kent   | 453 | 453  | 0             | 12.4 | 8.5                             | 1             | None reported | 31:1           | 57:1  |
| Medway   | 182 | 137  | 0             | 2    | 4.4                             | 0             | 0             | 69:1           | 91:1  |

|  |      |     |               |      |                                 |               |               |       |       |
|--|------|-----|---------------|------|---------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------|-------|
| Milton Keynes  | 295  | 306 | 11            | 2.5  | 1                               | None reported | 1             | 78:1  | 148:1 |
| Oxfordshire  | 510  | 637 | 117           | 10.8 | 2.6                             | 0             | 0.8           | 42:1  | 170:1 |
| Portsmouth   | 150  | 185 | 36            | 2.2  | 0                               | 0             | 0.1           | 60:1  | 75:1  |
| Southampton  | 200  | 270 | 67            | 2.1  | 3                               | 0             | 0             | 84:1  | 100:1 |
| Surrey   | 745  | 745 | 47            | 10.6 | 6.6                             | None reported | None reported | 64:1  | 149:1 |
| West Sussex  | 724  | 238 | 26            | 5.6  | 3.4                             | None reported | None reported | 116:1 | 181:1 |
| <b>South West</b>  |      |     |               |      |                                 |               |               |       |       |
| Bath & NE Somerset, Bristol, North Somerset and South Gloucester | 854  | 657 | 83            | 11.3 | 4.6                             | None reported | None reported | 68:1  | 122:1 |
| Cornwall   | 242  | 243 | None reported | 10.5 | No resource provisions reported | 0             | 0             | 22:1  | 242:0 |
| Devon  | 1038 | 854 | None reported | 7.7  | 0.6                             | None reported | None reported | 128:1 | 519:1 |
| Dorset, and Bournemouth, Christchurch and Pool (BCP)             | 824  | 452 | None reported | 10.2 | No resource provisions reported | None reported | None reported | 79:1  | 824:0 |
| Gloucestershire  | 403  | 423 | 11            | 4.9  | No resource provisions reported | 0             | 0             | 80:1  | 403:0 |
| Plymouth   | 215  | 215 | 25            | 2    | 3.4                             | None reported | None reported | 96:1  | 108:1 |
| Somerset   | 280  | 269 | 22            | 7.25 | No resource provisions reported | 0             | 0             | 37:1  | 280:0 |
| Swindon  | 236  | 354 | 118           | 4.1  | 0.6                             | 0             | 0             | 52:1  | 236:1 |
| Torbay   | 111  | 126 | <5            | 1.2  | 1.1                             | 0             | 0             | 84:1  | 56:1  |

|                                 |      |     |               |      |                                 |               |               |       |       |
|---------------------------------|------|-----|---------------|------|---------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------|-------|
| Wiltshire                       | 305  | 317 | None reported | 5.6  | 1.7                             | None reported | None reported | 45:1  | 153:1 |
| <b>West Midlands</b>            |      |     |               |      |                                 |               |               |       |       |
| Birmingham                      | 1556 | 589 | 66            | 11.2 | 10                              | None reported | None reported | 127:1 | 311:1 |
| Coventry                        | 406  | 406 | None reported | 5.2  | 1.6                             | 0             | 0.6           | 67:1  | 203:1 |
| Dudley                          | 249  | 355 | 102           | 3    | 5                               | None reported | None reported | 69:1  | 125:1 |
| Herefordshire                   | 170  | 196 | 15            | 3.4  | No resource provisions reported | 0             | 0             | 49:1  | 170:0 |
| Sandwell                        | 273  | 361 | 81            | 5.6  | 2                               | None reported | None reported | 41:1  | 137:1 |
| Solihull                        | 220  | 232 | 26            | 2.7  | No resource provisions reported | None reported | None reported | 72:1  | 220:0 |
| Staffordshire                   | 775  | 775 | 266           | 11.6 | No resource provisions reported | 0             | 0             | 65:1  | 775:0 |
| Stoke-on-Trent                  | 340  | 286 | 0             | 3.7  | 1.4                             | None reported | None reported | 78:1  | 340:1 |
| Telford & Wrekin and Shropshire | 549  | 662 | 104           | 8.7  | No resource provisions reported | None reported | None reported | 62:1  | 549:0 |
| Walsall                         | 228  | 280 | 52            | 3.3  | 1.1                             | 0             | 0             | 59:1  | 228:1 |
| Warwickshire                    | 320  | 388 | 52            | 5.6  | No resource provisions reported | 0             | 0             | 56:1  | 320:0 |
| Wolverhampton                   | 238  | 257 | 23            | 2.9  | 2.8                             | None reported | None reported | 74:1  | 119:1 |
| Worcestershire                  | 388  | 190 | 20            | 4.6  | No resource provisions reported | None reported | None reported | 82:1  | 388:0 |

| <b>Yorkshire and the Humber</b> |     |      |               |      |                                 |               |               |                |       |
|---------------------------------|-----|------|---------------|------|---------------------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|-------|
| Barnsley                        | 154 | 161  | 7             | 3    | 0 <sup>vii</sup>                | 0             | 0             | 51:1           | 154:1 |
| Bradford                        | 835 | 857  | 22            | 7.4  | 9                               | 0             | 0             | 104:1          | 278:1 |
| Calderdale                      | 221 | 293  | 72            | 3.2  | No resource provisions reported | None reported | None reported | 68:1           | 221:0 |
| City of York                    | 136 | 156  | 0             | 3    | None reported                   | 0             | 0             | 43:1           | 136:1 |
| Doncaster                       | 353 | 360  | 0             | 5    | 4.1                             | 0             | 0             | 64:1           | 177:1 |
| East Riding of Yorkshire        | 115 | 166  | 41            | 3.4  | No resource provisions reported | 0             | 0             | 31:1           | 115:0 |
| Hull                            | 294 | 216  | 0             | 3.5  | 3.4                             | 0             | 1.5           | 38:1           | 147:1 |
| Kirklees                        | 513 | 405  | 134           | 4.9  | 3.6                             | 0             | 0             | 100:1          | 257:1 |
| Leeds                           | 983 | 1071 | None reported | 12.2 | 4.4                             | 0             | 0             | Not calculated | 492:1 |
| North East Lincolnshire         | 67  | 119  | 52            | 1.8  | No resource provisions reported | 0             | 0             | 28:1           | 67:0  |
| North Lincolnshire              | 94  | 108  | 14            | 1.8  | 0.8                             | 0             | 0             | 48:1           | 94:1  |
| North Yorkshire                 | 332 | 340  | <5            | 3.6  | No resource provisions reported | None reported | None reported | 86:1           | 332:0 |
| Rotherham                       | 250 | 404  | 132           | 5.9  | 4.1                             | None reported | None reported | Not calculated | 125:1 |
| Sheffield                       | 584 | 644  | 128           | 10.5 | 11.7                            | None reported | None reported | 50:1           | 117:1 |
| Wakefield                       | 253 | 351  | 87            | 4.4  | 3                               | None reported | None reported | 53:1           | 127:1 |

- 
- <sup>i</sup> The figures for Luton are known to only include children aged 0 to 11. We understand that the service is working to improve how it collects data on deaf children living in their area.
- <sup>ii</sup> The service reported that Teachers of the Deaf in the peripatetic service support children in resource provisions.
- <sup>iii</sup> The service reported that Teachers of the Deaf in the peripatetic service support children in resource provisions.
- <sup>iv</sup> The service did not provide a figure for numbers of deaf children living in the area, however they did provide a figure for deaf children on caseload. To ensure we capture as many deaf children as possible, we have inserted the latter figure (minus those with temporary hearing loss) into our analysis on numbers of deaf children living in the area.
- <sup>v</sup> The service reported that Teachers of the Deaf in the peripatetic service support children in resource provisions.
- <sup>vi</sup> The service reported that there were Teachers of the Deaf working in resource provisions, but their levels of qualification was not known by the service.
- <sup>vii</sup> The service reported that there were no children in the resource provision at the time of the survey.