



Consortium for Research in Deaf Education

## 2013 report for England

### CRIDE report on 2013 survey on educational provision for deaf children in England

#### Introduction

In 2013, the Consortium for Research into Deaf Education (CRIDE) carried out its third annual survey on educational staffing and service provision for deaf children in the 2012/13 financial year<sup>1</sup>. This report sets out the results of the survey for England and is intended for heads of services, policy makers in local and central government and anyone with an interest in deaf education.

#### Summary of key findings

- There are around 38,000 deaf children in England; a reported increase of 9% in two years.
- 76% of school aged deaf children attend mainstream schools (where there is no specialist provision).
- 21% of deaf children are recorded as having an additional special educational need. The most common additional need appears to be moderate learning difficulties.
- Around 8% of deaf children have at least one cochlear implant.
- 79% of deaf children communicate using spoken English only. 12% speak another spoken language, either on its own or in combination with another language. 9% use sign language in some form, either on its own or alongside another language.
- Just 17% of deaf children identified by CRIDE have a statement of SEN.
- There are at least 1,117 teachers employed as Teachers of the Deaf in employment n services or resource provisions. Though the reported number of deaf children has increased, the reported number of Teachers of the Deaf in employment has declined by 3 to 4% in 2 years.
- Across England, on average, each visiting Teacher of the Deaf has a theoretical caseload of 44 deaf children. In 14% of services, this theoretical caseload exceeds 80.
- There are at least 1,325 other specialist support staff working with deaf children in England, a 4% increase since last year.

Responses were received from 132 services in England, covering 150 local authority areas. This means that this CRIDE survey achieved a response rate of 99%. However, as the remaining 2 local authorities were not contacted on the understanding that there are no or very few deaf children living in those areas meaning that the survey has effectively reached a 100% response rate. The overall response rate is up on last year (95%).

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

## Using the results

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

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

In the past year, data generated from previous CRIDE surveys has been cited in parliamentary debates and answers to parliamentary questions, showing it is being used within Government to aid their own understanding of deaf children in England. CRIDE would like to take the opportunity to thank all services for taking the time to respond, despite the considerable time constraints many services are subject to.

## Interpreting the results

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

Throughout the report, we have highlighted any notable differences between the findings from this survey and that of the CRIDE 2012 and 2011 surveys. **Again, caution is needed in making comparisons due to slight changes to how some questions were phrased from year to year and also differences in response rates between surveys.**

For the purpose of this survey, 'deaf children' were defined as all children and young people up to the age of 19 with sensorineural and permanent conductive deafness, using the descriptors provided by the British Society of Audiology and BATOD. We used the word 'deaf' to include all levels of deafness, from mild to profound.

## Contents

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

PART 1: Overall number of deaf children in England ("belonging") .....	3
PART 2: Number of deaf children supported .....	9
PART 3: Teachers of the Deaf .....	14
PART 4: Other specialist staff .....	19
PART 5: Eligibility criteria and funding arrangements .....	21
PART 6: Concluding thoughts.....	26
PART 7: Background and methodology .....	28
Annex A: Numbers of deaf children 'belonging' by service .....	29
Annex B: Provision and support for children with temporary deafness .....	32

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

Services were asked to give details of deaf children “belonging” to the service. “Belonging” was defined as: all deaf children who live in the local authority<sup>2</sup>.

### How many deaf children are there?

When giving figures for numbers of deaf children belonging, services were first asked to give an overall figure and then asked to provide a breakdown by level of deafness and educational setting. We found that some services did not always provide this data consistently; 27% of services gave broken-down figures where the sum generated a different total from that given elsewhere in the survey.

Furthermore, 34% of services later gave a figure for the number of children being supported that was the same as the number belonging. CRIDE continues to be concerned that some services may only be providing figures for children belonging that they actively support – i.e. children who do not receive support are not being recorded as they are unknown to the service.

Coming up with a clear answer to the question of how many deaf children there are is therefore not straightforward and figures need to be used with caution. For this report, we have taken the approach of using the highest figure given from either the overall total or the total generated through the sum of the broken-down figures. We do this because we want to ensure we’ve captured as many deaf children as possible<sup>3</sup>. Where we have done this, we refer to this as the “adjusted total” throughout this report.

Based on responses from 132 services covering 150 local authorities, the adjusted total number of deaf children in England is **37,948**. This is up from 37,414 in 2011/12, and 34,927 in 2010/11. This amounts to a 1% increase over the past year and 9% over the past two years. It is difficult to be certain on the extent to which this increase is due to changes in demography or improvements in reporting. Unadjusted figures are set out below.

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

	Total generated
<b>Adjusted total</b>	37,948
<b>Total given when asked how many children overall</b>	37,897
<b>Total given when asked about number of children, broken down by age group</b>	36,678
<b>Total given when asked about number of children, broken down by level of deafness (including ‘Level of deafness not known’)</b>	36,603
<b>Total given when asked about number of children, broken down by educational setting</b>	36,862

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

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

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

The tables below provide breakdowns by age, level of deafness and region. In most cases, there are very few significant changes in the proportions of children belonging to different categories from year to year, suggesting a core stability within the data set.

Table 2: Number of children belonging, by age

Age group	Number of deaf children reported	Percentage of total
<b>Preschool</b>	5,655	15%
<b>Primary</b>	15,944	43%
<b>Secondary</b>	12,472	34%
<b>Young people in maintained sixth forms (years 12 to 13)</b>	1,801	5%
<b>Young people in education who have completed year 11 but not in maintained sixth forms (e.g. in FE, apprenticeships, other)</b>	806	2%
<b>Total (n=130)</b>	<b>36,678</b>	

Looking at the number of reported 'post 16' deaf young people, 16 services (12% of services) do not report having any deaf young people in maintained sixth forms. In terms of other post 16 deaf young people in education (i.e. in FE, apprenticeships, etc.) 71 services (54% of services) do not report having any other deaf young people in this category in their area. CRIDE believes that this reflects the difficulties that some services have in identifying these deaf young people rather than a complete absence of deaf young people in post 16 education in these areas.

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

Level of deafness	Number of deaf children reported	Percentage of total (where known)
<b>Unilateral</b>	6,124	17%
<b>Mild</b>	9,777	28%
<b>Moderate</b>	11,220	32%
<b>Severe</b>	3,790	11%
<b>Profound</b>	4,421	13%
<b>Total not including 'Not known' (n=130)</b>	<b>35,332</b>	
<b>Not known</b>	1,271	
<b>Total including those 'Not known'</b>	<b>36,603</b>	

Annex A lists individual responses to this question by services.

Table 4: Number of children, belonging by educational setting

Type of educational provision		Number of deaf children	Percentage of total
<b>In local authority</b>	Supported at home – pre school children	4,849	13.2%
	Supported at home – of school age and home educated	168	0.5%
	Mainstream state funded schools (including academies and free schools)	21,679	58.8%
	Mainstream independent (non state funded) schools (e.g. Eton)	382	1%
	Resource provision in mainstream schools	2,280	6.2%
	Special schools for deaf pupils (maintained and non-maintained)	365	1%
	Other special schools, not specifically for deaf children	3,292	8.9%
	School sixth forms (including special schools)	1,335	3.6%
All other post 16 provision	664	1.8%	
<b>Out of local authority</b>	Mainstream state funded schools (including academies and free schools)	339	0.9%
	Mainstream independent (non state funded) schools	88	0.2%
	Resource provision in mainstream schools	202	0.5%
	Special schools for deaf pupils (maintained and non-maintained)	607	1.6%
	Other special school, not specifically for deaf children	218	0.6%
	School sixth forms (including special schools)	85	0.2%
All other post 16 provision	80	0.2%	
<b>Other</b>	NEET (Not in education, employment or training) (Post 16 only)	17	<0.1%
	Other (e.g. Pupil referral units)	32	0.1%
	Not known	180	0.5%
<b>Total (n=128)</b>		<b>36,862</b>	

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

Type of educational provision (excluding 'other' and 'not known')	Number of deaf children	Percentage of total
<b>In home local authority</b>	35,014	96%
<b>Out of home local authority</b>	1,619	4%
<b>Total (not including 'Not known') (n=128)</b>	<b>36,633</b>	

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

Type of educational provision (regardless of whether in or out of local authority)	Number of deaf children	Percentage of total	Percentage of total school-aged children (i.e. excluding pre-school children and young people post 16)
<b>Supported at home – pre-school</b>	4,849	13.2%	-
<b>Supported at home – of school age and home educated</b>	168	0.5%	0.6%
<b>Mainstream provision (including academies and independent schools)</b>	22,488	61%	75.9%
<b>Mainstream provision: resource provision</b>	2,482	6.7%	8.4%
<b>Special schools for deaf pupils</b>	972	2.6%	3.3%
<b>Other special schools</b>	3,510	9.5%	11.9%
<b>All post 16 provision including school sixth forms, FE, apprenticeships, etc.</b>	2,164	5.9%	-
<b>Other (e.g. Pupil referral units, NEET, not known)</b>	229	0.6%	-
<b>Total (n=128)</b>	<b>36,862</b>		
<b>Total (excluding pre-school children and young people post 16 and 'other')</b>	<b>29,620</b>		

New categories<sup>4</sup> were added this year with small changes to some of the other categories to allow for more sophisticated analysis, so it is not possible to directly compare this data with the data

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

from last year's survey. It remains a challenge to establish discrete categories without overcomplicating the survey.

The CRIDE 2013 results suggest that 76% of school aged deaf children are in mainstream settings without specialist provision (excluding sixth forms). This proportion is slightly lower than the 74% for 2011/2012, but this is likely to be largely accounted for by changes in the categories.

The smallest service reported 57 deaf children belonging in their boundaries. The largest reported 1,406 deaf children. The average number of deaf children belonging in each service was 287.

Table 7: Number of deaf children belonging, by region

Region	Number of deaf children reported (adjusted)	Percentage of total
East England	3,916	10%
East Midlands	2,374	7%
London	6,110	16%
North East	2,016	5%
North West	4,656	12%
South East	5,351	14%
South West	3,318	9%
West Midlands	5,027	13%
Yorkshire & Humber	4,820	13%
<b>Total</b>	<b>37,948</b>	

### **Incidence of Auditory Neuropathy Spectrum Disorder (ANSD)**

119 services gave a figure in response to a question on how many deaf children had ANSD in their area. It was not always clear whether other services did not give a figure because they do not have any children with ANSD or because they do not know whether they do. However, based on these responses, there are 557 deaf children in England with this condition, 0.3% of all deaf children (adjusted total).

The highest percentage of ANSD in a single service was 6.4%. The average number of children with ANSD in each service that responded to the survey was around 5.

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

## Incidence of additional special educational needs (SEN)

116 services were able to tell us how many deaf children had an additional SEN. The figures show that the adjusted total number of deaf children with an additional SEN is 8,196. This is 21% of the adjusted total of deaf children, which is the same as in 2011/12.

Services were asked to give a breakdown by type of additional SEN. For this question, some services were not able to give a breakdown so the adjusted total is larger than the unadjusted total comprising the sum of the broken-down figures (7,573). Services were asked to breakdown this figure by type of SEN, using the classification set out in the SEN Code of Practice.

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

	Number of deaf children	Percentage of deaf children with an additional SEN (where type of additional SEN known)	Percentage of all deaf children (adjusted total)
<b>Specific Learning Difficulty</b>	304	4%	0.8%
<b>Moderate Learning Difficulty</b>	1,470	20%	3.9%
<b>Severe Learning Difficulty</b>	1,146	16%	3.0%
<b>Profound &amp; Multiple Learning Difficulty</b>	672	9%	1.8%
<b>Behaviour, Emotional &amp; Social Difficulties</b>	378	5%	1.0%
<b>Speech, Language and Communications Needs</b>	891	12%	2.3%
<b>Visual Impairment</b>	365	5%	1.0%
<b>Multi-Sensory Impairment</b>	450	6%	1.2%
<b>Physical Disability</b>	693	10%	1.8%
<b>Autistic Spectrum Disorder</b>	385	5%	1.0%
<b>Other Difficulty/Disability</b>	523	7%	1.4%
<b>Not known</b>	296	-	0.8%
<b>Total (n=115)</b>	<b>7,573</b>		20%
<b>Total excluding those reported "not known"</b>	<b>7,277</b>		

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

Research<sup>5</sup> from 1996 suggested that 40% of deaf children have additional needs. However, this research uses a wide definition of additional needs (including, for example, eczema and cerebral palsy) whereas SEN is normally understood, through the SEN Code of Practice, to refer to where children have a learning difficulty, which calls for special educational provision to be made for them. The definition of learning difficulty includes where children have a disability, which prevents or hinders them from making use of educational facilities of a kind generally provided for children of the same in age in schools within the local authority area. In addition, this research may also have been based on a small cohort of deaf children, excluding those with mild and unilateral deafness.

According to data provided by the School Census, 18.7% of all children have an identified SEN. NDCS is unaware of any published information from the School Census on the proportion of deaf children with an additional need.

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

## Deaf children with cochlear implants

121 services were able to provide information about how many deaf children had a cochlear implant<sup>6</sup>. Based on these responses, there are 2,967 deaf children across England with cochlear implants (adjusted total). This is 8% of the adjusted total of deaf children.

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

Age	Total with cochlear implants	Total deaf children within each age category	Percentage of total within each age category
Pre-school	548	5,655	10%
Primary aged	1,375	15,944	9%
Secondary aged	857	12,472	7%
Post 16	155	2,607	6%
Not known	21	-	-
<b>Total (n=121)</b>	<b>2,956</b>	<b>36,678</b>	<b>8%</b>

Proportionally, there has been a slight increase in the number of deaf children with cochlear implants from 7% in 2011/12.

## Additional languages

Table 10: Number of deaf children, by languages mainly used with the child

Language	Total	Percentage of responses (where known)
Spoken English	25,705	79.3%
British Sign Language	643	2%
Other sign language	394	1.2%
Other spoken language	1,106	3.4%
Spoken English together with sign language	1,641	5.1%
Spoken English and other spoken language	2,657	8.2%
Other spoken language together with sign language	261	0.8%
<b>Total known (n=120)</b>	<b>32,407</b>	
Reported "not known"	1,303	

120 services provided information for at least some part this question. Of those that did respond, some were unable to identify the language of all deaf children in their area. There are around 2,731 deaf children who are unaccounted for in the above figures, so these figures should be used with caution. The results suggest that around 9% of deaf children use sign language as their main language or in some combination with another language. 12.4% use a spoken language other than English, again as their main language or in some combination with another language.

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

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

<sup>6</sup> Though not all services gave a figure for each age group.



## PART 2: Number of deaf children supported

Earlier, we looked at the number of deaf children who “belong” or live in a local authority. We also asked about deaf children who are supported<sup>7</sup> by the service. This section sets out our analysis of these figures on children being supported. Similar issues around given totals differing from each other also occurred here and we have taken the same approach in calculating an adjusted total.

Based on responses from 131 services, our survey indicates that at least **32,011** deaf children receive support from their local service (adjusted total). This is an increase from last year of 2% where 31,425 deaf children were reported as receiving support and from 31,067 in 2010/11 (3% increase over two years).

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

	Total generated
<b>Adjusted total</b>	32,011
<b>Total given when asked how many children overall</b>	31,613
<b>Total given when asked about number of children, broken down by age</b>	31,090
<b>Total given when asked about number of children, broken down by level of deafness</b>	30,884

The smallest number of children being supported by a service was 46 and the largest was 1,170. The average was 242.

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

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

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

Age group	Number of deaf children	Percentage of total
<b>Preschool children</b>	5,272	17%
<b>Primary aged children</b>	13,717	44%
<b>Secondary aged children</b>	10,080	33%
<b>Young people in maintained sixth forms (years 12 to 13)</b>	1,489	5%
<b>Young People in education who have completed year 11 but not in school sixth form (e.g. they are in a General Further Education College, enrolled with a private training provider, in employment etc.)</b>	396	1%
<b>Total (where known)</b>	<b>30,954</b>	
<b>Not known</b>	136	
<b>Total (including where not known) (n=128)</b>	<b>31,090</b>	

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

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

Level of deafness	Number of deaf children	Percentage of total (where known)
<b>Unilateral</b>	4,461	15%
<b>Mild</b>	8,056	27%
<b>Moderate</b>	10,557	35%
<b>Severe</b>	3,448	11%
<b>Profound</b>	3,686	12%
<b>Total (where known)</b>	<b>30,208</b>	
<b>Not known</b>	676	
<b>Total (including where not known) (n=128)</b>	<b>30,884</b>	

Table 14: Number of deaf children supported by the service, by region

Region	Number of deaf children	Percentage of total
<b>East England</b>	3,077	10%
<b>East Midlands</b>	2,303	7%
<b>London</b>	4,680	15%
<b>North East</b>	1,908	6%
<b>North West</b>	4,285	14%
<b>South East</b>	4,117	13%
<b>South West</b>	2,670	8%
<b>West Midlands</b>	4,423	14%
<b>Yorkshire &amp; Humber</b>	4,201	13%
<b>Total (n=131)</b>	<b>31,664</b>	

Assuming the figures are broadly comparable, if there are 37,948 deaf children (adjusted total) who live in England, there are at least 6,284 deaf children who are not being supported by the service. In other words, the figures suggest that 83% of deaf children receive support from their local service. It does not automatically follow that 17% of deaf children are not receiving any support at all; many may be receiving support elsewhere from, for example, special schools for deaf children or resource provisions not managed by the service.

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

Overall, the proportion of children who receive support from the service has increased from 82% to 85% since 2011/12. There are striking increases for those in post 16 education. It is unclear if this is due to more children receiving support or to better reporting. Whilst more deaf young people over the age of 16 are receiving support from the service, they are still proportionally less likely to receive support than other age groups, particularly where they are not in maintained sixth forms; 71 (54%) services reported that they did not have any post 16 deaf young people outside of sixth forms receiving support from their service.

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

Age group	Number of deaf children belonging	Number of deaf children supported by the local service	Proportion of deaf children being supported as a percentage of deaf children belonging
Preschool	5,648	5,272	93%
Primary	15,905	13,717	86%
Secondary	12,455	10,080	81%
Young people in maintained sixth forms (years 12 to 13)	1,789	1,489	83%
Young people in education who have completed year 11 but not in school sixth form (e.g. they are in a General Further Education College, enrolled)	806	396	49%
<b>Total not including 'not known'</b>	<b>36,603</b>	<b>30,954</b>	<b>85%</b>

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

Level of deafness	Number of deaf children belonging	Number of deaf children supported by the local service	Proportion of deaf children being supported as a percentage of deaf children belonging
Unilateral	6,124	4,461	73%
Mild	9,777	8,056	82%
Moderate	11,220	10,557	94%
Severe	3,790	3,448	91%
Profound	4,421	3,686	83%
<b>Total</b>	<b>36.603</b>	<b>30.884</b>	<b>84%</b>

Proportionally, more children with unilateral deafness seem to be receiving support from the local service than reported last year, rising from 64% to 73%.

The above table suggests that profoundly deaf children are less likely to receive support from their local service than moderately or severely deaf children, a finding also reported last year. This raises some interesting questions about what is happening with profoundly deaf children. It could be that a number of profoundly deaf children do not receive support from the service because they may be more likely to be placed in specialist provision. Alternatively, and assuming that profoundly deaf children are more likely than other children to have cochlear implants, it may also be that many of these deaf children are receiving Teacher of the Deaf support from a cochlear implant centre rather than from their local service. It is also possible, for example, that fewer deaf children with cochlear implants may now be receiving support compared to children without, due to apparent changes in their individual needs. There is no clear answer to this point though services will have made their own observations.

Table 17: Number of deaf children supported, by region

Region	Number of deaf children belonging	Number of deaf children supported by the local service	Proportion of deaf children being supported as a percentage of deaf children belonging
East England	3,916	3,077	79%
East Midlands	2,734	2,303	84%
London	6,110	4,680	77%
North East	2,016	1,908	95%
North West	4,656	4,285	92%
South East	5,351	4,117	77%
South West	3,318	2,670	80%
West Midlands	5,027	4,423	88%
Yorkshire & the Humber	4,820	4,201	87%
<b>Total</b>	<b>37,948</b>	<b>31,664</b>	<b>83%</b>

The previous table again suggests some regional differences between the proportion of deaf children being supported, ranging from 77% in some regions to 95% in one region. However, it is important to continue to bear in mind that these differences may be a reflection of how services have recorded the number of deaf children in their area – services with poor data on all deaf children, excluding those who do not receive support, may appear to be supporting more. It may also reflect differences in the availability of specialist provision in different regions.

### **Children with temporary conductive deafness**

We asked services if they also separately supported children who have temporary conductive hearing loss. Of the 127 services that responded to this question, 76 (60%) did, and 51 services (40%) did not. We then asked those services that did, how many they supported. Only 56 services gave a number. There are at least 1,672 children with temporary conductive deafness supported by services that services were able to tell us about. Annex B lists individual responses to this question by services.

### **How do CRIDE's 2013 figures compare to figures from other sources?**

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

#### *School Census*

School Census figures for 2012 indicate there are 16,270 children where deafness is the primary SEN and who have been placed at School Action Plus or have a statement of SEN. This is a 1% increase from 2011 when the corresponding figure was 16,130. School Census figures do not include information on deaf children where deafness is a secondary need.

The CRIDE survey reports there are 30,217 deaf children in primary or secondary schools and sixth forms. This includes deaf children where deafness is not a primary need. But, based on this figure, the School Census continues to significantly under-report the number of school aged deaf children – by around 53%. This is likely to be due to the fact that the School Census only records whether a child is deaf, whether the deafness is the primary need and if they have a statement or have been placed at School Action Plus.

Of the 16,270 deaf children recorded by the School Census, 6,285 have a statement. This is marginally down on last year when 6,375 were recorded as having a statement; it appears that while deaf children seem to be slightly more likely to be formally recorded as having a SEN, they are less likely to have a statement of need.

Comparing this figure with the number of children identified by the CRIDE survey, this would indicate that only around 21% of deaf children in primary or secondary school and sixth forms have a statement<sup>8</sup>, and 17% of all children.

The School Census indicates there are 1,435 children (where deafness is the primary SEN) in special schools in 2012, down from 1,500 in 2011. The corresponding figure from the CRIDE survey is 4,482 of which 972 are in special schools for deaf children. The Department for

---

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

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

*Prevalence data*

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

## PART 3: Teachers of the Deaf

Our survey asked how many Teachers of the Deaf there are who are employed by the local service, including those in a peripatetic role, and working in resource provisions. Figures are expressed as Full Time Equivalent (FTE) posts; a 0.5 Teacher of the Deaf FTE post could, for example, indicate that a person spent half of the standard “working week” as a Teacher of the Deaf. We did not ask about Teachers of the Deaf in special schools, cochlear implant centres and other settings and therefore the figures below do not provide a complete picture of the total population of Teachers of the Deaf in England.

In total, there are at least 1,104.5 (FTE) Teachers of the Deaf posts in employment in England. Of these 93% are occupied by a fully qualified Teacher of the Deaf. In addition, at the time the survey was completed, there were 40.8 FTE vacant posts. In 22% of these cases, these vacant posts were frozen.

If the vacant posts are added to the total number of Teachers of the Deaf in employment, this would indicate there are at least 1,145.2 Teacher of the Deaf posts, of which 4% are vacant.

According to the General Teaching Council (now subsumed into the Department for Education), there were 896 active teachers who hold the mandatory qualification for teaching pupils with a hearing impairment in 2011<sup>9</sup>. CRIDE’s figures suggest that this figure is likely to be an underestimate.

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

	Number of Teacher of the Deaf posts (FTE)	Percentage of total
<b>Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification</b>	1,031.9	93%
<b>Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years</b>	65.4	6%
<b>Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training</b>	7.2	1%
<b>Total (n=132)</b>	<b>1,104.5</b>	

Table 20: Number of Teacher of the Deaf vacancies overall

	Number of Teacher of the Deaf posts (FTE)	Percentage of total	
<b>Vacancies</b>	<b>Post frozen</b>	8.9	22%
	<b>Currently advertised</b>	23.6	58%
	<b>Advertised but no suitable candidate</b>	8.3	20%
<b>Total (n=132)</b>	<b>40.8</b>		

Table 21: Changes in numbers of Teachers of the Deaf from year to year

	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13		Change since last year	Change over 2 years
<b>Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification in employment</b>	1,062.11	1,063.7	1,031.9		3%	3%
<b>Number of teachers working as Teachers of the Deaf in employment</b>	1,162.51	1,136.4	1,104.5		3%	5%
<b>Number of Teacher of the Deaf posts (including vacancies)</b>	1,196.51	1,180	1,145.2		3%	4%

Comparing with figures from the CRIDE 2012 and 2011 survey, depending on which measure is used, there appears to have been a decline of 35% of the number of Teachers of the Deaf working in services and resource provision in the past 2 years. Given, as this report showed earlier, there has been no corresponding decrease in the number of deaf children being reported, these figures

<sup>9</sup> [http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201011/cmhansrd/cm111122/text/111122w0003.htm#111122w0003.htm\\_sbhd12](http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201011/cmhansrd/cm111122/text/111122w0003.htm#111122w0003.htm_sbhd12)

are of concern. It is possible that there has been an increase in numbers of Teachers of the Deaf working in other settings (such as special schools) which is not captured within this survey but it is CRIDE's view that this is unlikely.

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

### Teachers of the Deaf in a peripatetic role

Our survey asked how many Teachers of the Deaf were working in the specialist peripatetic service as of January 2013. In other words, how many "visiting" Teachers of the Deaf were working in each service. Visiting Teachers of the Deaf normally visit deaf children in "non-specialist" provision – i.e. pre-school deaf children, deaf children in mainstream schools or in a special school not designated for deaf children.

Table 22: Number of visiting Teachers of the Deaf in employment

	Number of Teacher of the Deaf posts (FTE)	Number of services with staff in relevant category
<b>Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification</b>	663.7	132
<b>Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years</b>	23.2	21
<b>Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training</b>	3.2	5
<b>Total (n=132)</b>	<b>690.1</b>	

Table 23: Number of visiting Teacher of the Deaf vacancies

	Number of Teacher of the Deaf posts (FTE)	Number of services with staff in relevant category
<b>Vacancies</b>	<b>Post frozen</b>	7.5
	<b>Currently advertised</b>	18.1
	<b>Advertised but no suitable candidate</b>	2.7
<b>Total (n=18)</b>	<b>28.3</b>	

In terms of fully qualified visiting Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification, the numbers within each service ranged from 0.5 at the smallest to 22 in the largest. The average number of visiting Teachers of the Deaf (with the mandatory qualification) per service is 5.0 (FTE).

26 (20%) of services employ 2 or fewer visiting Teachers of the Deaf, of which 8 services (6%) employed 1 or fewer visiting Teachers of the Deaf. Given the complex nature of deafness and the diverse needs of deaf children, it remains of concern that some services are attempting to meet the needs of all deaf children with relatively low numbers of visiting Teachers of the Deaf.

We asked if services had sought to recruit Teachers of the Deaf over the past 12 months. Of the 67 services that had, 20 (30%) indicated that they had experienced difficulties in recruiting for a permanent post. We also asked if services had sought to secure supply cover over the past 12 months. Of the 64 services that indicated yes, 27 (42%) said they had experienced difficulties in securing supply cover.

## Peripatetic Teachers of the Deaf caseloads

This section looks at the theoretical 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 are a range of views on both the usefulness of this and how best to calculate this ratio. Points to take into consideration include:

- Areas that are large or rural may, by necessity, have more visiting Teachers of the Deaf than areas that are small and urban because of the need to allow for travel time.
- Areas in which there is a specialist unit or special school may have fewer visiting Teachers of the Deaf because it has been assessed that deaf children with most need are already in specialist provision.
- Services that are better able to reliably record and identify how many deaf children, including those over 16, there are in their area may appear to have worse caseloads than services which have only given a figure for the number of deaf children they 'know' about.
- It does not reflect investment in other specialist staff<sup>10</sup>.

In simple terms and for consistency across all parts of England, NDCS calculates the theoretical caseloads by dividing the number of deaf children belonging in any given area and in non-specialist provision<sup>11</sup> by the number of qualified visiting Teachers of the Deaf<sup>12</sup>. This will include some deaf children in some areas who are not being actively supported by the service. However, to exclude these children would obviously produce an incentive to improve the figures by cutting support. In addition, even where a service is simply monitoring a deaf child, this still requires time and resource from the visiting Teacher of the Deaf. Responses were excluded where there were gaps in either the number of Teachers of the Deaf or numbers of deaf children belonging.

The CRIDE survey results show that each visiting (peripatetic) Teacher of the Deaf has a theoretical average caseload of 45 deaf children. The highest caseload found was 251 in one area. We suspect that this is an outlier based on mistaken figures. However, despite requests to do so, some services did not verify their figures where queries were raised, and so we have included them as provided.

There are 19 services (14%) where each visiting Teacher of the Deaf has a theoretical caseload of, on average, 80 or more deaf children, of which there are 6 services (5%) where there is, on average, 100 or more deaf children.

Table 24: Ratio of deaf children being supported by each visiting Teacher of the Deaf, by region

Region	Average ratio
East England	52.9:1
East Midlands	35.7:1
London	54.3:1
North East	35.1:1
North West	29.2:1
South East	51.5:1
South West	41.7:1
West Midlands	51.6:1
Yorkshire & Humber	59.3:1
England	45.1:1

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

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

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



## Teachers of the Deaf in resource provisions

The survey asked how many Teachers of the Deaf were employed in resource provisions for deaf children and whether employed centrally by the local authority or directly by the school. Respondents were asked to exclude time spent on other school duties (such as time as the school's SEN co-ordinator, for example). Again, we did not ask about other specialist staff in special schools, cochlear implant centres and other settings and therefore the figures below do not provide a complete picture of the total population of specialist staff in England.

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

	Number of teachers (FTE) in resource provision employed by the local authority	Number of services with staff in relevant category		Number of teachers (FTE) in resource provision employed by the school	Number of services with staff in relevant category
Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification	243.0	71		125.2	32
Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years	23.5	19		18.7	16
Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training	2.2	3		1.8	2
<b>Total (n=101)</b>	<b>268.7</b>			<b>145.7</b>	

There is an overall reduction in numbers between the above table and the corresponding figures from last year. In a nutshell, at face value, the results indicate fewer Teachers of the Deaf in resource provisions employed by the local authority in 2011/12 (down from 284.7), and fewer Teachers of the Deaf in resource provisions employed by the school (down from 167.5).

Table 26: Number of Teacher of the Deaf vacant posts in resource provisions employed by the local authority or the school

		Number of teachers (FTE) in resource provision employed by the local authority	Number of services with staff in relevant category		Number of teachers (FTE) in resource provision employed by the school	Number of services with staff in relevant category
Vacancies	Post frozen	0	0		1.4	2
	Currently advertised	4.5	4		1	1
	Advertised but no suitable candidate	2.6	1		3	3
<b>Total (n=11)</b>		<b>7.1</b>			<b>5.4</b>	

CRIDE again analysed the figures to examine the ratio in the number of deaf children supported by each Teacher of the Deaf in resource provisions. Based on usable results from 99 services, the CRIDE survey results show that the average number of deaf children in resource provision being supported by each Teacher of the Deaf is 6.1. Guidelines by BATOD state that each Teacher of the Deaf in a resource provision should be working with no more than 6 deaf children each, and fewer where deaf children with additional needs are being supported. 33 services had a ratio that was higher than 6:1. Of these, 6 had a ratio that was higher than 10:1.

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

years. The Department for Education has indicated that it expects teachers of classes of deaf children with sensory impairments to be qualified Teachers of the Deaf.

Table 27: Proportional differences in level of qualification of “Teachers of the Deaf”

	<b>Percentage of all peripatetic teachers</b>	<b>Percentage of all teachers in resource provision, employed by local authority</b>	<b>Percentage of all teachers in resource provision, employed by school</b>
Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification	91%	88%	83%
Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years	5%	9%	12%
Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training	0%	1%	1%

## PART 4: Other specialist staff

Our survey suggests that there are at least 1,325 specialist support staff, other than Teachers of the Deaf, supporting deaf children in England in either a peripatetic role or working in resource provisions. The most common role is teaching assistant followed by communication support worker.

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

	Number of staff (FTE)	Percentage of total
Teaching assistants / Classroom support assistants etc	834.3	63%
Communication support workers / Interpreters / Communicators etc	241.8	18%
Deaf instructors / Deaf role models / Sign language instructors etc	97.7	7%
Educational audiologists / Technicians etc	67.1	5%
Speech and language therapists	63.0	5%
Family support workers / Liaison officers	13.2	1%
Social workers / Social workers for deaf children	8.3	1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,325.2</b>	

A range of roles, with different full time equivalents, were cited when asked about other specialist staff, including outreach workers, early years workers, specialist portage workers, intervenors, transition support coordinators, specialist nursery nurses, and counsellors. As not all respondents gave a full time equivalent figure for all of the other roles, it was not possible to calculate a total for this.

The number of specialist staff overall is up from 1,270 in 2011/12, amounting to a 4% increase.

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

## Numbers of other specialist staff

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

Table 29: Number of specialist support staff, by role

	Peripatetic role			Resource provisions		
	Number of staff (full time equivalent)	Number of services with staff in relevant category	Percentage of total	Number of staff (full time equivalent)	Number of services with staff in relevant category	Percentage of total
Teaching assistants / Classroom support assistants etc	186	64	46%	648.3	75	71%
Communication support workers / Interpreters / Communicators etc	48.7	20	12%	193.1	36	21%
Deaf instructors / Deaf role models / Sign language instructors etc	50.4	39	12%	47.3	32	5%
Educational audiologists / Technicians etc	59.1	58	15%	8	13	1%
Speech and language therapists	48.3	17	12%	14.7	20	2%
Family support workers / Liaison officers	8.3	11	2%	4.9	7	1%
Social workers / Social workers for deaf children	6.2	6	2%	2.1	3	0.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>407.4</b>			<b>918.3</b>		

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

We also asked if services manage teaching assistants or other support staff based in schools to support named pupils. Of the 129 services that responded to this question, 28 (22%) said yes, 10 (8%) said they manage some, but not all, and the majority, 91 (71%) said they did not.

## Resource provisions

When asked if the resource provision provided outreach support to other schools, 15 (16%) replied yes, and 81 (84%) replied no. 13% of services indicated that outreach support was provided in 2011/12, suggesting an increase.

Where outreach support was provided, this amounted to 10 full time equivalent staffing time total across all of the services who responded, up from 5.7 in 2011/12. The actual figure may be higher; some services reported that provided outreach services “as required” without giving a rough figure.

## PART 5: Eligibility criteria and funding arrangements

### Eligibility criteria

The majority of services continue to use the National Sensory Impairment Partnership (NatSIP) criteria as a vehicle to help determine what support deaf children receive. The proportion of services using the NatSIP criteria has remained at 71% as it was in 2011/12.

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

	Number of services	Percentage of total
<b>NatSIP criteria<sup>13</sup></b>	93	71%
<b>Criteria is mostly developed locally</b>	25	19%
<b>Other</b>	13	10%
<b>Total (n=131)</b>	131	

Services were asked to specify what other criteria they used. In these cases, services tended to indicate that they were using NatSIP's criteria (or a variant of them) alongside locally developed criteria. Annex B lists how individual services responded to this question.

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

Table 31: Type of support provided by type of deafness

Type of need	Type of deafness	Number of services that provide no direct support	Number of services that provide annual, one-off or occasional visit	Number of services that provide allocated ToD and regular visits (i.e. more than once a year)	Number of services that gave no response
<b>Primary and permanent need</b>	Bilateral severe or profound sensorineural deafness	0	0	131	1
	Bilateral moderate sensorineural deafness	0	3	131	1
	Bilateral conductive deafness	10	46	93	2
	Bilateral mild or high frequency only sensorineural deafness	5	44	99	1
	Unilateral deafness (sensorineural or conductive)	20	93	46	2
<b>Additional and permanent need</b>	Bilateral severe or profound sensorineural deafness	0	7	129	1
	Bilateral moderate sensorineural deafness	0	14	125	1
	Bilateral conductive deafness	9	59	82	1
<b>Other</b>	With temporary conductive deafness as a primary or additional need	42	79	33	1
	In special schools other than schools for the deaf	8	36	110	1
	With auditory neuropathy	10	30	107	1
	With auditory processing difficulty/disorder	59	52	26	5
n=131					

<sup>13</sup> The NatSIP criteria were updated during the time this survey was launched. It builds on the SESIP/SERSEN Revised Eligibility Criteria (2009), which are in turn based on the SERSEN Eligibility Criteria (2005)

Table 32: Changes in eligibility criteria in the service between 2011/12 and 2012/13

	Number of services	Percentage of services
Changes resulting in some / all deaf children now receiving more support	16	13%
Changes resulting in some / all deaf children now receiving less support	21	17%
No changes	87	70%
<b>Total (n=124)</b>	<b>124</b>	

Where changes were indicated, services were asked to provide information on what had changed. Reasons given for reducing support included:

- Ongoing changes whilst services were in periods of transition.
- Applying NatSIP criteria more robustly.
- Increased case loads.
- Vacant posts not being filled.
- Reduction in FTE for some posts.
- Visit numbers being reduced or discontinued for some children and young people (those with mild deafness or unilateral deafness)
- Increase in case numbers, but no increase in staff capacity.
- More complex cases needing higher level of support.

Reasons given for increasing support included:

- In some areas, newly appointed or increase in full time equivalent roles
- Increase in the number of children with temporary conductive deafness being issued with temporary hearing aids requiring more support.

### Use of quality standards for service provision

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

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

	Number of services
BATOD, NDCS and RNID (now Action on Hearing Loss): Quality standards: Specialist teaching and support services for deaf children and young people (2009) <sup>14</sup>	103
Department for Children, Schools and Families (now Department for Education): Quality standards for special educational needs (SEN) support and outreach services (2008) <sup>15</sup>	88
Newborn Hearing Screening Programme Quality Standards	113
Other standards.	34
n=108	

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

- Other NDCS quality standards (such as on FM systems)
- Ofsted framework for schools
- Early Support Audit Tool
- Services' own local standards

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

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

## Funding arrangements – peripatetic services

In terms of funding arrangements, the majority of peripatetic specialist support services appear to be funded centrally by the local authority, as shown below. There appears to have been a small increase from 82% in 2011/12.

Table 34: Funding arrangements for peripatetic specialist support services

Funding is...	Number of services	Percentage of all services who responded
held centrally by the LA (including funding held by the LA to purchase hearing support services from other LAs, or external agencies e.g. SENSE)	109	84%
delegated to a special or mainstream school with a resource provision that then provides outreach to other schools	5	4%
delegated in full to individual schools in the LA who decide whether to purchase specialist support from the LA	0	0%
delegated in part to individual schools in the LA who decide whether to purchase specialist support from the LA (i.e. "traded services" for non statedeamed children)	0	0%
<b>Other</b>	16	12%
<b>Total (n=130)</b>	<b>130</b>	

Responses in the 'other' category generally indicated some form of combination of the previous options. One service noted that the service had now been subcontracted to a private provider; something which may prove to be an emerging trend in years to come. Another service indicated that they had started to use traded services for some children.

## Funding arrangements – impact of government changes

The Department for Education has made a number of changes to school funding. Services were asked about what impact they expect the Department's school funding reform to have on their peripatetic specialist support services.

Table 35: Expected impact of school funding reform on peripatetic specialist support services

Impact on peripatetic support expected...	Number of services	Percentage of services that responded, with academies and where funding arrangements known
<b>Overall, services will receive more funding to support deaf children</b>	0	0%
<b>Overall, services will receive less funding to support deaf children</b>	10	8%
<b>No change</b>	77	59%
<b>Don't know</b>	43	33%
<b>Total</b>	<b>130</b>	

Services were asked what impact they expected the Department's school funding reform to have on the services provided to deaf young people in post-16 settings (including Further Education colleges) in their area. Services mostly told us that the impact was unknown at the time of responding. Other answers included:

- Some FE colleges already have funding allocated, and are choosing to buy in service.
- There was no current service provided to FE colleges.

- Local authority developing a broker partnership with specialist provisions and FE colleges to strategically commission FE provision to meet local needs.
- Existing budget having to be stretched to fund support for young people in FE colleges.
- Possibility of developing regional services.
- Possibility of developing service level agreements.

### Funding arrangements – resource provisions

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

Table 36: Funding arrangements for resource provisions

Funding for resource provision is...	Number of services	Percentage of those where applicable
Held centrally by the local authority	36	36%
Delegated to schools	52	52%
Both central and delegated	12	12%
<b>Total responses</b>	<b>100</b>	

The majority of resource provisions continue to be delegated to schools. This is broadly in line with findings from 2011/12.

Table 37: Use of service level agreements by resource provisions

Where funding is delegated, does a contract / service level agreement exist?	Number of services	Percentage of those where applicable
Yes	42	66%
No	22	34%
<b>Total</b>	<b>59</b>	

Again, the majority of services continue to have service level agreements with resource provisions where funding is delegated. The proportion doing so is up slightly up from 61% in 2011/12.

85 (64%) of services reported that they have used the NDCS “Quality Standards: Resource provisions for deaf children and young people in mainstream schools”<sup>16</sup> to reflect on the service provided within the resource provision or to look at service development. There were a wide range of responses when asked about other standards, including references to:

- Ofsted framework for schools
- Other NDCS quality standards
- Local authority documents, service level agreement and data records
- Service’s own criteria and standards
- Newborn Hearing Screening Quality Standards
- Early Support Monitoring Protocol

Services were asked what impact they expect the Department’s school funding reform to have on resource provisions for deaf children in their areas. Of the 108 who replied and indicated that there were resource provisions in their area, the following answers were given.

<sup>16</sup> See: <http://www.ndcs.org.uk/document.rm?id=5765>



Table 38: Expected impact of school funding reform on resource provisions

Impact on resource provisions expected...	Number of services	Percentage of services that responded, with resource provisions and where funding arrangements known
Overall, resource provisions will receive more funding to support deaf children	5	5%
Overall, resource provisions will receive less funding to support deaf children	6	6%
No change	12	11%
Some resource provisions will receive more funding whilst others will receive less	47	44%
Don't know	38	35%
<b>Total</b>	<b>108</b>	

### Staffing changes

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

Table 39: Budget changes

	Increase in budget	Decrease in budget	No change in budget	Don't know / can't separate budget for HI team
<b>Staffing</b>	10 (8%)	3 (2%)	99 (77%)	17 (13%)
<b>Training</b>	7 (6%)	7 (6%)	90 (71%)	22 (17%)
<b>Equipment</b>	9 (7%)	10 (8%)	91 (72%)	17 (13%)
<b>Other</b>	2 (11%)	2 (11%)	9 (50%)	5 (28%)

## PART 6: Concluding thoughts

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

1. The CRIDE survey continues to show a wide discrepancy between the numbers of deaf children being supported by services and the number who are being recorded as being at School Action Plus or with a statement on the School Census. This highlights some significant flaws in the School Census. We also know that services, particularly larger services, continue to experience a range of challenges in providing reliable data, in response to this survey. This is not to discredit services but to recognise their limited capacity and the complexity of the task and the lack of appropriate and current tools available to services (e.g. databases) to handle such requests. Given the importance of reliable data sets to inform planning and commissioning, this is a concern. CRIDE believes there is need for central government action to improve the School Census, support local authority data collection and ensure the availability of reliable data sets that capture all deaf children and young people aged 0 to 25 in each area. There is a consensus within CRIDE that greater central co-ordination and improvement of data-sets would support local authorities in being able to respond to requests such as those from CRIDE more readily and easily. This would in time reduce the bureaucratic burden on services.
2. Changing structures in the education system are making it harder for some services to track deaf children in their area. For example, some services did not provide us with information on deaf children in specialist resource provisions. CRIDE suspects that where the host school is independent from the local authority (i.e. because it is an academy), such difficulties become more challenging. Whilst CRIDE recognises this challenge, the Department for Education has been clear that local authorities have strategic responsibility for all children with SEN and disabilities and thus we expect local authority services to be able to provide information on all deaf children in their area, and to be supported in this task by the Department for Education.
3. The survey reports a decline of around 3 to 4% in the number of qualified Teachers of the Deaf in employment over 2 years. Given that the numbers of deaf children has not declined, this is a key concern for members of CRIDE. This is amplified by anecdotal concerns that a large number of Teachers of the Deaf are due to retire in coming years. CRIDE intends that the 2014 survey will look in more detail at this.
4. At the same time as the number of Teachers of the Deaf is declining, there appears to be an increase in the number of other specialist support staff. Members of CRIDE would be concerned that deaf children's access to expert support from qualified Teachers of the Deaf may potentially be being offset by other support.
5. The survey continues to demonstrate that deaf children are a heterogeneous group of children including in terms of languages used, levels of deafness, other special educational needs, cochlear implants and so on. This highlights the demand on Teachers of the Deaf to be able to meet such a diversity of needs.
6. The CRIDE survey does not ask about attainment of deaf children; this is done through the National Sensory Impairment Partnership (NatSIP) outcomes benchmarking survey. CRIDE will continue to work with NatSIP on how we can join up the two surveys in the future. This will be a challenging task and potentially involves asking services to submit individual pupil data. Any such pilot will inevitably be limited in scale at the start. However, there is a wide consensus that this is something that should be explored further and piloted. Ultimately, it may be that this kind of analysis can only be done effectively and efficiently through improvements

to the School Census.

7. Many of the figures generated by the CRIDE survey are in line with those from previous years suggesting a core stability to the data. In light of the many demands on services and the forthcoming changes to SEN legislation in England, we do not intend to run a full survey next year, but to ask a series of 'core' questions and a small number of thematic questions on specific topics including sign language support and the age profile of Teachers of the Deaf.
8. Carrying out the CRIDE survey and analysing the results is not an easy task. As with all surveys, caution must be exercised in how the results are interpreted. However, it remains the most comprehensive survey of its kind in England. It is also the only known complete census of all deaf children in England (rather than just those formally recorded as having a SEN, as with the School Census). In the context of significant reform to the educational system for children with SEN, we hope the findings will be used to ensure that any reform carried out is done so with a firm and sound understanding of the impact it will have on all deaf children.

## PART 7: Background and methodology

CRIDE is a consortium bringing together a range of organisations and individuals with a common interest in improving the educational outcomes achieved by deaf children through research. AT the time the 2013 survey was issued, representatives include: the [British Association of Teachers of the Deaf](#) (BATOD), the [Ear Foundation](#), the [Ewing Foundation](#), the [National Deaf Children's Society](#) (NDCS), [National Sensory Impairment Partnership](#) (NatSIP), [Frank Barnes School for Deaf Children](#), [Mary Hare School](#), [London Borough of Barnet](#), [UCL](#) and [City University London](#).

The survey was designed and created by members of CRIDE. Feedback from services on the 2012 survey and lessons learnt from the analysis were used to inform improvements to the 2013 survey.

The England survey was disseminated to services in England around 4th February 2013 by NDCS on behalf of CRIDE. Services were asked to respond by the 15<sup>th</sup> April 2013. Where there was no response by this time, members of CRIDE contacted services by email and telephone. Following this, as a last resort, Freedom of Information requests were sent out to the remaining services who had not responded, mostly on 10<sup>th</sup> May 2013.

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

Table 40: Response rate by services to the CRIDE survey

	<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Cumulative total</b>
First deadline – 15 <sup>th</sup> April 2013	84	84
Second deadline following chasers	38	122
Freedom of Information requests	10	132

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

Analysis of the results using Excel and drafting of this report was largely completed by NDCS with guidance and clearance from members of CRIDE.

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

If you have any feedback or questions on the results, please contact [professionals@ndcs.org.uk](mailto:professionals@ndcs.org.uk).

## Annex A: Numbers of deaf children 'belonging' by service

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

Service	Level of deafness						TOTAL
	Unilateral	Mild	Moderate	Severe	Profound	Not known	
<b>Eastern England</b>							
Bedford	14	26	55	12	14	6	127
Cambridgeshire	68	117	81	31	36	8	341
Central Bedfordshire	11	50	45	20	15	*	145**
Essex	38	93	185	143	117	10	586
Hertfordshire	22	144	194	54	91	268	773
Luton	59	66	51	31	37	*	250**
Norfolk	92	243	148	54	48	*	590**
Peterborough	54	55	72	20	27	13	241
Southend on Sea	6	22	27	10	19	*	90**
Suffolk	100	118	177	35	51	6	487
Thurrock	33	42	37	9	13	7	141
<b>East Midlands</b>							
Derby City	18	*	40	20	36	*	125**
Derbyshire	67	146	228	47	50	77	615
Leicester City	23	65	86	26	30	*	235**
Leicestershire and Rutland	157	287	159	30	47	60	740
Lincolnshire	*	21	121	44	65	0	255*
Northamptonshire	51	41	130	40	68	16	346
Nottingham City	13	10	50	31	54	6	164
Nottinghamshire	-	-	-	-	-	-	250
<b>London</b>							
Barking and Dagenham	13	16	30	24	29	0	112
Barnet	70	108	65	18	29	*	295**
Bexley	43	20	77	16	26	7	189
Brent	55	31	80	36	41	16	259
Bromley	37	43	65	34	26	*	210**
Camden	27	30	58	10	27	*	155**
Croydon	69	51	88	24	36	*	270**
Ealing	21	50	59	13	9	0	152
Greenwich	57	76	64	24	20	18	259
Hackney	25	40	103	41	27	0	236
Hammersmith and Fulham	9	13	36	16	17	0	91
Haringey and Enfield	70	79	146	59	44	*	405**
Harrow	10	71	51	32	32	8	204
Havering	7	49	83	39	16	0	194
Hillingdon	42	45	51	19	31	0	188
Hounslow	55	39	70	18	36	0	218
Islington	30	33	36	26	14	*	145**
Kensington & Chelsea	6	7	19	14	14	0	60
Kingston Upon Thames	16	8	31	10	22	0	87
Lambeth	33	20	74	36	26	12	201
Lewisham	26	27	81	20	22	*	180**
Merton	31	35	54	18	9	0	147
Newham	35	55	91	18	36	45	280
Redbridge	24	39	51	31	35	25	205
Richmond	27	22	31	8	13	0	101
Southwark	44	33	53	25	22	10	187
Sutton	15	30	37	19	14	*	120**
Tower Hamlets	67	81	68	47	17	0	280
Waltham Forest	34	22	63	20	22	16	177
Wandsworth	58	103	62	31	29	41	324
Westminster	22	24	25	12	19	18	120
<b>North East</b>							
Darlington	9	24	33	7	6	0	79
Durham	39	120	73	20	36	9	297
Gateshead	40	55	28	19	20	0	162
Middlesbrough, Hartlepool,	110	193	127	31	21	0	482

Redcar & Cleveland and Stockton							
Newcastle Upon Tyne	25	35	70	24	19	*	180**
North Tyneside	12	24	52	29	21	*	145**
Northumberland	35	121	66	19	24	5	270
South Tyneside	32	28	47	12	13	*	135**
Sunderland	46	73	77	28	30	0	254
<b>North West</b>							
Blackburn with Darwen	*	8	50	25	13	0	100**
Blackpool	15	56	37	11	17	*	140
Bolton	26	37	49	120	93	0	325
Bury	27	34	39	12	26	0	138
Cheshire East	67	59	108	28	49	*	315**
Cheshire West & Chester	57	61	73	14	29	*	240**
Cumbria	27	34	80	28	34	0	203
Halton	14	11	25	13	13	0	76
Knowsley	28	14	42	11	11	7	113
Lancashire	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Liverpool	88	62	83	21	21	0	275
Manchester	27	205	164	48	64	49	557
Oldham	21	48	64	25	35	0	193
Rochdale	6	40	72	23	39	0	180
Salford	54	96	70	21	21	0	262
Sefton	50	42	39	17	25	0	173
St Helens	27	26	22	10	11	0	96
Stockport	33	60	82	35	42	0	252
Tameside	5	27	61	6	17	*	120**
Trafford	45	68	55	13	23	0	204
Warrington	37	27	33	19	13	0	129
Wigan	18	93	49	39	27	0	226
Wirral	54	73	93	26	21	19	286
<b>South East</b>							
Berkshire Consortium <sup>17</sup>	132	197	159	25	21	13	547
Brighton & Hove	49	67	53	26	15	*	215**
Buckinghamshire	66	87	95	12	17	22	299
East Sussex	14	92	78	32	36	0	252
Hampshire	198	235	213	67	80	*	800*
Isle of Wight	16	8	18	7	6	*	60**
Kent	43	57	298	72	102	12	584
Medway	39	30	52	32	38	0	191
Milton Keynes	49	30	62	25	5	*	175**
Oxfordshire	68	164	130	21	52	0	435
Portsmouth	37	68	27	15	10	0	157
Southampton	6	9	47	17	15	0	94
Surrey	230	291	211	58	90	*	885**
West Sussex	121	148	159	44	53	*	530**
<b>South West</b>							
Bristol, South Gloucestershire, Bath & NE Somerset, North Somerset	54	87	216	107	91	23	578
Cornwall	25	37	114	20	37	*	240**
Devon	72	277	116	37	76	7	585
Dorset, Poole, Bournemouth	145	189	110	28	46	0	518
Gloucestershire	80	79	130	41	36	*	370**
Plymouth	45	44	15	31	32	8	175
Somerset	68	75	85	15	36	*	285**
Swindon	31	29	30	16	24	*	135**
Torbay	8	29	22	*	8	0	75**
Wiltshire	28	133	128	27	34	10	360
<b>West Midlands</b>							
Birmingham	108	369	483	133	241	11	1345
Coventry	105	74	72	27	29	*	310**
Dudley	51	59	79	35	27	0	251
Herefordshire	11	63	60	9	7	0	150

<sup>17</sup> Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead, Bracknell Forest, Slough, Reading, Wokingham and West Berkshire

Sandwell	32	89	129	46	61	69	426
Solihull	19	41	29	18	23	0	130
Staffordshire	86	112	115	24	33	82	452
Stoke on Trent	47	63	82	17	25	0	234
Telford & Wrekin and Shropshire	139	171	92	22	33	8	465
Walsall	-	-	-	-	-	-	227
Warwickshire	33	73	125	28	17	10	286
Wolverhampton	38	81	64	27	13	0	223
Worcestershire	134	140	88	15	51	0	428
<b>Yorkshire and the Humber</b>							
Barnsley	43	42	64	19	18	8	194
Bradford	118	199	201	54	76	30	678
Calderdale	7	41	129	20	31	0	228
Doncaster	78	97	64	18	23	8	288
Hull, East Riding of Yorkshire, NE Lincolnshire	65	213	218	40	53	*	595**
Kirklees	52	30	111	18	36	24	271
Leeds	110	152	234	47	77	29	649
North Lincolnshire	24	22	34	13	8	0	101
North Yorkshire	36	53	113	52	35	0	289
Rotherham	43	76	75	27	27	28	276
Sheffield	72	289	257	133	82	5	838
Wakefield	48	50	66	21	48	*	240**
York	25	30	45	14	18	*	140**

#### Notes:

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

## Annex B: Provision and support for children with temporary deafness

Service	Eligibility criteria used	The number of children with temporary deafness supported by the service
<b>Eastern England</b>		
Bedford	Other	5
Cambridgeshire	NatSIP criteria	24
Central Bedfordshire	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Essex	NatSIP criteria	-
Hertfordshire	Criteria is mostly developed locally	34
Luton	Other	N/a
Norfolk	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Peterborough	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Southend on Sea	Criteria is mostly developed locally	*
Suffolk	Other	40
Thurrock	NatSIP criteria	N/a
<b>East Midlands</b>		
Derby City	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Derbyshire	Criteria is mostly developed locally	N/a
Leicester City	Criteria is mostly developed locally	45
Leicestershire and Rutland	Criteria is mostly developed locally	-
Lincolnshire	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Northamptonshire	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Nottingham City	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Nottinghamshire	Other	N/a
<b>London</b>		
Barking and Dagenham	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Barnet	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Bexley	Criteria is mostly developed locally	N/a
Brent	NatSIP criteria	-
Bromley	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Camden	NatSIP criteria	10
Croydon	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Ealing	NatSIP criteria	14
Greenwich	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Hackney	Criteria is mostly developed locally	N/a
Hammersmith and Fulham	NatSIP criteria	18
Haringey and Enfield	NatSIP criteria	-
Harrow	NatSIP criteria	27
Havering	NatSIP criteria	14
Hillingdon	NatSIP criteria	30
Hounslow	NatSIP criteria	32
Islington	Criteria is mostly developed locally	N/a
Kensington & Chelsea	NatSIP criteria	-
Kingston Upon Thames	Criteria is mostly developed locally	7
Lambeth	Criteria is mostly developed locally	N/a
Lewisham	NatSIP criteria	5
Merton	NatSIP criteria	37
Newham	Criteria is mostly developed locally	*
Redbridge	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Richmond	Other	-
Southwark	Criteria is mostly developed locally	N/a
Sutton	Criteria is mostly developed locally	14
Tower Hamlets	Other	N/a
Waltham Forest		-
Wandsworth	Other	77
Westminster	NatSIP criteria	8
<b>North East</b>		
Darlington	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Durham	NatSIP criteria	-
Gateshead	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Middlesbrough, Hartlepool, Redcar & Cleveland and Stockton	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Newcastle Upon Tyne	NatSIP criteria	N/a
North Tyneside	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Northumberland	NatSIP criteria	18



South Tyneside	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Sunderland	Other	-
<b>North West</b>		
Blackburn with Darwen	NatSIP criteria	6
Blackpool	NatSIP criteria	-
Bolton	Criteria is mostly developed locally	12
Bury	Criteria is mostly developed locally	-
Cheshire East	NatSIP criteria	0
Cheshire West & Chester	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Cumbria	Criteria is mostly developed locally	-
Halton	Criteria is mostly developed locally	19
Knowsley	NatSIP criteria	20
Lancashire	NatSIP criteria	-
Liverpool	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Manchester	Criteria is mostly developed locally	N/a
Oldham	NatSIP criteria	-
Rochdale	Criteria is mostly developed locally	N/a
Salford	NatSIP criteria	19
Sefton	NatSIP criteria	69
St Helens	NatSIP criteria	10
Stockport	NatSIP criteria	37
Tameside	NatSIP criteria	9
Trafford	Other	20
Warrington	Criteria is mostly developed locally	18
Wigan	NatSIP criteria	26
Wirral	NatSIP criteria	-
<b>South East</b>		
Berkshire Consortium <sup>18</sup>	Other	N/a
Brighton & Hove	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Buckinghamshire	NatSIP criteria	N/a
East Sussex	NatSIP criteria	0
Hampshire	Criteria is mostly developed locally	81
Isle of Wight	NatSIP criteria	19
Kent	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Medway	NatSIP criteria	40
Milton Keynes	Criteria is mostly developed locally	N/a
Oxfordshire	NatSIP criteria	-
Portsmouth	NatSIP criteria	13
Southampton	NatSIP criteria	*
Surrey	NatSIP criteria	20
West Sussex	NatSIP criteria	27
<b>South West</b>		
Bristol, South Gloucestershire, Bath & NE Somerset, North Somerset	Other	81
Cornwall	NatSIP criteria	71
Devon	NatSIP criteria	92
Dorset, Poole, Bournemouth	NatSIP criteria	84
Gloucestershire	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Plymouth	Other	-
Somerset	NatSIP criteria	-
Swindon	NatSIP criteria	-
Torbay	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Wiltshire	NatSIP criteria	N/a
<b>West Midlands</b>		
Birmingham	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Coventry	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Dudley	NatSIP criteria	61
Herefordshire	NatSIP criteria	10
Sandwell	Other	N/a
Solihull	NatSIP criteria	53
Staffordshire	NatSIP criteria	-
Stoke on Trent	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Telford & Wrekin and Shropshire	NatSIP criteria	93
Walsall	NatSIP criteria	-
Warwickshire	NatSIP criteria	N/a

<sup>18</sup> Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead, Bracknell Forest, Slough, Reading, Wokingham and West Berkshire

Wolverhampton	Criteria is mostly developed locally	N/a
Worcestershire	NatSIP criteria	-
<b><i>Yorkshire and the Humber</i></b>		
Barnsley	NatSIP criteria	*
Bradford	Criteria is mostly developed locally	N/a
Calderdale	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Doncaster	NatSIP criteria	-
Hull, East Riding of Yorkshire, NE Lincolnshire	NatSIP criteria	80
Kirklees	NatSIP criteria	-
Leeds	NatSIP criteria	N/a
North Lincolnshire	NatSIP criteria	7
North Yorkshire	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Rotherham	NatSIP criteria	31
Sheffield	NatSIP criteria	-
Wakefield	NatSIP criteria	56
York	Criteria is mostly developed locally	15

Notes:

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