



Consortium for Research in Deaf Education

2023 report for England

Education provision for deaf children in England in 2022/23

Introduction

In 2023, we carried out the 13th Consortium for Research in Deaf Education (CRIDE) annual survey on educational staffing and service provision for deaf children.¹ 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 2023 survey was the standard version, covering the 2022/23 academic year.²

The analysis in this report is based on responses from 132 services in England, covering 150 out of 152 authority areas and giving a response rate of 100%. The remaining two local authorities³ 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.....	4
PART 2: Teachers of Deaf Children and Young People and other specialist staff	15
PART 3: Post-16 support	26
PART 4: Support provided.....	28
PART 5: Support following identification of deafness	33
PART 6: Background and methodology	35
Annex: Information by local authority.....	36

¹ For the purpose of this section of the survey, unless otherwise stated, we use the term 'deaf children' to include children and young people under the age of 20 with sensori-neural or permanent conductive deafness.

² Reports from previous years can be found on the National Deaf Children's Society website at www.ndcs.org.uk/cride or on the BATOD website at www.batod.org.uk/information/cride-reports/.

³ The City of London and the Isles of Scilly.

Interpreting the results

Services were asked to give figures for the position as of 31st January 2023.

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 were at least 45,671 deaf children in England, similar to the 45,680 figure reported in 2022.
- 77% of school-aged deaf children attended mainstream schools. 6% attended mainstream schools with resource provisions. 3% attended schools for deaf pupils, whilst 14% attended special schools not specifically for deaf children. 1% were home educated.
- 24% of deaf children were recorded as having an additional special educational need⁴, this is an increase from 23% in 2021.
- 16% of deaf children used English as an additional spoken language at home.
- 80% of services reported they provide support to deaf young people over the age of 19.

Teachers of Deaf Children and Young People and other specialist staff

- There were at least 1,267 fte TOD posts, of which 4% were vacant. Of the 1,222 fte working as TODs, 81% held the mandatory qualification, whilst 13% were in training, 5% were qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training, and 1% were people not qualified as teachers⁵.
- The number of qualified TODs 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 2022 and fallen by 21% since we started the survey in 2011.
- 51% of peripatetic TODs were aged 50 or over and thus are likely to retire in the next 10 to 15 years.
- There were at least 678 other specialist staff posts employed directly by local authority specialist education services, of which 6% were vacant posts.

Resource provisions

- There were a reported 227 resource provisions, this is a decrease from 230 reported in 2022. Looking at the spread of resource provisions across England, on average, there was one resource provision for every 200 deaf children. In 2022, the corresponding figure was one resource provision for every 197 deaf children.

Outcomes

- 7% of services reported that they collect data on Key Stage 4 outcomes for all deaf children whilst 36% do so for deaf children on their caseload.

Referrals

- 18% of referrals to services came from the newborn hearing screening programme in 2022. Of these, 90% were contacted by a TOD 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, 85% were contacted by a TOD within 5 working days.
- 60% of referrals to services came from outside the newborn hearing screening programme and after a child had started statutory education. Of these, 75% were contacted by a TOD within 5 working days.
- Regardless of how the referral was made, 52% of families were offered a visit (either face to face or virtual) within 10 working days of the referral.

⁴ Defined as any other special educational need apart from deafness, regardless of whether this need is recognised as a 'primary' or 'secondary' need.

⁵ The category of 'People not qualified as teachers' was only asked about the separate survey for schools for deaf children.

PART 1: Deaf children in England

Services were asked to give details of deaf children living in the geographical area covered by their service.⁶

When giving figures for numbers of deaf children living in the area, we first asked for an overall figure and then asked for breakdowns by level of deafness, age, and educational setting. We found that some services did not always provide this data consistently; occasionally services 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 the "adjusted total".

131 services responded to this question⁷. Based on these responses, **the adjusted total number of deaf children in England was 45,671**. This is similar to 45,680 in 2022 when 131 services responded.

Unadjusted figures are provided in the table that follows.

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

	Total generated
Adjusted total	45,671
Total when asked how many children overall	45,293
Total when asked about number of children, broken down by age group	45,297
Total when asked about number of children, broken down by level of deafness (including 'Level of deafness not known')	44,919 ⁸
Total when asked about number of children, broken down by educational setting	45,198 ⁹

The smallest number of children reported by a service was 82 deaf children living within their boundaries. The largest reported was 1,500 deaf children. The average number of deaf children living in each service area was 349¹⁰.

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.

⁶ Services were asked to include: All children and young people under the age of 20 who have a unilateral or bilateral sensori-neural or permanent conductive deafness, at all levels from mild to profound, using BSA/BATOD descriptors. Children and young people with temporary deafness should not be included. Services were asked to include all deaf children and young people, regardless of whether they receive support from the service, and to include children and young people who attend education provision outside of your area but who normally live in your 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 and young people with temporary deafness those 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.

⁷ Of these, one service did not provide a figure for the question on the number of deaf children with a permanent deafness. As they had provided figures for the other questions on children and young people with deafness broken down by level of deafness, age range and where they were normally educated, these totals were used as the overall figure for children with permanent deafness living in the area.

⁸ 44,919 was the sum of the totals provided by services. The sum of the broken-down figures was 44,135.

⁹ 45,198 was the sum of the broken-down figures provided by services. The sum of the totals provided by services was 44,216.

¹⁰ Using adjusted totals.

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

	Number of children reported
CRIDE 2023 (adjusted total)	45,671
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

Region	Number of deaf children in 2017 - adjusted totals (% of adjusted total)	Number of deaf children in 2018 (% of total)	Number of deaf children in 2019 - adjusted totals (% of adjusted total)	Number of deaf children in 2021 - adjusted totals (% of adjusted total)	Number of deaf children in 2022 - adjusted totals (% of adjusted total)	Number of deaf children in 2023 - adjusted totals (% of adjusted total)
East England	4,430 (10%)	4,471 (10%)	4,666 (10%)	4,363 (10%)	4,405 (10%)	4,857 (11%)
East Midlands	3,765 (8%)	3,536 (8%)	3,503 (8%)	3,473 (8%)	3,558 (8%)	3,533 (8%)
London	7,358 (16%)	7,309 (17%)	7,554 (16%)	7,408 (16%)	7,570 (17%)	7,654 (17%)
North East	2,342 (5%)	2,393 (6%)	2,457 (5%)	2,409 (5%)	2,409 (5%)	2,275 (5%)
North West	5,945 (13%)	4,768 (11%)	6,219 (13%)	6,260 (14%)	6,354 (14%)	6,308 (14%)
South East	6,700 (15%)	6,279 (14%)	6,490 (14%)	5,759 (13%)	5,787 (13%)	5,587 (12%)
South West	3,823 (8%)	3,951 (9%)	4,303 (9%)	4,510 (10%)	4,508 (10%)	4,237 (9%)
West Midlands	5,711 (13%)	5,397 (12%)	5,532 (12%)	5,557 (12%)	5,722 (13%)	5,742 (13%)
Yorkshire & Humber	5,557 (12%)	5,363 (12%)	5,680 (12%)	5,321 (12%)	5,367 (12%)	5,478 (12%)
Total	45,631 (100%)	43,467 (100%)	46,404 (100%)	45,060 (100%)	45,680 (100%)	45,671 (100%)

Issues or gaps in the data

82 services (62%) 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 (33% 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 (17%)
- services only having figures for children who are hearing-aid wearers (6%)
- the audiology service not referring children with a unilateral hearing loss to services (1%)
- the audiology service not referring children with a mild hearing loss to services (1%)
- other (33%). Some 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
 - changes in the way data are recorded and held
 - database cleansing may affect figures since last year
 - referrals to the service for children with a unilateral deafness not being consistent over time
 - Ear, Nose and Throat (ENT) service not referring children and young people to the service
 - service does not report electively home educated children and young people
 - young people in colleges not visited by the service
 - data is not held or is only held for some children and young people educated out of the geographical area covered by the service, or in independent schools
 - data is only held for young people over aged 19 who have an Education, Health and Care plan (EHC plan)
 - data not held for young people once they have left college
 - data not provided by a resource provision when asked for.

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.

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

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

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

Age group	Number of deaf children reported	Percentage of total
Early years/pre-school	5,616	12%
Primary-aged	17,086	38%
Secondary-aged	16,488	36%
Post-16 and under the age of 20	6,107	13%
Total	45,297	

Since 2021 the proportion of deaf children in different age categories has changed as follows:

- early years/pre-school age – decreased by one percentage point

- primary-aged – decreased by two percentage points
- secondary-aged – increased by two percentage points
- post-16 category – increased by one percentage point.

By way of comparison, we looked at figures from the Office for National Statistics (ONS) statistics on population estimates by age¹¹ to see if there were any variations in the proportion of children in different age groups. It should be noted that in the CRIDE survey, we did not ask the specific age of children but whether they were of ‘primary age’, etc. so the data below should be taken as a rough approximation only. In addition, the incidence of deafness is known to vary by age, reflecting the fact that many deaf children acquire deafness as they grow up.

Table 5: Proportion of children and young people by age

ONS (mid-2021 data)		CRIDE	
Category	Percentage of all children aged 0-19	Category	Percentage of total
Children aged 0 to 4	23%	Preschool	12%
Children aged 5 to 11	36%	Primary (reception to year 6)	38%
Children aged 12 to 16	26%	Secondary (year 7 to 11)	36%
Young people aged 17 to 19	15%	Post-16 and under the age of 20	13%

Table 6: Number of children living in the area, by level of deafness

Level of deafness	Number of deaf children reported	Percentage of total (where known)
Unilateral	8,979	22%
Mild	10,228	25%
Moderate	13,225	32%
Severe	3,651	9%
Profound	4,987	12%
Total (excluding ‘not known’)	41,070	
Not known	3,065	
Total (including ‘not known’)	44,135	

Since the 2021 survey, the proportion of children and young people with a:

- unilateral deafness is unchanged
- mild level of deafness has decreased by one percentage point
- moderate level of deafness has increased by one percentage point
- severe level of deafness has increased by one percentage point
- profound level of deafness is unchanged.

There were at least 731 deaf children in England with Auditory Neuropathy Spectrum Disorder (ANS), 2% of all deaf children (adjusted total)¹². This is an increase from 2021 from 1%.

¹¹<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/populationestimatesforukenglandandwales/scotlandandnorthernireland>

¹² 731 children were reported by 120 services, in addition seven services reported no deaf children with ANSD living in the area and five services did not provide an answer to this question.

ANSD is most often identified in babies at the stage of the universal newborn hearing screen, which was fully rolled out in England in 2006. However, the screening protocols used for the 'well baby' population are different from those used for babies who have spent time in Neonatal Intensive Care Units (NICU), which means that babies in NICU with ANSD are likely to be identified early, but 'well' babies are not. This is because NICU babies are at much higher risk of ANSD and other types of deafness compared with well babies, so the screening test is designed to identify these babies. But this means that ANSD is unlikely to be identified in well babies until they are much older, if at all.

Figures provided through the newborn hearing screening programme indicate that around 1 in 10 congenitally deaf children has ANSD. But the true figure may be more, as ANSD is likely to remain unidentified in well babies who pass the newborn hearing screen.

The CRIDE figures indicate that ANSD is under-reported by education services. This could be partly due to under-identification of ANSD in older deaf children on their caseloads and those 'well babies' who passed screening and were identified later, as well as those with acquired/progressive deafness who have not been tested for ANSD.

Table 7: Number of children, living in the area, by educational setting

Type of educational provision		Number of deaf children	Percentage of total (where known)
In local authority	Supported only at home – pre-school children	2,789	6%
	Early years setting – pre-school children	2,640	6%
	Supported at home – of school age and home educated	238	1%
	Mainstream state-funded schools (including academies and free schools)	26,724	60%
	Mainstream independent (non-state-funded) schools (for example, Eton)	566	1%
	Resource provision in mainstream schools ¹³	1,951	4%
	Special schools for deaf pupils (whether state funded or non-maintained)	361	1%
	Other special schools, not specifically for deaf children (whether state funded or non-maintained)	4,607	10%
	All other post-16 provision (not including school sixth form colleges)	2,169	5%
Out of local authority	Early years setting – pre-school children	59	0%
	Mainstream state-funded schools (including academies and free schools)	601	1%
	Mainstream independent (non-state-funded) schools	174	0%
	Resource provision in mainstream schools	217	0%
	Special schools for deaf pupils (whether state funded or non-maintained)	557	1%
	Other special school, not specifically for deaf children (whether state funded or non-maintained)	377	1%
	All other post-16 provision (not including school sixth form colleges)	418	1%
Other	NEET (Not in education, employment or in training) (post-16 only)	108	0%
	Other (e.g. Pupil referral units)	51	0%
Total (excluding 'not known')		44,607	
Not known		591	
Total (including 'not known')		45,198 ¹⁴	

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.

¹³ 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. Five services stated they had included children and young people in schools with resource provisions not specifically for deaf children in this category.

¹⁴ 45,198 was the sum of the broken-down figures, the sum of the totals provided by services was 44,216.

Table 8: 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	2,789	6%	
Early years setting - pre-school children	2,699	6%	
Supported at home - of school age and home educated	238	1%	1%
Mainstream provision (including state-funded and independent schools)	28,065	62%	77%
Mainstream provision: resource provision	2,168	5%	6%
Special schools for deaf pupils	918	2%	3%
Other special schools, not specifically for deaf children	4,984	11%	14%
All other post-16 provision (not including school sixth forms)	2,587	6%	
Other (e.g. Pupil referral units, NEET, not known)	750	2%	
Total	45,198		
Total (excluding pre-school children and other post-16 provision and 'other')	36,373		

There has been no change since 2022 in any of the proportions of school-aged deaf children in different settings.

Table 9: 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	42,045	95%
Out of home local authority	2,403	5%
Total (not including 'not known and 'other')	44,448	

Since 2022, the number and proportions of deaf children in and out of home local authority have remained the same.

Incidence of additional special educational needs (SEN)

Services reported that the number of deaf children with an additional special educational need ¹⁵ was 10,950¹⁶. This is 24% of the adjusted total of deaf children. This is an increase from 23% in 2021.

Deaf children with cochlear implants and bone conduction hearing devices

4,201 children (9% of the adjusted total of deaf children) were reported to have at least one cochlear implant¹⁷. This is similar to 2021 when 3,907 children (9%) were reported.

¹⁵ Defined as any other special educational need apart from deafness, regardless of whether this need is recognised as a 'primary' or 'secondary' need.

¹⁶ 10,950 children were reported by 120 services, in addition six services reported no children and six services did not provide an answer to this question.

¹⁷ 129 services reported 4,201 children, in addition three services did not provide an answer to this question.

Children with severe to profound deafness are eligible for cochlear implants. We saw earlier in table 6 that there were 8,638 children with severe or profound deafness. Whilst this can only be a rough approximation, it can be estimated that 49% of children with severe or profound deafness had at least one cochlear implant. If one were to make an assumption that nearly all children with cochlear implants were those with a profound deafness, this percentage would rise to 84%.

Services also reported that 3,831 children (8% of the adjusted total of deaf children) had a bone conduction device¹⁸. The proportion has increased from 7% in 2021.

Additional languages

There were 7,151 children (16% of the adjusted total of deaf children reported) known by services to have English as an additional spoken language at home¹⁹. This is an increase from 2021 when 14% were known to have English as an additional spoken language.

Services were then asked to tell us about the languages mainly used in school/other education setting. Caution is needed when looking at the results because the 126 services²⁰ who responded to this question identified 41,572 children. This is lower than the figure of 45,671 identified earlier in this report (see table 1).

Table 10: Number of deaf children, by languages mainly used in school/other educational setting

Language	Total	Percentage of responses (where known)
Spoken English	34,500	89%
British Sign Language	792	2%
Spoken English together with signed support	2,238	6%
Other combination	1,381	4%
Total known	38,911	
Not known	2,661	
Total including not known	41,572 ²¹	

Comparing with data from the 2021 survey when this question was last asked, the proportion of children and young people using:

- spoken English has increased from 88% to 89%
- British Sign Language has remained the same at 2%
- spoken English together with signed support has decreased from 7% to 6%
- other combination has increased from 3% to 4%.

We saw earlier in table 6 that there were 8,638 children with severe or profound deafness. If it is assumed that children with severe or profound deafness are more likely to use sign language, it can be estimated that 9% of children with severe/profound deafness used British Sign Language in education whilst 26% used signed support with spoken English. Combined, 35% of children with severe/profound deafness used some form of sign language in education. It should be stressed that this is a very rough approximation made for illustration purposes only.

¹⁸ 128 services reported 3,831 children, in addition four services did not provide an answer to this question.

¹⁹ 111 services reported 7,151 children. In addition eight services reported no children, and 13 services did not provide an answer to this question.

²⁰ 126 services reported 41,572 children. Six services did not provide an answer to this question. One of these services provided some information using different categories of languages.

²¹ 41,572 is the sum of the broken-down figures, the sum of totals provided by services was 42,264.

It must also be stressed that the use of spoken/sign language in education may not always match the use of spoken/sign language within the home or the child’s own preferences.

Deaf children who are new to the country

There were 242 deaf children known to be ‘newly arrived’ (having arrived at their service from outside of the UK in the past year) reported by 79 services. This is 1% of the adjusted total of deaf children. 43 services stated there were no deaf children known to be newly arrived and 10 services did not provide an answer to this question. This has increased from 2021 when the figures were 206²² and less than 1% (0.5%) respectively.

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 132 services indicated that at least 43,851 deaf children with permanent or temporary deafness were on services’ caseloads. The smallest number of children on a caseload was 77 and the largest was 1,149. The average was 332 children.

The definition of ‘caseload’ within the CRIDE survey has changed over time. 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 11: Number of deaf children on caseloads reported, over successive years

Year	Number of children on caseload	Definition of caseload	Number of services
2023	43,851	Some form of support at least once a year	132
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. 93 services reported that there were 3,796 children²³.

²² Reported by 64 services.

²³ In addition, 19 services reported no children, and 20 services did not provide an answer to this question.

If there were 45,671²⁴ permanently deaf children living in England and 40,055 on services' caseloads with permanent deafness, there were at least 5,616 deaf children (12% of the adjusted total) who were not being supported by a service at least once a year. It does not automatically follow that 12% of permanently deaf children were not receiving any support at all; many may receive support less than once a year from a service, or elsewhere from, for example, resource provisions not managed by the service.

Post-19 support

105 services (80%) said they provided support to deaf young people over the age of 19, and 27 services (20%) said they did not. The proportion of services that provide support to deaf young people over the age of 19 has increased from 78% in 2022.

There were 1,276 deaf young people over the age of 19 on the caseloads of services where support was provided. This has increased from 1,003 in 2022.

Table 12: Settings where young people over the age of 19 are supported

Post-school destination	Number of young people	Percentage
Further education	788	72%
Higher education	73	7%
Apprenticeship or some form of work-based training	30	3%
Supported internship	23	2%
Employment	17	2%
NEET (Not in Education, Employment or Training)	41	4%
Other	117	11%
Total	1,089 ²⁵	

How do CRIDE's 2023 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 2023²⁶ indicate there were 23,189 children where deafness is the primary special educational need (SEN) and who have been placed at SEN support or have an EHC plan. School Census figures also indicate that there were an additional 5,056 children where deafness was a secondary need. The School Census therefore records a total of 28,245 children where deafness was a primary or secondary need. The 28,245 deaf children identified by the School Census amount to 62% of the 45,671 deaf children identified by local authorities through CRIDE.

Recognising that School Census figures mostly cover school-aged children, the following table compares the number of deaf SEN children aged 5 to 16 with CRIDE data on primary and secondary aged children. It shows that a percentage of school-aged children (39%) are not captured by published Government data, compared to those identified by local authorities.

²⁴ Adjusted total.

²⁵ 1,089 was the sum of the broken-down figures, 1,084 was the sum of the totals provided by services.

²⁶ Figures extracted from <https://explore-education-statistics.service.gov.uk/find-statistics/special-educational-needs-in-england> and analysed by the National Deaf Children's Society.

Table 13: Comparison of data on school-aged children from School Census and CRIDE

	Number of deaf SEN children – from School Census	Number of deaf children – from CRIDE 2023	Percentage of deaf SEN children as total of CRIDE figure
Primary aged (Years 1 to 6)	10,136	17,086	59%
Secondary aged (Years 7 to 11)	10,195	16,488	62%
Total	20,331	33,574	61%

There was a total of 8,664 deaf children with an EHC plan (6,242 where deafness was a primary need and 2,422 a secondary need). Comparing this figure with the number of children identified by the CRIDE survey, this would indicate that around 26% of deaf children had an EHC plan.

Looking specifically at data on school-aged deaf SEN children with EHC plans, where deafness was the primary need, the following table indicates that at least 16% of school-aged deaf children had an EHC plan.

Table 14: Comparison of data on school-aged children with EHC plans with data from CRIDE

	Number of deaf children with an EHC plan (where deafness is primary need)	Number of deaf children – from CRIDE 2023	Percentage of deaf children with EHC plan as total of CRIDE figure
Primary aged (5 to 10)	2,751	17,086	16%
Secondary aged (11 to 15)	2,700	16,488	16%
Total	5,451	33,574	16%

PART 2: Teachers of Deaf Children and Young People and other specialist staff

In previous surveys, we used the terminology 'Teachers of the Deaf'. For the 2023 survey and going forward, we use the terminology 'Teachers of Deaf Children and Young People (TODs)' instead. However, the definition of the role has not changed and should continue to be understood as a specialist teaching role, occupied by someone with the mandatory qualification for teaching deaf children or in training to acquire this qualification.

We asked how many TODs are working in different settings, including those in a peripatetic role, working in resource provisions²⁷ and/or working in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children or young people. We found that:

- overall, there were at least 1,222.15 fte teachers working as TODs in England.
- 81% of these posts were occupied by fully qualified TODs, 13% were occupied by teachers in training for the mandatory qualification, 5% were occupied by qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training, and 1% were occupied by people not qualified as teachers²⁸.
- at the time the survey was completed, there were at least 45 fte vacant posts reported.
- if the vacant posts are added to the total number of TODs in employment, this would indicate there were at least 1,267.15 fte TOD posts, of which 4% were vacant.

The following table provides a breakdown by type of setting.

²⁷ In the CRIDE survey, we use the term 'resource provision' to include all schools 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.

²⁸ Please note, the category of People not qualified as Teachers was only asked about in the separate survey for schools for deaf children and young people.

Table 15: Number of ToD posts overall (fte)²⁹

	Working mainly as a peripatetic TODs (total and percentage)	Working mainly in a resource provision (total and percentage)	Working mainly in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children or young people (total and percentage)	Working flexibly as a peripatetic TOD, in a resource provision and/or in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children or young people	Working in a special school for deaf children and young people (total and percentage)	TOD posts overall (total and percentage)
TODs with the mandatory qualification	570.93 (91%)	249.92 (82%)	3 (94%)	18.1 (84%)	151.5 (56%)	993.45 (81%)
Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years	48.1 (8%)	43.9 (14%)	0.2 (6%)	3 (14%)	61.2 (23%)	156.4 (13%)
Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training	5 (1%)	9.4 (3%)	0 (0%)	0.4 (2%)	45 (17%)	59.8 (5%)
People not qualified as teachers	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	12.5 (5%)	12.5 (1%)
Total - in employment	624.03 (100%)	303.22 (100%)	3.2 (100%)	21.5 (100%)	270.2 (100%)	1222.15 (100%)
Vacant posts	20.4 (3%)	20.8 (6%)	0.6 (16%)	0.2 (1%)	3 (1%)	45 (4%)
Total – posts	644.43 (100%)	324.02 (100%)	3.8 (100%)	21.7 (100%)	273.2 (100%)	1267.15 (100%)

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

²⁹ Percentages for TODs with the mandatory qualification, Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years, and Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training are out of the total in post. Percentages for vacant posts are out of all posts.

Table 16: Number of TODs in employment overall by role (fte)

	Total TODs in post	Percentage
Working mainly as a peripatetic TODs	624.03	51%
Working mainly in a resource provision	303.22	25%
Working mainly in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children or young people	3.2	0%
Working flexibly as a peripatetic TOD, in a resource provision and/or in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children or young people	21.5	2%
Working in a special school for deaf children and young people	270.2	22%
Total of figures given	1222.15	100%

Figures for TODs in auditory implant programmes across England were collected in a separate survey. Responses were received from 11 programmes. There were at least 24.77 fte fully qualified TODs reported in post, and 1 fte vacancy reported. This means there were 25.77 fte posts, of which 4% were vacant. There were no TODs in training for the mandatory qualification or not in training or people who have not qualified as a teacher reported.

Changes in numbers of TODs

In terms of any noteworthy changes in numbers of TODs in specific roles:

- overall, the number of peripatetic TODs in employment has increased slightly by 0.2% from 622.77 in 2022 to 624.03 fte. Of these, the proportion with the mandatory qualification has fallen from 93% to 91% whilst the number in training has increased from 6% to 8%
- the number of TODs in employment in resource provisions has fallen by 3% from 313.97 to 303.22 fte
- the number of TODs in employment in special schools for deaf children has increased from 257.62 to 270.2 fte. However, this may be due in part to the inclusion of a new option in the survey for special schools to include people working in the TOD role but who were not qualified as teachers (12.5 fte were reported under this category). There also appears to be a fall in the number of qualified TODs working in special schools for deaf children (from 162.55 to 151.5 fte) alongside an increase in those in training (from 52.48 to 61.2 fte).

The following table looks at changes in the number of qualified TODs in employment and posts since 2011.

Unless specified, these and other tables in the sections that follow **do not** include TODs working in special schools for deaf children or cochlear implant programmes as this data, collected separately, has not been collected consistently by CRIDE over time.

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.

Table 17: Changes in numbers of TODs from year to year³⁰

	TODs with the mandatory qualification in employment (fte)	TODs with the mandatory qualification in employment or in training (fte)	Number of teachers working as TODs in employment (fte)	Number of vacant posts (fte)	Number of TOD posts (including vacancies) (fte)
2023	841.95	937.15	951.95	42	993.95
2022	860.34	945.14	960.74	43.1	1,003.84
2021 ³¹	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 18: Percentage change in numbers of TODs

	Percentage change over past 12 years (between 2011 and 2023)	Percentage change over past year (between 2022 and 2023)
TODs with the mandatory qualification in employment	-21%	-2%
TODs with the mandatory qualification in employment or in training	-19%	-1%
Number of teachers working as TODs in employment	-18%	-1%
Number of vacant posts	24%	-3%
Number of TOD posts (including vacancies)	-17%	-1%

In the 131 services for which we were able to compare figures, we found that 29% had seen an increase in the number of TODs in employment between 2022 and 2023, 47% had seen no change, while 24% had seen a decrease.

In terms of any difficulties in recruiting TODs or supply cover over the past 12 months:

- 32 services (25%) reported difficulties in recruiting for a permanent post
- 48 (37%) reported no difficulties
- 49 services (38%) stated that this question was not applicable to them.

- 29 services (24%) reported difficulties in recruiting for supply cover
- 15 (13%) reported no difficulties

³⁰ In 2017, we began to ask about TODs 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 TODs.

³¹ In 2022 one service reported that in 2021 13 TODs working in special schools for deaf children were included in their main CRIDE survey as working in special schools or colleges not specifically for deaf children and were therefore double counted. The 2021 data was adjusted for this, however in years prior to that ToDs working in schools for deaf children were also double counted and 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.

- 76 services (63%) stated that this question was not applicable to them.

Combining the figures, 46 services (35%) reported difficulties in recruiting to either permanent or supply posts. Comments from services around this included:

- lack of applicants
- lack of suitable candidates
- lack of qualified TODs
- services recruiting teachers and funding them to undertake the MQ
- difficulty covering maternity leave
- lack of applicants for manager posts
- cover provided by other TODs
- lack of applicants to vacancies in resource provisions, including lack of applicants with the MQ, lack of supply cover from TODs who can sign, and lack of applicants for supply and longer-term supply cover
- lack of applicants for leadership role in resource provision
- maternity cover in resource provisions not getting funded due to TOD hiring costs
- recruitment halted during service review/remodelling.

Regional figures

The tables below provide a regional perspective on numbers of TODs.

Table 19: Number of qualified TODs by region

Region	Number of TODs with the mandatory qualification in 2011 (fte)	Number of TODs with the mandatory qualification in 2022 (fte)	Number of TODs with the mandatory qualification in 2023 (fte)	Percentage change between 2011 and 2023	Percentage change between 2022 and 2023
East England	97.6	89.59	88.84	-9%	-1%
East Midlands ³²	87.6	52.8	56	-36%	6%
London	165.4	155	144.1	-13%	-7%
North East	57.5	46.4	44.65	-22%	-4%
North West ³³	191.96	123.1	125.65	-35%	2%
South East	142.15	122.1	118.91	-16%	-3%
South West	95.6	67.55	64.1	-33%	-5%
West Midlands	98.15	88.7	90.2	-8%	2%
Yorkshire & Humber	126.15	115.1	109.5	-13%	-5%
Total	1062.11	860.34	841.95	-21%	-2%

³² In 2022 one service in the East Midlands did not respond to the survey.

³³ 12 TODs with the mandatory qualification were inaccurately included by a service in the North West in 2021 and were likely to have been included in previous figures. These have not been removed from figures for 2011 due to uncertainty about the exact nature of the double counting prior to 2021.

Table 20: Number of qualified TODs and teachers in training for the mandatory qualification by region

Region	Number of qualified or trainee TODs in 2011 (fte)	Number of qualified or trainee TODs in 2022 (fte)	Number of qualified or trainee TODs in 2023 (fte)	Percentage change between 2011 and 2023	Percentage change between 2022 and 2023
East England	105.1	102.09	98.84	-6%	-3%
East Midlands ³⁴	95.4	58.8	67.4	-29%	15%
London	183.7	177.8	163.6	-11%	-8%
North East	62.6	49	50.05	-20%	2%
North West ³⁵	209.66	127.5	129.85	-38%	2%
South East	153.45	138	138.81	-10%	1%
South West	98.6	76.75	74.2	-25%	-3%
West Midlands	106.95	96	96.4	-10%	0%
Yorkshire & Humber	138.25	119.2	118	-15%	-1%
Total	1153.71	945.14	937.15	-19%	-1%

Additional qualifications held by TODs

Table 21: Additional post-graduate specialist qualification in early years support

	Number of teachers (fte)	Percentage	Number of services with staff in relevant category
Working mainly as a peripatetic TOD	59	96%	45
Working mainly in a resource provision	1.85	3%	3
Working mainly in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children or young people	0	0%	0
Working flexibly as a peripatetic TOD, in a resource provision and/or in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children or young people	0.6	1%	1
Total	61.45	100%	

This means that 6% of all TODs in post had an additional post-graduate specialist qualification in early years support. This has fallen from 2021 when there were 87.2 TODs with this qualification, 9% of the then total.

³⁴ In 2022 one service in the East Midlands did not respond to the survey.

³⁵ 12 TODs with the mandatory qualification were inaccurately included by a service in the North West in 2021 and were likely to have been included in previous figures. These have not been removed from figures for 2011 due to uncertainty about the exact nature of the double counting prior to 2021.

Table 22: Additional specialist qualification as educational audiologists

	Number of teachers	Percentage	Number of services with staff in relevant category
Working mainly as a peripatetic TOD	46.7	83%	51
Working mainly in a resource provision	5.4	10%	7
Working mainly in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children or young people	0	0%	0
Working flexibly as a peripatetic TOD, in a resource provision and/or in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children or young people	4	7%	4
Total	56.1	100%	

This means that 6% of all TODs in post had additional specialist qualifications as educational audiologists. This is similar to 2021, when there were 59.9 TODs with this qualification, 6% of the then total.

Age profile of peripatetic TODs

Services were asked about the age profile of TODs. This is in light of ongoing concerns that the number of newly recruited TODs is significantly lower than the number of TODs retiring from the profession.

The following table indicates that 350.2 (51%) of peripatetic TODs were aged 50 or over and hence likely to retire in the next 10 to 15 years. In 2021, this figure stood at 53%.

Table 23: Age profile of peripatetic TODs

	Number of peripatetic teachers (fte)	Percentage of total
Aged 49 or under	334.27	49%
Aged between 50 and 59	291.4	43%
Aged between 60 and 64	51.6	8%
Aged 65 or over	7.2	1%
Total	684.47	100%

Peripatetic TOD caseloads

This section looks at the theoretical or notional caseloads of each visiting (peripatetic) TOD 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)³⁶. 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 TODs than areas that are small and urban because of the need to allow for travel time
- areas in which there are specialist resource provisions or special schools may have fewer visiting TODs 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.

³⁶ Ratios were not calculated for two services. In 2022 ratios were not calculated for six services due to the data provided.

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 provision³⁷ by the number of visiting TODs³⁸ who are qualified or in training for the mandatory qualification.

We found that:

- each visiting TOD had a theoretical average caseload of 64 deaf children
- the highest theoretical caseload found was 190
- there were 36 services (28%) where each visiting TOD had a theoretical caseload of, on average, 80 or more deaf children, of which there were 15 services (12%) where there were, on average, 100 or more deaf children on the theoretical caseload.

The theoretical average caseload is up slightly from 2022 when each peripatetic TOD had a theoretical average caseload of 63 deaf children.

Other specialist staff

We found that there were 638.6 fte specialist support staff, other than TODs, employed by services, supporting deaf children. There were 39.95 fte vacant post reported. This means there were 678.55 specialist staff posts, of which 6% were vacant.

³⁷ 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.

³⁸ TODs included are TODs either with the MQ or in training for the MQ, reported as working mainly in the peripatetic service or working flexibly as a peripatetic TOD, in a resource provision and/or in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children or young people.

Table 24: 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 (TAs)/ Classroom support assistants (CSAs) etc	358.65 (97%)	74	10.44 (3%)	14	369.09 (100%)
Communication support workers (CSWs)/ Communicators etc	141.8 (91%)	26	13.45 (9%)	9	155.25 (100%)
NRCPD registered BSL/English interpreters	5.6 (88%)	6	0.8 (13%)	2	6.4 (100%)
Deaf instructors/Deaf role models/Sign language instructors etc	53.72 (91%)	40	5.3 (9%)	8	59.02 (100%)
Educational audiologists/Audiologists in Education who do not also hold a qualification as a TOD	5.6 (100%)	8	0 (0%)	0	5.6 (100%)
Technicians et al.	24.66 (85%)	25	4.3 (15%)	5	28.96 (100%)
Speech and language therapists	8 (94%)	11	0.5 (6%)	1	8.5 (100%)
Family support workers/Liaison officers	7.24 (85%)	13	1.3 (15%)	3	8.54 (100%)
Social workers/Social workers for deaf children	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
Other	33.33 (90%)	29	3.86 (10%)	5	37.19 (100%)
Total of figures given	638.6 (94%)		39.95 (6%)		678.55 (100%)

Other roles included:

- Specialist nursery nurse/Specialist early years educator/Early years development worker
- Portage home visitor
- Specialist HI assistant/Specialist learning mentor/Specialist teaching assistant
- RP specialist practitioner
- Qualified teacher of MSI
- MSI intervenor/support worker
- Sensory support specialist/practitioner/worker/Sensory impairment advisor
- Deaf access and inclusion worker
- Habilitation specialist
- Higher level teaching assistant
- Bilingual teaching assistant
- Graphic visualiser
- Transition coordinator
- Wellbeing officer

- Midday supervisor
- Administrative/business support roles

Services also reported using teaching assistants from agencies or commissioning staff such as technicians or sign language tutors on a needs basis or a specific number of days a year.

The number of posts is down from 732.14 fte in 2022. In terms of fte changes since 2021 to the three most common roles:

- TAs/CSAs etc – down from 429.2 to 369.09
- CSWs/Communicators etc – down from 150.99 to 149.12
- Deaf instructors/Deaf role models/Sign language instructors etc – up from 54.21 to 59.02

Services were then asked about the British Sign Language (BSL) qualifications of any TAs/CSAs etc. and CSAs/Communicators etc. (those included in the first two rows in the previous table).

Table 25: BSL qualifications of TAs/CSAs etc. and CSWs/Communicators etc.

	Number of other specialist staff directly employed by the service (in fte)	Percentage
No formal qualification in BSL and not a first language BSL user	46.24	9%
Level 1 BSL or equivalent	95.15	19%
Level 2 BSL or equivalent	187.71	37%
Level 3 BSL or equivalent	116.99	23%
Level 4 BSL or equivalent	12.43	2%
Level 6 BSL or equivalent	34.2	7%
First language BSL user	21.48	4%
Total of figures given	514.2 ³⁹	

514.2 is the total of the broken-down figures given by services. The sum of the totals was 341.99. Both these figures differ from the 495.32 TAs and CSWs etc. in post reported in the earlier question on other specialist staff directly employed by services. This data should therefore be used with caution. Comments on BSL qualifications of other specialist staff included:

- difficulty finding TAs with appropriate GCSEs in English and Maths and BSL
- schools have difficulty recruiting CSWs/TAs with BSL level 2 or above so usually it is level 1
- service reported a struggle to recruit appropriately qualified CSWs for school resource bases and for the traded post-16 team in FE
- several services reported staff working towards the next BSL level qualification
- some staff with no formal qualification in BSL do not work with any children or young people requiring sign support, other staff have BSL qualifications
- service reported no children using BSL. Staff in the service use signalong/SSE to support language
Another service reported very few children and young people who use BSL in the area covered by the service
- service reported that staff also hold Edexcel BTEC level award in signing with babies and young children
- service reported that TAs receive ongoing BSL tuition/support from a Family Support Worker/BSL instructor

³⁹ 514.2 is the sum of the broken-down figures. The sum of totals provided by services was 341.99.

- an expectation for staff who do not have BSL level 2 or 3 to undertake this, and they are expected to work with a BSL tutor as needed
- service reporting it hopes to offer a BSL Level 3 course to staff and interested families
- service stated that BSL is a development area.

The National Deaf Children's Society recommends that deaf children who use BSL are supported by staff with **at least** a level 3 qualification in BSL. The figures in the previous table indicate that 36% of relevant TAs and CSWs hold a level 3 or higher qualification or are a first language BSL user.

PART 3: Post-16 support

Young people who have left school

115 services⁴⁰ reported that 1,730 deaf young people had left school at the end of the 2021/22 academic year⁴¹. We believe this figure to be lower than the number we would expect to be leaving school. For example, we saw earlier that there were at least 16,488 secondary-aged deaf children, suggesting there were approximately around 3,298 in each year. We also found (as reported by 112 services⁴²) that 1,003 young people had a transition plan informed by a TOD (58% of the reported deaf young people who had left school).

Careers advice

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

Table 26: Support on careers advice and moving into employment

Category	Yes (number and percentage of services)	No (number and percentage of services)	Not sure (number and percentage of services)	Total
Engaging with careers advisors in schools on careers advice to deaf young people	85 (65%)	36 (27%)	10 (8%)	131 ⁴³ (100%)
Engaging with careers advisors in colleges on careers advice to deaf young people	61 (47%)	61 (47%)	8 (6%)	130 ⁴⁴ (100%)
Provision of advice on the accessibility of work placements being undertaken by deaf young people	90 (69%)	29 (22%)	11 (8%)	130 ⁴⁵ (100%)
Provision of information to deaf young people about the support available through the Access to Work scheme for employment support	105 (80%)	17 (13%)	9 (7%)	131 ⁴⁶ (100%)
Provision of information to deaf young people about their rights under the Equality Act to reasonable adjustments in the workplace	101 (77%)	20 (15%)	10 (8%)	131 ⁴⁷ (100%)

Comparing with figures from the 2022 report there has been an increase in the proportion of services:

- providing information on the accessibility of work placements (68% to 69%)
- providing information on Access to Work (78% to 80%).

There has been a decrease in the proportion of services:

⁴⁰ Five of the 115 services reported no young people, 17 services did not provide a figure for this question.

⁴¹ In this context, leave school meant those who had moved onto further education, higher education, employment, training, etc. from any point after the age of 16 and who were no longer being educated in a school. Young people in sixth form were regarded as still being in school.

⁴² 17 of the 112 services reported no young people.

⁴³ One service did not answer this question.

⁴⁴ Two services did not answer this question.

⁴⁵ Two services did not answer this question.

⁴⁶ One service did not answer this question.

⁴⁷ One service did not answer this question.

- engaging with careers advisors in schools (70% to 65%)
- engaging with careers advisors in colleges (53% to 47%)
- providing information on the Equality Act and reasonable adjustments (78% to 77%).

PART 4: Support provided

Table 27: Where services are based

	Number of services	Percentage
Based in the local authority	113	86%
Based in a school with a resource provision	6	5%
Based in a special school for deaf children	1	1%
Based in a special school not specifically for deaf children	5	4%
Provided by another body or organisation	3	2%
Other	4	3%
Total	132	

Other arrangements included:

- early years TOD is based in the local authority whilst primary and secondary TOD is based in a school with a resource provision
- service is dual-funded with part of the service based in the local authority and part of the service commissioned by the local authority and based in a special school not specifically for deaf children
- delegated to a primary School in the local authority
- joint arrangement between six local authorities hosted by a not for profit organisation on behalf of the lead local authority.

Heads of services

We asked if peripatetic TODs in the service were managed by someone who is a qualified TOD or in training for the mandatory qualification. 94 services (71%) stated that they were, and 38 services (29%) stated that they were not.

Where services were not managed by a qualified TOD or TOD in training, we asked for the role of the person who was managing the service. Answers included:

- Interim Head of inclusion
- Head of SEN support
- Service Manager Peripatetic Teams
- Early Years SEND and Advisory Services Manager
- Lead for Specialist Teaching Advisory and Autism
- Principal Educational Psychologist
- Qualified specialist teacher specialising in complex medical and physical disabilities
- Specialist teacher of children with language and communication difficulties
- Specialist SEND Teacher
- Lead teacher - Autism
- Qualified teacher of vision impaired children
- Head of Service who is TVI in training
- Head teacher of primary school
- Ex headteacher with MA in Special Education
- Qualified teacher with the NASENCO award
- Qualified teacher with a post graduate certificate in Special Education

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 28: Number of resource provisions⁴⁸

	Managed by the local authority	Managed by the schools	Total
Resource provisions for primary-aged children	43.5	85	128.5
Resource provisions for secondary-aged children	35.5	63	98.5
Total	79	148	227

We found that:

- 89 services (67%) had at least one resource provision for primary-aged children in their area
- 78 services (59%) had at least one resource provision for secondary-aged children in their area.

The total of 227 resource provisions across England is a decrease of 3 (all primary aged resource provisions) from 2022 when the survey identified 230 resource provisions. Comments on resource provisions included:

- one service stated that two previous resource provisions merged into one resource provision since CRIDE 2022
- some services stated that children can access resource provisions in neighbouring authorities
- some services commented that resource provisions had low numbers, or no children attending
- one service commented that being in rural area makes it difficult to operate a resource provision, and that families prefer for children and young people to attend local schools with tailored support.

Table 29: Number of resource provisions over time

Year	Number of resource provisions
2023	227
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 number of deaf children.⁴⁹ 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 was one resource provision for every 200 deaf children. This has changed from 2022 when there was one resource provision for every 197 deaf children.

⁴⁸ 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.

⁴⁹ The overall total given by services is used here.

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

Table 30: Population of deaf children covered by each resource provision

Region	Average ratio
East England	161:1
East Midlands	320:1
London	151:1
North East	190:1
North West	263:1
South East	119:1
South West	265:1
West Midlands	383:1
Yorkshire & Humber	238:1
England	200:1

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

Eligibility frameworks

124 services (94% of services) reported that they used the NatSIP Eligibility Framework for Scoring Support Levels (2017) to help determine the level of support provided by TODs to children. Eight services (6% of services) said they did not.

114 services (86% of services) said they used the NatSIP Eligibility Framework for scoring support levels for deaf children from birth to the end of F1 (Nursery) (2019) to determine the level of support provided by TODs to pre-school deaf children. 18 services (14% of services) said they did not.

Support allocations

We asked if there had been any changes to their support allocation between the 2021/22 and 2022/23 academic years. 21 services (16%) reported that there had been changes whilst 111 (84%) reported that there had been no changes. Comments on changes included the following:

Positive changes:

- Post 16 offer improved
- Increase in capacity due to increase in posts.
- Service now actively supporting children and young people with mild-moderate hearing loss.
- Service now providing booster provision for some children with conductive losses impacted during covid (language delay).

Negative changes:

- Some allocations reviewed/adjusted due to staffing issues/recruitment to vacant post.
- Having to adjust the frequency of visits due to frozen post/maternity leave/long term sickness.
- Support to children monitored reduced to fit the monitoring caseloads into available time.

Other changes mentioned:

- Local NatSIP banding reviewed to reflect need
- A slight change to service criteria.
- Some students requiring extra support and advice.
- An end to support in further education as the demand is now met within the college/FE placements and we are no longer bought in therefore the service came to a natural end.
- Changes to support for school age children with unilateral losses who are managing hearing loss and equipment well.
- Support allocations decided using the eligibility criteria. Some children had support reduced and some had support increased according to need.
- A service reviews support allocation 3 times per year and change the offer to every child and young person according to their scores, whilst continuing to be able to offer and meet all of the NATSIP allocation scores.
- Sensory support is now described in 'a minimum of X hours support per year' and not in tiers.
- Updated banding descriptors to better support deaf students following the guidance from national quality standards.
- Using NATSIP criteria to categorise, prioritise and allocate hours based on need.

Outcomes

We asked services if they collected data on educational outcomes achieved by deaf children at the end of Key Stage 4:

- nine services (7% of services) said they did, for all deaf children living in the local authority or authorities covered by their service
- 47 services (36% of services) said they did, but only for children who receive support from the service
- 76 services (58% of services) said they did not.

The proportion of services reporting that they do not collect outcomes data has increased from 43% in 2021.

Of the services that collect this data 13 services (23%) reported that they shared it with the Children's Hearing Services Working Group (CHSWG) in their area whereas 43 services (77%) did not.

Some comments around this included:

- data collected for children in resource provisions
- service relying on education providers or students sharing their information/data difficult to collect as some education establishments will not release data
- data not shared with CHSWG, but data is shared with partners who are part of CHSWG
- data not shared with CHSWG because low numbers could potentially make children identifiable
- data not shared. Outcomes discussed in general as part of wider conversations
- data not shared previously but service plans to do so
- teams need to be fully staffed to undertake the extra data collections which are so valuable for informing practice.

Quality standards

The following table sets out the quality standards or resources that services told us they use to audit or improve practice.

Table 31: Quality standards and resources used by services

	Number of services	Percentage of services
NatSIP: Quality Standards for Sensory Support Services in England	120	91%
NDCS Quality Standards: Early years support for children with a hearing loss, aged 0 to 5 (England)	101	77%
Newborn hearing screening programme quality standards	76	58%
NatSIP Quality Improvement Support Pack	64	48%
Department of Health: Deafblind People: Guidance for local authorities	19	14%
Other	24	18%

When services answered ‘other’, they were asked to specify. Answers included:

- internal stakeholder surveys/feedback from service users and settings/pupil consultation
- NatSIP and NDCS Quality Standards for resource provisions for deaf children and young people in mainstream schools
- NDCS and UK Children’s Working Group Quality Standards for the use of personal radio aids
- Success From the Start
- MESH Guidelines
- RCSLT and BATOD Best Practice Guide: Collaborative Working between Qualified Teachers of the Deaf and Speech and Language Therapists
- Manchester University Audiology Guide
- How Good is Our Service; Scottish Sensory Service (2019)
- MSI Documentation
- BATOD guidance and conferences
- Ewing Foundation Training
- engagement with HOSS, DeafED forums
- Teacher Standards
- SEND Code of Practice 2015
- Mandatory qualification standards.

We then asked services if they had shared the findings of any such audits or any work they had done in relation to the above quality standards with the CHSWG in their areas over the past year. 54 services (41%) said they had, 76 services (58%) said they hadn’t and two services (2%) said there was no CHSWG in the area.

PART 5: Support following identification of deafness

We asked services how many referrals they received over the calendar year of 2022.

Table 32: Referrals

	Number and percentage of referrals	Number of services ⁵⁰
For children identified as deaf through the newborn hearing screening programme	1,084 (18%)	122
For children identified as deaf outside of the newborn hearing programme and before they had started statutory education	1,336 (22%)	121
For children identified as deaf outside of the newborn hearing programme and after they had started statutory education	3,617 (60%)	127
Total of figures given	6,037 ⁵¹ (100%)	

In terms of changes since 2022:

- the proportion of referrals through the newborn hearing screening programme has fallen from 19% to 18%
- outside newborn hearing screening and before statutory education has remained at 22%
- outside newborn hearing screening and after statutory education has increased from 58% to 60%
- the total number of referrals over the calendar year has increased from 5,189 to 6,073.

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, 971 of the families were contacted⁵² by a TOD within 2 working days. This amounts to 90% of the 1,084 children referred via this route. The corresponding figure was 89% in 2022
- of the referrals for children identified as deaf outside of the newborn hearing screening programme and before they had started statutory education, 1,130 of the families were contacted by a TOD within 5 working days. This amounts to 85% of the 1,336 children referred via this route. The corresponding figure was 75% in 2022
- of the referrals for children identified as deaf outside of the newborn hearing screening programme and after they had started statutory education, 2,716 of the families were contacted by a TOD within 5 working days. This amounts to 75% of the 3,617 children referred via this route. The corresponding figure was 66% in 2022

⁵⁰ This is the number of services that provided a figure over 0.

⁵¹ 6,037 was the sum of the figures given. The sum of totals provided by services was 5,899.

⁵² For these questions on contact we mean actual or attempted contact.

- 3,129 families were offered a visit (either face-to-face or virtually) from a TOD within 10 working days of any referral. This amounts to 52% of the 6,037 children referred either through or outside the newborn hearing screening programme. The corresponding figure was 55% in 2022.

Comments from services on this included:

- some services have their own timescales for visits
- contact with families was attempted, but not made within the timescales
- families are visited after hearing aid fitting
- families may choose not to engage with the service, or may engage outside of the timescales
- families may not be contacted within the timescales due to school holidays/schools not responding/administrative delays/when a referral has gone to a part time member of staff
- face to face visit may not be appropriate for parents coming to terms with their child's hearing loss
- school age children are visited at school and not at home. Families are not necessarily present at the first visit
- new referrals for school aged and some pre-school include children with conductive deafness. This can include one off advice being sent or given by the team depending on need of child or young person
- insufficient staffing levels to meet demand, do not meet criteria for visit schedules
- this does not show what families were offered, nor does it show when a visit was made within 10 days to a setting.

PART 6: 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, BATOD Cymru, Frank Barnes School for Deaf Children, National Deaf Children’s Society, UCL, University of Edinburgh, former heads of services or 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 2023 survey was the standard version.

The survey was disseminated to services in England in February 2023 by National Deaf Children’s Society staff on behalf of CRIDE. Where there was no response by 15 March, members of CRIDE contacted services by email and/or telephone. Where services had not responded after this, Freedom of Information requests were sent. The table below sets out the response rate at each stage.

Table 33: Response rate by services to the CRIDE survey

	Number of responses	Cumulative total
First deadline – 15 March 2023	119	119
Second deadline following chasers	8	127
FOI requests	5	132

Services were able to respond by completing an online survey. If they were not able to do this, they could complete a Word document version 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.

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 2023.

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

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	TODs in the specialist peripatetic service	TODs in resource provisions (RPs)	TODs mainly in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children and young people	TODs working flexibly	Average population of deaf children covered by each resource provision
<i>East of England</i>								
Bedford Borough	205	230	17	2.5	No RPs reported	0	0	205:0
Cambridgeshire	435	435	None reported	8.6	2	0	0	218:1
Central Bedfordshire	181	178	None reported	1.6	2.8	None reported	None reported	60:1
Essex	1050	860	16	10.8	15.3	0	0	131:1
Hertfordshire	860	610	0	9.2	2	None reported	None reported	430:1
Luton ⁱ	443	80 ⁱⁱ	0	1.8	2	None reported	0.8	222:1
Norfolk	658	658	0	11.1	3.8	0.4	0	165:1
Peterborough	296	230	14	4.8	0 ⁱⁱⁱ	0	0	148:1
Southend	136	136*	<5	1	No RPs reported	None reported	None reported	136:0
Suffolk	441	450	9	7.42	4.72	0	0	88:1
Thurrock	121	118*	<5	2	4.2	None reported	None reported	61:1
<i>East Midlands</i>								
Derby City	554	130*	<5	3.3	2.7	0	0	277:1
Derbyshire	403	612	None reported	7.2	1.6	0	0	101:1
Leicester City	316	345	None reported	6	No RPs reported	None reported	None reported	316:0
Leicestershire and Rutland	650	431	12	7.4	0.8	0	0	650:1

Lincolnshire	212	212	None reported	7	No RPs reported	0	0	212:0
North Northamptonshire and West Northamptonshire	802	802	None reported	12.1	1.8	0	0	401:1
Nottingham City	217	194	0	5.2	4.6	0	0	109:1
Nottinghamshire	368	470	None reported	7.7	No RPs reported	None reported	None reported	368:0
London								
Barking and Dagenham	176	176	17	1.8	6	0	0	59:1
Barnet	338	227	0	2.6	3.8	0	0	169:1
Bexley	256	264*	<5	1	0 ^{iv}	0	0	256:1
Brent	278	194	17	3.2	3	None reported	None reported	139:1
Bromley	267	250	11	4.1	4.3	0	0	134:1
Camden	150	164	9	1.8	No RPs reported	0	0	150:0
Croydon	404	237*	<5	6.4	1.6	0	0	404:1
Ealing	295	152	8	2.1	0 ^v	0	None reported	148:1
Greenwich	260	200	None reported	2.6	7.4	0	0	87:1
Hackney	290	343	12	4	1	None reported	None reported	290:1
Hammersmith & Fulham	88	88	0	1.4	No RPs reported	None reported	None reported	88:0
Haringey and Enfield	496	396	0	4.8	2	0	0	248:1
Harrow	220	304	64	3.3	1.6	0	0	110:1
Havering	218	223	5	1	2.65	0	0	218:1
Hillingdon	317	202	11	2.4	2.8	0	0	159:1
Hounslow	232	253	11	2	7.8	0	0	77:1
Islington	201	147	6	1.6	7.2	0	0	201:1
Lambeth	298	196	0	2.9	2	0	0	149:1

Lewisham	191	135	35	3.2	1	None reported	None reported	96:1
Merton	137	204	40	1.6	No RPs reported	0	0	137:0
Newham	393	397	17	4.8	3.8	0	0	197:1
Redbridge	291	266	5	3.7	5	None reported	None reported	146:1
Richmond and Kingston	263	263	7	1.8	1.6	0	0	88:1
Southwark	262	287	0	3.3	0.8	None reported	None reported	262:1
Sutton	189	234	18	1.5	1	0	0	95:1
Tower Hamlets	470	384	26	5.3	5.45	0	1	157:1
Waltham Forest	175	175	0	3	0 ^{vi}	0	0	88:1
Wandsworth	261	300	80	5.3	3.6	0	0	131:1
Westminster and Kensington & Chelsea	155	196	9	3.7	1	None reported	None reported	155:1
North East								
Darlington	87	77	0	1.7	No RPs reported	None reported	None reported	87:0
Durham	443	321	None reported	3.7	2.5	0	0	222:1
Gateshead	192	192	None reported	3.3	0 ^{vii}	0	0	192:1
Middlesbrough, Stockton, Hartlepool, Redcar and Cleveland	691	707	0	6.4	5	0	0	173:1
Newcastle upon Tyne	227	254	19	2.8	6.2	0	0	76:1
North Tyneside	114	141	27	3.2	No RPs reported	0	0	114:0
Northumberland	214	175	18	7.2	No RPs reported	0	0	214:0
South Tyneside	124	152	21	4.5	No RPs reported	None reported	None reported	124:0
Sunderland	183	206	41	3.05	0.5	0	0	92:1

North West								
Blackburn with Darwen	147	153	37	2.5	3	0	0	74:1
Blackpool	82	94	13	1.6	No RPs reported	1	None reported	82:0
Bolton	372	245	7	4	No RPs reported	0	0	372:0
Bury	254	254	41	3.5	1.4	None reported	None reported	254:1
Cheshire East	314	337	62	5.9	2	0	0	79:1
Cheshire West and Chester	225	220	0	5.3	No RPs reported	0	0	225:0
Cumbria	191	191	8	3.55	0 ^{viii}	0	0	96:1
Halton	95	110	15	3	No RPs reported	None reported	None reported	95:0
Knowsley	93	107	12	2	No RPs reported	0	0	93:0
Lancashire	1,029	673	None reported	9.9	3	None reported	None reported	515:1
Liverpool	290	295*	<5	4.8	4.8	0	0	145:1
Manchester	584	710	89	0	0	0	14.4	195:1
Oldham	362	386	66	5.1	2	0	0	362:1
Rochdale	220	220	64	4	2	None reported	None reported	110:1
Salford	240	240	109	5	No RPs reported	0	0	240:0
Sefton	194	205	0	3.3	No RPs reported	0	0	194:0
St Helens	131	97*	<5	2	No RPs reported	0	0	131:0
Stockport	309	332	None reported	3.7	4.9	0	0	155:1
Tameside	201	201	None reported	2.6	None reported	None reported	2	101:1

Trafford	214	395	80	6.2	No RPs reported	None reported	None reported	214:0
Warrington	160	213	52	1.6	No RPs reported	None reported	None reported	160:0
Wigan	191	235	44	5.6	No RPs reported	0	0	191:0
Wirral	408	304	41	4.2	0 ^{ix}	0	0	408:1
South East								
Berkshire Consortium (West Berkshire, Reading, Bracknell Forest, Wokingham, Windsor and Maidenhead and Slough)	852	714	None reported	13.71	7.9	0.2	0	170:1
Brighton and Hove	194	236	42	3.8	1.6	0	0	194:1
Buckinghamshire	343	381	60	5.8	3.6	None reported	0	114:1
East Sussex	409	424	23	4.8	5	0	0	102:1
Hampshire	846	1,037	222	7.4	4.4	0	0	141:1
Isle of Wight	83	83	8	2.5	No RPs reported	None reported	None reported	83:0
Kent	442	453	0	12.4	7.9	1	0	55:1
Medway	196	181	0	2	3.4	0	0	98:1
Milton Keynes	336	362	26	2.3	1	None reported	0.7	168:1
Oxfordshire	No data	715	None reported	10.3	2.8	0	1	No data
Portsmouth	150	191	41	2.2	0 ^x	0	0	75:1
Southampton	241	320	79	2	1.8	0	0.2	121:1
Surrey	756	756	184	10.8	6.9	0	0	151:1
West Sussex	737	276	39	5.4	4	0	0	184:1
South West								

Bath & NE Somerset, Bristol, North Somerset and South Gloucester	863	714	117	10	4.7	None reported	None reported	123:1
Cornwall	248 ^{xi}	248	None reported	10.3	No RPs reported	0	0	248:0
Devon	820	883	63	7.7	0 ^{xii}	0	0	410:1
Dorset, and Bournemouth, Christchurch and Pool (BCP)	783	859	56	9.8	No RPs reported	0	0	783:0
Gloucestershire	388	406	13	4.6	No RPs reported	0	0	388:0
Plymouth	194	212	19	2	3.2	0	0	97:1
Somerset	232	232	16	7.5	No RPs reported	0	0	232:0
Swindon	265	308	74	4.2	0.6	0	0	265:1
Torbay	114	123	7	1.2	1.1	0	0	57:1
Wiltshire	330	343	64	5.6	1.7	0	0	165:1
<i>West Midlands</i>								
Birmingham	1,500	652	6	12.8	9.4	0	0	300:1
Coventry	411	411	None reported	4.4	2.2	0.6	0	206:1
Dudley	269	372	99	3	4.8	0	0	135:1
Herefordshire	171	203	18	3.2	No RPs reported	0	0	171:0
Sandwell	275	355	64	5.6	2	0	0	138:1
Solihull	256	223	16	2.5	No RPs reported	None reported	None reported	256:0
Staffordshire	699	627	None reported	11.6	No RPs reported	0	0	699:0
Stoke-on-Trent	326	296	25	4	1.8	0	0	326:1
Telford & Wrekin and Shropshire	587	731	144	7.1	No RPs reported	0	1	587:0
Walsall	257	273	42	3.3	1.1	0	0	257:1

Warwickshire	318	429	58	5	No RPs reported	0	0	318:0
Wolverhampton	211	263	44	3.6	2.8	0	0	106:1
Worcestershire	462	235	35	4.6	No RPs reported	0	0	462:0
<i>Yorkshire and the Humber</i>								
Barnsley	134	182	31	2	No RPs reported	0	0	134:0
Bradford	828	832	55	7.8	9.8	0	0	276:1
Calderdale	154	332	178	3	No RPs reported	0	0	154:0
City of York	141	160	0	2.8	0 ^{xiii}	0	0	141:1
Doncaster	355	351*	<5	5.2	3.2	0	0	178:0
East Riding of Yorkshire	132	168	21	2.9	No RPs reported	0	0	132:1
Hull	204	215	0	4	4	0	0	102:1
Kirklees	403	395	137	4.5	4.1	0	0	202:1
Leeds	1,149	1,149	0	12.2	4.2	0	0	575:1
North East Lincolnshire	82	120	38	1.8	No RPs reported	0	0	82:0
North Lincolnshire	112	114	None reported	1.6	1	0	0	112:1
North Yorkshire	322	353	26	3.8	No RPs reported	None reported	None reported	322:0
Rotherham	414	414	None reported	5.3	4.5	0	0	207:1
Sheffield	525	641	120	10.6	12.3	None reported	None reported	105:0
Wakefield	274	393	119	4.4	3	0	0	137:1

ⁱ The information for Luton was provided by the primary and secondary services unless otherwise stated.

-
- ⁱⁱ This figure is for the children supported by the primary service only.
 - ⁱⁱⁱ It was reported that the settings have visiting QTOD support.
 - ^{iv} At the time of the response there was a 0.6fte post vacant in the resource provision.
 - ^v At the time of the response the local authority TOD was overseeing each resource provision.
 - ^{vi} There are resource provisions in Waltham Forest, but the information on TODs in the resource provisions wasn't included in the response.
 - ^{vii} At the time of the response there were no pupils accessing the resource provision.
 - ^{viii} There are resource provisions in Cumbria, but the information on TODs in the resource provisions wasn't included in the response.
 - ^{ix} It was reported that the peripatetic service provides TOD support to the resource provision.
 - ^x Low numbers of children in the resource provisions.
 - ^{xi} This figure is taken from figures given in answer to other questions about children living in the area. The figure was initially reported as 0.
 - ^{xii} At the time of the response one of the resource provisions bought TOD support from the local authority.
 - ^{xiii} It was reported that there is no TOD permanently on site at the resource provision, but children receive TOD visits as determined by NatSIP eligibility criteria.