



Consortium for Research in Deaf Education

2013 report for Wales

CRIDE report on 2013 survey on educational provision for deaf children in Wales

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 year¹. This report sets out the results of the survey for Wales 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 at least 2,904 deaf children in Wales; a reported increase of 6% since 2012. This is likely to be due to improved reporting.
- 85% of deaf children attend mainstream schools where there is no specialist provision.
- 16% of deaf children are recorded as having an additional special educational need. The most common additional need appears to be moderate learning difficulties.
- Around 5% of deaf children have at least one cochlear implant.
- Around 81% of deaf children communicate using spoken English only, and around 9% communicate using spoken Welsh only. Around 6% use sign language in some form, either on its own or alongside spoken English, and 0.5% use spoken Welsh with sign language.
- There are at least 74.5 (FTE) Teachers of the Deaf in employment.
- Teachers of the Deaf in resource provisions are proportionally less likely to have the mandatory qualification in teaching deaf children, compared to peripatetic Teachers of the Deaf.
- 56% of services that answered were able to provide Teacher of the Deaf peripatetic support through the medium of Welsh as required, and 44% were not able to. In resource provisions, 40% of services that answered were able to provide Teacher of the Deaf support through the medium of Welsh as required, and 58% were not.
- There are at least 83.4 (FTE) other specialist support staff working with deaf children in Wales, a 2% increase since last year.

Responses were received from 17 services in Wales, covering 22 authority areas. This means that this CRIDE survey achieved a response rate of 100%. The response rate is the same as last year.

¹ Reports from 2012 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.

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 concerns.
- 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 children will find the report interesting 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 National Assembly debates and answers to Assembly questions, showing it is being used within the Welsh Government to aid their own understanding of deaf children in Wales. 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 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 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.

Please note that where the number of deaf children for any category is fewer than 5, we have shown '<5'. This is to avoid any risk of individual children being identified.

Contents

This report has 7 parts, as set out below:

PART 1: Overall number of deaf children in Wales ("belonging")	3
PART 2: Number of deaf children supported.....	9
PART 3: Teachers of the Deaf	13
PART 4: Other specialist staff	17
PART 5: Eligibility criteria and funding arrangements	20
PART 6: Concluding thoughts	24
PART 7: Background and methodology	25
Annex A: Numbers of deaf children belonging by service	26
Annex B: Provision and support for children with temporary deafness.....	27

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

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

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; some 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 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 possible³. Where we have done this, we refer to this as the “adjusted total” throughout this report.

Based on responses from 17 services covering 22 local authorities, the adjusted total number of deaf children in Wales is 2,904. This is up from 2,743 in 2011/12, and 2,755 in 2010/11. This amounts to an overall 5% increase 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
Adjusted total	2,904
Total given when asked how many children overall	2,901
Total given when asked about number of children, broken down by age group	2,904
Total given when asked about number of children, broken down by level of deafness (including ‘Level of deafness not known’)	2,899
Total given when asked about number of children, broken down by educational setting	2,901

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

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 stability within the data set.

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

³ 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.

Table 2: Number of children belonging, by age

Age group	Number of deaf children reported	Percentage of total
Preschool	308	11%
Primary	1,630	56%
Secondary	842	29%
Young people in maintained sixth forms (years 12 to 13)	109	4%
Young people in education who have completed year 11 but not in maintained sixth forms (e.g. in FE, apprenticeships, other)	15	1%
Total (n=16)	2,904	

Looking at the number of reported 'post 16' deaf young people, 4 services (24% 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.) 14 services (82% 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)
Unilateral	334	12%
Mild	920	32%
Moderate	1,061	37%
Severe	281	10%
Profound	286	10%
Total not including 'Not known' (n=16)	2,882	
Not known	17	

Annex A lists individual responses by services to this question.

Table 4: Number of children, belonging by educational setting

Type of educational provision		Number of deaf children	Percentage of total
In local authority	Supported at home – pre-school children	255	8.8%
	Supported at home – of school age and home educated	5	0.2%
	Mainstream state funded schools	2,127	73.3%
	Mainstream independent (non state funded) schools (e.g. Eton)	13	0.4%
	Resource provision in mainstream schools	190	6.5%
	Other special schools, not specifically for deaf children	163	5.6%
	School sixth forms (including special schools)	77	2.7%
	All other post 16 provision	14	0.5%
Out of local authority	Mainstream state funded schools	17	0.6%
	Mainstream independent (non state funded) schools	<5	<0.2%
	Resource provision in mainstream schools	<5	<0.2%
	Special schools for deaf pupils (maintained and non-maintained)	22	0.8%
	Other special school, not specifically for deaf children	8	0.3%
	School sixth forms (including special schools)	0	0%
	All other post 16 provision	0	0%
Other	NEET (Not in education, employment or training) (Post 16 only)	0	0%
	Other (e.g. Pupil referral units)	<5	<0.2%
	Not known	0	0%
Total (unadjusted) (n=16)		2,901	

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')	Percentage of total
In home local authority	98%
Out of home local authority	2%

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 and other)
Supported at home – pre-school	255	8.8%	-
Supported at home – of school age and home educated	5	0.2%	0.2%
Mainstream provision (including independent schools)	2,159	74.4%	84.6%
Mainstream provision: resource provision	194	6.7%	7.7%
Special schools for deaf pupils	22	0.8%	0.8%
Other special schools	171	5.9%	6.7%
All post 16 provision including school sixth forms, FE, apprenticeships, etc.	91	3.2%	-
Other (e.g. Pupil referral units, NEET, home educated, not known)	<5	<0.2%	-
Total (n=16)	2,901		
Total (excluding pre-school children and young people post 16 and 'other')	2,551		

New categories⁴ 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 from last year's survey. It remains a challenge to establish discrete categories without overcomplicating the survey.

The CRIDE 2013 results suggest that 85% of school aged deaf children are in mainstream settings without specialist provision (excluding sixth forms). The smallest service reported 63 deaf children belonging in their boundaries. The largest reported 1,053 deaf children. The average number of deaf children belonging in each service was 171.

Incidence of Auditory Neuropathy Spectrum Disorder (ANSD)

11 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 23 deaf children in Wales with this condition, 0.4% of all deaf children (adjusted total).

The highest percentage of ANSD in a single service was 5.5%. The average number of children with ANSD in each service that responded to the survey was around 2.

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. Wales was the first

⁴ 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)'

country in the UK to introduce universal newborn hearing screening in 2003. 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 2003, 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)

Services were asked to tell us how many children (of their total ‘belonging’) had an additional special educational need (as defined by the SEN Code of Practice) as a secondary need, and how many had an another special educational need as a primary need.

Table 7: Additional special education needs as secondary need or primary need

	Total number of children	As a percentage of total ‘belonging’	Number of services who gave an answer
Children and young people with an additional special educational need as a “secondary need”?	222	7.6%	12
Children and young people with another special educational as their “primary need”? (i.e. deafness is their secondary or other need)	235	8.1%	13
Totals	457	15.7%	

This means that overall, 14 services (82%) were able to tell us how many deaf children had an additional SEN (as defined by the SEN Code of Practice). The figures show that the overall adjusted total number of deaf children with an additional SEN is 457. This is 15.7% of the adjusted total of deaf children, which is an increase from 14% in 2011/12.

Services were asked to give a breakdown by type of additional special educational need. 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 (337). 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
Specific Learning Difficulty	8	2%	0.3%
Moderate Learning Difficulty	76	23%	2.6%
Severe Learning Difficulty	73	22%	2.5%
Profound & Multiple Learning Difficulty	45	13%	1.5%
Behaviour, Emotional & Social Difficulties	10	3%	0.3%
Speech, Language and Communications Needs	25	7%	0.9%
Visual Impairment	7	2%	0.2%
Multi-Sensory Impairment	37	11%	1.3%
Physical Disability	17	5%	0.6%
Autistic Spectrum Disorder	17	5%	0.6%
Other Difficulty/Disability	22	7%	0.8%
Not known	21	-	0.7%
Total (unadjusted) (n=14)	358		20%
Total excluding those reported “not known” (unadjusted)	337		

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 at the advice of those who work with children with multi-sensory impairments, though we continue to be conscious of the confusion this causes.

Research⁵ 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.

Deaf children with cochlear implants

16 services were able to provide information about how many deaf children had a cochlear implant⁶. Based on these responses, there are 138 deaf children across Wales with cochlear implants (adjusted total). This is 5% 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	23	308	1%
Primary aged	68	1,630	2%
Secondary aged	40	842	1%
Post 16	7	116	0.2%
Not known	0	-	-
Total (n=16)	138	2,904	5%

Proportionally, the percentage of deaf children with cochlear implants has remained at 5% since 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	1,289	81%
Spoken Welsh	146	9.2%
British Sign Language	22	1.4%
Other sign language	8	0.5%
Other spoken language	23	1.4%
Spoken English together with sign language	68	4.3%
Spoken Welsh together with sign language	8	0.5%
Spoken English and other spoken language	19	1.2%
Spoken Welsh and other spoken language	9	0.6%
Other spoken language together with sign language	0	0%
Total known (n=120)	1,592	
Reported "not known"	7	

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

⁶ Though not all services gave a figure for each age group.

15 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 1,305 deaf children who are unaccounted for in the above figures, so these figures should be used with caution. That said, the number of deaf children reported in this question has increased from 1,387 since the last survey.

91.6% of deaf children in Wales are using a spoken language: English (81%), Welsh (9.2%) or another spoken language (0.5%). The number of deaf children in Wales using sign language in some form has increased from 4% in 2011/12 to around 6% in 2012/13.

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.

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 supported⁷ by the service. This section sets out our analysis of these figures of 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 16 services, our survey indicates that at least 2,530 deaf children receive support from their local service (adjusted total). This is a decrease from last year where 2,905 deaf children were reported as receiving support.

We reported in 2012 that it became clear when analysing the results, that whilst services were asked to include only figures for children with sensorineural and permanent conductive deafness, some services have included figures for children with temporary loss in this section. As a result, the figures were not as reliable as they should have been. Whilst we feel this is less of an issue for this year, it is still occurring in some survey responses. This may partly explain why there appears to be a large drop in the numbers of deaf children supported by services.

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

	Total generated
Adjusted total	2,530
Total given when asked how many children overall	2,530
Total given when asked about number of children, broken down by age	2,529
Total given when asked about number of children, broken down by level of deafness	2,511

The smallest number of children being supported by a service was 61 and the largest was 1,051. The average was 242.

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

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

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

Age group	Number of deaf children	Percentage of total (where known)
Preschool children	273	11%
Primary aged children	1,390	55%
Secondary aged children	746	30%
Young people in maintained sixth forms (years 12 to 13)	118	5%
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.)	>5	>0.2%
Total (where known) (unadjusted)	2,529	
Not known	0	
Total (including where not known) (unadjusted) (n=16)	2,529	

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

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

Level of deafness	Number of deaf children	Percentage of total (where known)
Unilateral	259	10%
Mild	849	34%
Moderate	917	37%
Severe	228	9%
Profound	230	9%
Total (where known) (unadjusted)	2,483	
Not known	28	
Total (including where not known) (unadjusted) (n=16)	2,511	

Assuming the figures are broadly comparable, if there are 2,904 deaf children (adjusted total) who live in Wales, there are at least 374 deaf children who are not being supported. In other words, the figures suggest that 87% of deaf children receive support from their local service. It does not automatically follow that 13% of deaf children are not receiving support; some may be receiving support elsewhere from, for example, special schools for deaf children.

The table below compares the percentage difference between each age group to see if any particular age groups appear less likely to receive support. Proportionally, deaf young people over 16 who are not in maintained sixth forms appear less likely to receive support than other age groups; 7 (44%) services reported that they did not have any post 16 deaf young people outside of sixth forms receiving support from their service. In some cases, the number of children being supported appears to be larger than those living in the area.

Table 14: Comparison between number of deaf children belonging and supported by age

Age group	Number of deaf children belonging	Number of deaf children supported	Proportion of deaf children being supported as a percentage of deaf children belonging
Preschool	308	273	89%
Primary	1,630	1,390	85%
Secondary	842	746	89%
Young people in maintained sixth forms (years 12 to 13)	109	118	108%
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.)	15	>5	>33%
Total not including 'not known' (unadjusted)	2,904	2,529	87%

Table 15: 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	Proportion of deaf children being supported as a percentage of deaf children belonging
Unilateral	334	259	78%
Mild	920	849	92%
Moderate	1,061	917	86%
Severe	281	228	81%
Profound	286	230	80%
Not known	17	28	164%
Total (unadjusted)	2,899	2,511	84%

The above table suggests that severely or profoundly deaf children are less likely to receive support from their local service than children with a mild or moderate deafness. It could be that a number of severely or profoundly deaf children do not receive support from the service because they may be more likely to be placed in specialist provision. It is also possible, for example, that deaf children with cochlear implants may now be receiving less 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.

Children with temporary conductive deafness

We asked services if they also separately supported children who have temporary conductive hearing loss. Of the 16 services that responded to this question, 12 (75%) did, and 4 services (25%) did not. We then asked those services that did, how many they supported. 11 services gave a number (meaning that one service that does support children with temporary conductive deafness did not provide a number). There are 425 children with temporary conductive deafness supported by services that services were able to tell us about.

Annex B lists individual responses by services to this question.

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

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

CRIDE 2011 and 2012

As set out in the introduction, comparisons with the CRIDE 2011 and 2012 reports should be made with caution due to differences in the quality of the responses and response rates between the surveys, as well as some small changes and improvements to the questions asked across the years.

The number of deaf children belonging being recorded this year by CRIDE is 2,904, which is up from 2,743 in 2012 and 2,755 in 2011.

School Census

The 2013 CRIDE survey reports there are 2,472 deaf children of school age in Wales. This number excludes pre-school and all in post-16 education. However the Welsh Government's School Census figures for the 2012/13 academic year indicate there are 2,081 pupils where 'hearing impairment' is the major SEN and the child has been placed on School Action/Action Plus or has a statement of SEN⁸. Most of these children appear to be of school age; of this number, 9 are recorded as being in maintained nurseries, leaving 2,072 deaf children of school age. Therefore the School Census indicates a 7.2% increase from the 2011/12 academic year when the corresponding figure was 1,933⁹.

Of the 2,072 school-aged pupils recorded in the School Census as having a hearing impairment as a major SEN need, 342 have a statement. This amounts to 16.5% of children identified by the School Census and 13.8% of school aged children identified by CRIDE.

⁸Data available at <http://wales.gov.uk/statistics-and-research/schools-census/?lang=en>

The School Census data is based on PLASC (Pupil Level Annual School Census) returns from schools across Wales. The data would not, therefore, include children who attend a specialist school outside of Wales or who are home educated. It covers children who are on School Action, School Action Plus, or who are in receipt of a Statement. The figure includes one pupil who attends an independent school and has a Statement, but the dataset does not provide information on whether there are any deaf children who may attend an independent school without a Statement.

⁹Welsh Government, School Census, 2011: Final results, Table 8.13, available at <http://wales.gov.uk/topics/statistics/headlines/schools2011/110906/?lang=en>

The Welsh Government now also provides data on the numbers of children in maintained schools where hearing impairment is recorded as a secondary SEN¹⁰. In 2013, this figure was 614. As a result, the School Census recorded a total of 2,695 pupils with a hearing impairment in the 2012/13 academic year. This includes an undetermined number of children in maintained nurseries¹¹.

Finally, there are an additional 122 children with multisensory impairments in Wales (either as a primary or secondary need)¹². This brings the total number of deaf children in Wales to 2,817 captured by the School Census.

¹⁰ Although it should be noted that information on secondary needs is provided by schools on a voluntary basis . It should also be noted that data is not collected for other needs beyond a secondary need.

¹¹ It is not possible to identify how many of these relate to nursery pupils but, based on figures given earlier, it is not unreasonable to assume it is relatively low.

¹² This figure relates to children in maintained nurseries and schools.

PART 3: Teachers of the Deaf

Our survey asked how many Teachers of the Deaf there are working in different settings, including those in a peripatetic role and working in resource 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.

In total, there are at least 71.5 (FTE) Teachers of the Deaf posts in employment in Wales. Of these 89% are occupied by a fully qualified Teacher of the Deaf. In addition, at the time the survey was completed, there were 3 FTE vacant posts.

If the vacant posts are added to the total number of Teachers of the Deaf in employment, this would indicate there are at least 74.5 Teacher of the Deaf posts, of which 4% are vacant.

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

	Number of Teacher of the Deaf posts (FTE)	Percentage of Total
Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification	66.5	93%
Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years	5	7%
Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training	0	0%
Total (n=16)	71.5	

Table 17: Number of Teacher of the Deaf vacancies overall

	Number of Teacher of the Deaf posts (FTE)	Percentage of Total	
Vacancies	Post frozen	0	0%
	Currently advertised	2	67%
	Advertised but no suitable candidate	1	33%
Total (n=16)	3		

The figure of 74.5 posts is close to the figure of 76 posts recorded in the 2010-11 CRIDE survey which leads us to conclude that the figure of 100.55 posts reported in the 2011-12 survey was an anomaly. The volatility in the figures reported to us remains a concern and so the figures should be used with caution.

Table 18: Numbers of Teachers of the Deaf (FTE), year by year

	2013	2012	2011
With the mandatory qualification (MQ) (complete and certified)	66.5	91.75	71.95
In training for MQ or intending to train within 3 years	5	8.8	2
Qualified teachers without the MQ and not in training	0	0	2
Vacancies – Post frozen	0	0	0
Vacancies – Currently advertised	2	0	0
Vacancies – Advertised but no suitable candidate	1	0	0
Total	74.5	100.55	75.95
Total in post	71.5	100.55	75.95
Total Vacancies	3	0	0

The sections below 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 specifically for deaf children.

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

	Number of Teacher of the Deaf posts (FTE)	Number of services with staff in relevant category
Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification	39.2	16
Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years	3	3
Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training	0	0
Total (n=16)	42.2	

Table 20: Number of visiting Teacher of the Deaf vacancies

		Number of Teacher of the Deaf posts (FTE)	Number of services with staff in relevant category
Vacancies	Post frozen	0	0
	Currently advertised	1	1
	Advertised but no suitable candidate	1	1
Total (n=2)		2	

In terms of fully qualified visiting Teachers of the Deaf with the mandatory qualification, the numbers within each service ranged from 0.5 to 6.1(FTE). The average number of visiting Teachers of the Deaf (with the mandatory qualification) per service is 2.4 (FTE).

10 (63%) of services employ 2 or fewer visiting Teachers of the Deaf, of which 4 services (25%) employed 1 or fewer visiting Teachers of the Deaf .

Services were asked how many of their Teachers of the Deaf were qualified in BSL. Of the 44.2 Teachers of the Deaf working for peripatetic services, services provided data for 44.

Table 21: BSL qualifications held by Teachers of the Deaf in peripatetic services

	Teachers of the Deaf in peripatetic services
No qualification	2 (5%)
BSL Level 1	22 (50%)
BSL Level 2	19 (43%)
BSL Level 3 or above	3 (7%)
Total	44

Services were asked if they were able to provide Teacher of the Deaf peripatetic support through the medium of Welsh as required.

Table 22: Number of services able to provide Teacher of the Deaf support through the medium of Welsh in peripatetic services

	Teachers of the Deaf in peripatetic services
Yes	9 (56%)
No	7 (44%)
Total	16

We asked if services had sought to recruit Teachers of the Deaf over the past 12 months. Of the 7 services that had, 2 (29%) 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 9 services that indicated yes, 4 (44%) said they had experienced difficulties in securing supply cover.

Teachers of the Deaf in resource provisions

The survey asked how many Teachers of the Deaf were employed in resource provisions for deaf children and whether employed centrally by the local authority or directly by the school. Respondents were asked to exclude time spent on other school duties (such as time as the school's SEN co-ordinator, for example).

Table 23: 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	13.1	6		14.2	6
Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years	0	0		2	2
Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training	0	0		0	0
Total (n=11)	13.1			16.2	

Table 24: 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		0	0
	Currently advertised	0	0		1	1
	Advertised but no suitable candidate	0	0		0	0
Total (n=11)		0			1	

Table 25: BSL qualifications held by Teachers of the Deaf in resource provisions

	Teachers of the Deaf employed by the local authority		Teachers of the Deaf employed by the school	Total
No qualification	1		1	2 (7%)
BSL Level 1	5		5	10 (35%)
BSL Level 2	4		10	14 (48%)
BSL Level 3 or above	1		2	3 (10%)
Total	11		18	29 (100%)

This means that of the 29 Teachers of the Deaf in resource provisions we have data for, 35% held BSL Level 1, 48% held BSL Level 2, 10% held BSL Level 3 or above, and 7% held no BSL qualification.

Table 26: Number of services able to provide Teacher of the Deaf support through the medium of Welsh in resource provisions as required

	Teachers of the Deaf employed by the local authority	Teachers of the Deaf employed by the school
Yes	1	4
No	5	2
Total	6	6

PART 4: Other specialist staff

Our survey suggests that there are at least 83.4 FTE specialist support staff, other than Teachers of the Deaf, supporting deaf children in Wales in either a peripatetic role or working in resource provisions. The most common role is teaching assistant followed by communication support worker.

Table 27: Number of specialist support staff overall, by role

	Number of staff (FTE)	Percentage of Total
Teaching assistants / Classroom support assistants etc	68.9	83%
Communication support workers / Interpreters / Communicators etc	10	12%
Deaf instructors / Deaf role models / Sign language instructors etc	0	0%
Educational audiologists / Technicians etc	1.5	2%
Speech and language therapists	2.5	3%
Family support workers / Liaison officers	0	0%
Social workers / Social workers for deaf children	0.5	1%
Total	83.4	

The number of specialist staff overall is up from 81.5 in 2011/12, amounting to a 2% increase. The next table breaks down the 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 working in a resource provision

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

	Peripatetic role			Resource provisions		
	Number of staff (full time equivalent)	Number of services with staff in relevant category	Percentage of Total	Number of staff (full time equivalent)	Number of services with staff in relevant category	Percentage of Total
Teaching assistants / Classroom support assistants etc	18.3	7	80%	50.6	10	83%
Communication support workers / Interpreters / Communicators etc	1	1	4.7%	9	2	15%
Deaf instructors / Deaf role models / Sign language instructors etc	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
Educational audiologists / Technicians etc	1.5	2	7%	0	0	0%
Speech and language therapists	1.5	2	7%	1	1	2%
Family support workers / Liaison officers	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
Social workers / Social workers for deaf children	0.5	1	2%	0	0	0%
Total	22.8			60.6		

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 continue to be predominantly employed in peripatetic roles.

Services were asked about the BSL qualifications held by the specialist staff. Not all services provided data for this, and some services provided data in FTE whilst others appeared to provide data in numbers of people, so there are issues with the reliability of the data.

Table 29: BSL qualifications of specialist staff

	Teaching assistants / Classroom support assistants etc	Communication support workers / Interpreters / Communicators etc	Educational audiologists / Technicians etc	Speech and language therapists	Social workers / Social workers for deaf children	Total
No qualification	1	0	0.5	0	0	1.5 (7%)
BSL Level 1	4	0	1	0.5	0	5.5 (26%)
BSL Level 2	11	1	0	1	0	13 (62%)
BSL Level 3 or above	1	0	0	0	0	1 (5%)
Total	17	1	1.5	1.5	0	21

Services were asked if they were able to provide teaching assistant and communication support worker peripatetic support through the medium of Welsh as required.

Table 30: Number of services able to provide teaching assistant and communication support worker peripatetic support through the medium of Welsh

	Number of services
Teaching assistants only	1 (7%)
Communication support workers only	1 (7%)
Both Teaching assistants and Communication support workers	1 (7%)
No support through the medium of Welsh	11 (79%)
Total	14

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

Services were asked about the BSL qualifications held by the specialist staff. Not all services provided data for this, and some services provided data in FTE whilst others appeared to provide data in numbers of people, so there are issues with the reliability of the data. Also, some services stated that they had particular specialist staff working in the resource provisions, but did not provide data on their levels of qualifications, so this data should be used with caution.

Table 31: BSL qualifications of specialist staff in resource provisions

	Teaching assistants / Classroom support assistants etc	Communication support workers / Interpreters / Communicators etc	Speech and language therapists	Total
No qualification	5.5	0	0	5.5 (10%)
BSL Level 1	14.5	0	0	14.5 (26%)
BSL Level 2	25.5	4	0	29.5 (53%)
BSL Level 3 or above	4	2	0	6 (11%)
Total	49.5	6	0	55.5

Services were asked if they were able to provide teaching assistant and communication support worker support through the medium of Welsh in resource provisions as required. One service with a resource provision did not answer this question.

Table 32: Number of services able to provide teaching assistant and communication support worker peripatetic support through the medium of Welsh

	Number of services
Teaching assistants only	2 (20%)
Communication support workers only	2 (20%)
Both Teaching assistants and Communication support workers	0 (0%)
No support through the medium of Welsh	6 (60%)
Total	10

When asked if the resource provision provided outreach support to other schools, 2 (22%) replied yes, and 7 (78%) replied no. One service did not answer this question.

Where outreach support was provided, this amounted to 0.6 full time equivalent staffing time total across all of the services who responded. The actual figure may be higher; some services did not provide answers to these two questions.

PART 5: Eligibility criteria and funding arrangements

Eligibility criteria

The majority of services continue to use the National Sensory Impairment Partnership (NatSIP) as a vehicle to help determine what support deaf children receive. The proportion of services using the NatSIP criteria is up from 72% in 2011/12 to 81% in 2012/13.

Table 33: Criteria used to help determine the level of support for deaf children

	Number of services	Percentage of total
“NatSIP” criteria ¹³	13	81%
Criteria are mostly developed locally	2	13%
Other	1	6%
Total (n=16)	16	

Services that said they were using ‘other’ criteria were asked to specify what other criteria they used. No other criteria were listed by services, other than the service saying they were moving to NatSIP criteria in the future. Annex B lists individual responses by services 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 34: 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
Primary and permanent need	Bilateral severe or profound sensorineural deafness	0	0	16	1
	Bilateral moderate sensorineural deafness	0	1	16	1
	Bilateral conductive deafness	1	4	13	1
	Bilateral mild or high frequency only sensorineural deafness	0	5	13	1
	Unilateral deafness (sensorineural or conductive)	1	8	11	1
Additional and permanent need	Bilateral severe or profound sensorineural deafness	0	1	15	1
	Bilateral moderate sensorineural deafness	0	1	15	1
	Bilateral conductive deafness	0	7	11	1
Other	With temporary conductive deafness as a primary or additional need	3	6	7	1
	In special schools other than schools for the deaf	3	1	13	1
	With auditory neuropathy	3	1	10	3
	With auditory processing difficulty/disorder	5	4	6	2
n=16					

¹³ 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 35: 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	1	6%
Changes resulting in some / all deaf children now receiving less support	2	12%
No changes	14	82%
Total (n=16)	124	

Due to changes in the way this question was asked in previous years, it is not possible to draw comparisons.

Where changes were indicated, services were asked to provide information on what had changed:

- Support staff becoming more generic due to changes in criteria.
- Training for schools increasing to develop independence and understanding of deafness within schools to support children with mild and unilateral deafness.
- Numbers of children with conductive losses increasing, and long waiting lists for grommets resulting in more children being aided.

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 36: 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) ¹⁴	12
Department for Children, Schools and Families (now Department for Education): Quality standards for special educational needs (SEN) support and outreach services (2008) ¹⁵	4
Newborn Hearing Screening Programme Quality Standards	7
Other standards.	5
n=16	

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)
- Welsh Government Quality Standards for Paediatric Audiology
- Welsh Government Quality Standards for Sensory Support Services

¹⁴ See: http://www.ndcs.org.uk/professional_support/our_resources/index.html

¹⁵ 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 an increase from 71% in 2010/11.

Table 37: 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)	13	87%
Delegated to a special or mainstream school with a resource provision that then provides outreach to other schools	0	0%
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 statemented children)	0	0%
Other	2	13%
Total (n=15)	130	

Responses in the 'other' category indicated some form of combination of the previous options, or funding being allocated to a host authority, or involving changing processes.

Funding arrangements – resource provisions

CRIDE also sought information on the funding arrangements for resource provisions. 11 services (65%) indicated that they had resource provisions in their area.

Table 38: Funding arrangements for resource provisions

Funding for resource provision is...	Number of services	Percentage of those where applicable
Held centrally by the local authority	3	30%
Delegated to schools	6	60%
Both central and delegated	1	10%
Total responses	10	

One service did not provide an answer to this question. The majority of resource provisions continue to be delegated to schools. This is in line with findings from 2011/12.

Table 39: 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	3	43%
No	4	57%
Total	7	

Staffing changes

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

Table 40: Budget changes

	Increase in budget	Decrease in budget	No change in budget	Don't know / can't separate budget for HI team
Staffing	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	11 (73%)	3 (20%)
Training	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	8 (53%)	6 (40%)
Equipment	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	9 (60%)	5 (33%)
Other	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	9 (60%)	5 (33%)

Services were also asked if there were any proposed changes to the budget for their service between 2012/13 and 2013/14.

Table 41: Proposed budget changes

	Increase in budget	Decrease in budget	No change in budget	Don't know / can't separate budget for HI team
Staffing	2 (22%)	0 (0%)	7 (78%)	0 (0%)
Training	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	7 (78%)	0 (0%)
Equipment	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (100%)	0 (0%)
Other	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (100%)	0 (0%)

PART 6: Concluding thoughts

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, School Action Plus or with a statement on the School Census. Some 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. 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. The numbers of Teachers of the Deaf in Wales seems to be relatively stable at the moment with only a slight decrease of 1.5 FTE posts between 2010/11 and 2012/13. It appears that the number of Teachers of the Deaf recorded in the 2011/12 survey was an anomaly.
3. The slight increase in specialist support staff is to be welcomed. There does not appear to be a corresponding decrease in Teachers of the Deaf, as is happening in England.
4. There is some concern about the lack of Welsh language provision, particularly in the area of specialist support staff. Although the situation with Welsh language support from Teachers of the Deaf is slightly better it is still a matter of concern that 44% of services cannot provide peripatetic Teacher of the Deaf support. There are also difficulties in many areas in recruiting, including securing supply cover. 11 services of the 14 which replied could not provide teaching assistant and communication support worker peripatetic support in Welsh and in resource provision no service could provide both teaching assistant and communication support in Welsh.

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. 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 Wales survey was disseminated to services in Wales around 26 March 2013 by NDCS on behalf of CRIDE. Services were asked to respond by 17 May 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 on 29 July 2013.

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

Table 42: Response rate by services to the CRIDE survey

	Number of responses	Cumulative total
First deadline – 17 May 2013	9	9
Second deadline following chasers	7	16
Freedom of Information requests	1	17

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.

Annex A: Numbers of deaf children belonging by service

This table sets out some individual data from services. CRIDE's intention to publish this data was made clear to services when they were 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	
Blaenau Gwent, Caerphilly, Monmouthshire, Newport, Torfaen	77	463	371	72	67	*	1,055**
Bridgend	26	50	61	24	11	12	184
Cardiff	40	53	106	32	36	0	267
Carmarthenshire	15	17	31	10	18	0	91
Ceredigion	8	18	27	9	5	0	67
Conwy	*	12	33	8	5	*	65**
Denbighshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Flintshire	9	16	36	19	9	0	89
Isle of Anglesey and Gwynedd	15	51	57	9	24	*	160**
Merthyr Tydfil	*	39	16	5	5	0	70**
Neath Port Talbot	24	21	39	14	17	*	120**
Pembrokeshire	12	10	25	8	10	0	65
Powys	26	66	43	10	9	0	154
Rhondda Cynon Taff	15	40	90	18	23	0	186
Swansea	14	10	30	18	24	0	96
Vale of Glamorgan	23	34	69	18	8	0	152
Wrexham	25	20	27	7	15	0	94

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?
Blaenau Gwent, Caerphilly, Monmouthshire, Newport, Torfaen	NatSIP criteria	-
Bridgend	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Cardiff	Other	51
Carmarthenshire	NatSIP criteria	79
Ceredigion	NatSIP criteria	8
Conwy	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Denbighshire	-	-
Flintshire	NatSIP criteria	5
Isle of Anglesey and Gwynedd	Criteria are mostly developed locally	N/a
Merthyr Tydfil	NatSIP criteria	*
Neath Port Talbot	NatSIP criteria	75
Pembrokeshire	NatSIP criteria	97
Powys	NatSIP criteria	30
Rhondda Cynon Taff	NatSIP criteria	N/a
Swansea	NatSIP criteria	62
Vale of Glamorgan	NatSIP criteria	10
Wrexham	Criteria are mostly developed locally	5

Notes:

- ‘*’ indicates that the number of children who fall into the specified category is less 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.
- “NatSIP criteria” refers to NatSIP Revised Eligibility Criteria (2012), SESIP/SERSEN Revised Eligibility Criteria (2009) or SERSEN Eligibility Criteria (2005)