# 2022 report for Scotland

## Educational provision for deaf children is cotland in 2021/22

Introduction

In 2022, we carried outthe eleventhannual survey for ducational staffing and service provision for deaf children<sup>1</sup> This is the sixth survey since a CRIDE reference group was set up to steer the work of CRIDE in Scotland. This report sets out the results of the survey Socotland and is intended for heads of services, policymakers in local and central government and anyone with arriest in deaf education.

The surveyalternates from year to year betweenstandard survey and a survey with a mix of core and thematic questions. The 2022 surveyasthe version with thematic questions covering the 2021/

### ۶¢

37% of services directly provide informal opportunities for families to leappractis51 0 0 18.1Q q 0.0000

How ma Tm 0 g 0 G [(H)-8(ow)3()6(m)-6(a Tm 0 g 0 G [(H)-8(ow)3()6(m)-60008869 0 5-5<00n BT

years, alongside the definition used in that survey.

Please also note that iand from 2017, the survey question was changed to allow children with temporary deafness to be included in the responsetions question; previously services were asked to include only children with permanent deafness.

<b>6</b> 6: <b>6</b>		cing:
Year	Number of children on caseload	Number of services
2022	3,493	30
2021	2,612	25
	) -	-

2020	2,674	27
2019	3,280	30
2018	3,328	30
2017	1,889	24
2016	No surveyissued by CRIDE	-
2015	2,618 (adjusted total)	29

Working

**∭a**nt∂

Combining the figures, 3 services (43%) reported difficulties in recruiting to either permanent or supply posts. Comments from services covered the lowing themes:

lack of qualified applicants having to recruit teacherwho agreed to undertake the qualification lack of budget for supply cover staff.

Changes in numbers of Teachers of the Deaf

The following table look at changes in the number of qualified Teachers of the Deaf in employment and posts over successive years.

It should be noted that in 2010 the CRID Scotland survely egan to ask about eachers of the Deaf who work mainly in aspecialist school for d

The increase between 2021 and 2022 should be seen in a context when the response rate has increased from 25 to 30 (out of 30 services).

Teachers of the Deaf in a peripatetic role

Weasked how many Teachers of the Deaf were working in the specialistapetic

provision<sup>15</sup>

#### Other specialist staff

We found that there were at leas 5.9 fte specialist support staff in post employed by services. There were 6.1 fte vacant posts reported. This means there a 02 specialist support staff posts, of which are vacant posts.

#### **b** 17:**billing**

Number working in this role	Vacant posts	Total
Number of staff (full timimof		

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

### Te 18: fined cellifor

Category	Yes	No	Not sure	Total
	(number and	(number and	(number and	
	percentage of	percentage of	percentage of	
	services)	services)	services)	
Engaging with careers advisorssighoolson	25	3	2	30
careers advice to deaf young people	(83%)	(10%)	(7%)	(100%)
Engaging with careers advisorsciolleges	12	16	2	30
on careers advice to deaf young people	(40%)	(53%)	(7%)	(100%)
Provision of advice on the accessibility of	25	2		
work placements being undertaken by dea	(83%)			

young people

#### **5** 19**6**

	Number of services	Percentage
Based in the local authority	20	69%
Based in a school with a resource provision	3	10%
Based in a specialist school for deaf children	3	10%
Based in a special school not specifically for deaf child	3	10%
Provided by another body or organisation	0	0%
Other	0	0%
Total	29 <sup>19</sup>	

Number of resource provisions

In the CRIDE survey,  $w \mu \bullet \tilde{s} Z \tilde{s} OE u Z OE \bullet \} \mu OE % OE \} Å ] (m) a instream for special o o <math>\bullet$  with a resource provision, base or unside cifically for deaf children regardless of whether staff in the resource provision are employed by the local authority or by the school.

#### **b** 20:**b**

	Managed by the local authority	Managed by the schools	Total
Resource provisions for primary-aged children	4	3	7
Resource provisions for secondaryaged children	5	4	9
Total	9	7	16

We also found that

sevenservices(23% of all service)shad at least one resourcerovision for primaryaged children in their area

eight services(27%) had at least one resource provision for second agged children in their area 22 services7(3%) reported no resource provisions for either primary or second agged childen in their area

Thetotal of 16 resource provisions acrosscotlands an increase from 2021 when the surveyidentified 14 resource provisions. However, the difference in response rates to the survey between these years should be noted.

We also looked at the number of resource provisions against the overall lation of deaf children<sup>0</sup>. This is intended to indicate the spread of resource provisions across Scotland, relative to the overall population of deaf children. We found that, on average, there is one resource provision for every 207 deaf children. This is provide the found that there as one resource provision for every 201 deaf children.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup>One service did not answer this question.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 20}\,{\rm The}$  overall total given by services is used here.

This is not a measure of the number of places available in or individual delatreh enrolled at each

Weasked services how many referrals they received over the calendar year df 202

#### **₽** 21:**₽**

	Number and percentage of referrals	Number of
	Teleffais	services
For children identified as detairough the	61	17
newborn hearing screening programme	(18%)	
For children identified as deaf outside of the	64	20
newborn hearing programme arbuefore they	(19%)	
have started statutory education		
For children identified as deaf outside of the	219	25
newborn hearing programme araditer they	(64%)	
have started statutory education		
Totalof figures given	344	
	(100%)	

In terms of changes since 2021:

The number of referrals for childred entified as deaf through the newborn hearing screening programme has fallen from 120 in 2021 to 61 in 2022 fall of nearly 50% The number of services responding to this question was 17 in both surveys.

The 2021 survey askéor a total figure of childrenidentified as deaf outside of newborn hearing screening whilst the 2022 survey split this out between the identified before and after they started statutory education. The 2022 combined figure for these grou 283s The 2021 figure was 165, the 22 services responding to this question that difficult to be sure if the increase from 165 to 283 reflects a difference in how services might have ponded to the question out fferences in the response rate, or if there has been a genuine in the increase.

We then went on to ask about how soon families were contacted and visited following the initial referral. These questions were drafted with reference to <u>thetSIP Quality Standards for Sensory Support Services</u> in England (2016) in particular, standards A1ii and A1iii.

We recognise there mabe 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 **o**/whthese quality standards are being met.

In response to these questions, we found that:

of the referrals for children identified through the newborn hearing screening program 20 mef, the families were contacted by a Teacher of the Deaf within 2 wngrkdays. This amounts to 33% of the 61 children referred via this route

of the referrals for children identified as deaf outside of the newborn hearing screening programme and before they had started statutory educations of the families were contacted to Teacher of the Deaf within 5 working days. This amount 50% of the 64 children referred outside of the newborn hearing screening programme and before they had started statutory education Pre-school reviews take place with a Health Visitor when a child is aged 13 months, 27 months and 4 years We asked services if they contribute information to the service serv

#### 

Number of services	Percentage
9	30%
7	23%
	Number of services97

Some deaf children

	On demand or at least weekly (number of services, and percentage of all services)	At least monthly (number of services, and percentage of all services)	At least termly (number of services, and percentage of all services)	At least once a year (number of services, and percentage of all services)
Other courses	3	0	0	0
supporting the use	(10%)	(0%)	(0%)	(0%)
of sign language				
specifically in a				
family context				
A course that	2	0	0	1
focused on teaching	(7%)	(0%)	(0%)	(3%)
of BSL but without				
necessarily leading				
to any of the below				
qualifications	-			
A course that leads	1	0	0	1
to a BSLlevel 1	(3%)	(0%)	(0%)	(3%)
qualification				
A course that leads	1	0	0	1
to a BSILevel 2	(3%)	(0%)	(0%)	(3%)
qualification				

Where services provide, fund or commission courses in sign langouagenilies, they were asked whether criteria were in place to determine if families are eligible to ess courses:

**E** 5: **G** 

No there is no criteria, any family can access if they wouF1 11.04 Tf

We asked servicesthey record whether a school ged child is eligible for the upil Equity Fund.

### **b** 26:

	Number of services	Percentage of services
Yes (peripatetic and resource provision)	0	0%
Yes (peripatetic only)	1	3%
Yes (resource provision only)	5	17%

The table that follows sets out some individual data from services a set authorities were asked to provide figures as of 31 Janu 20/20

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

As set out earlier, theoretical caseloads for peripatetic Teachers of the Deaf are calculative during the number of permanently deaf children living in any given area and in non-pecialist provision by the number of visiting Teachers of the Deaf who are qualified or in training for the mandatocational of Response have beer excluded where there were by outgaps or anomalies in either the number of Teachers of the Deaf or numbers of deaf childring in the area Please see pages for more information. In some cases, where there was an obvious error or anomaly, we have not calculated a ratio.

F

Number of Number of Number of Teachers of permanently children with children with the Deaf in deaf children the specialist permanent or temporary living in the temporary deafness on peripatetic geographical deafness on the caseload service area covered the caseload for the service by the service for the service

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>i</sup> This ratio was influenced by a get proportion of the Teacher of the Deaf posts being a vacancy for a time. The vacancy has since been filled, whic arweiffeat on the ratio.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>ii</sup> This service did not report any Teachers of Deaf working in the peripatetic service, but they diploted Teachers of the Deaf working flexibly across the peripatetic service and resource provisions.

iii This service did not report any Teachers of the Deaf in resource provisions, but they did report Teachers of the Deaffexibrly integross the peripatiet service and resource provisions.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>iv</sup> Information in the response from this service indicates that the service is for sece**aged**ychildren and young people.