

Summary of key findings

Year

School Census figures for 2024¹⁴ indicate there are 23,476 children where deafness is the primary special educational need (SEN) and who have been placed at SEN support or have an Education, Health and Care (EHC) plan. School Census figures also indicate that there are an additional 5,124 children where deafness is a secondary need. The School Census therefore records a total of 28,600 children where deafness is a primary or secondary need. The 28,600 deaf children identified by the School Census amount to 61% of the 46,799 deaf children identified by local authorities through CRIDE.¹⁵

There was a total of 8,809 deaf children with an EHC plan (of whom 6,320 are children where deafness is a primary need and 2,489 a secondary need). Comparing this figure with the number of children identified by the CRIDE survey, this would indicate that around 19% of deaf children have an EHC plan.

We recognise that School Census figures mostly cover school-aged children whilst the above CRIDE figures are for children aged 0 to 19. In this report, we are not able to provide a comparison against CRIDE figures for school-aged children as this is only possible in the years that CRIDE runs the full standard survey. However, in 2023, our analysis indicated that 39% of school-aged deaf children were not captured by published Government data, compared to those identified by local authorities in their response to CRIDE.

¹⁴ Data 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.

¹⁵ School Census figures mostly cover school-aged children whilst CRIDE figures are for children aged 0 to 19.

	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 (total and percentage)	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 in employment (fte)	TODs with the mandatory qualification in employment or in training (fte)	Teachers working as TODs in employment (fte)	Vacant posts (fte)	Number of TOD posts (including vacancies) (fte)
2024	803.54	934.84	949.14	34.82	

34 services (27%) reported difficulties in recruiting for supply cover
 21 (16%) reported no difficulties.

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

- lack of qualified or experienced applicants
- lack of applicants with BSL skills
- candidates not wanting the number of days/days of the week offered
- difficulties recruiting to posts in resource provisions
- difficulties recruiting to leadership roles
- difficulties retaining qualified staff
- lack of interest in training to qualify as a TOD and take on responsibilities at the same time
- lack of budget to cover staff on sick leave
- lack of funding
- recruitment freeze in the local authority/school.

Regional figures

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

Region	TODs with the mandatory qualification in 2011 (fte)	TODs with the mandatory qualification in 2023 (fte)	TODs with the mandatory qualification in 2024 (fte)	Percentage change between 2011 and 2024	Percentage change between 2023 and 2024
East England	97.6	88.84	84.42	-14%	-5%
East Midlands	87.6	56	49.4	-44%	-12%
London	165.4	144.1	148.55	-10%	3%

Region	Qualified or trainee TODs in 2011 (fte)	Qualified or trainee TODs in 2023 (fte)	Qualified or trainee TODs in 2024 (fte)	Percentage change between 2011 and 2024	Percentage change between 2023 and 2024
East England	105.1	98.84	98.42	-	

	Number working in this role		Vacant posts		Total
	Number of staff (full time equivalent)	Number of services with staff in relevant category	Number of staff (full time equivalent)	Number of services with staff in relevant category	
Teaching assistants/Classroom support assistants/Learning support assistants etc	340.95 (92%)	71	29.1 (8%)	22	370.05
Communication support workers etc	139.36 (92%)	25	12.1 (8%)	8	151.46
NRCPD registered BSL/English interpreters	6.8 (97%)	6	0.2 (3%)	1	7
Deaf instructors/Deaf role models/Sign language instructors etc	52.823 (90%)	44	6 (10%)	4	59.823
Educational audiologists/Audiologists in Education who do not also hold a qualification as a TOD	7.2 (95%)	10	0.4 (5%)	1	7.6
Technicians et al	30.15 (96%)	30	1.3 (4%)	2	31.45
Speech and language therapists	7.6 (84%)	12	1.4 (16%)	2	9
Family support workers/Liaison officers	11.95 (96%)	17	0.5 (4%)	1	12.45
Social workers/Social workers for deaf children	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)	0	0
Other	47.04 (90%)	31	5.19 (10%)	6	52.23
Total of figures given	644.873 (92%)		56.19 (8%)		701.063

Other roles included:

- Specialist nursery nurse
- Specialist portage home visitor
- Specialist early years educator for the deaf
- Sensory support specialist
- Inclusion support practitioner
- Social inclusion facilitator
- Specialist learning mentor
- Habilitation officer
- Hearing assistant
- MSI/HI advisory support worker
- Qualified MSI teacher
- Transitions coordinator
- Adult sensory officer

Specialist advisory teacher – developmental language disorder

Year	Number of resource provisions
2024	220
2023	227
2022	230

PART 4: Support following identification of deafness

We asked services how many referrals they received over the calendar year of 2023.

	Number and percentage of referrals	Number of services ²⁹
For children identified as deaf through the newborn hearing screening programme	1,027 (14%)	126
For children identified as deaf outside of the newborn hearing programme and before they had started statutory education	1,782 (24%)	126
For children identified as deaf outside of the newborn hearing programme and		

PART 5: Thematic questions: Early identification and early intervention pathways

This year's CRIDE survey included some thematic questions about referrals into and accepted by education services. We asked these questions as we know that, across the UK, not all deaf children are referred into education services. We were keen to better understand if this is because the referrals are not made by audiology services or because they are not accepted by education (because of any eligibility criteria or policy in place).

When asked if there were any groups of deaf children routinely not referred into the service by audiology services (such as, children with unilateral, mild, moderate or temporary deafness, and children without a hearing aid):

80 services (60%) reported that all children identified as deaf were referred

26 services (20%) reported that children without a hearing aid were not routinely referred

22 services (17%) reported that children with temporary deafness were not routinely referred

four services (3%) reported that children with unilateral deafness were not routinely referred

two services (2%) reported that children with mild deafness were not routinely referred

where services reported other groups of children not routinely referred, comments included:

- children with a temporary deafness who are unaided
- children with mild temporary deafness who are referred for grommets
- children with mild conductive deafness not yet in school settings
- children with APD who are unaided
- families who do not agree to a referral
- audiology services may have different approaches to referring to the services.

When asked if there were any groups of deaf children where a referral to the service (if made) would not routinely be accepted:

89 services (67%) reported that all referrals for children identified as deaf were accepted

19 services (14%) reported that referrals for children without a hearing aid were not routinely accepted

13 services (10%) reported that referrals for children with temporary deafness were not routinely accepted

four services (3%) reported that referrals for children with unilateral deafness were not routinely accepted

three services (2%) reported that referrals for children with mild deafness were not routinely accepted

where services reported other groups of children for whom a referral would not routinely be accepted, comments included:

- children with temporary deafness who are unaided
- children with mild unilateral deafness and are unaided
- children with a mild or moderate deafness who are unaided
- children with processing disorders
- some services reported that referrals are considered on an individual basis
- some services specified that all referrals are accepted, but not all children referred would receive support and be on active caseload, they might receive generic advice and information and parents can contact the service if needed.

We asked services if there was a school entry hearing screening programme in place in the areas they covered:

- 45 services (34%) reported that there was, across the whole area covered by their service
- Six services (5%) reported there was, but not across the whole area covered by their service
- 62 services (47%) reported there was not

communication approaches:

- well attended parent friendly BSL level 1 course
- package of family sign to support a Total Communication approach for early years in discussion with parents about their communication choice
- sign bilingual offer to all families in the early years
- families can be referred to a club consisting of ten free BSL lessons for families following a family-based, flexible and child-centred curriculum
- signing in the home is offered as an early intervention pathway if appropriate

groups for families:

- preschool groups, baby and toddler group, sensory family groups, coffee mornings in response to an increase in referrals for children with BAHAs, sing and sign early years group, family sign group, community BSL group
- early intervention language and communication preschool group, where families can access other services such as sign language teaching, audiology and speech and language services
- deaf instructor attends family group

significant TOD support, and a

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: British Association of Teachers of Deaf Children and Young People, British Association of Teachers of Deaf Children and Young People Cymru, Frank Barnes School for Deaf Children, Longwill School for the Deaf, National Deaf Children's Society, Royal School for the Deaf Derby, 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 2024 survey was the version with a mix of core and thematic questions.

The survey was disseminated to services in England in February 2024 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.

	Number of responses	Cumulative total
First deadline – 15 March 2024	110	110
Second deadline following chasers	18	128
FOI requests	5	133

Services were able to respond by completing an online survey. If they were not able to do this they could complete a Word document of the survey. Analysis of the results using Excel and drafting of this report was largely completed by the National Deaf Children's Society, with guidance and clearance from members of CRIDE.

CRIDE would like to thank the services for taking the time to complete this survey. The results from this

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 2024.

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 Tf(f)5()-3(c)3(h)-4(ild)5(re)7(n)-4()-3(2546 0 841.92 595.32 reW* nBT/F2 15.96 Tf1 0 e6 0 841.92 59BT/F5 9 ty 0 8

	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
Luton ³²	337	131	0	0.8	2.8	None reported	0.2	169:1
Norfolk	705	705	None reported	10.9	3.1	0	0	235:1
Peterborough	288	317	29	4.2	1.4	None reported	None reported	144:1
Southend	138	148	None reported	1	No RPs reported	None reported	None reported	138:0
Suffolk	422	464	42	5.4	5.12	None reported	1.2	84:1
Thurrock	110	110*	<5	1.2	5	0	0	55:1
Derby City	No data ³³	134*	<5	3.3	2.7	0	0	67:1
Derbyshire	442	677	100	7.2	1.6	0	0	111:1

	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
Bromley	268	255	14	4.3	5.3	None reported	None reported	134:1
Camden	152	172	8	1.8	No RPs reported	0	0	152:0
Croydon	381	223*	<5	6.4	1.6	0	0	381:1
Ealing								

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
--	---	--	-------------

	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
Birmingham	1,658	792	None reported	12.8	9.5	None reported	None reported	332:1
Coventry	425	425	None reported	4.4	1.8	None reported	None reported	213:1
Dudley	296	394	98	3.4	3.8	0	0	148:1

