



Consortium for Research in Deaf Education

## 2023 report for Scotland

### Education provision for deaf children in Scotland in 2022/23

#### Introduction

In 2023, we carried out the 12<sup>th</sup> Consortium for Research in Deaf Education (CRIDE) annual survey on educational staffing and service provision for deaf children. This is the seventh 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 for Scotland 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.<sup>1</sup>

The analysis in this report is based on responses from 29 services in Scotland, covering 31 authority areas and giving a response rate of 97%<sup>2</sup>.

#### Contents

Summary of findings .....	3
PART 1: Deaf children in Scotland.....	5
PART 2: Teachers of Deaf Children and Young People and other specialist staff .....	14
PART 3: Post-16 support .....	22
PART 4: Support provided.....	23
PART 5: Support following identification of deafness .....	27
PART 6: Background and methodology .....	29
Annex: Information by local authority.....	30

<sup>1</sup> Reports from previous years can be found on the National Deaf Children's Society website at [www.ndcs.org.uk/cride](http://www.ndcs.org.uk/cride) or on the BATOD website at [www.batod.org.uk/information/cride-reports/](http://www.batod.org.uk/information/cride-reports/).

<sup>2</sup> One service – Eilean Star (Western Isles) – did not respond to the survey.

## Interpreting the results

Services were asked to give figures as of 31<sup>st</sup> 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. Please also note that where there is a reported cohort of less than five children in any of the tables in this report, we have replaced the figure with a '<5' and suppressed the actual figure to zero when calculating the totals in that table unless otherwise stated. This is indicated by an asterisk against the total.

## Summary of findings

### *Numbers of deaf children*

- There were at least 3,418 deaf children in Scotland, a reported increase of 3% from 3,313 in 2022.
- 83% of school-aged deaf children attended mainstream schools; 9% attended mainstream schools with resource provisions, 1% attended schools for deaf children and young people, whilst 7% attended special schools not specifically for deaf children.
- 28% of deaf children were recorded as having another additional support need<sup>3</sup>, an increase from 20% in 2021.
- 8% of deaf children used English as an additional spoken language at home.
- 17% of services reported they provide support to deaf young people over the age of 18.

### *Teachers of Deaf Children and Young People and other specialist staff*

- There were at least 179.44 Teacher of Deaf Children and Young People (TOD) posts, of which 3% were vacant. Of the 174.84 full time equivalent (fte) working as TODs, 60% held the mandatory qualification, 32% were in training and 9% were qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training.
- The number of qualified TODs in employment working in a peripatetic role, in a resource provision, in a special school for deaf children, and/or in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children has increased by 4% since 2022 and fallen by 37% since we started the survey in 2011.
- 40% 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 93.87 fte other specialist staff posts employed directly by local authority specialist education services, of which 6% are vacant.

### *Resource provisions*

- There were a reported 15 resource provisions. Looking at the spread of resource provisions across Scotland, on average, there was one resource provision for every 227 deaf children. In 2022, the corresponding figure was one resource provision for every 207 deaf children.

### *Outcomes*

- 7% of services reported that they collect data on S4 outcomes for all deaf children in their area, whilst 24% do so for deaf children on their caseload.

### *Referrals*

- Services stated they had received 435 referrals during the 2022 calendar year, an increase from 344 in 2022.
- 20% of referrals to services came from the newborn hearing screening programme in 2022. Of these, 41% 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, 67% were contacted by a TOD within 5 working days.

---

<sup>3</sup> Defined as any other additional support need apart from deafness, regardless of whether this recognised as a 'primary' or 'secondary' need.

- 57% of referrals to services came from outside the newborn hearing screening programme and after a child had started statutory education. Of these, 70% were contacted by a TOD within 5 working days.
- Regardless of how the referral was made, 38% of families were offered a visit (either face to face or virtual) within 10 working days of the referral.

## PART 1: Deaf children in Scotland

### How many deaf children are there?

Services were asked to give details of deaf children living in the geographical area covered by their service.<sup>4</sup>

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 this as the "adjusted total".

29 services responded to this question. Based on these responses, **the adjusted total number of deaf children in Scotland was 3,418**. This is a 3% increase from 3,313 in 2022 when 30 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	3,418
Total when asked how many children overall	3,400
Total when asked about number of children, broken down by age group	3,400 <sup>5</sup>
Total when asked about number of children, broken down by level of deafness (including 'Level of deafness not known')	3,400 <sup>6</sup>
Total when asked about number of children, broken down by educational setting	3,382 <sup>7</sup>

The smallest number of children reported by a service was 11 deaf children living within their boundaries; the largest number reported was 352 deaf children. The average number of deaf children living in each service area was 118<sup>8</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> Services were asked to include all children and young people under the age of 19 who have a unilateral or bilateral sensori-neural or permanent conductive deafness, at all levels from mild to profound, using BSA/BATOD descriptors, excluding children and young people with temporary deafness. 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 their area but who normally live in that 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.

<sup>5</sup> 3,400 was the sum of the totals provided by services. The sum of the broken-down figures provided by services was 3,390.

<sup>6</sup> 3,400 was the sum of the totals provided by services. The sum of the broken-down figures provided by services was 3,395.

<sup>7</sup> 3,382 was the sum of the broken-down figures provided by services after category totals of lower than 5 were suppressed. The sum of the totals given by services was 2,929.

<sup>8</sup> Using adjusted totals.

The following table compares the total number of deaf children living in Scotland 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.

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

	<b>Number of children reported</b>	<b>Number of services that responded to the survey</b>
CRIDE 2023 (adjusted total)	3,418	29
CRIDE 2022 (adjusted total)	3,313	30
CRIDE 2021 (adjusted total)	2,841	25
CRIDE 2020	2,898	27
CRIDE 2019 (adjusted total)	3,647	30
CRIDE 2018	3,363	30
CRIDE 2017 (adjusted total)	3,174	24
CRIDE 2016	No survey issued by CRIDE	-
CRIDE 2015 (adjusted total)	2,942	29
CRIDE 2014	3,057	28
CRIDE 2013 (adjusted total)	2,842	28
CRIDE 2012	No survey issued by CRIDE	-
CRIDE 2011 (adjusted total)	2,526	26

### **Issues or gaps in the data**

Nine services (31%) indicated that there were no known issues or gaps in data. Where services 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 (48% of all services)
- services not holding figures for children who have left school (59%)
- services not able to split out figures for children with permanent or temporary deafness (14%)
- services only having figures for children who are hearing-aid wearers (3%)
- the audiology service not referring children with a mild hearing loss to services (3%)
- other (14%). Some of the 'other' answers given were different ways of expressing the above set options. Other reasons given included:
  - referrals are only made with parental/pupil consent
  - some data missing for children aged 0-3 not attending an establishment
  - some data missing for children who attend independent schools.

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

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

Table 3: Number of children living in the area, by age

Age group	Number of deaf children reported	Percentage of total
Early years/pre-school	459	14%
Primary-aged	1,430	42%
Secondary-aged	1,290	38%
Post-16 up to the age of 19	211	6%
Total	3,390 <sup>9</sup>	

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

- early years/pre-school age – increased by one percentage point
- primary-aged – increased by one percentage point
- secondary-aged – decreased by three percentage points
- post-16 category – increased by one percentage point.

Table 4: 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	690	21%
Mild	678	21%
Moderate	1,049	32%
Severe	355	11%
Profound	524	16%
Total (excluding 'not known')	3,296	
Not known	99	
Total (including 'not known')	3,395 <sup>10</sup>	

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

- with a unilateral deafness has remained the same
- with a mild level of deafness has decreased by three percentage points
- with a moderate level of deafness has increased by two percentage points
- with a severe level of deafness has increased by one percentage point
- with a profound level of deafness has remained the same.

There were at least 39 deaf children in Scotland with Auditory Neuropathy Spectrum Disorder (ANS<sup>11</sup>), 1% of all deaf children (adjusted total) <sup>12</sup>. This was also 1% in 2021.

ANS<sup>11</sup> is most often identified in babies at the stage of the universal newborn hearing screen. 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

<sup>9</sup> 3,390 was the sum of the broken-down figures provided by services. The sum of totals provided by services was 3,400.

<sup>10</sup> 3,395 was the sum of the broken-down figures. The sum of totals was 3,400.

<sup>11</sup> Two services did not provide an answer to this question.

<sup>12</sup> Two services reported no deaf children with ANSD living in the area.

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 5: Number of children, living in the area, by educational setting*

Type of educational provision		Number of deaf children	Percentage of total (where known)
<b>In local authority</b>	Supported only at home – pre-school children	168	5%
	Early years setting – pre-school children	298	9%
	Supported at home – of school age and home educated	<5	0%
	Mainstream state-funded schools	2,414	71%
	Mainstream independent (non-state-funded) schools (for example, Fettes)	17	1%
	Resource provision in mainstream schools <sup>13</sup>	245 <sup>14</sup>	7%
	Special schools for deaf pupils	38	1%
	Other special schools, not specifically for deaf children	194	6%
	All other post-16 provision	<5	0%
<b>Out of local authority</b>	Early years setting – pre-school children	<5	0%
	Mainstream state-funded schools	0	0%
	Mainstream independent (non-state-funded) schools	0	0%
	Resource provision in mainstream schools	8	0%
	Special schools for deaf pupils	0	0%
	Other special school, not specifically for deaf children	0	0%
	All other post-16 provision	0	0%
<b>Other</b>	NEET (Not in education, employment or in training) (post-16 only)	0	0%
	Other (e.g. Alternative educational placements)	0	0%
<b>Total (excluding ‘not known’)</b>		3,382*	
<b>Not known</b>		0	
<b>Total (including ‘not known’ and suppressed figures)</b>		3,402	

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.

<sup>13</sup> In the CRIDE survey, we use the term ‘resource provision’ to include all schools with resource provision, base or unit, regardless of whether staff in the resource provision are employed by the local authority or by the school.

<sup>14</sup> Five services included deaf children and young people attending resource provisions not specifically for deaf children and young people in their figures.



Table 6: 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	168	5%	
Early years setting - pre-school children	298*	9%	
Supported at home - of school age and home educated	<5	0%	0%
Mainstream provision (including state-funded and independent schools)	2,431	72%	83%
Mainstream provision: resource provision	253	7%	9%
Special schools for deaf pupils	38	1%	1%
Other special schools, not specifically for deaf children	194	6%	7%
All other post-16 provision	<5	0%	
Other (e.g. Pupil referral units, NEET, not known)	0	0%	
Total	3,382*		
Total (excluding pre-school children and other post-16 provision and 'other')	2,916*		

Comparing with figures on school-aged deaf children and young people from 2022, the proportion of children and young people:

- in mainstream provision (including state-funded and independent schools) has decreased by one percentage point from 84% to 83%
- in resource provisions in mainstream schools has increased by three percentage points from 6% to 9%
- in schools for deaf pupils has decreased from 2% to 1%
- in other special schools not specifically for deaf children has decreased from 9% to 7%.

Table 7: 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	3,374	100%
Out of home local authority	8	0%
Total (not including 'not known and 'other')	3,382	

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

### Incidence of additional support needs

Services reported that the number of deaf children with another additional support need<sup>15</sup> was 943<sup>16</sup>. This is 28% of the adjusted total of deaf children. This is an increase from 20% in 2021.

<sup>15</sup> Defined as any other additional support need apart from deafness, regardless of whether this recognised as a 'primary' or 'secondary' need.

<sup>16</sup> Two services did not respond to this question.

## Deaf children with cochlear implants and bone conduction hearing devices

380 children (11% of the adjusted total of deaf children) were reported to have at least one cochlear implant. This is an increase since 2021 when 296 children (10%) were reported<sup>17</sup>.

Children with severe or profound deafness are eligible for cochlear implants. We saw earlier in table 4 that there are 879 children with severe or profound deafness. Whilst this can only be a rough approximation, it can be estimated that 43% 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 are those with a profound deafness, this percentage would rise to 73%.

Services also reported that 238 children (7% of the adjusted total of deaf children) had a bone conduction device. The proportion has increased from 5% in 2021.

## Additional languages

There were 281 children (8% of the adjusted total of deaf children reported) known by services to have English as an additional spoken language at home<sup>18</sup>. This is similar to 2021 when 8% 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 for this question. This is because services identified 3,397 children. This is lower than the figure of 3,418 identified earlier in this report (see table 1).

*Table 8: Number of deaf children, by languages mainly used in school/other educational setting*

Language	Total	Percentage of responses (where known)
Spoken English	3,008	89%
British Sign Language	104	3%
Spoken English together with signed support	183	5%
Gaelic	5	0%
Other combination	97	3%
Total known	3,397	
Not known	0	
Total including not known	3,397	

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 87% to 89%
- British Sign Language has remained the same at 3%
- spoken English together with signed support has decreased from 9% to 5%
- Gaelic has remained the same at 0%
- other combination has increased from 2% to 3%.

We saw earlier in table 4 that there were 879 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

<sup>17</sup> As already noted, differences in response rates to the survey over the years should be considered when comparing data.

<sup>18</sup> Three services did not provide a figure this question.

that 12% of children with severe/profound deafness used British Sign Language in education whilst 21% used signed support with spoken English. Combined, 33% 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.

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 21 deaf children known to be 'newly arrived' (having arrived at their service from outside of the UK in the past year) reported by 12 services. This is 1% of the adjusted total of deaf children. 15 services stated there were no deaf children known to be newly arrived<sup>19</sup>. This has increased from 2021 when the fewer than 5 children were reported (less than 0.2%).

### **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 29 services indicated that at least 3,435 deaf children with permanent or temporary deafness were on services' caseloads. The smallest number of children on a caseload was 16 and the largest was 309. The average was 118 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 and from 2017, 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.

---

<sup>19</sup> In addition two services did not provide an answer to this question.

Table 9: Number of deaf children on caseloads reported over successive years

Year	Number of children on caseload	Number of services
2023	3,435	29
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 survey issued by CRIDE	-
2015	2,618 (adjusted total)	29
2014	2,773	28
2013	2,629 (adjusted total)	28
2012	No survey issued by CRIDE	-
2011	2,343 (adjusted total)	26

We asked services to split out how many children on their caseloads had a temporary conductive hearing loss. 17 services reported that there were 222 children<sup>20</sup>.

If there were 3,418<sup>21</sup> permanently deaf children living in Scotland and 3,213 on services' caseloads with permanent deafness, there were at least 205 deaf children (6% of the adjusted total) who were not being supported by the service at least once a year. It does not automatically follow that 6% of permanently deaf children were not receiving any support at all; many may be receiving support less than once a year from a service, or elsewhere from, for example, resource provisions not managed by the service.

### Post-18 support

Five services (17%) said they provide support to deaf young people over the age of 18, and 24 services (83%) said they did not. There were fewer than five deaf young people over the age of 18 on the caseloads of services where support was provided.

The proportion of services that provide support to deaf young people over the age of 18 has increased from 13% in 2022.

### How do CRIDE's figures compare to School Census figures?

Because of the differences in how data have been collected, definitions used, and the number of areas involved, we recommend the following figures be used as a basis for further debate and analysis, rather than to reach firm conclusions.

These data are published in accordance with the Additional Support for Learning (Scotland) Act and since 2010 have included pupils with Co-ordinated Support Plans, Individualised Education Plans, Child Plans as well as those receiving 'other' types of support. These may be needs which are of short-term duration, or which do not need significant differentiation of learning and teaching to overcome barriers to learning.

<sup>20</sup> In addition, eight services reported no children, and four services did not provide an answer to this question.

<sup>21</sup> Adjusted total.

The latest available data on deaf pupils in Scotland from the Scottish Pupil Census<sup>22</sup> recorded 3,740 deaf children in primary, secondary and special schools as at 2022<sup>23</sup>, compared to the figure of 3,418 reported by local authorities to CRIDE.

It should be noted that the CRIDE figures include children in the early years and young people over the age of 16, whilst these are not included in the Scottish Pupil Census figures. However, it is noteworthy that the Scottish Pupil Census figures still report a higher number of deaf children than CRIDE.

---

<sup>22</sup> The Scottish Pupil Census that took place in September 2022.

<sup>23</sup> <https://www.gov.scot/publications/pupil-census-supplementary-statistics/> Pupil census 2022 supplementary tables, table 1.8.

## **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 were working in different settings, including those in a peripatetic role, working in resource provisions<sup>24</sup> 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 174.84 fte teachers working as TODs in Scotland.
- 60% of these posts were occupied by fully qualified TODs, 32% were occupied by teachers in training for the mandatory qualification, and 9% were occupied by qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training.
- at the time the survey was completed, there were at least 4.6 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 179.44 fte TOD posts, of which 3% were vacant.

The following table provides a breakdown by type of setting.

---

<sup>24</sup> 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.

Table 10: Number of ToD posts overall<sup>25</sup>

	Working mainly as a peripatetic TODs (total and percentage)	Working mainly in a resource provision (total and percentage)	Working mainly in a special school for deaf children and young people (total and percentage)	Working flexibly as a peripatetic TOD, in a resource provision, in a special school for deaf children and young people, and/or in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children or young people	TOD posts overall (total and percentage)
TODs with the mandatory qualification	60.44 (66%)	31.6 (53%)	7.8 (43%)	4.2 (84%)	104.04 (60%)
Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years	26 (28%)	18.8 (31%)	9.8 (54%)	0.8 (16%)	55.4 (32%)
Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training	5.4 (6%)	9.4 (16%)	0.6 (3%)	0 (0%)	15.4 (9%)
Total - in employment	91.84 (100%)	59.8 (100%)	18.2 (100%)	5 (100%)	174.84 (100%)
Vacant posts	2.6 (3%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	1 (17%)	4.6 (3%)
Total – posts	94.44 (100%)	60.8 (100%)	18.2 (100%)	6 (100%)	179.44 (100%)

No TODs were reported as working mainly in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children.

Table 11: Number of TODs in employment overall by role (fte)

	Total TODs in post	Percentage
Working mainly as a peripatetic TODs	91.84	53%
Working mainly in a resource provision	59.8	34%
Working mainly in a special school for deaf children and young people	18.2	10%
Working flexibly as a peripatetic TOD, in a resource provision, in a special school for deaf children and young people, and/or in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children or young people	5	3%
Total of figures given	174.84	100%

<sup>25</sup> 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.

Figures for TODs in the Scottish Cochlear Implant Centre were collected in a separate survey, who reported that there were no TODs in employment, and no vacant posts.

*Table 12: Regional breakdown of TODs with mandatory qualification*

Region <sup>26</sup>	Number of TODs with the mandatory qualification (percentage of total)	Number of teachers working as TODs in region (percentage of total)
Eastern Scotland	31.64 (30%)	43.04 (25%)
Highlands and Islands	7.8 (7%)	12.4 (7%)
North Eastern Scotland	8.4 (8%)	17.2 (10%)
South Western Scotland	56.2 (54%)	102.2 (58%)
Total	104.04 (100%)	174.84 (100%)

For the 29 services for which we were able to compare figures, we found that 34% of services had seen an increase in the number of TODs in employment between 2022 and 2023, 34% of services had seen no change, while 31% of services had seen a decrease.

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

- four services (14%) reported difficulties in recruiting for a permanent post
- 12 (41%) reported no difficulties
- 13 services (45%) stated that this question was not applicable to them.
- 12 services (41%) reported difficulties in recruiting for supply cover
- three (10%) reported no difficulties
- 14 services (48%) stated that this question was not applicable to them.

Combining the figures, 13 services (45%) reported difficulties in recruiting to either permanent or supply posts. Comments from services covered the following themes:

- lack of qualified/suitable applicants
- lack of qualified applicants for supply cover/maternity cover
- lack of applicants with suitable level of BSL skills
- no qualified TODs on the casual supply list
- service not being able to request supply cover
- recruiting someone with BSL Level 3 who will train as a TOD
- lack of applicants for resource provision vacancy.

<sup>26</sup> Based on Eurostat Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS) areas.



## Changes in numbers of TODs

The following tables look at changes in the number of qualified TODs in employment and posts over successive years.

It should be noted that in 2017 the CRIDE Scotland survey began to ask about TODs who work mainly in a special school for deaf children and young people, and TODs who mainly work in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children or young people. This means that figures for 2017 onwards may not be directly comparable with those from previous years.

As set out earlier, when making year on year comparisons, there are varying response rates to the surveys over the years, and anomalies can sometimes appear in the responses from year to year. CRIDE makes every effort to investigate any anomalies that appear particularly strange; however, services and schools do not always respond to such queries.

*Table 13: Changes in numbers of TODs from year to year*

	Number of TODs with the mandatory qualification in employment	Number of teachers working as TODs in employment	Number of services
2023	104.04	174.84	29
2022	100	161.7	30
2021	89.91	131.89	25
2020	77.48	117.98	27
2019	99.63	151.53	30
2018	121.68	154.88	30
2017	101.15	166.5	24
2016	No survey	No survey	No survey
2015	129.5	198	29
2014	138.7	204.7	28
2013	140.6	208.5	28
2012	No survey	No survey	No survey
2011	165.3	218.1	26

*Table 14: Percentage changes in numbers of TODs*

	Percentage change over past 12 years (between 2011 and 2023)	Percentage change over past year (between 2022 and 2023)
Number of TODs with the mandatory qualification in employment	-37%	+4%
Number of teachers working as TODs in employment	-20%	+8%

In terms of any changes of TODs in post in specific roles:

- the total of 91.84 fte peripatetic TODs in employment is up from 77.8 in 2022 (an 18% increase)
- the total of 59.8 fte TODs in resource provisions has increased from 48.2 in 2022 (a 24% increase)
- there were 18.2 fte TODs reported as working mainly in a special school for deaf children or young people. This is a slight decrease from 2022 when there were 18.7 fte TOD reported (a 3% decrease)

- there were 5 fte TODs reported as working flexibly as a peripatetic TOD, in a resource provision, in a special school for deaf children, and/or in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children or young people. A 69% decrease from 2022 when 16 fte TODs were reported as working in this way.

There were two areas that saw large increases in the numbers of TODs they employ. The first area reported an increase from 8.8 to 17.4 fte due to the 2023 response including data from parts of the service supporting primary and secondary children, whereas in 2022 the response covered the secondary service only. A second area reported an increase from 13.6 to 24.8 fte – this was due to the response including data from resource provisions that wasn't included in 2022.

### Additional qualifications held by TODs

Table 15: SCQF 6 BSL (Signature/Institute of BSL Level 3) or equivalent or above

	Number of teachers (fte)	Percentage of TODs in employment in relevant category	Number of services with staff in relevant category
Working mainly as a peripatetic TOD	24.3	26%	13
Working mainly in a resource provision	22	37%	6
Working mainly in a special school for deaf children and young people	8.2	45%	3
Working flexibly as a peripatetic TOD, in a resource provision, in a special school for deaf children and young people, and/or in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children or young people	0	0%	0
Total	54.4	31%	

In terms of other qualifications:

- 3 fte TODs (2% of all TODs in employment) held an additional post-graduate qualification in early years support; 2 fte were working mainly as a peripatetic TOD, whilst 1 fte was working mainly in a resource provision
- 3.2 fte TODs (2% of all TODs in employment) held an additional specialist qualification as an educational audiologist. 2 fte were working mainly as a peripatetic TOD, 1 fte was working mainly in a resource provision and 0.2 fte was working flexibly between roles/settings.

### Age profile of 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 40% of TODs were over the age of 50 and hence likely to retire in the next 10 to 15 years, the same as reported in 2021.

Table 16: Age profile of peripatetic TODs

	Number of teachers (fte)	Percentage of total
Aged 49 or under	91.24	60%
Aged between 50 and 59	50.7	33%
Aged between 60 and 64	8	5%
Aged 65 or over	2.6	2%
Total	152.54	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). 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.

In simple terms, and for consistency across all parts of Scotland, we calculate the theoretical caseloads by dividing the number of permanently deaf children living in any given area and in non-specialist provision<sup>27</sup> by the number of visiting TODs<sup>28</sup> who are qualified or in training for the mandatory qualification.

We found that:

- each visiting TOD had a theoretical average caseload of 34 deaf children
- one service had 33 children in non-specialist provision for deaf children who were not being supported by a qualified or trainee peripatetic TOD<sup>29</sup>
- otherwise, the highest theoretical caseload found was 86, the lowest theoretical caseload found was 11, and the average theoretical caseload was 37.

The theoretical average caseload was the same as in 2022 when each peripatetic TOD had a theoretical average caseload of 34 deaf children.

<sup>27</sup> 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.

<sup>28</sup> 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.

<sup>29</sup> The service reported 2 fte teachers in the peripatetic role – but neither were qualified nor in training to gain the mandatory qualification within three years.

## Other specialist staff

We found that there were 88.39 fte specialist support staff, other than TODs, employed by services, supporting deaf children. There were 5.48 fte vacant posts reported. This means there were 93.87 fte specialist support staff posts, of which 6% were vacant.

Table 17: 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)/Learning support assistants (LSAs) etc	57.1 (98%)	15	1 (2%)	1	58.1 (100%)
Communication support workers (CSWs)/ Communicators etc	18.5 (84%)	9	3.6 (16%)	2	22.1 (100%)
NRCPD/SRLPDC registered BSL/English interpreters	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
Deaf instructors/Deaf role models/Sign language instructors etc	5.22 (86%)	8	0.88 (14%)	1	6.1 (100%)
Educational audiologists/Audiologists in Education who do not also hold a qualification as a TOD	2 (100%)	2	0 (0%)	0	2 (100%)
Technicians et al.	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
Speech and language therapists	0.6 (100%)	2	0 (0%)	0	0.6 (100%)
Family support workers/Liaison officers	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
Social workers/Social workers for deaf children	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)	0	0 (0%)
Other	4.97 (100%)	5	0 (0%)	0	4.97 (100%)
Total of figures given	88.39 (94%)		5.48 (6%)		93.87 (100%)

Other roles included early years practitioners, nursery nurses, and clerical assistants.

The number of posts is down from 102 fte in 2022, although it should be noted that one service stated that in 2022 they had in error included figures for staff that were not directly employed by the service.

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

Table 18: BSL qualifications of TAs and CSWs 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	10.9	15%
Level 1/SCQF 4 BSL or equivalent	13.2	18%
Level 2/SCQF 5 BSL or equivalent	23.5	32%
Level 3/SCQF 6 BSL or equivalent	14.1	19%
Level 4/SCQF 7 BSL or equivalent	0	0%
Level 6/SCQF 10 BSL or equivalent	4	5%
First language BSL user	8.4	11%
Total of figures given	111.8 <sup>30</sup>	

111.8 fte was the total of the broken-down figures given by services. The sum of the totals was 61.8. Both of these figures differ from the 75.6 TAs and CSWs in post reported in the earlier question on other specialist staff directly employed by services. These data should therefore be used with caution. Comments on BSL qualifications of other specialist staff included:

- difficulty finding BSL signers for communicator roles and/or deaf role models
- difficulty in recruiting to CSW posts
- staff working towards the next BSL/SCQF levels
- waiting for the next level course to start in the area for staff to be able to enrol
- use of an external organisation to provide BSL interpretation in schools
- using money for an unfilled TA post to employ an interpreter for student on a weekend/holiday drama course
- pupil support assistants are paid at a higher level because they are using sign
- balance between teaching and communication support staff being assessed in a service
- services access other services/staff externally but do not employ them
- service level agreement between services to share deaf specialists speech and language therapists.

The National Deaf Children’s Society recommends that deaf children who use BSL are supported by staff with **at least** a level 3 (SCQF 6) qualification in BSL. The figures in the previous table indicate that 35% of relevant TAs and CSWs held a level 3 or higher qualification or are a first language BSL user.

<sup>30</sup> 111.8 was the sum of the broken-down figures. 61.8 was the sum of the totals given by services.

## PART 3: Post-16 support

### Young people who have left school

26 services reported that 243 deaf young people had left school at the end of the 2021/22 academic year<sup>31</sup>. We also found (as reported by 26 services<sup>32</sup>) that 150 young people had a transition plan informed by a TOD (62% 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 19: 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 <b>schools</b> on careers advice to deaf young people	24 (83%)	3 (10%)	2 (7%)	29 (100%)
Engaging with careers advisors in <b>colleges</b> on careers advice to deaf young people	15 (52%)	12 (41%)	2 (7%)	29 (100%)
Provision of advice on the accessibility of work placements being undertaken by deaf young people	21 (75%)	5 (18%)	2 (7%)	28 <sup>33</sup> (100%)
Provision of information to deaf young people about the support available through the Access to Work scheme for employment support	24 (86%)	4 (14%)	0 (0%)	28 <sup>34</sup> (100%)
Provision of information to deaf young people about their rights under the Equality Act to reasonable adjustments in the workplace	26 (93%)	2 (7%)	0 (0%)	28 <sup>35</sup> (100%)

Comparing with figures from the 2022 report, the proportion of services engaging with careers advisors in schools has remained the same (83%). There has been an increase in the proportions of services:

- engaging with careers advisors in colleges (40% to 52%)
- providing information on Access to Work (67% to 86%)
- providing information on the Equality Act and reasonable adjustments (70% to 93%)

There has been a decrease in the proportions of services providing information on the accessibility of work placements (83% to 75%).

<sup>31</sup> Two of these services reported no young people.

<sup>32</sup> Three of these services reported no young people.

<sup>33</sup> One service did not answer this question.

<sup>34</sup> One service did not answer this question.

<sup>35</sup> One service did not answer this question.

## PART 4: Support provided

Table 20: Where services are based

	Number of services	Percentage
Based in the local authority	23	79%
Based in a school with a resource provision	3	10%
Based in a specialist school for deaf children	2	7%
Based in a special school not specifically for deaf children	1	3%
Provided by another body or organisation	0	0%
Other	0	0%
Total	29	

### 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. 17 services (59%) stated that they were, and 12 services (41%) 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:

- Education manager – inclusion and equalities
- Head of ASN and Educational Psychology
- Qualified teacher of Additional Support for Learning
- Head teacher/Depute head teacher
- Principal teacher pupil support
- Qualified primary teacher.

### 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 21: Number of resource provisions

	Managed by the local authority	Managed by the schools	Total
Resource provisions for primary-aged children	4	3	7
Resource provisions for secondary-aged children	4	4	8
Total	8	7	15

We found that:

- seven services (24%) had at least one resource provision for primary-aged children in their area
- eight services (28%) had at least one resource provision for secondary-aged children in their area.

The total of 15 resource provisions across Scotland is down from the 16 reported in 2022. We believe this apparent decrease is due to a special school for the deaf being reported in error as a resource provision in the previous survey.

13 of the 15 resource provisions (87%) were managed by a qualified TOD.

We also looked at the number of resource provisions against the number of deaf children<sup>36</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 was one resource provision for every 227 deaf children. This has changed from 2022 when there was one resource provision for every 207 deaf children.

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.

### **Number of schools for deaf children**

Three special schools for deaf children were reported across Scotland. All three of these schools were managed by a qualified TOD.

### **Eligibility frameworks**

17 services (59% 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. 12 services (41% of services) said they did not. Where services did not use it, they:

- refer to the criteria as an example but do not use the scoring
- use elements of the criteria but determine support using professional judgement and consultation with families and settings
- determine support levels on an individual basis looking at a range of factors
- use a locally developed tailored version taken from NatSIP scoring levels
- use local protocol/locally agreed levels of intervention
- use assessment information
- use individual school policy
- use professional judgement.

12 services (41% 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. 17 services (59% of services) said they did not. Where services did not use it, they:

- use their own criteria/protocol/locally agreed levels of intervention
- tailor NatSIP scoring levels
- determine support levels on an individual basis looking at a range of factors
- refer to the criteria as an example but do not use the scoring
- make decisions in discussion with families and speech and language therapy colleagues
- use Success from the Start
- use professional judgement looking at a range of factors.

---

<sup>36</sup> The overall total given by services is used here.



## Support allocations

We asked if there had been any changes to their support allocation between the 2021/22 and 2022/23 academic years. Eight services (28%) reported that there had been changes whilst 21 (72%) reported that there had been no changes. Comments on changes included the following:

- increase in non-teaching staff due to new pupils
- support/frequency of visits is reassessed/reviewed regularly and adjustments made based on needs of individual pupils
- service now has a pupil support assistant and some pupils are receiving more support
- support allocations changed due to staffing changes
- substantial number of increased referrals – children with glue ear and late fitting of hearing aids
- increase in children getting temporary hearing aids due to the backlog and long waiting lists for grommets. Discussions at the local Children’s Hearing Services Working Group (CHSWG) on how these children are supported
- service unable to fill maternity leave.

## Outcomes

We asked services if they collected data on educational outcomes achieved by deaf children at the end of S4:

- two services (7% of services) said they did, for all deaf children living in the local authority or authorities covered by their service
- seven services (24% of services) said they did, but only for children who receive support from the service
- 20 services (69% of services) said they did not.

Three services that collect this data reported that they shared it with the CHSWG in their area, four services reported that they didn’t, and one service reported that there was no CHSWG in their area<sup>37</sup>.

## Quality standards

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

---

<sup>37</sup> One service did not answer this question.

Table 22: Quality standards and resources used by services

	Number of services	Percentage of services
How Good Is Our Sensory Service? (SSC)	25	86%
How Good Is Our School? (Education Scotland)	22	76%
SSC Early Years Quality Standards (SSC)	11	38%
Achieving success for deaf pupils: Count Us In (SSC)	8	28%
NatSIP: Quality Standards for Sensory Support Services in England	9	31%
NDCS Quality Standards: Early years support for children with a hearing loss, aged 0 to 5 (England)	4	14%
Newborn hearing screening programme quality standards	4	14%
NatSIP Quality Improvement Support Pack	5	17%
SeeHear Strategy	6	21%
Other	4	14%

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

- quality indicators developed by another service
- multi agency working and looking at resources from other authorities as a guide for shaping improved practice
- How good is our early learning and childcare?
- Care Inspectorate Framework
- department improvement plan within school.

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. Seven services (24%) said they had, 17 services (59%) said they hadn't and five services (17%) 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 23: Referrals

	Number and percentage of referrals	Number of services <sup>38</sup>
For children identified as deaf through the newborn hearing screening programme	88 (20%)	22
For children identified as deaf outside of the newborn hearing programme and <b>before</b> they had started statutory education	97 (22%)	21
For children identified as deaf outside of the newborn hearing programme and <b>after</b> they had started statutory education	250 (57%)	26
Total of figures given	435 <sup>39</sup> (100%)	

In terms of changes since 2022:

- the total number of referrals over the calendar year has increased from 344 to 435
- the proportion of referrals through the newborn hearing screening programme has increased from 18% to 20%
- outside newborn hearing screening and before statutory education has increased from 19% to 22%
- outside newborn hearing screening and after statutory education has decreased from 64% to 57%.

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, 36 of the families were contacted<sup>40</sup> by a TOD within two working days. This amounts to 41% of the 88 children referred via this route. The corresponding figure was 33% in 2022
- of the referrals for children identified as deaf outside of the newborn hearing screening programme and before they had started statutory education, 65 of the families were contacted by a TOD within five working days. This amounts to 67% of the 97 children referred via this route. The corresponding figure was 59% in 2022
- of the referrals for children identified as deaf outside of the newborn hearing screening programme and after they had started statutory education, 176 of the families were contacted by a TOD within five working days. This amounts to 70% of the 250 children referred via this route. The corresponding figure was 52% in 2022

<sup>38</sup> This is the number of services that provided a figure over 0.

<sup>39</sup> 435 was the sum of the broken-down figures. The sum of the totals provided by services was 434.

<sup>40</sup> For these questions on contact we mean actual or attempted contact.

- 166 families were offered a visit (either face-to-face or virtually) from a TOD within ten working days of any referral. This amounts to 38% of the 435 children referred either through or outside the newborn hearing screening programme. The corresponding figure was 48% in 2022.

Comments from services on this included:

- not all families want visits. In particular, children with a mild deafness in school where the school and family agreed a visit was not required did not become a priority
- not all families are able to meet within these timescales, including those still in hospital when referrals were made. Phone contact is always made quickly when a referral is received
- all families are invited to a face to face meeting within ten days, but some families prefer a telephone conversation
- visits within ten days were not an option for the families with older referred pupils in education due to families' work commitments. Families were happy with a phone call initially
- first visits may be to a nursery/school rather than at home, even though the initial contact is made with the parent by email or phone. This is discussed with the parent at the time
- peripatetic staff make contact with families over the telephone as soon as possible after a referral has been received. Visits are then organised to the home or school but rarely do they take place within 2-5 working days
- the audiologist and speech and language therapist lead this initial contact with the family post diagnosis. The TOD works collaboratively to provide support
- families of 0 to 3s are contacted and supported by the educational audiologist who is also a TOD
- TOD attends paediatric appointments in audiology and so meets children in that setting. Follow up may be phone call due to location of family. Video call is always an option.
- following the initial referral from NHS audiology, families are usually contacted with a letter offering a date and time for a visit often with the specialist speech and language therapist. The service will make contact by phone if there is a request by audiology. The service has found that the timescales put forward by NatSIP are irrelevant to the service which responds to the needs of the family and not to a performance indicator which does not take into account particular circumstances of families. The speed of contact is not an indicator of a successful service.

## 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.

This is the seventh year that a CRIDE Scotland reference group has been in place. Members of this group have worked to improve how the CRIDE survey fits within the Scottish education context, whilst ensuring the data collected can still be compared with the rest of the UK. Current members include: National Deaf Children’s Society, Scottish Sensory Centre, University of Edinburgh, BATOD, Aberdeenshire Sensory Service, Ayrshire Hearing Impairment Service, Fife Sensory Service and Highland Deaf Education Service.

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

*Table 24: Response rate by services to the CRIDE survey*

	<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Cumulative total</b>
First deadline – 15 March 2023	25	25
Second deadline following chasers	4	29

Services were able to respond by completing an online 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 and the CRIDE Scotland reference group.

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.scotland@ndcs.org.uk](mailto:cride.scotland@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.

In some cases, the number of children on the caseload with a temporary deafness is less than five. Where this happens, we have replaced the figure with a '<5' and suppressed the figure to zero in any calculations on the total caseload figure. This is indicated by an asterisk against the caseload figure.

Table 25: 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	TODs mainly in a special school for deaf children	TODs working flexibly <sup>41</sup>	Average population of deaf children covered by each resource provision
Aberdeen City	116	116	0	6.2	No resource provisions reported	6	0	116:0
Aberdeenshire	81	81	None reported	4.4	No resource provisions reported	No schools reported	0	81:0
Angus	103	100*	<5	1.6	No resource provisions reported	No schools reported	0	103:0
Argyll & Bute	60	72	12	1	No resource provisions reported	No schools reported	0	60:0
Clackmannanshire	39	39	0	1	No resource provisions reported	No schools reported	0	39:0
Dumfries and Galloway	75	75	0	1.6	No resource provisions reported	No schools reported	none reported	75:0
Dundee City	67	28	8	0.2	0 <sup>i</sup>	No schools reported	4.2	34:1
East Ayrshire, North Ayrshire, South Ayrshire	175	180	18	8	14.8	No schools reported	0	88:1

<sup>41</sup> TODs working flexibly as a peripatetic TOD, in a resource provision, in a special school for deaf children and young people and/or in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children or young people.

East Dunbartonshire	118	118	20	2.3	No resource provisions reported	No schools reported	0	118:0
East Lothian	60	60*	<5	1.4	No resource provisions reported	No schools reported	0	60:0
East Renfrewshire	108	129	24	2	No resource provisions reported	No schools reported	0	108:0
Edinburgh City	238	238	None reported	4.14	No resource provisions reported	No schools reported	0	238:0
Eilean Siar (Western Isles)	No response	No response	No response	No response	No response	No response	No response	No response
Falkirk	130	144	14	2	No resource provisions reported	7.4	0	130:0
Fife	274	274	11	9.1	1.4	No schools reported	0	137:1
Glasgow City	352	309	18	3.4	14.8	No schools reported	0	176:1
Highland	204	168	0	3.9	3.6	No schools reported	0	102:1
Inverclyde	50	95	42	0 <sup>ii</sup>	1.6	No schools reported	0	25:1
Midlothian	88	88	0	2.8	No resource provisions reported	No schools reported	0	88:0
Moray	36	36	0	1.6	No resource provisions reported	No schools reported	0	36:0
North Lanarkshire	211 <sup>iii</sup>	211	0	6.6	10.6	No schools reported	0	106:1
Orkney	11	12*	<5	1	No resource provisions reported	No schools reported	0	11:0



Perth & Kinross	116	114	None reported	1.8	No resource provisions reported	No schools reported	0	116:0
Renfrewshire	196	196	None reported	4.8	No resource provisions reported	No schools reported	0	196:0
Scottish Borders	51	51*	<5	2	No resource provisions reported	No schools reported	0	51:0
Shetland	12	12*	<5	0.5	No resource provisions reported	No schools reported	0	12:0
South Lanarkshire	185	209	24	5.7	3.6	4.2	0.8	185:1
Stirling	70	90	15	1.6	No resource provisions reported	No schools reported	0	70:0
West Dunbartonshire	59	59*	<5	2	No resource provisions reported	No schools reported	0	59:0
West Lothian	115	115	0	3.8	No resource provisions reported	No schools reported	0	115:0

<sup>i</sup> The service in Dundee City reported 0.6 fte qualified teachers without the MQ and not in training working as TODs in resource provisions.

<sup>ii</sup> The service in Inverclyde reported 2 fte qualified teachers without the MQ and not in training working as peripatetic TODs.

<sup>iii</sup> This is the combined figure for the primary and secondary services.