



Consortium for Research in Deaf Education

## 2024 report for England

### Education provision for deaf children in England in 2023/24

#### Introduction

In 2024, we carried out the 14<sup>th</sup> Consortium for Research in Deaf Education (CRIDE) annual survey on educational staffing and service provision for deaf children.<sup>1</sup> This report sets out the results of the survey for England and is intended for heads of services, policy makers in local and central government and anyone with an interest in deaf education.

The survey alternates from year to year between a standard survey and a survey with a mix of core and thematic questions. The 2024 survey was the version with a mix of core and thematic questions, covering the 2023/24 academic year.<sup>2</sup>

The analysis in this report is based on responses from 133 services<sup>3</sup> in England, covering 151 out of 153 authority areas and giving an effective response rate of 100%. The remaining two local authorities<sup>4</sup> were not contacted on the understanding that they do not have any deaf children in their areas. Responses from a separate survey of special schools for deaf children are also included in parts of this report.

#### Contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Summary of key findings.....   | 3  |
| PART 1: Deaf children in England.....  | 4  |
| PART 2: Teachers of Deaf Children and Young People and other specialist staff .....    | 9  |
| PART 3: Support provided.....  | 17 |
| PART 4: Support following identification of deafness .....                             | 20 |
| PART 5: Thematic questions: Early identification and early intervention pathways ..... | 22 |
| Part 6: Background and methodology .....   | 28 |
| Annex: Information by local authority.....   | 29 |

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

<sup>2</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>3</sup> The increase from 132 services in 2023 to 133 services in 2024 is due to the Cumbria service splitting in to two services – Cumberland, and Westmorland and Furness between the 2023 and 2024 surveys.

<sup>4</sup> The City of London and the Isles of Scilly.

## Interpreting the results

Services were asked to give figures for the position as of 31<sup>st</sup> January 2024.

In the survey, we acknowledge that services and children do not always fit into the boxes or options provided. Services were able to leave comments or clarify where needed throughout the survey. This report notes particular issues that emerged in some areas.

As we see later, it is clear that some services still experience difficulties in extracting data about deaf children in their area and there remain inconsistencies in how different questions are completed throughout the survey. The response rates to individual questions may sometimes vary and anomalies occasionally appear. We make every effort to investigate any inconsistencies that appear particularly strange. However, services do not always respond to such queries. **Therefore, the results should continue to be used with caution.** Caution is also needed due to differences in response rates to individual questions and potential mistakes in data provision between surveys.

Please note that percentages in this report have been rounded up or down to the nearest whole number.

## Summary of key findings

### *Deaf children in England*

- There were 46,933 deaf children. This figure of 46,933 is a reported increase of 1,262 (3%) from 45,671 in 2023.

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

- There were at least 1,258 fte Teachers of Deaf Children and Young People (TOD) posts, of which at least 37 fte (3%) were vacant.
- Of the 1,220 fte working as TODs, 79% held the mandatory qualification, whilst 14% were in training, 6% were qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training, and 1% were occupied by people not qualified as teachers.<sup>5</sup>
- The number of qualified TODs in employment working in a peripatetic role or, in a resource provision and/or in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children has decreased by 5% since 2023 and decreased by 24% since we started the survey in 2011.
- There were at least 701 fte specialist support staff posts (other than TODs) directly employed by services, of which at least 56 fte (8%) are vacant posts.

### *Resource provisions*

- There are a reported 220 resource provisions, a decrease from 227 in 2023. Looking at the spread of resource provisions across England, on average, there is one resource provision for every 213 deaf children.

### *Support following identification of deafness*

- Services stated they had received 7,481 referrals during the 2023 calendar year, an increase from 6,073 in 2022.
- 14% of referrals to services came from the newborn hearing screening programme in 2023. Of these, 93% were contacted by a TOD within two working days.
- 24% of referrals to services came from outside the newborn hearing screening programme and before a child had started statutory education. Of these, 85% were contacted by a TOD within five working days.
- 62% of referrals to services came from outside the newborn hearing screening programme and after a child had started statutory education. Of these, 72% were contacted by a TOD within five working days.
- Regardless of how the referral was made, 43% of families were offered a visit (either face to face or virtual) within ten working days of the referral.

### *Thematic questions: Early identification and early intervention pathways*

- 80 services (60%) reported that all children identified as deaf were referred to the service.
- 89 services (69%) reported that all referrals for children identified as deaf were accepted.
- 45 services (34%) reported that there was a school entry hearing screening programme across the whole area covered by their service.

---

<sup>5</sup> The category of People not qualified as Teachers was only asked about in the separate survey for schools for deaf children and young people.

## PART 1: Deaf children in England

### How many deaf children are there?<sup>6</sup>

Based on the responses from 133 services<sup>7</sup>, there were 46,933 deaf children. This figure of 46,933 is a reported increase of 1,262 (3%) from 45,671<sup>8</sup> in 2023. In some areas there were large changes in the figures provided compared with last year. Some services responded to queries on the changes, and some services did not. Therefore, earlier caveats about interpreting the results should be borne in mind.<sup>9</sup>

The smallest service reported 72 deaf children living within their boundaries. The largest reported 1,658 deaf children. The average number of deaf children living in each service area was 353.

The following table compares the total number of deaf children living in England with figures from previous years. As set out in the introduction, comparisons with earlier reports should be made with caution due to differences in the quality of the responses and response rates between the surveys.

*Table 1: Number of deaf children reported, over successive years*

|                             | Number of children reported |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| CRIDE 2024                  | 46,933                      |
| CRIDE 2023 (adjusted total) | 45,671                      |
| CRIDE 2022 (adjusted total) | 45,680                      |
| CRIDE 2021 (adjusted total) | 45,060                      |
| CRIDE 2020*                 | 37,340                      |
| CRIDE 2019 (adjusted total) | 46,404                      |
| CRIDE 2018                  | 43,467                      |
| CRIDE 2017 (adjusted total) | 45,631                      |
| CRIDE 2016                  | 41,261                      |
| CRIDE 2015 (adjusted total) | 41,377                      |
| CRIDE 2014                  | 40,614                      |
| CRIDE 2013 (adjusted total) | 37,948                      |
| CRIDE 2012 (adjusted total) | 37,414                      |
| CRIDE 2011 (adjusted total) | 34,927                      |

*\*In 2020, there were 103 responses to this question.*

<sup>6</sup> Services were asked to include children and young people with a permanent deafness under the age of 20, including as much as possible: all children who have a unilateral or bilateral sensori-neural or permanent conductive deafness, at all levels from mild to profound, using BSA/BATOD descriptors; all deaf children, regardless of whether they receive support from the service; children who attend education provision outside of the area but who normally live in the area. Please also note that we use the term 'permanent deafness' to include those 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. It also includes those children with glue ear who are not expected to 'grow out' of the condition before the age of 12 years, such as those born with a cleft palate, Down's syndrome, cystic fibrosis, or primary ciliary dyskinesia. Under temporary conductive deafness, we include those children 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 12 years. Please note that for the purpose of these questions we used the term 'children' to include children and young people under the age of 20 (unless otherwise specified).

<sup>7</sup> One service did not provide a figure for the number of children and young people with permanent deafness living in the area. In this case, we included a figure based on the figure they provided for their caseload, minus the number of children with temporary deafness on the caseload in their survey response. However, this figure is significantly lower than the number of children with permanent deafness living in the area that the service reported in 2023.

<sup>8</sup> 45,671 was the adjusted total in 2023.

<sup>9</sup> For example, in Surrey in the South East, the number of deaf children was reported to have increased by 855 (113%), which forms a significant chunk of the overall England-wide increase. The service did not respond to a request to confirm this figure. Nottingham City in the East Midlands also reported an increase of 178 (82%) since 2023 and did not respond to a request to confirm this. Calderdale in Yorkshire and the Humber reported an increase of 91 (59%) and did not reply to a request to confirm this. Another area, Derby City in the East Midlands reported a best estimate that showed a decrease of 420 (76%) since the figure provided in 2023. Another area, Rotherham in Yorkshire and the Humber reported a 38% decrease and confirmed that the figures provided last year were not just for those with permanent deafness, and the figures were correct this year.

The following table looks in more detail at the number of deaf children in different regions of England, and how this has changed since 2022. It should be noted that changes in response rates by some local authorities can sometimes have a significant impact on regional figures.

*Table 2: Number of deaf children in England, by region*

| Region             | Number of deaf children in 2022 – adjusted totals (% of adjusted total) | Number of deaf children in 2023 – adjusted totals (% of adjusted total) | Number of deaf children in 2024 – totals (% of total) <sup>10</sup> |
|--------------------|---|---|---|
| East England       | 4,405<br>(10%)  | 4,857<br>(11%)  | 4,731<br>(10%)  |
| East Midlands      | 3,558<br>(8%)   | 3,533<br>(8%)   | 3,514<br>(7%)   |
| London             | 7,570<br>(17%)  | 7,654<br>(17%)  | 7,524<br>(16%)  |
| North East         | 2,409<br>(5%)   | 2,275<br>(5%)   | 2,252<br>(5%)   |
| North West         | 6,354<br>(14%)  | 6,308<br>(14%)  | 6,473<br>(14%)  |
| South East         | 5,787<br>(13%)  | 5,587<br>(12%)  | 7,114<br>(15%)  |
| South West         | 4,508<br>(10%)  | 4,237<br>(9%)   | 4,235<br>(9%)   |
| West Midlands      | 5,722<br>(13%)  | 5,742<br>(13%)  | 5,935<br>(13%)  |
| Yorkshire & Humber | 5,367<br>(12%)  | 5,478<br>(12%)  | 5,155<br>(11%)  |
| Total              | 45,680<br>(100%)  | 45,671<br>(100%)  | 46,933<br>(100%)  |

### Issues or gaps in the data

95 services (73%) indicated there were known issues or gaps in the data they provided for the number of children. These included:

- services only having figures for children who are receiving support from the service (38% of all services)
- services not holding figures for children who have left school (28%)
- services not able to split out figures for children with permanent or temporary deafness (21%)
- services only having figures for children who are hearing-aid wearers (8%)
- the audiology service not referring children with a unilateral deafness to services (2%)
- other (33%). Some of the 'other' answers given were different ways of expressing the above set options, other reasons for why there were gaps or known issues in services' data on numbers of deaf children included:
  - children and young people whose level of deafness is not known or, based on BATOD criteria, have normal hearing levels not included
  - children whose families declined referral to a service not included
  - figures only include children and young people that a service has been notified about by audiology
  - services not having information for students who have cochlear implants

<sup>10</sup> Please see previous footnotes on changes in some areas.

- services may not know about children and young people educated out of their area
- services not able to separate out figures for children on the caseload who live outside of the area but are educated within it
- potential under reporting of pupils placed in specialist provision (not schools for deaf children).

The extent of these issues and gaps is a reminder that the figures generated from the CRIDE survey need to be used with caution. The data in this report are only as good as the data held by and provided to us, by local authorities, and the above section raises questions about how we can improve the data collected on deaf children. At the same time, we believe that data generated through the CRIDE reports remain amongst the best sources of data available.

We asked services how many children were known to be eligible for the Pupil Premium. 43 services provided a figure of over zero in answer to this question, reporting a total of 3,072 children and young people. This amounts to 19% of the total number of deaf children identified in these 43 areas. However, 18 of the 43 services also commented that the data they provided was not necessarily complete or accurate. If we include only the data provided by 25 services that did not indicate the data was not accurate, 1,953 children were reported to be known to be eligible for the Pupil Premium, 22% of the total for these 25 areas.

### **Number of deaf children on the service's caseload**

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 and teachers, providing hearing aid checks, etc. We asked services to include children they supported but who do not live in the geographical area covered by their service. Children with temporary deafness could be included in the response to this question if they were on service's caseloads.

Responses from 133 services indicate that there were at least 46,211 deaf children with permanent or temporary deafness were on caseload. This is a reported 5% increase from 2023 when services reported that 43,851 deaf children were on their caseloads.

Table 3: Number of deaf children on caseloads reported, over successive years

| Year | Number of children on caseload | Definition of caseload                     | Number of services |
|------|--------------------------------|--|--------------------|
| 2024 | 46,211                         | Some form of support at least once a year  | 133 <sup>11</sup>  |
| 2023 | 43,851                         | Some form of support at least once a year  | 132                |
| 2022 | 42,366                         | Some form of support at least once a year  | 131                |
| 2021 | 42,353                         | Some form of support at least once a year  | 132                |
| 2020 | 32,820                         | Some form of support more than once a year | 103*               |
| 2019 | 40,217                         | Some form of support more than once a year | 131                |
| 2018 | 42,058                         | Clear definition not provided              | 130                |
| 2017 | 35,666                         | Some form of support more than once a year | 129                |
| 2016 | 40,084                         | Some form of support at least once a year  | 131                |
| 2015 | 32,773                         | Some form of support more than once a year | 129                |
| 2014 | 33,139                         | Some form of support more than once a year | 132                |
| 2013 | 32,011                         | Some form of support more than once a year | 131                |
| 2012 | 31,425                         | Some form of support more than once a year | 126                |
| 2011 | 31,067                         | Clear definition not provided              | 123                |

\*There was a lower number of responses to the survey in 2020 due to the covid-19 pandemic.

We asked services to split out how many children on their caseloads had a temporary conductive hearing loss. 91 services reported that there were 4,634 children.<sup>12</sup> This is an increase of 22% on 3,796 in 2023.

If there were 46,933 permanently deaf children living in England and 41,577 on services' caseloads with permanent deafness<sup>13</sup>, there were at least 5,356 deaf children (11% of the total) who were not being supported by a service at least once a year. It does not automatically follow that 11% of permanently deaf children were not receiving any support at all; many may receive support less than once a year from a service, or elsewhere from, for example, resource provisions not managed by the service or from special schools for deaf children.

### Children in schools for deaf children and young people

The separate short survey for schools for deaf children and young people asked about the number of children placed in the school, and how many live in the local authority that the school is located in. 17 schools for deaf children and young people in England reported that there were 1,161 children and young people placed at the schools, of whom 410 lived within the local authority in which the schools were located.

The 2024 survey did not include on numbers of deaf children in different education settings. However, by way of comparison, in 2023 survey, services reported that there were 918 deaf children living in their area who attended special schools for deaf children. This suggests that services are under-reporting the number of deaf children in special schools by around 21%.

### How do CRIDE's 2024 figures compare to School Census figures?

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

<sup>11</sup> The increase in the number of services in 2024 is due to a service in Cumbria separating into two services (Cumberland, and Westmorland and Furness) between the 2023 and 2024 surveys.

<sup>12</sup> In addition, 18 services reported no children, and 24 services did not provide an answer to this question.

<sup>13</sup> The figure of 41,577 is reached by subtracting the number of children with temporary deafness on services' caseloads from the number of children with permanent or temporary deafness on services' caseloads.

School Census figures for 2024<sup>14</sup> 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.<sup>15</sup>

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.

---

<sup>14</sup> 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.

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



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

We asked how many TODs are working in different settings, including those in a peripatetic role, working in resource provisions<sup>16</sup> and/or working in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children or young people. We also separately asked schools for deaf children in England for figures on TOD posts. We found that:

- overall, there were at least 1,220 fte teachers working as TODs in England.
- 79% of these posts were occupied by fully qualified TODs, 14% were occupied by teachers in training for the mandatory qualification, 6% were occupied by qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training, and 1% were occupied by people not qualified as teachers.<sup>17</sup>
- at the time the survey was completed, there were at least 37 fte vacant posts reported.
- if the vacant posts are added to the total number of TODs in employment, this would indicate there were at least 1,258 fte TOD posts, of which 3% were vacant.

---

<sup>16</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.

<sup>17</sup> Please note, the category of People not qualified as Teachers was only asked about in the separate survey for schools for deaf children and young people.

Table 4: Number of ToD posts overall (fte)<sup>18 19</sup>

|  | <b>Working mainly as a peripatetic TODs</b><br>(total and percentage) | <b>Working mainly in a resource provision</b><br>(total and percentage) | <b>Working mainly in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children or young people</b><br>(total and percentage) | <b>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</b><br>(total and percentage) | <b>Working in a special school for deaf children and young people</b><br>(total and percentage) | <b>TOD posts overall</b><br>(total and percentage) |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| TODs with the mandatory qualification                                      | 557.32<br>(89%)   | 236.37<br>(76%)   | 2.9<br>(100%)   | 6.95<br>(96%)  | 158.73<br>(58%)   | 962.27<br>(79%)                                    |
| Teachers in training for the mandatory qualification within 3 years        | 67.5<br>(11%)   | 63.5<br>(20%)   | 0<br>(0%)   | 0.3<br>(4%)  | 35.44<br>(13%)  | 166.74<br>(14%)                                    |
| Qualified teachers without the mandatory qualification and not in training | 3.9<br>(1%)   | 10.4<br>(3%)  | 0<br>(0%)   | 0<br>(0%)  | 63.94<br>(24%)  | 78.24<br>(6%)                                      |
| People not qualified as teachers   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a   | n/a  | 13.5<br>(5%)  | 13.5<br>(1%)                                       |
| Total - in employment  | 628.72<br>(100%)  | 310.27<br>(100%)  | 2.9<br>(100%)   | 7.25<br>(100%)   | 271.61<br>(100%)  | 1,220.75<br>(100%)                                 |
| Vacant posts   | 25.32<br>(4%)   | 9.5<br>(3%)   | 0<br>(0%)   | 0<br>(0%)  | 2.7<br>(1%)   | 37.52<br>(3%)                                      |
| Total – posts  | 654.04<br>(100%)  | 319.77<br>(100%)  | 2.9<br>(100%)   | 7.25<br>(100%)   | 274.31<br>(100%)  | 1,258.27<br>(100%)                                 |

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

<sup>18</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, as well as People not qualified as teachers are out of the total in post. Percentages for vacant posts are out of all posts.

<sup>19</sup> A small number of services separately indicated that they had additional supply/zero hours contract staff in addition to the TODs they reported.

Table 5: Number of TODs in employment overall by role (fte)

|   | Total TODs in post | Percentage |
|---|--------------------|------------|
| Working mainly as a peripatetic TODs  | 628.72             | 52%        |
| Working mainly in a resource provision  | 310.27             | 25%        |
| Working mainly in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children or young people  | 2.9                | 0%         |
| Working flexibly as a peripatetic TOD, in a resource provision and/or in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children or young people | 7.25               | 1%         |
| Working in a special school for deaf children and young people  | 271.61             | 22%        |
| Total of figures given  | 1,220.75           | 100%       |

Figures for TODs in auditory implant programmes across England were collected in a separate survey. Responses were received from 12 programmes. There were at least 26.2 fte fully qualified TODs reported in post, and 0.9 fte vacancies reported. This means there were 27.1 fte posts, of which 3% were vacant. There were no TODs in training for the mandatory qualification or not in training or people who have not qualified as a teacher reported.

### Changes in numbers of TODs

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

- overall, the number of peripatetic TODs in employment has increased slightly by 0.8% from 624.03 in 2023 to 628.72 fte. Of these, the proportion with the mandatory qualification has decreased from 91% to 89% whilst the number in training has increased from 8% to 11%
- the number of TODs in employment in resource provisions has increased by 2% from 303.22 to 310.27 fte. Of these, the proportion with the mandatory qualification has decreased from 82% to 76% whilst the number in training has increased from 14% to 20%
- the number of TODs in employment and working flexibly between different roles and settings has fallen from 21.5 fte to 7.25 fte
- the number of TODs in employment in special schools for deaf children has increased from 270.2 to 271.61 fte. Of these, the proportion who are qualified teachers but without the mandatory qualification to teach deaf children has increased from 17% to 24%. The proportion in training has fallen from 23% to 13% whilst the proportion with the mandatory qualification has increased slightly from 56% to 58%.

The following table looks at changes in the number of qualified TODs in employment and posts since 2011.<sup>20</sup>

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

As set out earlier, when making year on year comparisons, anomalies can sometimes appear in the responses. We make every effort to investigate anomalies that appear particularly strange; however, services and schools do not always respond to such queries.

<sup>20</sup> A small number of services reported that service leads/managers, and resource provision management time was or may have been included in responses in previous years.

Table 6: Changes in numbers of TODs from year to year<sup>21</sup>

|                    | 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              | 983.96  |
| 2023               | 841.95  | 937.15   | 951.95                                       | 42                 | 993.95  |
| 2022               | 860.34  | 945.14   | 960.74                                       | 43.1               | 1,003.84  |
| 2021 <sup>22</sup> | 874.82  | 962.92   | 974.52                                       | 44.65              | 1,019.17  |
| 2019               | 903.41  | 1,007.77   | 1,019.37                                     | 34.8               | 1,054.17  |
| 2018               | 898.82  | 1,020.62   | 1,027.87                                     | 30.8               | 1,058.67  |
| 2017               | 913.75  | 1,037.35   | 1,050.75                                     | 44.65              | 1,095.4   |
| 2016               | 932.38  | 1,047.18   | 1,059.28                                     | 60.9               | 1,120.18  |
| 2015               | 995.75  | 1,117.85   | 1,126.35                                     | 45.6               | 1,171.95  |
| 2014               | 999.2   | 1,071.3  | 1,079.9                                      | 45.8               | 1,125.7   |
| 2013               | 1,031.89  | 1,097.29   | 1,104.49                                     | 40.75              | 1,145.24  |
| 2012               | 1,063.7   | 1,125.6  | 1,136.4                                      | 44.5               | 1,180.9   |
| 2011               | 1,062.11  | 1,153.71   | 1,162.51                                     | 34                 | 1,196.51  |

(2020 data not included because of lower response rate to survey)

Table 7: Percentage change in numbers of TODs

|  | Percentage change over past 13 years (between 2011 and 2024) | Percentage change over past year (between 2023 and 2024) |
|--|--|--|
| TODs with the mandatory qualification in employment                | -24%   | -5%  |
| TODs with the mandatory qualification in employment or in training | -19%   | 0%   |
| Teachers working as TODs in employment                             | -18%   | 0%   |
| Vacant posts   | 2%   | -17%   |
| Number of TOD posts (including vacancies)                          | -18%   | -1%  |

In the 131 services for which we were able to compare figures, we found that 40% had seen an increase in the number of TODs in employment between 2023 and 2024, 27% had seen no change, while 33% had seen a decrease.

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

- 36 services (27%) reported difficulties in recruiting for a permanent post
- 36 (27%) reported no difficulties.

<sup>21</sup> In 2017, we began to ask about TODs in special schools or colleges not specifically for deaf children or young people. Figures from before/after are therefore not directly comparable. However, it is worth noting that the inclusion of these figures did not lead to a noticeable increase in the number of TODs.

<sup>22</sup> In 2022 one service reported that in 2021 13 TODs working in special schools for deaf children were included in their main CRIDE survey as working in special schools or colleges not specifically for deaf children and were therefore double counted. The 2021 data was adjusted for this, however in years prior to that ToDs working in schools for deaf children were also double counted and given the complexities and uncertainties involved in correcting data going back several years, data from previous years have not been adjusted to reflect this issue.

- 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.

*Table 8: Number of qualified TODs by region*

| 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%                                      |
| North East               | 57.5  | 44.65   | 44.55   | -23%                                    | 0%                                      |
| North West <sup>23</sup> | 191.96  | 125.65  | 116.17  | -39%                                    | -8%                                     |
| South East               | 142.15  | 118.91  | 114.35  | -20%                                    | -4%                                     |
| South West               | 95.6  | 64.1  | 63.5  | -34%                                    | -1%                                     |
| West Midlands            | 98.15   | 90.2  | 86.8  | -12%                                    | -4%                                     |
| Yorkshire & Humber       | 126.15  | 109.5   | 95.8  | -24%                                    | -13%                                    |
| Total                    | 1,062.11  | 841.95  | 803.54  | -24%                                    | -5%                                     |

<sup>23</sup> 12 TODs with the mandatory qualification were inaccurately included by a service in the North West in 2021 and were likely to have been included in previous figures. These have not been removed from figures for 2011 due to uncertainty about the exact nature of the double counting prior to 2021.

Table 9: Number of qualified TODs and teachers in training for the mandatory qualification by region

| 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                                   | -6%                                     | 0%                                      |
| East Midlands            | 95.4                                    | 67.4                                    | 66.2                                    | -31%                                    | -2%                                     |
| London                   | 183.7                                   | 163.6                                   | 174.85                                  | -5%                                     | 7%                                      |
| North East               | 62.6                                    | 50.05                                   | 51.15                                   | -18%                                    | 2%                                      |
| North West <sup>24</sup> | 209.66                                  | 129.85                                  | 128.57                                  | -39%                                    | -1%                                     |
| South East               | 153.45                                  | 138.81                                  | 138.65                                  | -10%                                    | 0%                                      |
| South West               | 98.6                                    | 74.2                                    | 70.9                                    | -28%                                    | -4%                                     |
| West Midlands            | 106.95                                  | 96.4                                    | 94                                      | -12%                                    | -2%                                     |
| Yorkshire & Humber       | 138.25                                  | 118                                     | 112.1                                   | -19%                                    | -5%                                     |
| Total                    | 1153.71                                 | 937.15                                  | 934.84                                  | -19%                                    | 0%                                      |

### Other specialist staff

We found that there were at least 644 fte specialist support staff, other than TODs, employed by services, supporting deaf children. There were at least 56 fte vacant post reported. This means there were at least 701 fte specialist staff posts, of which 8% were vacant.

<sup>24</sup> 12 TODs with the mandatory qualification were inaccurately included by a service in the North West in 2021 and were likely to have been included in previous figures. These have not been removed from figures for 2011 due to uncertainty about the exact nature of the double counting prior to 2021.

Table 10: 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/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 <b>do not</b> 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

- Speech and language therapy teaching assistant
- Business services assistant/Administrator
- Midday supervisor.

Some comments also referred to staff that were commissioned, including educational audiologists and speech and language therapists, as well as CSWs on zero hours contracts to provide cover.

The total of 701.063 fte specialist staff posts reported this year is a 3% increase since 2023 when there were 678.55 specialist staff posts reported, of which 6% were vacant. There has been a noticeable increase in the number of staff reported in the 'other' category, from 37.19 fte in 2023 to 52.23 fte in 2024.



## PART 3: Support provided

Table 11: Where services are based

|  | Number of services | Percentage |
|--|--------------------|------------|
| Based in the local authority                                 | 117                | 88%        |
| Based in a school with a resource provision                  | 5                  | 4%         |
| Based in a special school for deaf children                  | 1                  | 1%         |
| Based in a special school not specifically for deaf children | 2                  | 2%         |
| Provided by another body or organisation                     | 3                  | 2%         |
| Other  | 5                  | 4%         |
| Total  | 133                |            |

Other arrangements included:

- an early years part of a service being based in the local authority and the primary and secondary parts of a service working from a school with a resource provision
- a service being delegated to a primary school
- a service being commissioned to a special school not specifically for deaf children, but based elsewhere
- a dual-funded service with part being based in the local authority and part being commissioned by the local authority and based in a special school not specifically for deaf children
- a joint arrangement between six local authorities hosted by a not-for-profit organisation.

### 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. 96 services (73%) stated that they were, and 36 services (27%) stated that they were not.<sup>25</sup>

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:

- Early years SEND and advisory services manager
- Head of SEND support and school improvement adviser
- SEND service manager
- Learning and support manager for SEND-Sensory
- Lead teacher – Sensory impairment service
- Specialist advice team manager
- Sensory manager
- Advisory teacher for early years and inclusion
- Principal/senior educational psychologist
- Educational psychologist
- Outreach manager
- QTMSI
- QTVI
- Qualified teacher of children with speech, language and communication difficulties

---

<sup>25</sup> One service did not answer this question.

- Specialist advisory teacher – developmental language disorder
- Lead advisory teacher for physical disabilities
- Specialist ASD teacher
- School SENCO
- Head teacher
- Combination of Head teacher and resource provision TOD
- Experienced teacher with post graduate experience in special education.

### Number of resource provisions

In the CRIDE survey, we use the term ‘resource provision’ to include all schools (mainstream or special) with a resource provision, base or unit specifically for deaf children, regardless of whether staff in the resource provision are employed by the local authority or by the school.

Table 12: Number of resource provisions<sup>26 27</sup>

|   | Managed by the local authority | Managed by the schools | Total |
|---|--------------------------------|------------------------|-------|
| Resource provisions for primary-aged children   | 47.5                           | 78                     | 125.5 |
| Resource provisions for secondary-aged children | 34.5                           | 60                     | 94.5  |
| Total   | 82                             | 138                    | 220   |

We found that:

- 86 services (65%) had at least one resource provision for primary-aged children in their area
- 77 services (58%) had at least one resource provision for secondary-aged children in their area.

180 of the 220 resource provisions (82%) were managed by a qualified TOD.

The total of 220 resource provisions across England is a decrease of 7 from 2022 when the survey identified 227 resource provisions. Comments on resource provisions included:

- one service stated there was one other resource provision with no children and no TOD due to no demand for places
- one service reported a naturally arising cluster of deaf children in a primary school that is not a designated resource provision but receives support from the sensory support service
- some services reported the expected closure of a resource provision in their areas
- some services with no resource provisions reported that families tell them they are not in favour of a resource provision, usually due to travel times
- one service reported that resource provisions that were previously mothballed may be re-established in the future if there is demand for them. Currently children attend hubs at special schools and link with resource provisions in a neighbouring local authority
- one service reported they also have pop up resource provisions in an area which has a transient population.

<sup>26</sup> One response indicated that there was a resource provision which supports children of both primary and secondary age. This resource provision has been recorded as 0.5 for each age group in the table.

<sup>27</sup> A small number of services have reported how resource provisions are managed differently in recent years, but have also commented that there have been no changes to management.

Table 13: Number of resource provisions over time

| Year | Number of resource provisions |
|------|-------------------------------|
| 2024 | 220                           |
| 2023 | 227                           |
| 2022 | 230                           |
| 2021 | 237                           |
| 2019 | 246                           |
| 2018 | 240                           |
| 2017 | 251                           |
| 2016 | 260                           |

(2020 data not included because of lower response rate to survey)

We also looked at the number of resource provisions against the number of deaf children.<sup>28</sup> This is intended to indicate the spread of resource provisions across England, relative to the overall population of deaf children. We found that, on average, there was one resource provision for every 213 deaf children. This has changed from 2023 when there was one resource provision for every 200 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.

Table 14: Population of deaf children covered by each resource provision

| Region             | Average ratio |
|--------------------|---------------|
| East England       | 163:1         |
| East Midlands      | 319:1         |
| London             | 154:1         |
| North East         | 188:1         |
| North West         | 324:1         |
| South East         | 155:1         |
| South West         | 282:1         |
| West Midlands      | 396:1         |
| Yorkshire & Humber | 224:1         |
| England            | 213:1         |

<sup>28</sup> The number of children and young people with permanent deafness living in the area.

## PART 4: Support following identification of deafness

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

Table 15: Referrals

|   | Number and percentage of referrals | Number of services <sup>29</sup> |
|---|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| For children identified as deaf through the newborn hearing screening programme   | 1,027<br>(14%)                     | 126                              |
| For children identified as deaf outside of the newborn hearing programme and <b>before</b> they had started statutory education | 1,782<br>(24%)                     | 126                              |
| For children identified as deaf outside of the newborn hearing programme and <b>after</b> they had started statutory education  | 4,672<br>(62%)                     | 127                              |
| Total of figures given  | 7,481 <sup>30</sup><br>(100%)      |                                  |

In terms of changes since 2023:

- the total number of referrals over the calendar year has increased from 6,073 to 7,481
- the proportion of referrals through the newborn hearing screening programme has decreased from 18% to 14%
- referrals for children identified outside newborn hearing screening and before statutory education has increased from 22% to 24%
- referrals for children identified outside newborn hearing screening but after they had started statutory education has increased from 60% to 62%.

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). It should also be noted that some services were not able to provide data for the questions on timescales for contacting families and offering visits to families. Therefore the percentages for contact and visit timescales should not be assumed to apply to all services. It should also be noted that the extent of gaps in data varied between years. For these reasons this data is not directly comparable to last year. 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, 956 of the families were contacted<sup>31</sup> by a TOD within two working days. This amounts to 93% of the 1,027 children referred via this route. The corresponding figure was 90% reported in 2023
- of the referrals for children identified as deaf outside of the newborn hearing screening programme and before they had started statutory education, 1,511 of the families were contacted by a TOD

<sup>29</sup> This is the number of services that provided a figure over 0.

<sup>30</sup> 7,481 was the sum of the broken down figures provided by services, 7,323 was the sum of the totals provided by services.

<sup>31</sup> For these questions on contact, the survey stated that we mean actual or attempted contact.

within five working days. This amounts to 85% of the 1,782 children referred via this route. The corresponding figure was 85% in 2023

- of the referrals for children identified as deaf outside of the newborn hearing screening programme and after they had started statutory education, 3,374 of the families were contacted by a TOD within five working days. This amounts to 72% of the 4,672 children referred via this route. The corresponding figure was 75% in 2023
- 3,242 families were offered a visit (either face-to-face or virtually) from a TOD within ten working days of any referral. This amounts to 43% of the 7,481 children referred either through or outside the newborn hearing screening programme. The corresponding figure was 52% in 2023.

Comments from services on this included:

- referral information not always including contact details for parents
- families may request that visits take place after the ten working days from referral for a variety of reasons, or there may be delayed responses from parents
- some families prefer phone calls rather than video calls, and some services routinely make contact via phone call rather than video call
- some services visit after hearing aids are fitted, and keep in contact with families
- families with children with a conductive temporary deafness not always contacted in the same time frames
- children being in hospital or having additional health appointments can affect when face to face visits happen
- sourcing an interpreter can affect when families are contacted
- children are in school are visited in their educational settings (some services also reported they keep in contact with parents by phone call or sending information)
- school holidays can affect whether a visit happens within ten days
- turnover of staff or staff being on leave made contact or visits within the relevant timescales challenging
- some services reported they don't have the capacity to meet the timescales
- audiology/hospital and clinic not routinely referring to services. Some services stated they were working to improve this
- referrals from settings may go through a centralised intake process before a service becomes aware of them
- group sessions every fortnight for all new referrals, ensuring face to face contact
- some services referred to having good relationships with referring hospitals and school SENCOs with regards to referral processes
- some services referred to working to improve data on contact and visit timescales, and recording reasons for visits not being within expected timescales for monitoring
- some services reported recording data in a different way to what was requested in the questions.

## **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
- 20 services (15%) reported that they did not know.

Services were then given an opportunity to share any insight or anecdotal views on several topics.

On how well or not referral pathways were working in their area:

- some services reported good/strong connections with audiology clinics – including information sharing by audiology clinics and regular meetings
- regular multi-agency working with meetings for audiology, speech and language therapy and TODs
- strong links with cochlear implant services
- referrals received electronically/online referrals are processed quicker and are more efficient
- health visitors know the referral pathway and are proactive
- some services reported ear mould clinics working well, e.g. at a school resource provision, or for ear mould impressions at baby and toddler groups
- Children’s Hearing Services Working Group (CHSWG) mapped out a referral pathway which is being reviewed to involve all service areas
- effective CHSWGs ensuring good communication between all services/stakeholders
- an open referral system so that anyone can refer works well
- ‘single pathway’ referral route works well
- TODs being part of the diagnostic team with the role of increasing awareness of the importance of early intervention, giving families a holistic approach combining clinical and education services, or TODs attending first fitting appointments
- a pathway where referrals for children under five with permanent deafness are treated in the same way as newborn hearing screening (NHSP) referrals working well
- close relationships with education settings, and education settings knowing how to refer children to the service
- TODs offering training and information to early years settings and schools
- improving relationships with BAHA team
- growing referrals for post 18 young people not previously known to a service
- increases in referrals for children with unilateral deafness
- increases in referrals for children with temporary conductive deafness
- some concern about referrals from hospitals outside of the local authority
- variable standards/criteria or processes for referrals between clinics
- referrals received by letter/post can cause issues
- some concern about audiology caseloads, or having to chase audiology for updates that are not sent in a timely manner, or staff turnover in audiology having an impact
- audiology service review in an area causing delays in some referrals
- some concern about not receiving NHSP referrals in a timely manner and backlog in writing reports
- some concern that GPs take too long to refer to audiology or refer to ENT by mistake
- some concern about ENT waiting times, capacity, and struggles to get information from ENT

- some concerns around referral pathways for children with conductive deafness, as well as services commenting they don't always find out if a child is discharged
- some concern around waiting lists for speech and language therapy having an impact on referrals
- issue with timely secure email referrals due to structure of an education service
- referrals pathway for APD not in place and processed ad-hoc by schools
- children moving into the area are not always picked up by their schools
- some schools/SENCOs not referring in a timely manner
- some referrals for children new to the country can be slow or missed
- independent/private schools may not be included in the school entry hearing screening programme
- some concern that due to less reception screening children with glue ear could be missed
- sometimes services don't get all the contact information needed for contacting parents
- some concern about education staffing/capacity
- potential issues supporting children with complex needs and early identification of deafness, or these children not receiving early intervention due to delayed diagnosis
- challenges with parental engagement, and families not attending appointments.

On whether there had been any difference in the number or type of referrals that have been made into services since 2020, services commented on increases in:

- overall referrals/numbers of deaf children and young people
- referrals for deaf children with complex needs
- referrals for children with temporary conductive deafness being given hearing aids/waiting for grommet surgery
- children with unilateral deafness
- children with mild deafness
- children identified with ANSD
- children with APD
- babies with unilateral deafness being fitted with BAHA/bone conduction hearing aids
- parental referrals where only ENT are involved
- children with cochlear implants
- children presenting with language delay
- school aged pupils/older children being referred
- EHCP referrals
- children living in other local authorities being supported as a reciprocal arrangement
- children new to the area or are in-year admissions
- children new to the country
- refugee children
- EAL families and non-English speaking families
- families in deprivation, or more complex family issues.

On changes to types of referrals, services also commented on:

- late diagnosis and referrals
- decline in the number of children and young people being referred with a diagnosis of Down's Syndrome.



On any good or encouraging practice in terms of early identification and early intervention pathways, services commented on:

- multidisciplinary working:
  - joint meetings and clinics with audiology
  - joint clinics with community paediatrician
  - good connections/communication with audiology, neighbouring TOD services, health visitors/SENCO forum
  - multidisciplinary working/meetings, may include the family, audiology, SALT, paediatricians, portage, social care, early years professionals
  - attending initial hearing aid fitting or final diagnostic appointment
  - improving links with ENT
  - participation in two-year old checks
  - close/joint working with cochlear implant programmes including supporting families through the assessment process
  - good communication with preschools
  - good communication with parents
  - attending and being proactive at CHSWGs
  - TODs trained by audiology and qualified to carry out otoscopy within homes and settings, reducing numbers attending clinics for new moulds
  
- pathways:
  - designated early years team that have an early identification pathway
  - formal/agreed pathways with audiology
  - joint pathway with specialist speech and language therapists for deaf children
  - developing pathways that specialist SALTs are referred to at the time of diagnosis
  - working with audiology and SALT to develop a pathway for children with a diagnosis of ANSD
  - earlier identification and more detailed/accurate results by paediatric audiologists enabling TODs to deliver an even better service
  - links with health visitor pathways
  - universal and well-managed school entry screening
  
- resources and training:
  - training for health visitors resulting in more joint working around children with a suspected deafness, and a greater awareness and understanding of the service
  - training for early years SEND advisers
  - free glue ear training to schools, or a one-off visit
  - 'How to spot hearing loss' leaflets for health visitors, and online for parents and SENCOs
  - resource developed for early year settings on meeting the needs of deaf children in the early years
  - A Baby Pathway HI Working group including parents and professionals working to create family friendly information about services for children aged 0-3 identified as deaf 'Family Service Booklet' for families when they become part of the caseload
  - informal parent-to-parents mentoring

- 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 giving parents early contact with a Deaf adult and first language BSL user
  - work with SALT to run a group for preschool deaf children and their families
  
- other comments:
  - NHSP referrals are prioritised effectively
  - remote visits for initial care plan meeting at parents' convenience
  - team leads attending the panel for statutory assessments
  - offering AVT as an early intervention practice
  - radio aids considered for preschool children from first fit and provided accordingly
  - ensuring early years quality standards are met
  - NatSIP Framework of Eligibility used to allocate TOD time
  - Success from the Start, Teddy Talks and other materials used to track progress and support decision making and next steps
  - appointment of an interim speech and language therapist, deaf specialist to the team, carrying out joint home visits and running a preschool group
  - new purpose built resource provision improving the local offer for key stage 3, and providing a specialist hub with workspaces available to the peripatetic sensory team, fostering more integrated practices.

On other issues or challenges that have had a significant impact on the support that services are able to provide, services commented on:

- a service comprising of all TODs new in post, whilst having been a challenge, the TODs have taken full responsibility of the children and young people on their caseloads and met set visit criteria
- delays in assessments, implantation and follow ups at regional cochlear implant centre
- more families home-schooling children
- NHS strikes leading to late referrals
- more families requesting funded independent provisions with TOD support
- families new to the country including refugee families with children whose prior education and health support differed from that would have been available in the UK, creating demand for

significant TOD support, and an increased need for interpreting services putting pressure on service budgets

- seeing higher needs at nurseries/early years foundation stage where children born during the covid pandemic had limited in-person support and delays in implantation
- the covid pandemic having an impact on speech and language delays and development of social skills
- upskilling workforce to meet the growing demand for BSL to support learning
- lack of speech and language therapists, including those with a specialism in deafness, and increased waiting times for speech and language therapy
- shortages of staff and turnover of staff, and challenges in recruiting in schools and early years settings
- lack of specialist support staff, several services specifically referring to communication support workers
- more social and emotional support needed, especially for teenagers, and pupils struggling to return to school/refusing to attend school
- changing the hearing aids being given to children causing issues, including different types of hearing aids being provided by different areas, having an impact on the assistive technology a service needing to purchase and loan, and the impact of hearing aids with integrated receivers being lost
- some families not maintaining consistent hearing aid use for a variety of reasons including limited access to audiology and TODs during covid pandemic
- budgets for radio aids
- covering resource provisions that are under-resourced
- budgets for services not growing in line with the needs of children and young people which are becoming more diverse and complex
- shrinking pool of staff as young teachers are priced out of central areas of London
- funding for mandatory training to attract new/unqualified TODs
- changing IT means extra administration tasks and training.

## 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.

*Table 16: Response rate by services to the CRIDE survey*

|                                   | <b>Number of responses</b> | <b>Cumulative total</b> |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| 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 survey will be used for research purposes, to influence government policy and to campaign to protect funding and services for deaf children.

If you have any feedback or questions on the results, please contact [cride@ndcs.org.uk](mailto:cride@ndcs.org.uk).

## Annex: Information by local authority

The table that follows sets out some individual data from services. Local authorities were asked to provide figures as of 31 January 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 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 17: Data by local authority

|                        | Number of permanently deaf children living in the geographical area covered by the service | Number of children with permanent or temporary deafness on the caseload for the service | Number of children with temporary deafness on the caseload for the service | TODs in the specialist peripatetic service | TODs in resource provisions (RPs) | TODs mainly in a special school or college not specifically for deaf children and young people | TODs working flexibly | Average population of deaf children covered by each resource provision |
|------------------------|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------------|--|
| <b>East of England</b> |  |   |  |  |                                   |  |                       |  |
| Bedford Borough        | 244  | 242   | 30   | 2.5  | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 244:0  |
| Cambridgeshire         | 406  | 406   | 0  | 8.6  | 2                                 | 0  | 0                     | 203:1  |
| Central Bedfordshire   | 193  | 189   | None reported  | 1.4  | 2.4                               | None reported  | None reported         | 64:1   |
| Essex                  | 1,106  | 989   | 24   | 12.6                                       | 18.4                              | 0  | 0                     | 138:1  |
| Hertfordshire          | 782  | 457   | None reported  | 6.2  | 2                                 | 0  | 0                     | 391:1  |

|  | 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 |
|--|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------------|--|
| Luton <sup>32</sup>                              | 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   |
| <b>East Midlands</b>                             |  |   |  |  |                                   |  |                       |  |
| Derby City                                       | No data <sup>33</sup>  | 134*  | <5   | 3.3  | 2.7                               | 0  | 0                     | 67:1   |
| Derbyshire                                       | 442  | 677   | 100  | 7.2  | 1.6                               | 0  | 0                     | 111:1  |
| Leicester City                                   | 349  | 380   | 31   | 6  | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 349:0  |
| Leicestershire and Rutland                       | 686  | 437   | 5  | 7.3  | 1.1                               | 0  | 0                     | 686:1  |
| Lincolnshire                                     | 226  | 226   | 0  | 8.2  | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 226:0  |
| North Northamptonshire and West Northamptonshire | 826  | 826   | None reported  | 12.1                                       | 1.8                               | 0  | 0                     | 413:1  |
| Nottingham City                                  | 395  | 222   | 0  | 5.2  | 2.4                               | 0  | 0                     | 198:1  |
| Nottinghamshire                                  | 456  | 406   | None reported  | 7.3  | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 456:0  |
| <b>London</b>                                    |  |   |  |  |                                   |  |                       |  |
| Barking and Dagenham                             | 172  | 181   | 9  | 1.8  | 7                                 | 0  | 0                     | 57:1   |
| Barnet   | 404  | 275   | None reported  | 2.6  | 2.8                               | None reported  | 0                     | 202:1  |
| Bexley   | 223  | 250   | 9  | 1  | 0.6                               | 0  | 0                     | 223:1  |
| Brent  | 285  | 231   | 27   | 3.2  | 2.5                               | None reported  | None reported         | 143:1  |

<sup>32</sup> The information for Luton was provided by the primary and secondary services unless otherwise stated.

<sup>33</sup> Derby City did not provide the number of children and young people with permanent deafness living in the area. For analysis and to be able to report on as many deaf children as possible, we calculated a figure for children living in the area, using figures provided about children on the caseload.

|                                      | 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                               | 337  | 165*  | <5   | 2.3  | None reported                     | 0  | 0                     | 337:1  |
| Greenwich                            | 237  | 263   | None reported  | 3  | 6.4                               | None reported  | None reported         | 79:1   |
| Hackney                              | 286  | 308*  | 15   | 4  | 1                                 | None reported  | None reported         | 286:1  |
| Hammersmith & Fulham                 | 100  | 100   | None reported  | 1.4  | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 100:0  |
| Haringey and Enfield                 | 523  | 414   | None reported  | 6  | 2.5                               | None reported  | None reported         | 262:1  |
| Harrow                               | 218  | 310   | 71   | 3.3  | 1.6                               | 0  | 0                     | 109:1  |
| Havering                             | 229  | 205   | 11   | 1  | 3.65                              | None reported  | None reported         | 115:1  |
| Hillingdon                           | 318  | 280   | 20   | 2.6  | 2.8                               | 0  | 0                     | 159:1  |
| Hounslow                             | 237  | 267   | 21   | 2  | 6.6                               | 0  | 0                     | 79:1   |
| Islington                            | 198  | 170   | 7  | 1.6  | 7.8                               | 0  | 0                     | 198:1  |
| Lambeth                              | 332  | 219   | 0  | 2.9  | 1.0                               | None reported  | None reported         | 166:1  |
| Lewisham                             | 205  | 165   | 47   | 3.2  | 1.0                               | 0  | 0                     | 103:1  |
| Merton                               | 145  | 193   | 31   | 1.6  | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 145:0  |
| Newham                               | 283  | 371   | 28   | 4.2  | 3.4                               | 0  | 0                     | 142:1  |
| Redbridge                            | 287  | 287   | None reported  | 4.1  | 7                                 | 0  | 0                     | 144:1  |
| Richmond and Kingston                | 195  | 253   | 28   | 3.4  | 2                                 | 0  | 0                     | 98:1   |
| Southwark                            | 258  | 284   | 0  | 3.7  | 1                                 | 0  | 0                     | 258:1  |
| Sutton                               | 176  | 259   | 11   | 1.2  | 0.8                               | 0  | 0                     | 88:1   |
| Tower Hamlets                        | 460  | 441   | 41   | 5.4  | 6.4                               | 0  | 0                     | 153:1  |
| Waltham Forest                       | 169  | 204   | 35   | 3  | 2                                 | 0  | 0                     | 85:1   |
| Wandsworth                           | 298  | 311   | 56   | 5.8  | 4.6                               | None reported  | None reported         | 149:1  |
| Westminster and Kensington & Chelsea | 148  | 190   | 9  | 4.7  | 2                                 | 0  | 0                     | 148:1  |

|   | 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 |
|---|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------------|--|
| <b>North East</b>   |  |   |  |  |                                   |  |                       |  |
| Darlington  | 72   | 75*   | <5   | 1.7  | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 72:0   |
| Durham  | 452  | 353   | None reported  | 3.7  | 3.1                               | 0  | 0                     | 226:1  |
| Gateshead   | 178  | 178   | None reported  | 3.3  | 0 <sup>34</sup>                   | 0  | 0                     | 178:1  |
| Middlesbrough, Stockton, Hartlepool, Redcar and Cleveland | 695  | 695   | None reported  | 7.3  | 4.6                               | 0  | 0                     | 174:1  |
| Newcastle upon Tyne                                       | 227  | 246   | 45   | 2.8  | 6                                 | 0  | 0                     | 76:1   |
| North Tyneside  | 101  | 135   | 34   | 3.2  | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 101:0  |
| Northumberland  | 165  | 155   | 40   | 6.2  | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 165:0  |
| South Tyneside  | 133  | 170   | 34   | 4.6  | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 133:0  |
| Sunderland  | 229  | 234   | 46   | 1.8  | 1                                 | 0  | 1.85                  | 115:1  |
| <b>North West</b>   |  |   |  |  |                                   |  |                       |  |
| Blackburn with Darwen                                     | 139  | 132   | 35   | 2.5  | 1.8                               | 0  | 0                     | 70:1   |
| Blackpool   | 98   | 122   | 27   | 1.87                                       | No RPs reported                   | 1.0  | None reported         | 98:0   |
| Bolton  | 375  | 240   | 7  | 4  | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 375:0  |
| Bury  | 268  | 268   | 36   | 3.6  | 1.5                               | None reported  | None reported         | 268:1  |
| Cheshire East   | 319  | 349   | 88   | 5.8  | 1.4                               | 0  | 0                     | 106:1  |
| Cheshire West and Chester                                 | 234  | 234   | 0  | 5.3  | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 234:0  |
| Cumberland  | 115  | 115   | 6  | 1.85                                       | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 115:0  |
| Halton  | 108  | 130   | 20   | 3  | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 108:0  |
| Knowsley  | 99   | 70  | 8  | 2.5  | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 99:0   |
| Lancashire  | 1,197  | 727   | None reported  | 10.2                                       | 2                                 | None reported  | None reported         | 599:1  |

<sup>34</sup> The service reported there are no children currently accessing the resource provision.



|  | 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 |
|--|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------------|--|
| Liverpool  | 302  | 293*  | <5   | 4.8  | 4.5                               | 0  | 0                     | 151:1  |
| Manchester   | 643  | 750   | 107  | 7.9  | 5.8                               | 0  | 0                     | 322:1  |
| Oldham   | 247  | 313   | 66   | 4  | 2.7                               | 0  | 1.0                   | 247:1  |
| Rochdale   | 211  | 212   | None reported  | 4.2  | 2                                 | None reported  | None reported         | 106:1  |
| Salford  | 237  | 340   | 103  | 6.2  | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 237:0  |
| Sefton   | 190  | 156   | 0  | 3.3  | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 190:0  |
| St Helens  | 123  | 84  | 13   | 2  | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 123:0  |
| Stockport  | 309  | 336   | 66   | 5.5  | 3.1                               | 0  | 0                     | 155:1  |
| Tameside   | 202  | 202   | None reported  | 2.6  | 0 <sup>35</sup>                   | None reported  | 0                     | 101:1  |
| Trafford   | 249  | 336   | 79   | 6.6  | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 249:0  |
| Warrington   | 158  | 209   | 49   | 1.8  | No RPs reported                   | None reported  | None reported         | 158:0  |
| Westmorland and Furness  | 73   | 73  | 0  | 1.85                                       | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 73:0   |
| Wigan  | 191  | 248   | 57   | 5.6  | No RPs reported                   | None reported  | None reported         | 191:0  |
| Wirral   | 386  | 314   | 50   | 4.5  | 0                                 | 0  | 0.3                   | 386:1  |
| <b>South East</b>  |  |   |  |  |                                   |  |                       |  |
| Berkshire Consortium (West Berkshire, Reading, Bracknell Forest, Wokingham, Windsor and Maidenhead and Slough) | 700  | 761   | None reported  | 11.35                                      | 8.6                               | 0.5  | 0                     | 140:1  |
| Brighton and Hove  | 208  | 267   | 59   | 3.8  | 1.6                               | 0  | 0                     | 208:1  |
| Buckinghamshire  | 332  | 386   | 75   | 5.8  | 2                                 | 0  | 0                     | 111:1  |
| East Sussex  | 466  | 514   | 48   | 4.8  | 5                                 | 0  | 0                     | 117:1  |

<sup>35</sup> The service reported Teachers working as TODs without the MQ and not in training or intending to train, but no TODs with the MQ or TODs in training or intending to train within three years.

|  | 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 |
|--|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------------|--|
| Hampshire  | 1,072  | 1,168   | 373  | 7.5  | 4.8                               | None reported  | None reported         | 153:1  |
| Isle of Wight  | 72   | 90  | 14   | 2.2  | No RPs reported                   | None reported  | None reported         | 72:0   |
| Kent   | 452  | 467   | 0  | 12.8                                       | 7.9                               | 1.0  | 0                     | 57:1   |
| Medway   | 200  | 200   | 0  | 2  | 4                                 | 0  | 0                     | 100:1  |
| Milton Keynes  | 310  | 343   | 33   | 3.1  | 0.4                               | None reported  | None reported         | 310:1  |
| Oxfordshire  | 542  | 682   | 140  | 11.5                                       | 2.5                               | 0  | 0.8                   | 271:1  |
| Portsmouth   | 177  | 196   | 19   | 2.3  | None reported                     | None reported  | 0.1                   | 89:1   |
| Southampton  | 224  | 354   | 130  | 1.8  | 1.8                               | 0  | 0                     | 112:1  |
| Surrey   | 1,611  | 1,611   | 0  | 8.9  | 10.3                              | None reported  | None reported         | 322:1  |
| West Sussex  | 748  | 279   | 41   | 5.2  | 4.3                               | 0  | 0                     | 187:1  |
| <b>South West</b>  |  |   |  |  |                                   |  |                       |  |
| Bath & NE Somerset, Bristol, North Somerset and South Gloucester | 840  | 741   | 146  | 10.2                                       | 4.7                               | None reported  | 0                     | 120:1  |
| Cornwall   | 269  | 269   | None reported  | 6.6  | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 269:0  |
| Devon  | 924  | 886   | None reported  | 7.7  | 1                                 | 0  | 0                     | 924:1  |
| Dorset, and Bournemouth, Christchurch and Pool (BCP)             | 760  | 747   | 91   | 10.8                                       | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 760:0  |
| Gloucestershire  | 388  | 400   | 10   | 4.2  | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 388:0  |
| Plymouth   | 202  | 195   | 20   | 2  | 3                                 | 0  | 0                     | 101:1  |
| Somerset   | 239  | 239   | 0  | 6.2  | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 239:0  |
| Swindon  | 170  | 353   | 211  | 4.2  | 0.6                               | 0  | 0                     | 170:1  |
| Torbay   | 107  | 140   | 33   | 1.2  | 1.1                               | 0  | 0                     | 54:1   |
| Wiltshire  | 336  | 336   | 6  | 5.6  | 1.8                               | 0  | 0                     | 168:1  |

|                                 | 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 |
|---------------------------------|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------------|--|
| <b>West Midlands</b>            |  |   |  |  |                                   |  |                       |  |
| 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  |
| Herefordshire                   | 169  | 193   | 21   | 3.2  | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 169:0  |
| Sandwell                        | 277  | 354   | 73   | 5.6  | 2                                 | 0  | 0                     | 139:1  |
| Solihull                        | 190  | 201   | 0  | 2.1  | No RPs reported                   | None reported  | None reported         | 190:0  |
| Staffordshire                   | 699  | 703   | None reported  | 11.6                                       | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 699:0  |
| Stoke-on-Trent                  | 301  | 279   | 27   | 3.8  | 0.8                               | None reported  | None reported         | 301:1  |
| Telford & Wrekin and Shropshire | 601  | 775   | 194  | 7.1  | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 1                     | 601:0  |
| Walsall                         | 291  | 361   | 62   | 2.3  | 1.1                               | 0  | 0                     | 291:1  |
| Warwickshire                    | 348  | 447   | 62   | 6.8  | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 348:0  |
| Wolverhampton                   | 205  | 257   | 32   | 4  | 2                                 | None reported  | None reported         | 103:1  |
| Worcestershire                  | 475  | 237   | 0  | 4.9  | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 475:0  |
| <b>Yorkshire and the Humber</b> |  |   |  |  |                                   |  |                       |  |
| Barnsley                        | 142  | 199   | 57   | 3  | None reported                     | 0  | 0                     | 142:1  |
| Bradford                        | 863  | 863   | None reported  | 8.2  | 7.9                               | 0  | 0                     | 288:1  |
| Calderdale                      | 245  | 314   | 69   | 3  | No RPs reported                   | None reported  | None reported         | 245:0  |
| City of York                    | 137  | 156*  | <5   | 2.8  | 0 <sup>36</sup>                   | 0  | 0                     | 137:1  |
| Doncaster                       | 314  | 307*  | <5   | 4  | 1.8                               | 0  | 0                     | 157:1  |
| East Riding of Yorkshire        | 126  | 181   | 68   | 2.9  | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 126:0  |
| Hull                            | 215  | 211*  | <5   | 2.7  | 4.5                               | 0  | None reported         | 108:1  |

<sup>36</sup> The service reported that there is no TOD permanently on site in their resource provision but children receive TOD visits as determined by NatsIP, and are primarily in their mainstream class with support from a TA employed by the school.

|                         | 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 |
|-------------------------|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------------|--|
| Kirklees                | 370  | 490   | 174  | 5.5  | 2.5                               | 0  | 0                     | 185:1  |
| Leeds                   | 1,085  | 1,085   | 0  | 11.2                                       | 4.2                               | 0  | 0                     | 543:1  |
| North East Lincolnshire | 96   | 161   | 65   | 2.2  | No RPs reported                   | 0  | 0                     | 96:0   |
| North Lincolnshire      | 135  | 129   | 0  | 1.8  | 0.8                               | 0  | 0.8                   | 135:1  |
| North Yorkshire         | 398  | 396   | 0  | 4  | No RPs reported                   | None reported  | None reported         | 398:0  |
| Rotherham               | 255  | 364   | 109  | 4.4  | 3.1                               | 0.4  | None reported         | 128:1  |
| Sheffield               | 507  | 661   | 129  | 12   | 11                                | None reported  | None reported         | 101:1  |
| Wakefield               | 267  | 424   | 148  | 4.4  | 3                                 | 0  | 0                     | 134:1  |