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Appendix 1 The policy context

Trends in transitions policy for children and young people with disabilities in Scotland

In the UK, the concept of special educational needs (SEN) was introduced by the Warnock Report (DES, 1978). The report recommended special educational provision for children with SEN, and emphasised the need for common educational goals for all children, irrespective of their abilities. In Scotland it was followed by Education (Scotland) Act 1980 (As amended), which required schools to identify, assess and make provisions for children with SEN.

In 2004, the Education (Additional Support for Learning) (Scotland) Act 2004 (the ASL Act) replaced the concept of SEN with Additional Support Needs, a broader concept meant to include all children who have difficulties in learning. It also phased out the Record of Needs, and introduced the Coordinated Support Plan (CSP) for those children with multiple difficulties who need additional support from agencies outwith education. The Act was amended in 2009. Under the Act, young people with additional support needs (hereafter ASN) who are still in school or their parents/carers can make a reference to the Additional Support Needs Tribunal over schools’ failure to exercise their post-school transitional duties.

Schools’ duties with regard to the post-school transition planning for young people with ASN are specified in the related Code of Practice (Scottish Government, 2009b and 2010f). According to the Code of Practice, transitional duties apply to all young people who:

- have a co-ordinated support plan
- are in a specialist placement such as a specialist unit or a day or residential special school
- have additional support needs arising from a disability within the meaning of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995
- are otherwise at risk of not making a successful transition (Scottish Government, 2010f, p. 108).

Although schools play a central role in managing the post-school transitions of young people with ASN, there is a strong emphasis on multi-agency work with all those involved in supporting young people with ASN (e.g., health services, social work services, voluntary agencies, Skills Development Scotland, colleges and universities). Good communication between the school leavers, their parents and all the supporting agencies is considered essential to the planning process.

The Code of Practice sets the minimum timescales for transition planning (outlined in Figure A1), while acknowledging that it is often better to start planning at an earlier point in the young person’s secondary schooling, perhaps prior to making subject choices for externally validated courses. Schools are required to have clear arrangements in place at least 12 months before the expected school leaving date. The purpose of these arrangements is to ensure that the additional support and other services provided in the period leading to the young person leaving school are appropriate, and that there is a good match between the needs of the young person and options for subsequent support. In order to make arrangements, schools must request information and advice from agencies which may be involved with the young person on leaving school. They are advised to do so with the consent of the young person, and by seeking and taking account of the young person’s and parents’ wishes. Schools also need to ensure that the young person has enough information and

---

1 Disability Discrimination Act 1995 has since been replaced by the Equality Act 2010.
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understanding of the options available in order to make an informed decision. And finally, schools have the duty to inform relevant agencies of issues such as the expected school leaving date, the nature of the young person’s support needs, and any provision the local authority may make (e.g., through social work or housing), at least 6 months before school leaving date.

Figure A1: Post-school transition planning for young people with ASN

The arrangements required for transition are required to be clear, so that the young person and all those involved ‘know exactly what is happening, when it is happening, and who is responsible’ (Scottish Government, 2010f, p.120). The code recommends that transition is coordinated by a relevant person known to the young person and their family, and the effectiveness of the arrangements is monitored, and if necessary reviewed, by a lead person.

Ultimately, careful and timely planning by schools is considered necessary in order to help young people with ASN prepare for the next stage in their education, training or employment. Depending on their particular needs, some pupils may need to develop independence skills, some may need to learn how to manage their new educational arrangements and/or work commitments, and those with significant disabilities may need to familiarize themselves with the social work, health or voluntary sector services which will support them on leaving school.

The Code of Practice is due to be revised by the Advisory Group for Additional Support for Learning to the Scottish Government, to include the Children and Young People’s Bill. The Bill aims to bring together children’s and young people’s rights and services into a comprehensive framework, in line with the United Nations’ Convention of the Rights of the Child.

In February 2012, the Scottish Ministers reported to the Scottish Parliament for the first time on the implementation of the Education (Additional Support for Learning) (Scotland) Act 2004 (As Amended) (Scottish Government, 2012]). The report noted that between 2009 and 2011 the Scottish Government examined post-16 transition strategy and practice of local authorities and key partner organizations, and found that ‘post-16 transitional planning [...] represents a very mixed picture
across Scotland’ (p. 26). They found variation in the way local authorities identified children and young people with ASN, in the effectiveness of partnership work, and in the monitoring and tracking of young people through transitions. Although authorities generally followed a staged intervention approach, the approach adopted differed from authority to authority. Another interesting finding was that examples of effective transitional planning were mostly seen in special schools.

The report concluded that ‘there remains scope for improvement in transition planning for young people with additional support needs’ (p. 36). The next report to the Parliament is due later this year.

Commentators pointed out that the multi-agency model, although generally appropriate and helpful, may fail to take into account the ‘cultural differences between children’s and adult services’. Also, often because planning started too late, schools fail to take into account the views and wishes of disabled young people and their parents (Stalker & Moscardini, 2012).

Last year, the Scottish Government announced Opportunities for All (Scottish Government, 2012e), the government’s pledge to ensure that ‘every 16-19 year-old in Scotland who is not in work, a Modern Apprenticeship or education will be offered a place in education or training’. Opportunities for All builds on previous commitments to prepare all young people, including those with ASN, for further learning, training or employment. It focuses on 16-19 year olds who have disengaged or are at risk of disengagement. Its core principle is that young people’s participation in education or training is positive and it improves their lifelong career options. Opportunities for All is delivered through partnership between local authorities and schools, Skills Development Scotland, colleges, Jobcentre Plus and sector-led skills academies.

At the same time as publishing Opportunities for All implementation paper, the Scottish Government published an improved Post-16 Transitions Policy and Practice Framework (Scottish Government, 2012g). The new post-16 transition model incorporates the guidelines of newly-developed strategy frameworks, such as the Career Information Advice and Guidance in Scotland Strategy, Opportunities for All, Youth Employment Strategy, as well as the forthcoming reform of the post-16 education system. This may be in response to criticism that the various policy documents and initiatives, some targeted exclusively at young people with additional support needs or at risk of disengagement, some universal to all young people, lacked cohesion and caused confusion among professionals and parents (Haughey, 2011, as cited in Stalker & Moscardini, 2012). Similar to Opportunities for All, added attention is given to transition planning for young people with ASN: ‘While the focus is on 16-19 year olds it is important to recognise that progress for young people with additional support needs often takes longer; in such cases the offer of learning or training may be extended appropriately’ (Scottish Government, 2012g, p.8).

The framework emphasises the need for multi-agency collaboration and data sharing. It outlines the roles and responsibilities of all the agencies involved in supporting young people at transition point, such as local authorities, Skills Development Scotland, colleges and other public, private and third sector providers of learning and support. Figure A2 shows the range of professionals who are likely to be involved in post-16 transition planning. However, against the backdrop of economic recession, the Scottish Government’s assumption that all young people can be offered a place in learning, training or employment through multi-agency work has been described as ‘disingenuous’ by some commentators (Stalker & Moscardini, 2012).
Recognising the need for consistent identification, tracking and monitoring of young people through various stages of transitions, the Scottish Government also published the Post-16 Transitions Data Practice Framework (Scottish Government, 2012f), which sets out the data-sharing roles and responsibilities of all partners involved in supporting post-16 transitions in Scotland. According to the framework, Skills Development Scotland has the responsibility to compile and integrate all partners’ data in one management information system, through the 16+ Learning Choices Data Hub. In addition to this, the Scottish Government is planning to impose a duty on all learning institutions to share data with Skills Development Scotland on all 15-25 year olds in education or training through the Post-16 Education (Scotland) Bill (Scottish Parliament, 2012). Thus the 16+ Learning Choices Data Hub is expected to track progress on the National Indicator on positive post-school destinations.

The underlying theme of recent trends in education and transitions policy is that the delivery of an appropriate place in post-16 education for all young people plays an integral role in achieving sustainable economic growth. The forthcoming reform of the post-16 education system ‘aims to put the needs of the learners – especially young learners – and employers at the heart of the system’ (Scottish Parliament, 2012. p. 7). The proposals for reform call for better understanding of the interaction between school, training, college, university or work, and of how learners move between these sectors.

Perhaps the most severe criticism of post-school transitional practices to date was made by the Doran Review of learning provision for children and young people with complex additional support needs (Scottish Government, 2012l). Although transition to adulthood was not part of their remit, the committee could not ignore the ‘strength of feeling’ they encountered during their consultations with parents and carers of children and young people with complex needs:
We all should recognize the issues and fully endorse any moves to improve the services and coordination of services to children and young people through this crucial period. Putting it very simply, it does not make sense nor is it in any way justifiable or tolerable that any ‘black holes’ in this important period in a young person’s life are allowed to continue because of the failure of services to coordinate and take responsibility (Scottish Government, 2012), p. 29).

The review team found that parents and carers of children with complex additional needs expressed ‘deep anxieties and concerns’ about post-school transitions even before their children entered secondary school. In some cases parents believed that the lack of support after compulsory schooling would force them into giving up paid employment in order to look after their young people. And most importantly, there was evidence that no transitional planning took place for some of the school leavers interviewed by the review team.

The review also identified various barriers to effective collaborative working between agencies:

- a lack of co-ordination and continuity across all relevant services
- a lack of understanding of joint working and all this entails
- a lack of clarity and understanding of roles and responsibilities, leading to a lack of cohesive working
- a lack of information sharing
- different management structures and priorities within different agencies and services
- pressures in terms of resources, funding, workloads and time (p. 33).

Given the importance and intricacy of post-16 transitional planning for young people with complex needs, suggestions were made in the review that post-school transition planning should cover young people up to the age of 25.

In its response to the review (Scottish Government, 2012d), the government recognised the need to improve transitional practices, in particular in relation to post-16 transitions, and announced that transitions will be the theme of the 2014 report to the Parliament on Additional Support for Learning.

In order to get a better understanding of the various factors which may impact on post-school transitional policy and practice, we need to analyse transitions in the wider context of recent changes in equality and benefits legislations, as well as employment schemes and skills policies. It is important to note here that the responsibility for equality, employment and welfare benefits legislation, as well as compulsory employment schemes, lies with Westminster, while some responsibilities for skills, training and economic development are devolved.

**Trends in equality legislation**

The first piece of legislation which sought to eliminate disability discrimination in the UK was the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) 1995. It was significantly extended and improved by the DDA 2005, which gave more rights to disabled people to employment and education, and at the same time imposed duties on employers and educational institutions to eliminate discrimination.

In 2005, four governmental departments contributed to the report *Improving the Life Chances of Disabled People* (PMSU, 2005), which looked at issues related to independent living, families with young disabled children, transition into adulthood, and employment support and incentives. The report recommended, among other things: increased support for disabled people to get into and
stay in employment; increased expectations of disabled people and incentives for employers. Following this report, the Office for Disability Issues (ODI) was established within the Department of Work and Pensions (DWP).


In 2006 the Scottish Parliament Equal Opportunities Committee published Removing barriers and creating opportunities (Scottish Parliament, 2006), a report on its two-year inquiry into the barriers faced by disabled people in Scotland with regard to their participation in work, further and higher education and leisure activities. Among the Committee’s findings were lack of person-centred support to enable disabled people to get into and stay in employment; lack of information and support for employers; and lack of resources for supporting disabled people who were in employment. The report stressed that there was insufficient awareness among disabled people regarding their rights. Service providers often showed little knowledge of their responsibilities in making provisions for disabled people. Hence the report made a long list of recommendations to address these issues.

Following the Equality Act 2006, the Disability Equality Duty was enforced in December 2006. It required public bodies to produce disability equality schemes, action plans and subsequent annual reports, in order to encourage positive attitudes towards disabled people and to ensure that disabled people have more employment opportunities and are not discriminated against either as employees or clients/customers. It also required Secretaries of State and government ministers in the devolved administrations to report every three years on progress made for their respective policy sectors. In Scotland, the latest report was published in 2010 (Disability Equality Scheme 2008-11: Annual Report 2010, Scottish Government, 2010b).

In December 2009, the Office for Disability Issues published Roadmap 2025, which ‘sets out how the UK government is working towards disability equality by 2025’ (ODI, 2009). It reported on what had been achieved since the ODI was established in 2005, and it set out future goals towards disability equality.

The same year, the UK Government ratified the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN, 2006), which recognizes disabled people’s rights in ‘all areas of life’, such as the right not to be discriminated against, the right to education, employment, health, equal justice and the right to participate in culture. In Scotland, this was followed by a 2010 report by the Scottish Government on its contribution towards the implementation of the Convention, and an awareness-raising event held jointly by the Scottish Human Rights Commission and the Equality and Human Rights Commission in March 2011. The target audience was disabled people in rural areas of Scotland, and its purpose was to encourage the participation of disabled people in the implementation of the rights stipulated in the Convention. The event was followed by a report, Being part of Scotland’s Story under the Disability Convention (April 2011). The Scottish Human Rights Commission also held a series of online seminars on issues such as access to justice and independent living with a view to promoting, protecting and monitoring the implementation of the Convention.

On 1st October 2010, the UK Parliament passed the Equality Act 2010 (UK Parliament, 2010), which replaced most of the previous discrimination legislation for England, Scotland and Wales, including
the Disability Discrimination Act. It prohibits discrimination on grounds of any of the following nine ‘protected characteristics’: age, disability, race, religion/belief, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, sex, and sexual orientation. The Equality Act identifies six categories of discrimination: direct discrimination, discrimination arising from disability, indirect discrimination, failure to make reasonable adjustments, harassment, and victimisation. It offers protection to disabled job applicants and employees by placing the following duties on organizations and employment services: not to discriminate in the way they offer employment or work; in the way they offer access to benefits and services; and in the way they bring working arrangements to an end. The Equality Act also seeks to eliminate discrimination in the provision of services and premises, and in education.

Based on the Equality Act, a **General Equality Duty** was imposed in April 2011 to all public authorities in Great Britain, to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding. Specific duties were imposed by secondary legislation (e.g., The Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties) (Scotland) Regulations 2012, which came into force in May 2012), and they set responsibilities to most public authorities to publish equality information annually regarding their employees and the people affected by their policies and practices, and to prepare and publish specific and measurable equality objectives every four years. The Equality and Human Rights Commission is responsible for monitoring and enforcing the Equality Duties.

In November 2011, the Office for Disability Studies published the **UK Initial Report on Implementation of the UN Convention on the Rights of Disabled People to the United Nations** (ODI, 2011b). The report reiterates the UK government’s commitment to the inclusion and mainstreaming of disabled people, and to the involvement of disabled people in decisions which affect their lives. With regard to the employment of disabled people, it mentions the government’s positive response to the main theme of the Sayce Review, *Getting in, staying in and getting on: Disability employment support fit for the future* (2011), that employment support should focus on the disabled people themselves, rather than institutions.

**Trends in benefits legislation and benefit schemes**

The provision of support for disabled people who cannot work and for those who are looking for work has been undergoing major changes in recent years under the aegis of welfare reform. The ostensible reasons for these changes are to provide disabled people with more employment opportunities and to boost overall employment rates in the UK and reduce the level of public spending on social benefits (Meager & Hill, 2006).

These changes have culminated with the Welfare Reform Act, which took effect in March 2012 and brings the biggest change to the British welfare system in over 60 years. It aims to make the benefit system ‘fairer and simpler’, and to create incentives for people to seek employment, by introducing Universal Credit. Universal Credit is a single payment which, in 2013, replaces the income-based Jobseeker’s Allowance and Employment and Support Allowance, Income Support, Child Tax Credits, Working Tax Credits and Housing Benefit. As regards specific benefits for disabled people, the Disability Living Allowance is replaced by the Personal Independence Payment, which is based on an assessment of each individual’s needs, drawing on information from the individual and the professionals who work with or support them.

The scheduled reform of the benefits system is accompanied by the UK Government’s intention to ‘put work […] at the centre of our welfare system’ (DWP, 2010). This has been met with anxiety that the new Universal Credit will intensify the poverty of disabled people and other marginalised groups
Post-school transitions of people who are deaf or hard of hearing: Appendices

(Tonybee & Walker, 2012). In the last of a series of three reports on the effects of the Coalition Government’s welfare reform agenda on disabled people, Wood (2012) argues that reductions in benefits and in the availability and affordability of local services have had a significant impact on disabled people’s quality of life. Poverty is seen as only one of the consequences. According to the report, disabled people and their families are also experiencing diminished levels of civic and social engagement and increased levels of depression and anxiety. These raised levels of anxiety are partly caused by the introduction of stringent new tests designed to shrink the category of disability and limit access to a range of disability benefits. The French firm Atos, contracted to undertake fitness to work assessments, has come in for strong criticism from the disability movement. The firm’s unpopularity amongst disabled people was highlighted at the Paralympic Games in London in the summer of 2012, of which Atos was a co-sponsor (see below for further discussion of this point).

Until the new payments are introduced, the benefit schemes currently available to working-age disabled people are as follows:

- **Disability Living Allowance** is a tax-free benefit to help with costs arising from disability, and is available to working-age people who need help caring for themselves and/or cannot walk. It is not affected by employment status or by savings and income. From the 8\(^{th}\) of April 2013 Disability Living Allowance is gradually being replaced by Personal Independence Payments. The application and assessment process has been met with criticism from organizations representing deaf and hard or hearing people, as ‘the whole system is based on the claimant being able to make a telephone call or a textphone call’ (SCoD, 2013). This is likely to cause difficulties for those who cannot use the phone or do not have access to a textphone.

- **Employment and Support Allowance** provides help for those who cannot work and personalized support for those who can work. It involves a Work Capability Assessment, and those who are considered able to work are required to prepare for work with the help of specially trained personal advisors, and a series of other services, such as supported employment and training. Figures released in January 2013 showed that 52% of those claimants between March and May the previous year were found ‘fit for work’, and therefore considered ineligible for Employment and Support Allowance (DWP, 2013b). However, a recent report of the Committee of Public Accounts (House of Commons, 2013) has described the decision-making processes of the Department for Work and Pensions as ‘poor’ and causing ‘considerable distress’ to claimants. The report also cast doubts on the system’s value for money, as 38% of decisions have been overturned in appeals. In the last of three consecutive independent reviews of Work Capability Assessments, Professor Harrington (Harrington, 2012) considers that Work Capability Assessment are ‘the right concept’, and although improvements have been made since the first review, the process is not complete. He acknowledges that face-to-face assessments need to be improved, and that ‘shifting emphasis from independent face-to-face assessments to a more holistic approach [built around a DWP Decision Maker]will help improve both the accuracy and integrity of the whole process’ (p. 10).

- **Direct Payments for Care and Services** are local council payments for people who have been assessed as needing help from social services, and who prefer to arrange and pay for their own care and support services rather than receive them directly from the local council. They are intended to give users greater choice and control of their care. Direct Payments are one
of the options of managing Individual Budgets (known as Personal Budgets in the rest of the UK), which are planned to be introduced in Scotland in the near future, as part of the Self-directed Support Strategy.

- **Income Support** is available to all working-age people who have a low income, are not in full-time study (with some exceptions) and do not receive Jobseeker’s Allowance and Employment Support Allowance.

- **Jobseeker’s Allowance** provides financial support for people aged 18 and over, who are unemployed and looking for work. The conditions under which Jobseeker’s Allowance is received are discussed in more detail in the next section. Both Income Support and Jobseeker’s Allowance will be replaced by Universal Credit. Universal Credit will go live from October 2013. Apart from fears that Universal Credit will increase levels of poverty, there are concerns about how it will work in practice. The majority of people are expected to manage their claims online, although not all may have access to a computer or broadband; moreover, some claimants may have little to no experience of managing their income on a monthly basis (SCoD, 2013).

**Governmental employment schemes**

In the UK, most employment schemes are provided through Jobcentre Plus offices. However, in Scotland, employment schemes are also provided by Skills Development Scotland, an executive non-departmental public body of the Scottish Government, the voluntary sector (organizations such as Enable, Action on Hearing Loss, and Capability Scotland), and social care services. Remploy, a government company in the UK which provides employment for disabled people, also offers employment placement services.

Jobcentre Plus offices have specially trained Disability Employment Advisors (DEA), who provide advice to disabled people, as well as actual and potential employers. Jobcentre also runs Access to Work, a scheme which offers financial and practical support to disabled people and their employers. Access to Work can assess a disabled person’s needs at work, pay for equipment, adaptations to premises, and support workers, and provide awareness training for co-workers.

The UK government runs a series of compulsory employment schemes for the recipients of Jobseeker’s Allowance. During the duration of these programmes, the applicants receive Jobseeker’s Allowance and are required to continue seeking employment. The Work Experience Programme is a short-term employment scheme aimed at people aged 16-24. It is voluntary to join, but it becomes compulsory once the jobseeker accepts a place. The Mandatory Work Activity Scheme, a four week employment scheme, is aimed at people aged 18 and over. The Work Programme is part of the Employment, Skills and Enterprise Scheme, and is run for Jobcentre Plus by various organizations, which are free to set the rules of their own schemes depending on local and employment conditions, and are paid according to their results.

The Work Programme was launched in June 2011, as part of the Coalition Government’s programme of welfare reform, which we discussed in the previous section. It brings previous welfare-to-work measures into a single programme, which aims to facilitate employment for those who are long-term unemployed or in danger of becoming so (DWP, 2012b). The programme is compulsory for some categories of benefit recipients, and voluntary for others. For instance, 18-24 year old recipients of the Jobseeker’s Allowance are automatically transferred to the Work Programme nine
months into their claim. The same is true for 18 year old NEET\(^2\) recipients of Jobseeker’s Allowance, three months into their claim. Most of those in receipt of Employment and Support Allowance are required to enter the programme as soon as they have been assessed as fit-for-work.

In her review of employment programmes and support for disabled people, Liz Sayce (Sayce, 2011) notes that ‘the Work Programme is the largest programme and is likely to serve more disabled people than all specialist disability employment programmes put together’ (p. 67). In order to ensure that the programme works effectively to support disabled people into sustained employment, she recommends that it is continuously monitored and reviewed. The Government’s response to the review (DWP, 2011) acknowledges that monitoring the impact of the programme is a priority and pledges to ‘examine the feasibility’ of collecting and publishing systematic data on disabled people’s participation and outcomes. In spite of this, the latest Work Programme official statistics release (DWP, 2012c) still does not include data on key performance indicators, such as impairment type, qualification level and length of time out of work of disabled clients.

Among voluntary government schemes is Community Jobs Scotland, which offers a minimum of 26-39 weeks of paid employment in the voluntary sector to 16-19 year-old who have been unemployed for at least 13 weeks, and have been referred by a Jobcentre Plus or Skills Development Scotland advisor. In October 2010 the Department for Work and Pensions introduced Work Choice, a voluntary employment programme which is particularly targeted at disabled people with severe and complex barriers to employment. It includes both pre-employment support and ongoing support in work (DWP, 2013c). It is designed to complement the Work Programme, and to lead to unsupported employment, where possible. When clients move into unsupported employment, they are tracked by the programme for another six months and can re-join the programme if necessary. Work Choice providers in Scotland are the Shaw Trust, a UK-wide charity (covering Edinburgh, Lothians and Borders, Ayrshire, Dumfries, Galloway, Inverclyde, Forth Valley, Fife, Tayside, Glasgow, Lanarkshire and East Dunbartonshire), and Momentum Scotland (Highlands, Islands, Clyde Coat and Grampian).

Unlike statistical releases on the Work Programme, Work Choice official statistics (DWP, 2013c) started to include a breakdown by type of impairment from May 2011. Unfortunately the figures on hearing-impaired clients are combined with those on people with speech impairments. In spite of this, it is worth mentioning that between May 2011 and December 2012, people with ‘hearing and/or speech impairment’ accounted for 5.14\(^3\) of all referrals to the programme, but for only 2.69\(\%\) of those who started Work Choice and of those who achieved a job outcome.

Work Choice supports people in open employment, but also funds places in supported businesses. The fact that Work Choice funds supported business places was criticised in the Sayce Review (Sayce, 2011): ‘… the segregated nature of supported business places […] is not fully conducive to the vision […] of people being supported in mainstream employment’ (p. 74). The review recommended that funding for supported business places is stopped, and that Work Choice and Access to Work are eventually merged into a single programme based on individual budgets. The Government’s consultation on the recommendations in the Sayce Review revealed strong consensus amongst respondents regarding the recommendation to merge the two programmes, while opinions were evenly divided on the matter of ceasing special protection to supported employment places (DWP, 2012a). As a consequence, Work Choice does not seem to feature in the Government’s plans to reform disability employment support.

The programme that takes centre stage in the Government’s plans for reform is Access to Work. Liz Sayce gave a very positive review of Access to Work, emphasising its value for money, effectiveness

\(^2\) Young people who are not in education, employment or training.

\(^3\) Figures exclude Remploy clients.
and relatively wide reach. She is critical, however, of the fact the programme was poorly publicized. Her main recommendation was that Access to Work is ‘transformed from being the best kept secret in Government to being a recognised passport to successful employment’ (Sayce, 2011, p. 81). Following the consultation on the recommendations in the Sayce review, the Government announced plans to increase funding for the scheme from 2014, in order to support more disabled people to enter and remain in employment (DWP, 2012a).

**Skills policies and national training programmes**

While the right to pass equality and benefits legislations lies with the UK Government, some responsibilities for skills, training and economic development are devolved. Skills policies in the UK and the devolved administrations have drawn on the Leitch (2006) *Review of Skills: Prosperity for all in the Global Economy - World Class Skills*. The report stressed the importance of a demand-led system for training, and suggested that funding should be awarded depending on how effectively training providers fulfil the training demand of local employers and individuals. At the same time, the report acknowledged that programmes for disabled people cannot be entirely demand-led.

The **UK Commission for Employment and Skills** (UKCES) was established in 2008 at the recommendation of the Leitch Review. The UKCES is a non-departmental public body which deals with skills and employment issues in the UK. It is supplemented by local employment and skills boards. The non-departmental public body supporting individuals and businesses in Scotland is **Skills Development Scotland** (SDS). SDS was formed in 2008 by bringing together the following services: careers information, advice and guidance; funding for skills and training (e.g., Modern Apprenticeships and the Employability Fund); and services to employers which help companies plan/recruit their workforce and to access learning and training resources to develop their existing employees.

Skills policies in Scotland started with the publication of *WorkForce Plus: An Employability Framework for Scotland* (Scottish Executive, 2006b), a framework document which aimed to improve coordination of funding and cooperation between agencies in an effort to get more people in employment. At the same time, the government published *More Choices, More Chances: A Strategy to Reduce the Proportion of Young People not in Education, Employment or Training in Scotland* (Scottish Executive, 2006a). The strategy aligns with the principles of *WorkForce Plus*, and identifies employment as a ‘realistic option’ for young people who are not in education, employment or training. Unlike *WorkForce Plus*, it focuses mainly on prevention, starting from pre-16 education.

In a similar vein, **The Scottish Government Economic Strategy** (Scottish Government, 2007b) identified ‘learning, skills and wellbeing’ as one of the key prerequisites of economic growth. Strongly linked with the economic strategy, **Skills for Scotland: A Lifelong Skills Strategy** (Scottish Government, 2007a) placed an increased emphasis on skills development across the lifespan. It viewed skills development as a major contributor to economic growth. However, in a review of evaluations and policy documents related to governmental policy outcomes and measures on skills, Riddell, Edward, Raffe, Tett and Weedon (2008) found that disabled people were underrepresented on programmes like Modern Apprenticeships, and on training programmes offered by Scottish Enterprise and Highland and Islands Enterprise.

In 2010 the refreshed strategy, **Skills for Scotland: Accelerating the Recovery and Increasing Sustainable Economic Growth** (Scottish Government, 2010e) added emphasis on the following four themes: empowering people, supporting employers, simplifying the skills system, and strengthening partnerships between private, public and third sectors, all with the common goal of achieving sustainable economic growth. An **Initial Equalities Impact Assessment** (Scottish Government,
2010c) was published alongside the strategy. It looked at possible barriers faced by different racial groups, disabled people, and men and women affected by the strategy, and set out alternative courses of action in order to remove these barriers.

The Scottish Economic Recovery Plan (Scottish Government, 2010f) announced the launch of the Supported Employment Framework and Implementation Group, aimed to assist disabled people who want to work. It also mentioned the Integrated Employment and Skills scheme, a collaboration between Jobcentre Plus and Skills Development Scotland, in which Jobcentre Plus advisors can refer disabled jobseekers to SDS advisors for career guidance and skills assessments. At the same time, the refreshed Scottish Government Economic Strategy (Scottish Government, 2011f) announced Opportunities for All, the government’s pledge to ensure that ‘every 16-19 year-old in Scotland who is not in work, a Modern Apprenticeship or education will be offered a place in education or training’. It also publicized the reforming of post-16 learning, in an effort to reduce youth unemployment and stimulate economic growth. The proposals for reform were published in Putting Learners at the Centre: Delivering Our Ambitions for Post-16 Education (Scottish Government, 2011c). Opportunities for All came into effect on 1st April 2012.

In Scotland, national training programmes are offered by Skills Development Scotland, in collaboration with private learning providers and colleges. Training can also be provided by Scottish Enterprise and Highland and Islands Enterprise, local authorities or third sector organizations. Those who are not ready to take part in training with employers or in college can access training via social work services.

Until the 31st of March 2013, the training programmes offered by Skills Development Scotland were Modern Apprenticeships, Get Ready for Work and Training to Work. Get Ready for Work4 and Training to Work5 were phased out the 1st of April 2013. The support provided through these programmes is now covered by the Employability Fund. The Employability Fund is meant to bring together existing Scottish Government investment in pre-employment training into an integrated commissioning process, which is ‘responsive to differing client needs, employer demand and other funded training at regional level’ (Scottish Government, 2013c).

Modern Apprenticeships are available to those who are in employment, and are funded jointly by Skills Development Scotland and the employer. Modern Apprenticeships can last for up to 4 years, and the apprentices aim to obtain qualifications ranging from SCQF 5 to SCQF 11. Wage incentives of up to £2000 may be offered to those who employ 16-19 year-olds under certain schemes, such as the Employer Recruitment Incentive

---

4 Get Ready for Work was a training programme for 16-19 year-olds. It consisted of up to 6 months of training and temporary work experience placement. Those who enrolled full-time were entitled to training allowance. Lifeskills, a part-time programme for young people who needed longer to prepare for employment, was part of Get Ready for Work. Those who completed Lifeskills were eligible to join the Get Ready for Work programme.

5 Training for Work offered vocational training to people aged 18 and over who had been unemployed for at least 13 weeks. In order to maximize employment outcomes, training was tailored to meet the needs of potential employers in specific areas.
Appendix 2 Analysis of official statistics on the attainment, post-school destinations and employment outcomes of young people who are deaf or hard of hearing

Introduction
This section consists of a secondary analysis of administrative and survey data on the attainment, post-school destinations and employment outcomes of DHH pupils and young people. These data are gathered and published by a variety of public bodies, among which the Scottish Government and the Department for Work and Pensions.

We first discuss the proportions of DHH pupils and pupils with other additional support needs (hereafter ASN) in publicly-funded Scottish schools, based on the 2012 Pupil Census (Scottish Government, 2013b). We continue with an overview of the attainment levels of pupils who left publicly-funded Scottish schools in 2010/11 (Scottish Government, 2012i). We also looked at attainment data from previous years (Scottish Government, 2010d, 2011d and 2012i), in order to draw a comparison between the highest qualifications of DHH school leavers and leavers with no ASN in the last three years.

The remainder of this section consists of a comparative analysis of the post-school destinations of young people who are DHH, young people who have other needs or disabilities, and young people with no additional needs or disabilities. We start with an overview of the positive and non-positive destinations of the 2010/11 cohort of school leavers from publicly-funded Scottish schools (Scottish Government, 2011b). Then we compare the proportions of DHH school leavers in each destination category, with those of leavers with any type of ASN and leavers with no ASN over a period of four years (Scottish Government, 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011).

We supplement this with data collected and published by other public bodies. Data published by HESA shows the participation of DHH students in higher education institutions across the UK (as publicly available figures are not broken down by country). Information on the destinations of disabled and non-disabled leavers from higher education institutions in the UK is published by the Association of Graduate Careers Advisory Services (AGCAS) Disability Task Group. Based on this, we compare the destinations, occupations and unemployment rates of DHH graduates with those of all disabled and all non-disabled graduates over a period of five years. Data on the participation of DHH students in further education institutions in Scotland is compiled and published by the Scottish Funding Council. Employment rates of people who are DHH are based on Labour Force Survey estimates. We reproduced figures published by the Office for Disability Issues, which encompass the entire working-age population in Great Britain.

We also analyse data on financial support available to disabled people in higher education (specifically those in receipt of Disabled Students’ Allowance) and employment (specifically those in receipt of Access to Work), as well as data on disabled people in receipt of the Disability Living Allowance.

In this section, when discussing official statistics on people with hearing loss, we use the terms and categories employed in the original data sets, which tend to reflect a medical, rather than social

---

6 Based on numbers of DHH pupils who are recorded as receiving additional support for hearing impairment. These numbers do not reflect the entire population of DHH pupils in Scottish publicly-funded schools.

7 Information on disability in HESA administrative data is based on students’ self-assessment, therefore it should be treated with caution.

8 Also based on students’ self-assessment.
model of disability. For instance, in the Scottish Pupil Census, children with hearing loss fall under the ‘Hearing impairment’ or ‘Deafblind’ categories; the term used by the Higher Education Statistics Agency is ‘Deaf/Hearing impairment’, while the Labour Force Survey uses the more neutral term ‘Difficulty in hearing’.

**DHH pupils in publicly-funded Scottish Schools**

In 2012 there were 117,755 pupils with Additional Support Needs (ASN) in publicly-funded mainstream and special schools, including grant-aided schools. They represent approximately 18% of the total pupil population in Scotland.

**Figure A3: Reasons for support for pupils with Additional Support Needs, 2012**

![Diagram showing reasons for support for pupils with Additional Support Needs, 2012](image)

**SOURCE:** PUPIL CENSUS 2012, SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT (2013b)

**Note:** Pupils with more than one reason for support will appear in each row.

According to the Education (Additional Support for Learning) (Scotland) Act 2004 (Scottish Executive, 2004), education authorities must have arrangements in place to identify pupils with ASN, and from among them those who may require a support plan. ASN data are collected on the main difficulty of learning, or the reason for support for those pupils who have Co-ordinated Support Plans (CSP), Individualised Educational Programmes (IEP), or other types of support, such as Child plans, short term or temporary support and support that is not covered in the CSP or IEP. The Scottish Government does not collect data on pupils with ASN educated in independent schools.

In recent years there has been a constant increase in the number of children with recorded ASN (for instance, in 2010 and 2011 the number of pupils receiving support was 69,587 and 98,227,
respectively). This increase is due to improved recording criteria, which now also include children with plans other than IEPs and CSPs. Furthermore, in 2012 six extra categories were introduced as reasons for support for pupils with ASN: Communication Support Needs, Young Carer, Bereavement, Substance Misuse, Family Issues and Risk of Exclusion. The reasons for support for pupils with ASN in 2012 are given in Figure A3 above.

Despite the broad range of categories used, only about 13% of pupils with ASN are identified as disabled. This accounts for 2.29% of all pupils in publicly-funded Scottish schools. Pupils with all levels of hearing loss are grouped in the ‘Hearing Impairment’ category. There is a separate, ‘Deafblind’, category for those with hearing and sight loss. There is an overlap between categories, as pupils with more than one reason for support are included in each of the categories of need for which they receive support.

As shown in A3 above, 2,253 pupils, representing 0.34% of all pupils in Scotland, were recorded as receiving support for hearing impairment. Figure A4 shows that unlike most groups of pupils with ASN, where male pupils tend to be overrepresented, there is no marked gender gap for pupils with hearing impairment.

**Figure A4: Gender distribution of pupils who receive support for particular types of need, 2012**

![Gender distribution of pupils who receive support for particular types of need, 2012](image)

**SOURCE: PUPIL CENSUS 2012, SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT (2013b)**

The Scottish Government does not publish a breakdown of pupils identified as disabled by local authority. However, Figure A5 shows wide variation across local authorities with regard to pupils in mainstream schools who are in receipt of support for their hearing impairment through Coordinated Support Plans, Individualised Educational Programmes and other types of support. The local authorities with the highest proportions of hearing impaired pupils per total pupil population are Eilean Siar and Glasgow City. There is no special school in Eilean Siar, and this could be the reason for the high concentration of hearing impaired pupils in its mainstream schools. However, numbers are very small in this authority so percentages should be treated with caution. Glasgow City Council is a large authority with a significant number of special schools (see Figure A5 below).

---

9 Where pupils attended a ‘special unit’ attached to a mainstream school, they are usually included in the figures for the mainstream school. However, some schools and local authorities have reported pupils from ‘special units’ separately.
Post-school transitions of people who are deaf or hard of hearing: Appendices

Figure A5: Pupils in receipt of support for hearing impairment in mainstream schools, by school sector and local authority, as percentage of all pupils in each local authority, 2012

It is interesting to note here that in most authorities there seem to be more pupils who receive support for hearing impairment in secondary schools, as compared to primary schools. This probably reflects delays in diagnosis of some children.

Figure A6 shows the hearing-impaired pupils in special schools, as a percentage of all pupils in special schools in each authority. Local authorities where there are no special schools or where no pupils are registered as receiving support for hearing impairment have not been included in Figure A6. The hearing impaired pupils in grant aided schools are listed separately, as percentage of all pupils in grant aided schools, irrespective of local authority.

The Scottish Government does not publish the total number of pupils who receive support for hearing impairment in special schools. Based on the breakdown by authority, which includes figures which had to be repressed for disclosure reasons, we estimated that between 14 -15% of all students in receipt of support for hearing impairment were educated in special schools. There are special schools in 25 out of the 32 Scottish Local Authorities. Pupils with hearing impairment were educated in special schools in most of these Local Authorities (23 out of 25). The local authorities with the highest proportions of pupils with hearing impairments in special schools were Midlothian, Perth & Kinross and Falkirk.
Figure A6: Pupils in receipt of support for hearing impairment in special and grant-aided schools, by local authority, as percentage of all pupils in special schools in each authority, 2012

SOURCE: PUPIL CENSUS 2012, SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT (2013b)
1. Local authorities with no special schools or no hearing-impaired pupils in special school are not listed.
2. Local authorities with less than 5 hearing-impaired pupils are listed, but the numbers of pupils are not given for disclosure reasons.
3. Grant-aided schools are not included in the local authority of their location.
4. Pupils in grant-aided schools are given as a percentage of all pupils in grant-aided schools.

Figure A7 shows the percentage of hearing-impaired pupils in receipt of different types of support in 2012. Most pupils had Individualised Educational Programmes (33%), while only 7% had Co-ordinated Support Plans. Less than 1% of all pupils with hearing impairment had Child’s Plans.

Figure A7: Percentage of hearing-impaired pupils per type of support, 2012

SOURCE: THE SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT
1. Does not include pupils in grant-aided schools, as there is no information on whether they were assessed or declared disabled.
Figure A8 shows the spread of all pupils in publicly-funded schools, hearing-impaired pupils and pupils with any type of ASN across the quintiles of the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD2012). SIMD is a statistical tool which produces a ranking of small areas in Scotland, in order of their relative level of deprivation. When we calculated the percentages of pupils in each of the quintiles of the SIMD, we noticed that the pupils in Scottish public schools were more or less randomly distributed across the SIMD quintiles. Similarly, there was no clear pattern in the spread of hearing impaired pupils across areas with different levels of deprivation, although we should note that they came from the most deprived areas in Scotland (SIMD 1st quintile) in a slightly larger proportion. However, when we look at the spread of pupils with any type of ASN, we can see that they were overrepresented in the most deprived areas in Scotland (SIMD 1st quintile), and that there was a gradual decrease in the proportion of pupils with ASN in quintiles 2, 3, 4 and 5. There were only 6% of pupils with ASN in socially-advantaged areas (5th quintile), down from 15% in the most deprived areas (1st quintile). This suggests that there is a direct relationship between the prevalence of ASN and level of deprivation, as pupils from less socially-advantaged areas were more likely to have recorded support needs. The relationship between SIMD and hearing impairment is not as clear although there appears to be overrepresentation in the most deprived quintile and over-representation in the least deprived quintile.

**Figure A8: Distribution per SIMD quintiles of all pupils in Scottish schools, pupils with hearing impairment and pupils with any type of ASN, as percentage of total in each category, 2012**

This section provided a snapshot of DHH pupils’ participation in Scottish mainstream and special publicly-funded schools in 2012. These figures reflect only a fraction of the DHH pupil population in Scotland, as they don’t include those who do not receive additional support and those who are educated in independent schools. We found that:

- pupils who receive support for hearing impairment are a relatively small group compared to pupils with most other types of ASN, and in 2012 they represented only 0.34% of all pupils in publicly-funded Scottish schools;
- unlike pupils with other types of ASN, there is no marked difference between the proportions of male and female pupils who are DHH;

1. Does not include the unknown cases which represent less than 1% of all three groups.
2. The most deprived areas are in quintile 1 and the least deprived are in quintile 5.
the majority of DHH pupils are educated in mainstream schools, and the Local Authority with the highest percentage of students in receipt of support for hearing impairment is Glasgow City;

- the most common type of support plan that DHH pupils received in schools were Individualised Educational Programmes (33%);

- hearing-impaired pupils were slightly overrepresented in the most deprived quintile and underrepresented in the least deprived quintile. There is a relationship between deprivation and hearing impairment, but it is weaker than the overall relationship between ASN and deprivation.

In the next section we look at the attainment levels of school leavers from publicly-funded Scottish schools.

School leavers’ attainment

The section below uses information compiled and published by the Scottish Government (2012) as a supplement to *Summary statistics for attainment, leaver destinations and healthy living, No. 2: 2012 Edition*. It is data on post-appeal attainment information, and initial and sustained school leaver destinations in 2010/11, obtained from the Scottish Qualifications Authority (SQA) and Skills Development Scotland (SDS), respectively. Data on the attainment and destinations of the 2011/12 cohort were not published at the time of writing and could not be included in this report. The Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF) is used as the basis for reporting attainment. The SCQF levels are shown in Table A1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCQF level</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 7</td>
<td>Advanced Higher at A-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 6</td>
<td>Higher at A-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Intermediate 2 at A-C; Standard Grade at 1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Intermediate 1 at A-C; Standard Grade at 3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Access 3 cluster; Standard Grade at 5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Access 2 cluster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information on the destination of leavers from publicly funded schools was collected by the SDS, by identifying where each school leaver was during September 2011 (initial destination) and March 2012 (follow-up destination). The initial destinations data provide information on the outcomes for young people approximately three months after leaving school while the follow up survey provides information on the outcomes of young people approximately nine months after leaving school.

Data on pupils with ASN include leavers from special schools as well as secondary schools with a Record of Need, Coordinated Support Plan and/or an Individualised Education Plan. The ASN categories used in the data on leaver destinations are not as wide-ranging as the ones used in the 2012 Pupil Census (see Figure A9). There is no separate category for deafblind school leavers, probably because of the small numbers of deafblind young people. School leavers for whom the reason for support is not given have been included in the ‘Other’ or ‘Unknown’ category. ‘Other’, the largest category, subsumes ‘More able pupil’, ‘Interrupted learning’ and ‘Mental health problem’ categories.

In 2010/11, there were 5,831 school leavers with ASN, representing 10.65% of all school leavers. School leavers who received support for hearing impairment accounted for 0.19% of all school
leavers. Amongst the ASN categories listed, ‘Hearing impairment’ was the smallest, with only 103 pupils. Similarly, in 2009/10 there were 66 school leavers with hearing impairment, representing 0.12% of all school leavers.

Figure A9: School leavers with Additional Support Needs, 2010/11

![Bar chart showing school leavers with additional support needs, 2010/11](chart.png)

**SOURCE:** SCHOOL LEAVER ATTAINMENT AND SQA ATTAINMENT, SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT (2012i)

1. Leavers from publicly-funded secondary and special schools. 16 leavers from grant-aided specials could not be matched to census or attainment data and were left out of the analysis.

2. Pupils with more than one reason for support will appear in each row.

The proportions of school leavers with hearing impairment in 2009/10 and 2010/11 (i.e., 0.12% and 0.19%, respectively) were smaller than the proportion of pupils with hearing impairment in all Scottish publicly-funded schools in 2012 (i.e., 0.34%). This may indicate that in the recent years more DHH pupils have been receiving additional learning support.

Figure A10 provides a comparison between the achievement of pupils with no additional support needs and those with additional support needs by type of need. Pupils who have a number of reasons for additional support are included in all of the categories relating to their needs. For reasons of brevity, the original national qualification categories were collapsed into new categories, which show the percentages of pupils who have at least one qualification at a particular level as their highest qualification on leaving school. For example, 1+ @ SCQF 2 means ‘at least one qualification at SCQF Level 2’.

It can be seen that there was a considerable discrepancy between those with no additional support needs and those with additional support needs in terms of achievement of recognised qualifications. More than half of those with no ASN acquired the qualifications needed to enter higher education, one to four Highers or above (SCQF 6 and 7). On average, only around 17% of those with additional support achieved these qualifications.

However, this figure masks differences within the ASN population as well as within specific groups of pupils with a particular impairment. Those with a learning disability, those in the ‘Looked after’
group, and those with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties are the least likely to achieve the qualifications required to enter higher education. Those with language and speech disorders, visual impairment and a learning disability are most likely to leave school with no qualifications.

There can be a lot of variation in the attainment of pupils in the same ASN category. For instance, a large proportion (approximately 29%) of all pupils with visual impairment left school in 2010/11 with no qualifications. However, 10% acquired qualifications at SCQF Level 7, which is the highest proportion of SCQF 7 achievers of all pupils with ASN. Although these figures should be interpreted with caution due to the small numbers of pupils with visual impairment, they mirror the heterogeneity of pupils with visual impairment as a group, which is a consequence of the nature of sight loss, presence of additional impairments, age of onset, and intervention strategies. There is a similarly wide variation in the attainment level of pupils with physical health problems.

**Figure A10: Highest qualifications\(^1,2\) of school leavers with ASN compared to those with no ASN, as percentage of total qualifications obtained by each ASN category, 2010/11**

![Graph showing highest qualifications of school leavers with ASN compared to those with no ASN](image)

**SOURCE:** SCHOOL LEAVER ATTAINMENT AND SQA ATTAINMENT, SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT (2012i)

1. Each SCQF category shows the percentage of school leavers who have at least one qualification at that level as their highest qualification.
2. Where data are not disclosed due to low numbers (below 5) we have allowed for two pupils in order to show that some pupils achieved qualifications at a particular level.
3. Because of the undisclosed figures and rounding up of percentages, numbers may not add up to 100%.

Figure A11 shows the full range of national qualifications and provides a comparison between pupils with no ASN, with any ASN, and pupils with hearing impairment. It can be seen that nearly 13% of all pupils with hearing impairment left school with no qualifications at Level 2 or better. Although this is similar to the proportion of pupils with any type of ASN who left school with no qualifications (11.6%), it is far greater than that of pupils with no ASN (1.5%). Pupils with hearing impairment are almost twice as likely as pupils with no ASN to leave school with one to four qualifications at SCQF Level 4, which is Standard Grade at 3-4 (17.5% and 8.9%, respectively). It is at SCQF Level 5 (Standard Grade at 1-2) that pupils with hearing impairment are most similar to pupils with no ASN: approximately 25% of pupils with hearing impairment and 21% of all pupils with no ASN leave school...
with one to four Standard Grade Credit qualifications.

The discrepancies between the achievement levels of pupils with hearing impairment and those with no ASN become very pronounced at SCQF Levels 6 and 7. As mentioned above, more than half of those with no ASN acquired the qualifications needed to enter higher education, one to four Highers or above. By comparison, only 20% of the hearing impaired school leavers in the 2010/11 cohort were qualified to enter higher education. Less than 5 pupils with hearing impairment obtained qualifications at Level 7 (Advanced Highers), and the exact figure was repressed for disclosure reasons. However, in Figure A11, we allowed for two pupils, in order to show that in 2010/11 a few (or possibly one pupil) with hearing impairment left from publicly-funded schools with qualifications at Level 7. In stark contrast, almost 9000 pupils with no ASN (18% of all pupils with no ASN) left school with Advanced Highers in 2010/11.

Figure A11: Highest qualifications of school leavers with hearing impairment, leavers with any ASN and those with no ASN, as percentage of total qualifications obtained by each ASN category, 2010/11

However, the small numbers taking examinations at SCQF Levels 6 and 7 means that the proportion of pupils with hearing impairment achieving at this level is likely to fluctuate from year to year. This is demonstrated by Figure A12, which shows a comparison between the achievement levels of school leavers with hearing impairment and those no additional needs, over a period of three years.

Because in 2009/10 new categories of pupils with ASN were introduced (i.e., ‘Looked after’, ‘Physical health problem’ and ‘English as an additional language’), we cannot make direct comparisons between the achievement of pupils with ASN, as a group, between 2008 and 2011. Therefore this category is not included in the comparison in Figure A12. Furthermore, the figures for the ‘Hearing impairment’ category should be interpreted with caution, as 2010/11 saw a sudden increase in the total number of school leavers with hearing impairment (from 0.11% and 0.12% in 2008/9 and 2009/10, to 0.19% in 2010/11, see Table A2). This increase may not reflect an actual increase in pupils receiving support for hearing impairment; it may be a consequence of the fact that in 2010/11
there was a change in the criteria for inclusion in the ASN pupil population. Previously, only pupils who had Co-ordinated Support Plans (CSP), Individualised Educational Programmes (IEP) or Record of Needs (RON) were included in the ASN category. In 2010/11, pupils with other types of support, such as Child Plans, short term or temporary support and support that is not covered in the CSP or IEP were also included.

Table A2: Hearing-impaired school leavers from publicly funded schools, 2008/9 to 2010/11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage of all school leavers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008/9</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: SCHOOL LEAVER ATTAINMENT AND SQA ATTAINMENT, SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT (2010d, 2011d and 2012i)

Figure A12 shows only a selection of the full range of national qualifications, in order to illustrate the particular qualification levels where there are wider discrepancies between school leavers with hearing impairment and those with no ASN. As discussed above, there are wider discrepancies between the two groups at both ends of the qualification spectrum (i.e., below SCQF Level 2, and at SCQF Levels 6 and 7).

Figure A12: Highest qualifications of school leavers with hearing impairment and school leavers with no ASN, as percentage of total qualifications obtained by each ASN category, 2008/9 to 2010/11

There seems to be an increase in the last three years in the proportions of pupils with no ASN who leave school with Highers and Advanced Highers (SCQF Levels 6 and 7), and a decrease in the proportion of pupils with no ASN who leave school with no or low qualifications (below SCQF Level 2), while the proportions of school leavers with qualifications at Level 5 (Standard Grades at 1-2) remain stable. It is harder to discuss the figures for hearing-impaired school leavers. The small size
of the population may be a reason for the fluctuation in proportions of deaf pupils who left school with no qualifications (below Level 2). Less than 5 hearing-impaired pupils left school with Advanced Highers between 2008 and 2011, and the exact figures have not been published. However, it is interesting to note two similarities with the ‘No ASN’ group: (1) the proportion of pupils leaving school with qualifications at Level 5 (Standard Grades at 1-2) seems to remain stable; (2) there seems to be an increase in the proportions of school leavers with one to four Highers (SCQF Level 6).

This section provided a comparison of the highest qualifications of school leavers who received additional support for hearing impairment, school leavers with any type of ASN, and leavers with no support needs in 2010/11 and the previous two years. Here are the key findings:

- Compared with school leavers with ASN as a group, hearing-impaired leavers in the 2010/11 cohort were better qualified; there were proportionally fewer leavers with qualifications at the lower end of the spectrum (below SCQF2 to Standard Grade at 3-4), and more at the higher end of the spectrum (Standard Grades at 1-2 and Highers).

- In 2010/11, compared with school leavers with no support needs, those with hearing impairment:
  - left school with no qualifications in far greater proportion (13% vs. 1.5%);
  - were twice as likely to leave school with one to four Standard Grade qualifications at 3-4 (18% vs. 9%);
  - were less than half as likely to qualify for entry into higher education immediately after leaving school (22% had Highers and Advanced Highers, as opposed to 56% of those with no ASN).

- When looking at the attainment levels of school leavers with no support needs between 2008/9 and 2010/11, we noticed that there has been a gradual increase in the proportions of leavers with Highers and Advanced Highers, and a decrease in the percentage of leavers with no or low qualifications (below SCQF 2 and with Standard Grades at 3-4). These trends are reflected to a certain degree in the attainment levels of hearing-impaired leavers: over the three year period there has been a decrease in the proportions of leavers with no qualifications, and an increase in the proportion of leavers with Highers. Similarly, the proportions of school leavers with Standard Grades at 3-4 are comparable in the two groups, and they have stayed relatively stable.

What can be said with certainty at this stage is that school leavers with hearing impairment continue to lag behind those with no additional needs, and the gap in achievement levels is high. As some of the school leavers who receive support for hearing impairment may also have other support needs besides hearing loss (such as learning disabilities), we cannot say that hearing loss is the direct cause.

Whatever the cause, this gap in achievement is likely to impact on the participation of young people with hearing impairment in higher and further education, training and employment. The next section is a comparative analysis of the post-school destinations of school leavers with hearing impairment, with any type of ASN and with no ASN.

**School leavers’ destinations**

Information on the destination of leavers from publicly funded schools is collected by Skills Development Scotland (SDS). SDS collects data on school leavers’ destinations in two stages: approximately three months after leaving school (initial destinations) and approximately nine months after leaving school (sustained destinations, through a follow-up survey). The information presented in this section draws mainly on the outcomes of the 2010/11 cohort, which were published as a supplement to *Summary Statistics for Schools in Scotland, No.2: 2011 Edition* (Scottish...
We also carry out a comparison of initial and follow-up destinations of hearing-impaired school leavers from publicly-funded schools, which is based on the outcomes of the 2011/12 cohort compiled in the *Attainment and Leaver Destinations, Supplementary Data.* (Scottish Government, 2013a).

The Scottish Government uses information from the follow-up survey for National Outcome Indicator 10 (i.e., increase the proportion of school leavers in positive and sustained destinations) (Scottish Government, 2011b). However, data on the follow-up destinations are not broken down by type of ASN. Therefore, the following analysis is based solely on the initial destinations of 2010/11 school leavers, and it represents a snapshot of their destinations in September 2011.

A school leaver is defined as ‘a young person of school leaving age, who left school during (at the end of the winter term) or at the end of the school year, where the school year is taken to run from 1 August to 31 July’ (Scottish Government, 2011b). As compulsory schooling in Scotland ends at the end of fourth year, school leavers can be between 16 and 19 years old. The document refers to evidence which suggests that approximately 20% of young people leave school at the end of the winter term. The majority decide to leave school only after they have received the results of external examinations, have been offered a job, or achieved entry to further or higher education or training.

Table A3 provides an overview of the destination categories employed by the Scottish Government. Destinations are based on how the school leavers describe their destinations. A new destination category, Activity Agreements, was introduced in April 2011, as part of the government’s strategy to improve the employability of disadvantaged and vulnerable young people. It includes elements of training, volunteering and learning in various community settings, and other developmental activities.

Information on ASN was taken from the September 2010 Pupil Census. Leavers were identified as having ASN if they had an IEP (Individualised Education Programme), a CSP (Co-ordinated Support Programme), were assessed or declared disabled, or had other needs. However, the categories ‘Looked after’, ‘Physical health problem’ and ‘English as an additional language’, which appear in the 2010 Pupil Census, were not included in data on leavers’ destinations.
Table A3: School leavers’ destination categories, 2010/11

| Positive                          | Higher Education: includes leavers following HND (Higher National Diploma) or HNC (Higher National Certificate) courses, degree courses, courses for the education and training of teachers and higher level courses for professional qualifications. It also includes programmes at a level higher than the standard of the National Qualifications, (i.e., above SCQF level 7). Leavers with a deferred, unconditional place in higher education have also been included in this category.  
Further Education: includes leavers undertaking full-time education which is not higher education and who are no longer on a school roll. This may include National Qualifications. 
Training: includes leavers who are on a training course and in receipt of an allowance or grant, such as the national training programme Get Ready for Work. It also includes leavers who are on local authority or third sector-funded training programmes and are in receipt of a training allowance.  
Employment: includes those who are employed and in receipt of payment from their employers. It includes young people undertaking training in employment through national training programmes such as Modern Apprenticeships.  
Voluntary Work: includes those undertaking voluntary work, with or without financial allowance, who are not ‘unemployed and actively seeking’, as per the unemployed definition. Included in this category would be individuals who are on a gap year, those participating in Project Scotland/ Community Service Volunteers or other voluntary programmes. Activity Agreements: agreements between a young person and a trusted professional that the young person will take part in a programme of learning and activity which helps them become ready for formal learning or employment. This category was introduced in 2010/11. |
| Non-positive | Unemployed and Seeking Employment or Training: includes those who are registered with Skills Development Scotland and are known by them to be seeking employment or training. This is based on regular contact between Skills Development Scotland and the client. This does not refer to the definition of ‘unemployed’ used by the Benefits Agency to calculate published unemployment rates. Young people participating in Personal/Skills Development (see below) who do not fit in any of the existing categories are counted in this category.  
Personal/Skills Development: leavers who participate in learning opportunities/personal and social development activities with the aim of improving their confidence and employability. These programmes can be viewed as a stepping stone towards a positive destination. They are often delivered by community learning and development or third sector organisation.  
Unemployed and Not Seeking Employment or Training: includes all those individuals who are not seeking employment or training for a range of reasons. The reasons may involve sickness, prison, pregnancy, caring for children or other dependents or taking time out. |
| Unknown | Includes all leavers whose destination is not known either to Skills Development Scotland or to the school attended. |

SOURCE: INITIAL SCHOOL LEAVER DESTINATIONS DATA SET 2010/11, SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT (2011b)
Figure A13: School leavers with no ASN, with any ASN, and with particular types of ASN in positive destinations, as percentage of total number of leavers in each group, 2010/11

Figure A13 shows the percentages of school leavers in positive destinations (i.e., higher and further education, training, voluntary work, employment and Activity Agreements) in September 2011. Although percentages are generally high, leavers with ASN are less likely to be in positive destinations. School leavers with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties (SEBD) seem to be most disadvantaged: only 67% were in positive destinations. It is interesting to note here that the ASN category which has the highest proportion of school leavers in positive destinations are leavers with hearing impairment; at approximately 89%, hearing-impaired school leavers are as likely as their peers with no ASN (90%) to enter positive destinations on leaving school. However, due to lack of data, we do not know whether these positive destinations were sustained.

In spite of this similarity between the hearing impaired school leavers and those with no ASN, a closer look at the destination categories of these groups (see Figure A14) reveals a very different pattern, which reflects the discrepancies in attainment discussed in the previous section. While the largest proportion of leavers with no ASN entered higher education (38%), the destination of choice for hearing-impaired leavers was further education (42%).

At 38%, leavers with no ASN were more than twice as likely to enter higher education, compared to their hearing-impaired peers (17%). This discrepancy was also evident in our analysis of attainment levels in the previous section. Some leavers with other types of ASN were better represented in higher education (such as those with visual impairment, at 33%).

Training was another category where hearing-impaired school leavers were underrepresented: less than five people (the exact figure was not published for disclosure reasons) entered national, local authority or third-sector funded training courses, compared to 5% of all school leavers with no ASN. No hearing-impaired leavers from publicly funded schools entered Activity Agreements or voluntary work in 2010/11.

As mentioned above, compared to their peers with no ASN, hearing impaired school leavers were overrepresented in further education (42%, as opposed to 26% of all leavers with no ASN).
A14 demonstrates that further education was the destination of choice of school leavers with all types of additional needs; 40% of all school leavers with ASN entered further education.

Less than five hearing-impaired young people were unemployed and not seeking three months after leaving school (the exact figure was not published). The unemployed and not seeking account for at most 4% of all hearing-impaired school leavers in 2010/11. This suggests that compared with school leavers with other types of ASN, hearing-impaired young people were among the least likely to be unemployed and not seeking, along with those with specific and moderate learning disabilities (1.3% and 2.7%) and visual impairment (less than 5 people).

Similar proportions of leavers with hearing impairment and with no ASN entered employment (20% of both groups) and were unemployed and seeking work three months after leaving school (10% and 9%, respectively). Among school leavers with ASN, those with hearing impairment had one of the highest rates of employment after leaving school, second after those with specific learning disabilities (23%). Due to lack of data, we don’t know what proportion of hearing-impaired school leavers in employment were on Modern Apprenticeship programmes.

Conversely, hearing impaired school leavers were among the least likely to be unemployed and seeking (10%), along with those with visual (8%), physical and motor impairments (8%) and autistic spectrum disorder (9%). Because the Scottish Government does not publish the results of the follow-up survey by type of ASN, we don’t know whether the proportions of unemployed and seeking changed in the following six months.

**Figure A14:** Destinations of school leavers with and without ASN, as percentage of all leavers in each group, 2010/11

[source: Initial School Leaver Destinations Data Set 2010/11, Scottish Government (2011b)]

1. Where data are not disclosed due to low numbers (below 5) we have allowed for two pupils in order to show that some pupils achieved qualifications at a particular level.
2. Because of undisclosed figures and rounding up of percentages, numbers may not add up to 100%.

Figure A14 provides only a snapshot of the initial destinations of school leavers in 2010/11. As discussed above, due to the small numbers of young people in some ASN groups (notably those with hearing and visual impairment, see Figure A9), we expect a considerable degree of fluctuation from year to year in the proportions of young people in different destinations. Figure A15 below demonstrates this.

**Figure A15: Destinations of school leavers with hearing impairment and with no ASN, as percentage of all leavers in each group, 2007/8 to 2010/11**

![Graph showing destinations of school leavers](image)

**SOURCE:** INITIAL SCHOOL LEAVER DESTINATIONS DATA SETS, SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT (2008, 2009, 2010d and 2011b)

1. Where data are not disclosed due to low numbers (below 5) we have allowed for two pupils in order to show that some pupils achieved qualifications at a particular level.
2. Because of undisclosed figures and rounding up of percentages, numbers may not add up to 100%.
3. Activity Agreements was introduced as a destination category in 2010/11. No hearing impaired school leavers entered Activity Agreements in 2010/11; this destination was therefore not included in the figure.

Apart from a slight increase in the proportion of school leavers who entered higher education, and a sudden drop in the proportion of school leavers who entered employment, the proportions of school leavers with no ASN in various destinations remain fairly constant over the four year period. On the contrary, there is a lot more fluctuation in the proportions of hearing-impaired school leavers in each destination during the same period. The main reason for this fluctuation may lie with the relatively small numbers of pupils with hearing impairment who left school each year (see Table A4).

Further education has been the destination of choice of hearing-impaired school leavers over the four year period; between 40% and 57% entered further education, much larger proportions than leavers with no ASN. There seem to be no clear upward or downward trends in the further education enrolment rates of either group.

Higher education has been the second most popular post-school destination of hearing-impaired young people. There was a sudden drop in the enrolments to higher education in 2007/8 (from 24% to 7% the following year), which was accompanied by an increase in enrolments into further education at a similar rate, which suggests that pupils who would have opted for HE the previous
year chose FE in 2007/8. After 2007/8, the number of enrolments in HE increased gradually, although it did not reach the 2006/7 levels. This gradual increase also reflects the increase in the proportion of hearing-impaired pupils leaving school with Highers, which we discussed in the previous section (Figure A12).

Table A4: School leavers with hearing impairment from publicly funded schools, 2007/8 to 2010/11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage of all school leavers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007/8</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/9</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The numbers of school leavers with hearing impairment reported in the Initial School Leaver Destinations datasets are slightly smaller than the ones reported in the SQA Attainment datasets.
2. The sudden increase in the number of school leavers with hearing impairment in 2010/11 may be due to the inclusion of pupils who received support other than Co-ordinated Support Plans (CSP), Individualised Educational Programmes (IEP) or Record of Needs (RON) in the total number of pupils who received support for hearing impairment.

The data on the presence of school leavers with hearing impairment in employment, training and in the unemployed categories should be treated with caution because of the small numbers of young people in each of these destinations.

From 2007/8 to 2009/10 there has been a constant decrease in the numbers of young people entering employment on leaving school (from 16% in 2007/8, to 5.6% in 2009/10). In 2010/11 there was a sudden increase to 20%. Due to this increase, in 2010/11 equal proportions of school leavers with hearing impairment and with no ASN entered employment.

Proportionally more school leavers with hearing impairment compared with leavers with no ASN went on training courses between 2007/8 and 2009/10 (8%, 7% and 9%, as opposed to a constant 5% of the leavers with no ASN). However, in 2010/11 there was a sudden drop to less than five people, which accounted for an estimated 2-4% of all hearing impaired school leavers. Because of the way data was reported, we do not know how many of the young people in training were on national training programmes, like Get Ready for Work, and how many were on local authority or third sector-funded training programmes.

Between 2007/8 and 2009/10 there was a slight increase in the proportions of hearing-impaired young people who were unemployed and seeking work or training three months after leaving school (from 9% to 15%), while the proportions of jobseekers with no ASN remained constant at a comparable 11%. In 2010/11 there was a drop in the numbers of jobseekers in both groups, to 10% for those with hearing impairment, and 9% for those with no ASN. Therefore it can be said that in 2010/11 there were similar proportions of school leavers with hearing impairment and with no ASN who were unemployed and actively seeking work or training.

The proportions of school leavers who were unemployed and not seeking were very small and fairly constant over the four year period (1% of those with no ASN, and between 2% and 3% of those with hearing impairment).

In June 2013, the Scottish Government published the Attainment and Leaver Destinations dataset, which included for the first time information on both the initial and follow-up destinations of school
leavers with various types of ASN. This allowed us to compare the destinations of DHH young people three months and nine months after they left school (see Table A5).

Table A5: Percentage of school leavers in initial and follow-up destinations, 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial destinations (app. 3 months after leaving school)</th>
<th>Follow-up destinations (app. 9 months after leaving school)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Destinations</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further Education</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Work</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Agreement</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed Seeking</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed Not Seeking</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: ATTAINMENT AND LEAVER DESTINATIONS, SUPPLEMENTARY DATA. SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT (2013)

1. These percentages are based on 132 school leavers with hearing impairments who took part in both the initial and follow-up survey, and who represented 90% of all school leavers with hearing impairment in 2011/12.
2. Percentages based on numbers below 5 were repressed for disclosure reasons.
3. Because of undisclosed figures and rounding up of percentages, numbers may not add up to 100%.

What the data shows is that DHH leavers entered and stayed in positive destinations three and nine months after leaving school. Young people who entered higher education were present in higher education in the same proportion, which meant that there were not drop-outs in the six-month period between the two surveys. However, the data suggests that approximately 6% of the young people who entered further education dropped out six months later (i.e., the percentage dropped from an initial 44.7% to 38.6%). There was only a slight decrease in the numbers of jobseekers (i.e., from 9.8% to 8.3%), which suggests that only few young people entered employment in that period. There was a 4% increase in the employment rates, as well as a 4.5% increase in the number of young people who were unemployed and not seeking employment. This may be an indication that some of the young people who dropped out of college entered employment, while others became NEET.

To summarise, the lag in attainment levels of school leavers with hearing impairment is reflected in their post-school destinations. Although proportions of hearing-impaired leavers in positive destinations are comparable to those of leavers with no ASN, an in-depth examination shows that leavers with hearing impairment are most likely to enter further education, while the largest proportions of leavers with no ASN entered higher education. Mainly due to the small numbers, there is more fluctuation in the proportions of hearing impaired young people in various destinations. Nevertheless, some patterns emerge. Here is a summary of the main findings:

- In 2010/11, school leavers with hearing impairment entered positive destinations in the highest proportion amongst leavers with ASN. However, they were not as well represented in higher education as leavers with other types of ASN (most notably those with visual impairment), as the most common destination was further education. Their employment rates were among the highest, second only to those of leavers with specific learning disabilities, such as dyslexia, and they were the least likely to be unemployed and seeking work.
- Compared to school leavers with no support needs, in 2010/11 hearing-impaired leavers entered positive destinations to a similar degree. However, their destinations were very different. They were underrepresented in higher education (by half) and training, and
overrepresented in further education. On the other hand, their employment rates and proportions of jobseekers were very similar.

- If we look at their post-school destinations over a period of four years, we see that hearing impaired school leavers have constantly been overrepresented in further education and underrepresented in higher education, compared to their peers with no support needs. Between 2007/8 and 2009/10, they were overrepresented in training and underrepresented in employment, but this changed radically in 2010/11.
- Clear patterns emerge in the post-school destinations of leavers with no ASN between 2008/9 and 2010/11: more have entered higher education; their employment rates suddenly dropped in 2008/9 and have remained low; and there were slightly fewer jobseekers in 2010/11, compared with previous years.
- The post-school destinations of hearing-impaired school leavers do not show such clear patterns, either because of small numbers or because of numerous other factors at play. For instance, there was a steep drop in higher education enrolments in 2008/9, followed by a gradual increase, but still far below the 2008/9 levels. Between 2007/8 and 2009/10 the proportions of jobseekers were rising, but they suddenly dropped in 2010/11. This coincided with a similar drop in their enrolments on training courses, and with a more than three-fold increase in employment rates.
- The comparison between the initial and follow-up destinations of the 2011/12 cohort of school leavers from publicly-funded schools showed that those who entered higher education stayed in higher education, but that a small proportion of the young people who entered further education courses dropped out and either entered employment or became NEET. This is a particularly significant finding, considering that further education has been the most common destination for DHH young people immediately after school.

In the following sections we examine in more detail the participation rates of DHH young people in post-school education, training and employment, and we supplement the data published by the Scottish Government with information from other sources.

### Participation in higher education

In this section, patterns of participation in higher education of leavers from publicly-funded Scottish schools are analysed in conjunction with statistics on students in higher education published by the Higher Education Statistics Agency (henceforth HESA). HESA collects administrative data from all publicly-funded higher education institutions in the UK (and one private institution) and from the Universities and Colleges Admissions Service (UCAS).

Unlike the Scottish Government, HESA classifies students by ‘disability’, rather than ‘support needs’. The disability categories employed by HESA (2013) are:

- a specific learning difficulty
- blind or a serious visual impairment
- deaf or a serious hearing impairment
- a physical impairment or mobility issues
- personal care support
- a mental health condition
- social communication/autistic spectrum disorder
- a long-standing illness or health condition
- two or more conditions
an another disability, impairment or medical condition.

All other students are placed in the ‘no known disability’. What is important to note here is that disability status is recorded based on students’ self-assessment. Only those students who declare disability on UCAS form or at registration are recorded. HESA statistics do not include those who declare disability after registration or those who choose not to declare disability at all. Due to this and the fact the disability is self-assessed, these figures should be interpreted with caution.

First let us go back to the proportions of hearing-impaired school leavers from publicly-funded Scottish schools who entered higher education courses at institutions of higher education or colleges, straight after leaving school. Figure A16 compares the proportions of hearing-impaired school leavers with those of leavers with any type of ASN and leavers with no support needs, over a period of four years.

We can see that hearing-impaired school leavers have entered higher education in generally greater proportions than leavers with ASN as a group, although they have been significantly less likely to do so compared to their peers with no support needs. We also notice a slow but gradual increase in the proportions of all school leavers who entered higher education. However, for the hearing-impaired the increase took place only in the last three years; it was preceded by a steep drop in enrolments in 2008/9, which we discussed in the previous section. We should note here, once more, that the small numbers of hearing impaired school leavers make these changes in percentages seem more drastic than they actually are. If we look at the raw numbers, four hearing impaired school leavers went into higher education in 2008/9, as compared to 16 the previous year.

Figure A16: Proportions of hearing-impaired school leavers from publicly-funded Scottish schools who entered higher education institutions, compared with proportions of leavers with any ASN and with no ASN, 2007/8 to 2010/11

In 2010/11, school leavers who received support for hearing impairment represented only 0.08% of all leavers from Scottish publicly-funded schools entering higher education. This percentage is much smaller than the percentage of all first year undergraduates who are ‘deaf or have a serious hearing impairment’, as reported by HESA in 2010/11 (0.28%, see Table A6 below). We have to bear in mind that HESA figures cover DHH students in the entire United Kingdom, not only Scotland. However,
this marked difference is worth pointing out as it may reflect the fact that some DHH pupils do not receive support in school. DHH young people are more likely to disclose a disability when applying to university.

Figure A17 demonstrates that there seem to be proportionally more disabled undergraduates (9.26%) than graduates (7.92%). This has been proven to be a general trend in higher education statistics (Riddell, Tinklin & Wilson, 2005), and the reasons for this have been assumed to lie with the fact that postgraduate do not complete a UCAS form and may not be asked about their disability status. However, as far as the DHH group are concerned, there seem to be slightly more postgraduates (0.31%) than undergraduates (0.27%). Table A6 below shows that this pattern has been consistent over the last three years, although the differences in proportions of DHH undergraduates and postgraduates are minimal. The higher proportion of DHH students at postgraduate level is not a reflection of the fact that more DHH undergraduates progress to postgraduate study compared to undergraduates with other disabilities. The Destinations of Leavers from Higher Education Survey (see Figure A21 in the next section) demonstrates that DHH undergraduates are in fact less likely to progress to postgraduate study. Therefore the slightly higher percentage of DHH students at postgraduate level must be due to the fact that, unlike other disabled students, more DHH postgraduates disclose disability compared to DHH undergraduates.

Figure A17: UK-domiciled first year higher education students by level of study and disability status, as percentage of all students in each level of study, 2011/12

In 2010/11 the way data was recorded changed, and for certain categories of disability we cannot make comparisons with previous years. The ‘Deaf/hearing impairment’ category was replaced with ‘Deaf or a serious hearing impairment’, suggesting stricter inclusion criteria than before. However, the percentages of deaf students do not seem to differ much from those of previous years (Table A6).

Figure A18 shows that there are proportionally more women than men in higher education, both at undergraduate and postgraduate levels, and the trend seems to remain unchanged across the three categories of disability. We have to remember that, when looking at the gender distribution of pupils
with ASN in publicly-funded schools (Figure A4), we found that there was no marked difference between the proportions of male and female hearing-impaired pupils.

### Table A6: Hearing impaired and disabled UK-domiciled higher education students as percentage of all students, 2009/10 to 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All undergraduate</th>
<th>All postgraduate</th>
<th>First year undergraduate</th>
<th>First year postgraduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>7.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Gap in data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>7.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>7.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** STUDENTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS, HESA (2011, 2012 and 2013)

### Figure A18: Gender distribution of UK-domiciled higher education students with hearing impairment, any disability and no disability, 2011/12

![Gender distribution chart](chart)

**Source:** STUDENTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS, HESA (2013)

Figure A19 shows the percentages of students in receipt of Disabled Students’ Allowance from the Student Awards Agency for Scotland over a period of five years, by type of disability. The Disabled Students’ Allowance (DSA) is non-means tested financial support for full-time and part-time Higher education students who have a disability. It is meant to help with extra costs incurred as a consequence of disability, and it is available to first degree and post-graduate students, as well as students on higher education courses in colleges (such as HNC and HND). Scottish-domiciled higher education students studying throughout the UK are awarded DSA through Student Awards Agency for Scotland (SAAS).
Figure A19: Scottish-domiciled students in receipt of Disabled Students' Allowance (DSA) by disability, as percentage of all students who received DSA, 2006/07 to 2010/11

In 2011/12 there was an improvement in the way data was recorded. There were almost twice as many categories of disability, and this provided more information on the nature of difficulty of DSA recipients (see figure A20). One improvement was that a new category, ‘Deaf/blind’, was created, thus separating the deafblind DSA recipients from other students with multiple disabilities.

Figure A20: Scottish-domiciled students in receipt of Disabled Students' Allowance by disability, 2011/12
However, these changes do not seem to have influenced the way data on DHH recipients are recorded, as the total numbers and the proportions out of all DSA recipients has not changed significantly. Table A7 below shows that the total numbers of DHH recipients have stayed relatively constant over the six-year period, although the total numbers of students in receipt of DSA has increased over the years.

**Table A7: Scottish-domiciled DHH students in receipt of DSA, 2006/7 to 2011/12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total number of DSA recipients</th>
<th>DHH DSA recipients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>3,385</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>3,625</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>4,065</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>4,275</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>4,435</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>4,495</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Higher Education Student Support in Scotland, Scottish Government (2011a and 2012b)*

We do not know how many students who self-identify as deaf and hearing impaired receive DSA. We know that in 2011/12, 3.11% of all disabled first year undergraduates and postgraduates in UK higher education institutions were DHH (HESA, 2013), and that 2.45% of all Scottish-domiciled DSA recipients were DHH. Although these two figures are not directly comparable as they cover different geographical regions, they suggest that a high proportion (around 80%) of HE students who consider themselves DHH may be in receipt of DSA.

The Higher Education Funding Council for England analysed the dropout rates of disabled first year full-time students over a six year period (Table A8), and found that disabled students in receipt of DSA were less likely to drop out in their first year, compared with disabled students who did not receive DSA, and even compared with non-disabled students. Disabled students who did not claim DSA were most likely to drop out.

**Table A8: Non-continuation rates of full-time first degree students at UK higher education institutions after their first year, 2004/5 to 2009/10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Disabled students not in receipt of DSA</th>
<th>Disabled students in receipt of DSA</th>
<th>Non-disabled students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Higher Education Funding Council for England Analysis of HESA Student Records, Published by Office for Disability Issues (2012)*

*Note. These figures do not include mature students (i.e., students older than 21 on 30th September of the year they entered Higher Education).*

In this section we compared the proportions of pupils in receipt of support for hearing impairment in publicly-funded Scottish schools who entered higher education straight after leaving school with the proportions of self-assessed DHH students in higher education and the proportions of DHH recipients of DSA. The data on self-assessed DHH students cover the entire UK, as we didn’t have access to national statistics, therefore comparisons with the DHH population in Scotland can only be made on an exploratory, rather than confirmatory basis. Here is a summary of the main findings:
• Pupils who receive support for hearing impairment are more likely to enter higher education straight after leaving school compared with pupils with other support needs, but are still significantly less likely to do so compared with their peers with no support needs.

• DHH pupils make up a very small percentage of all leavers who entered higher education straight after leaving school (0.08%), much smaller than the general participation rates of DHH students in higher education in the UK. This may be an indication that DHH young people enter higher education later, possibly after gaining the necessary qualifications in colleges. Further research is needed to confirm whether this is indeed the case.

• Unlike other disabled students, more DHH postgraduates than undergraduates declare disability.

• In the last six years, the numbers of Scottish-domiciled DHH students in receipt of DSA have stayed relatively constant.

The next section is an analysis of outcomes of DHH first degree graduates from UK higher education institutions. We look at their destinations six months after completion, and we focus in particular on employment status and occupations of those who enter employment.

**First destinations of DHH graduates**

The information in this section is based on the results of HESA’s Destinations of Leavers from Higher Education Survey, which is administered through the careers services of higher education institutions across the UK, and collects data on the first destinations of first degree graduates, six months on from completion. Since 2003, the Association of Graduate Careers Advisory Services (AGCAS) Disability Task Group has been publishing annual reports on the first destination of disabled graduates, as compared to their non-disabled peers. Its main purpose is to provide ‘evidence of the effect of disability on a graduate’s prospects in the labour market’ (AGCAS, 2012).

At the time of writing, the 2013 edition of the AGCAS Disability Task Group report was published, therefore this analysis is based on figures from the latest five reports, which cover the 2005/6 to 2009/10 cohorts of HE graduates.

The categories of disability used in the Destinations of Leavers from Higher Education Survey are the same as those used in HESA administrative data (see Figure A21 below). DHH students fall under the ‘Deaf/Hearing impairment’ category. Just like in the previous section, we have to bear in mind that the information on disability status is based on students’ self-assessment, and it may not reflect the real proportions of DHH students in higher education.

Table A9 shows the raw numbers of DHH respondents to the survey. We can see that, although the numbers of respondents have been growing over the years, their percentages of all respondents have remained relatively unchanged. The percentages of DHH respondents to the survey vary between 0.27 - 0.30% of all respondents. If we go back to Table A6 in the previous section, we see that these percentages are comparable with those of DHH undergraduates out of all undergraduates (0.27 - 0.33%), which suggests that the findings of this survey are representative of the wider population of DHH undergraduates in the UK.
### Table A9: UK-domiciled D/HHDHH respondents to Destinations of Leavers from Higher Education Survey, 2005/6 to 2009/10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005/06</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of all respondents (including unclassified)</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Figure A21: Respondents to Destinations of Leavers from Higher Education Survey by disability type, 2009/10

![Bar Chart](chart.png)

**SOURCE:** WHAT HAPPENS NEXT? AGCAS DISABILITY TASK GROUP (2012)

The destinations of graduates are defined by type of activity, as follows:

- **Full-time paid work only** (including self-employed)
- **Part-time paid work only**
- **Voluntary/unpaid work only**
- **Work and further study** (includes those who reported that they were in full-time paid work only, including self-employed, part-time paid work only, voluntary/unpaid work only plus work and further study)
- **Further study only** (includes those who gave their employment circumstances as temporarily sick or unable to work/looking after the home or family, not employed but not looking for employment, further study or training, or something else, and who were also either in full-time or part-time study, training or research. It also includes those who were due to start a job within the next month or unemployed and looking for employment, further study or training, and who were also in full-time study, training or research)
• Assumed to be unemployed (includes those students who gave their employment circumstances as unemployed and looking for employment, further study or training, and who were also either in part-time study, training or research or not studying, plus those who were due to start a job within the next month and who were also either in part-time study, training or research or not studying)
• Not available for employment
• Other.

Figure A22 shows a comparison of the destinations of DHH graduates, all disabled graduates and those with no disabilities in 2009/10. The largest destination of all graduates irrespective of disability status was full-time employment. At 47.1%, DHH graduates entered full-time paid work in higher proportion than disabled graduates as a whole (45.5%), but in lower proportion than non-disabled graduates (49.0%). Conversely, their unemployment rate (10%) was lower than that of disabled graduates as a whole (11.4%), but higher than that of their non-disabled peers (8.8%). In 2009/10 the unemployment rate of DHH graduates was the lowest of all groups of disabled graduates.

Compared with disabled and non-disabled graduates, DHH graduates were overrepresented in other types of employment: part-time work (14.3% vs. 12% for the disabled and non-disabled groups); voluntary work (3.4% vs. 3.1 and 2.0%, respectively); and work and further study (7.6% vs. 7.1 and 7.3%, respectively). And finally, DHH graduates were underrepresented in the ‘Further study only’ category (12%, vs. 15.3 and 16.5%), which suggests that they are less likely to progress to postgraduate level.

Figure A22: Destinations of DHH graduates, compared to disabled and non-disabled graduates, as percentage of all graduates in each group, 2009/10

Figure A23 provides an overview of the fluctuation in the percentages of DHH and non-disabled graduates in different destinations in the last five years. What stands out is that the full-time employment rates of DHH graduates, albeit slightly lower than those of non-disabled graduates, have followed the same trend: they peaked in 2006/7, dropped in 2008/9, and rose again in 2009/10, although not as high as the 2006/7 levels.
It is interesting to note that before 2008/9, DHH stayed on in full-time study in higher proportions than their disabled peers. Since 2008/9 this trend has reversed: more non-disabled graduates stayed on in education, while DHH graduates either became unemployed or entered part-time employment in higher proportions than before. This suggests that the economic crisis may have affected the two groups in different ways: non-disabled graduates continued to study, and DHH graduates were left unemployed or worked part-time (which, depending on the frequency of work, could be seen as a proxy for unemployment).

Figure A24 is a comparison of the unemployment rates of DHH, all disabled and non-disabled graduates over a five year period. The unemployment rates of DHH graduates have been constantly higher than those of their non-disabled peers. They vary in comparison with those of disabled graduates as a group. In 2009/10 the unemployment rates of DHH graduates were lower than those of all disabled graduates for the first time since 2006/7.

The Destinations of Leavers from Higher Education Survey also collects data on the occupations, annual salaries and industries entered by employed respondents. However, as the AGCAS Disability Task Group’s analysis does not provide a breakdown of industries and salaries by type of disability, they are not discussed here. We will focus instead on the analysis of occupations.

The survey uses a variant of the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC2000). Occupations are classified in one of nine groups, as follows: managers and administrators; professional occupations; associate professional and technical occupations; clerical and secretarial occupations; craft and related occupations; personal and protective service occupations; sales occupations; plant and machine operatives; and other occupations.
Figure A24: Unemployment rates of DHH, disabled and non-disabled graduates of UK Higher education institutions, 2005/6 to 2009/10

![Graph showing unemployment rates for DHH, disabled, and non-disabled graduates from 2005/6 to 2009/10.](image)


Figure A25: Occupations of employed DHH graduates, compared to disabled and non-disabled graduates, as percentage of all graduates in each group, 2009/10

![Bar chart showing the distribution of occupations among DHH, disabled, and non-disabled graduates.](image)


Figure A25 below shows the proportions of DHH, disabled and non-disabled graduates in the 2009/10 cohort in each of the nine occupational groups. It shows a positive picture of the outcomes of employed DHH graduates in 2009/10. Compared with their disabled and non-disabled peers, DHH graduates were overrepresented in managerial and professional occupations, which are considered to be graduate-level employment (Elias & Purcell, 2004) and underrepresented in half of groups considered to fall below the graduate employment marker, clerical and sales occupations (i.e., 7.9% DHH graduates in managerial occupations, compared with 7.3% of disabled and non-disabled graduates; 27.4% in professional occupations, as compared to 23.1% and 25.9%, respectively; 7.9% in clerical occupations, compared with 8.2% and 9.4%, respectively; and 7.6% in sales occupations,
compared with 12.6% and 13.6%, respectively). This means that in 2009/10 proportionally more DHH graduates entered jobs suited to their degrees than other graduates.

The graduate level employment marker was developed by Elias & Purcell (2004). It splits Standard Occupational Classification codes into 'graduate occupations' and 'non-graduate occupations'. Based on a basic definition, graduate employment includes the first three SOC groups (managers and administrators, professional occupations and associate professional and technical occupations), and non-graduate employment covers the rest of the SOC groups.

If we look at the occupations of DHH graduates over a period of five years (Figure A26), we see that DHH graduates have been markedly overrepresented in associate professional and technical occupations compared with their non-disabled peers. They have also been overrepresented in professional occupations, although to a slightly lesser degree. And although we have seen that in 2009/10 they entered managerial occupations in the largest proportion of all graduates, this has not always been the case.

**Figure A26: Occupations of employed DHH graduates of UK higher education institutions compared with non-disabled graduates, as percentage of all graduates in each group, 2005/6 to 2009/10**

![Occupations of employed DHH graduates of UK higher education institutions compared with non-disabled graduates, as percentage of all graduates in each group, 2005/6 to 2009/10](image)

 Conversely, DHH graduates have been underrepresented in most ‘non-graduate occupations’ (i.e., clerical and sales occupations). However, they have been constantly overrepresented in personal and protective service occupations. These include people in caring personal service, such as medical nurses, nursery nurses, and care assistants, and in leisure and other personal service occupations, such as beauticians, housekeepers and travel guides. These types of occupations have been widespread amongst DHH people.

Finally, Figure A27 provides a comparison of the rates of graduate and non-graduate employment of DHH, disabled and non-disabled graduates over the same five year period. Once more, this paints a
positive picture for DHH graduates, as they have constantly been more likely than their disabled and non-disabled peers to enter graduate employment six months after completing their first degrees. This suggests that a graduate level qualification brings a significant improvement to a DHH young person’s employment prospects. Alternatively, DHH graduates may be a very socially selective group.

Figure A27: Proportions of DHH, disabled and non-disabled graduates of UK higher education institutions in graduate and non-graduate level employment, 2005/6 to 2009/10

To summarise, the analysis of the initial destinations and occupations of DHH first degree graduates from UK higher education institutions proves that the outcomes of this group are far removed from the discourse of disadvantage and underachievement which is generally associated with disability. The data shows that the employment rates of DHH graduates are higher than those of graduates with disability as a group. And although DHH graduates have slightly lower employment rates than their non-disabled peers, when they do enter employment they are more likely to enter graduate level employment, particularly professional and associate professional occupations.

And last, but not least, in 2009/10 DHH graduates were described as ‘this year’s most positive story’ (AGCAS, 2012, p.s), as they had the lowest unemployment levels amongst disabled groups, entered full-time and part-time employment in the highest proportion, and entered management and administration occupations in the highest proportion of any group of graduates.
Participation in further education

Figure A28 shows the proportions of school leavers from publicly-funded Scottish schools who entered further education between 2007/8 and 2010/11, by ASN status. School leavers who received support for hearing impairment entered further education in significantly higher proportions than those with no ASN. It is interesting to note that proportions of hearing impaired school leavers who opted for further education have been constantly higher than those of leavers with ASN as a group.

Figure A28: Proportions of hearing-impaired school leavers from publicly-funded Scottish schools who entered further education institutions, compared with proportions of leavers with any ASN and with no ASN, 2007/8 to 2010/11

The Scottish Funding Council collects and publishes statistics on the participation rates of disabled young people in further education institutions in Scotland, but the data is not as rich and detailed as the data on higher education. Similar to HESA, the information on the disability status of young people in further education is based on self-assessment. Figure A29 shows the Scottish further education institutions in order of the percentage of students who declared that they are deaf or hard of hearing in 2010/11. Newbattle Abbey College stands out as having a far larger proportion of deaf students than any other college (6%). Apart from Newbattle Abbey college, there was little variation in the proportions of DHH students registered at the rest of the further education institutions (i.e., from 1.3% at John Wheatley College to 0.15% at Cardonald College).
Figure A29: Scottish colleges in order of percentage of DHH students, 2010/11

SOURCE: SCOTTISH FUNDING COUNCIL, THROUGH INFRACT
Figure A30: Further education students at Scottish Colleges, by disability status, as percentage of all students, 2010/11

Figure A30 shows that self-declared DHH young people made up approximately 0.55% of all students in further education in 2010/11. This is slightly higher than the percentage of hearing impaired pupils in publicly-funded schools (i.e., 0.34%, Figure A3) and the percentage of self-declared DHH students in first year higher education courses (i.e., 0.27%, Figure A17), which once more shows that there are relatively more DHH young people in further education.

**Participation in training**

Figure A31 shows the proportions of school leavers from publicly-funded Scottish schools who entered training courses (National Training Programmes or training programmes offered by local authorities and the third sector) and were in receipt of a training allowance. It is important to note that young people on Modern Apprenticeship programmes were not included in this category, as they were counted under Employment. Therefore these figures below represent the proportions of young people who were on programmes like Get Ready for Work or Training for Work, and on training programmes offered by private or third-sector providers.

Compared with school leavers with no ASN, hearing impaired leavers were overrepresented on training programmes up to 2010/11. In 2010/11 there was a sudden decrease in the numbers of DHH school leavers on training programmes. In the next section we see that this steep drop is accompanied by a sudden increase in the percentage of hearing-impaired school leavers in employment, and we speculate on the factors which may have contributed to this. However, it is interesting to note here that the steep drop in hearing-impaired school leavers’ presence on training programmes in 2010/11 is not reflected in the wider group of leavers with any kind of support needs, which suggests that the factors which led to this fluctuation in the DHH post-school destinations may have only influenced this particular group.
Figure A31: Proportions of hearing-impaired school leavers from publicly-funded Scottish schools who entered training courses, compared with proportions of leavers with any ASN and with no ASN, 2007/8 to 2010/11


Note. Where data are not disclosed due to low numbers (below 5) we have allowed for 2 pupils in order to show that some pupils achieved qualifications at a particular level.

Figure A32 contains data collected by Skills Development Scotland (SDS) on the proportions of disabled people on the national training programmes delivered between 2010 and 2012, including Modern Apprenticeships. As SDS does not collect data on the particular types of disability of people in training, we don’t know the proportion of DHH young people on these programmes. Figure A32 shows that those who declared a disability represented 0.77% or less of all those on Modern Apprenticeships and Get Ready for Work, and that their numbers seemed to be in decline.

Figure A32: Disabled people on National Training Programmes as of 31st March, as percentage of total number of people on each programme, 2010 to 2012

SOURCE: SKILLS DEVELOPMENT SCOTLAND

1. Disability information is based on self-assessment.
2. Modern Apprenticeships figures include all ages (16-19 and 20+) and all qualification levels.
Disabled people also represented small proportions of those on Lifeskills programmes, which are designed for young people who needed longer to prepare for employment. On the other hand, disabled people represent a much larger proportion of those on Training for Work (3.72-5.48%), a programme aimed at people who are 18 or older and have been out of work for 13 weeks or more.

**Employment rates**

Figure A32 shows the proportions of school leavers from publicly-funded Scottish schools who entered paid employment or training through Modern Apprenticeships between 2007/8 and 2010/11, by ASN status. It is interesting to note here that the proportion of hearing impaired young people going straight into employment increased significantly in 2010/11, although there was no significant increase for those with no ASN. Furthermore, if we look at the employment rates of the entire population of 16-24 year olds (Figure A33 below) we can see that this age group was most severely affected by the economic crisis in 2008. There could be two reasons for this increase in DHH school leavers’ employment rates. In 2010 the Government announced new funding for Modern Apprenticeships (Scottish Government, 2010g). The same year the Department for Work and pensions launched Work Choice, a supported employment programme for people with disabilities, and 15,900 people across the UK joined the programme in the first three months following its launch (DWP, 2012c). Unfortunately, neither Modern Apprenticeships nor Work Choice official statistics for 2010/11 are broken down by type of disability, so we don’t know how DHH people are represented on these programmes.

When looking at figures on employment we should keep in mind that we don’t know what proportion of DHH school leavers were in full-time employment. The increase in employment rates may be inflated by more young people taking up part-time jobs.

**Figure A33: Proportions of hearing-impaired school leavers from publicly-funded Scottish schools who entered paid employment, compared with proportions of leavers with any ASN and with no ASN, 2007/8 to 2010/11**

![Graph showing proportions of hearing-impaired school leavers from publicly-funded Scottish schools who entered paid employment, compared with proportions of leavers with any ASN and with no ASN, 2007/8 to 2010/11.](image)


---

10 Figures exclude Remploy clients.
Figure A34: Proportions of hearing-impaired school leavers from publicly-funded Scottish schools who entered paid employment, compared with proportions of leavers with any ASN and with no ASN, 2007/8 to 2010/11

![Graph showing proportions of hearing-impaired school leavers from publicly-funded Scottish schools who entered paid employment, compared with proportions of leavers with any ASN and with no ASN, 2007/8 to 2010/11.](image)

SOURCE: ANNUAL POPULATION SURVEY, JAN-DEC (ONS), AS REPORTED IN LOCAL AREA LABOUR MARKETS IN SCOTLAND (SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT, 2012c)

Table A10 shows the highest and lowest estimated employment rates of working-age people with hearing impairment, visual impairment and with severe and specific learning difficulties, between 2008 and 2012. We can see that over the 5 year period the employment rates of people with ‘difficulty in hearing’ have been almost constantly higher than those of people with ‘difficulties in seeing’, and significantly higher than those of people with learning difficulties.

Figure A35: Highest and lowest estimated employment rates for males aged 16-64 and females aged 16-59 in Great Britain with particular types of impairment, 2008 to 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Difficulty in hearing</th>
<th>Difficulty in seeing</th>
<th>Severe or specific learning difficulties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Lowest 49.00</td>
<td>38.90</td>
<td>14.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest 67.30</td>
<td>54.40</td>
<td>24.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Lowest 50.00</td>
<td>32.10</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest 69.20</td>
<td>47.30</td>
<td>24.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gap in data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Difficulty in hearing</th>
<th>Difficulty in seeing</th>
<th>Severe or specific learning difficulties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Lowest 35.60</td>
<td>33.90</td>
<td>10.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest 55.50</td>
<td>51.20</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Lowest 44.80</td>
<td>31.10</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest 64.20</td>
<td>48.60</td>
<td>16.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Lowest 38.60</td>
<td>39.90</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest 57.60</td>
<td>55.50</td>
<td>14.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: OFFICE FOR DISABILITY ISSUES, BASED ON THE LABOUR FORCE SURVEY (2012)

1. Respondents who experience multiple difficulties are asked to identify their main impairment.
2. The gap in data is due to a change in the way people report disability. In 2010, provisions in the Equality Act 2010 replaced the majority of provisions in the DDA.

3. Labour Force Survey figures from previous years have been updated to reflect changes to weighting variables, in line with the latest population estimates published by Office for National Statistics.

4. The estimates are based on relatively small sample sizes and are presented as ranges which are confidence intervals at 95 per cent level.

Figure A36: Employment rates of working-age people in Great Britain by type of impairment, 2010

Figure A34 shows a wider picture of the employment rates of people with different types of impairment in 2010. People with ‘difficulties in hearing’ have lower employment rates than most people with long-term health conditions, and higher employment rates than those with ‘difficulty in seeing’ and those with severe and specific learning difficulties. However, it is important to keep in mind that the employment rates of the entire working-age DHH population are likely to be inflated by the inclusion of people who acquired hearing loss later in life (i.e., people who were not DHH during their formative years).

DHH people not only have employment rates which are lower than those of the majority of people with long-term health conditions, but they also have much higher support needs when in employment. Figure A35 shows the numbers of people in receipt of employment support through Access to Work between April 2012 and January 2013. Those with ‘difficulties in hearing’ are the largest category of recipients, while far fewer people with long-term health conditions use Access to Work.

Access to Work Official Statistics releases do not include a breakdown by types of support required by clients with particular types of impairment. Figure A36 shows the types of support received by all Access to Work clients. Between April 2012 and January 2013, the highest proportion of Access to Work funds was used to pay for support workers, such as BSL interpreters and notetakers for DHH people. In 2010/11 it was reported that 22% of the budget was spent on BSL interpreters, 28 per cent on travel-to-work support and around 11 per cent on special aids and equipment (DWP, 2013a).
Figure A37: Individuals in receipt of Access to Work awards between April 2012 and January 2013

![Bar chart showing the distribution of Access to Work awards by condition. The most common conditions are hearing difficulty, seeing difficulty, and other conditions.](source: ACCESS TO WORK: OFFICIAL STATISTICS, DEPARTMENT FOR WORK AND PENSIONS (JANUARY 2013a))

Figure A38: Access to Work awards granted between April 2012 and January 2013, by type

![Bar chart showing the distribution of Access to Work awards by type. The most common types are support worker, travel to work, and AtW assessment.](source: ACCESS TO WORK: OFFICIAL STATISTICS, DEPARTMENT FOR WORK AND PENSIONS (JANUARY 2013a))
Note. A person may receive more than one type of award.

Table A11 demonstrates that since 2010/11 the total number of Access to Work awards has decreased, while the percentage of DHH recipients has increased. Figure A37 shows how this was possible: while in 2010 people with back and neck problems were one of the largest categories of Access to Work recipients, since the end of 2011 the number of awards for this category decreased significantly; at the same time, the number of recipients with difficulties in hearing and seeing increased gradually. Since summer 2012, DHH people became the largest category of recipients.

Table A10: Access to Work awards, Great Britain, 2010 to 2013 (new categories)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total number of awards</th>
<th>Awards for people with ‘difficulties in hearing’, as percentage of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>122330</td>
<td>15.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>113740</td>
<td>16.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>102400</td>
<td>17.32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note. Access to Work statistics are published quarterly. The figures above are totals per financial year.

Figure A39: Largest categories of AtW award recipients, as percentage of total, 2010 to 2013


Note. The category ‘Other’, which was also among the largest, is not shown.
Jobseekers

Figure A38 shows that there was little fluctuation in the proportion of school leavers with no ASN who started looking for work straight after leaving school between 2007 and 2011. The apparent fluctuation in the percentage of jobseekers with ASN and with hearing impairment may be an effect of the relatively small numbers in these categories, and in the changes in recording practices.

Figure A40: Proportions of hearing-impaired school leavers from publicly-funded Scottish schools who were unemployed and seeking employment or training, compared with proportions of leavers with any ASN and with no ASN, 2007/8 to 2010/11

Young people who are unemployed and not seeking employment or training

The proportions of school leavers with no ASN who were unemployed and not seeking employment or training straight after school were constantly low between 2007 and 2010. By comparison, school leavers with ASN seemed to be more likely to become NEET after leaving school. The proportions of hearing-impaired school leavers who became disengaged were smaller than those of school leavers with other types of ASN. However, we have to keep in mind that these were the initial destinations of school leavers, which showed what school leavers did three months after leaving school. The follow-up destinations, collected six month later show a slight increase in the rates of young people who became NEET (see Table A5 in School Leavers’ Destinations).

Figure A41: Proportions of hearing-impaired school leavers from publicly-funded Scottish schools who were unemployed and NOT seeking employment or training, compared with proportions of leavers with any ASN and with no ASN, 2007/8 to 2010/11

Note. Where data are not disclosed due to low numbers (below 5) we have allowed for 2 pupils in order to show that some pupils achieved qualifications at a particular level.

Benefit claimants

Figure A40 shows a comparison of the proportions of 16-24 year old Disability Living Allowance (DLA) claimants with particular types of impairment. The main source for these statistics is DWP’s Work and Pensions Longitudinal Study, which covers 100% of claimants. It represents a snapshot of the proportions of Scotland-domiciled claimants with hearing impairment, visual impairment, learning difficulties and behavioural disorders over a period of one year (May 2011 to May 2012). It is interesting to note the differences among the categories of impairment (claimants with learning difficulties made up the largest group of the four, accounting for 11% of all DLA claimants). This difference is even more pronounced in the 16-24 age group, where young people with learning difficulties accounted for 40% of all 16-24 year old claimants. The proportions of DHH young people claiming DLA were small (2.17%), and similar to those of young people with visual impairments (2.22%). If we look at all working-age claimants, DHH people make up an even smaller proportion (slightly over 1% of all claimants).
Figure A42: Disability Living Allowance claimants in Scotland with particular types of impairment, as percentage of all claimants in each age group, May 2011 to May 2012

Summary and conclusion
This section was intended to provide snapshots of DHH young people’s journeys through the education system and beyond, into employment. We analysed data collected and published by various institutions, such as the Scottish Government, the Higher Education Statistics Agency, the Scottish Funding Council and the Department for Work and Pensions. There were challenges in piecing together a comprehensive trajectory of DHH young people’s post-school trajectories because of there was variation in the definitions used by different institutions (e.g., in receipt of support vs. self-declared disabled), variation in the way data was recorded (e.g., sometimes categories of disability varied) and in the geographical areas covered by official statistics (e.g., some of the data referred only to Scottish-domiciled people, while other data was UK-wide).

We started with an analysis of official statistics published by the Scottish Government with regard to the proportion of DHH pupils’ in publicly-funded schools, the attainment levels of school leavers, and their post-school destinations. Then for each destination (i.e., higher or further education, training or employment), we added data from other sources:

- The Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA), for information on the participation rates of DHH young people studying at undergraduate and postgraduate levels in higher education institutions
- The Association of Graduate Careers Advisory Service (AGCAS), for information on the destinations of DHH graduates, their employment rates and types of occupations
- The Scottish Funding Council, for information on the participation of DHH young people in further education
- Skills Development Scotland, for data on the participation of disabled young people on national training programmes (as SDS does not collect information on specific types of disability)
• The Labour Force Survey for data on DHH people’s employment rates.

In order to build a more complete picture, we also included statistics about financial support, such as the Disabled Students’ Allowance for higher education students and Access to Work for people in employment. We also presented that data in context. Whenever possible, we included statistics from several years, and we made comparisons with statistics on young people with other types of ASN or disabilities, and with young people with no ASN or disabilities. Here are the key findings:

• Participation in compulsory education and demographic characteristics. We found that there was no information on the total number of DHH children and young people in Scotland. The only information that is publicly-available is the number of DHH children who receive additional learning support in Scottish publicly-funded schools, which may represent only a fraction of the total number of DHH children. Compared with children in receipt of support for other types of needs, DHH children are a very small group. In 2012, they represented 0.34% of all pupils in Scottish publicly-funded schools, while pupils with any type of ASN represented 18%. Unlike pupils with ASN as a group, there seemed to be no direct relationship between hearing loss and socio-economic status, and there was no marked difference between the proportions of male and female pupils who are deaf or hard of hearing. More than 80% were educated in mainstream schools.

• School leavers’ attainment. On average, DHH school leavers had higher attainment levels than school leavers with other types of ASN. However, their attainment levels were not the highest. In 2010/11 more pupils with visual impairment and physical and motor impairments left school with Advanced Highers. Compared with school leavers with no ASN, the attainment levels of DHH school leavers were much lower. According to figures from 2010/11, they were nine times more likely to leave school with no qualifications, while more than half of the school leavers with no ASN had Highers and Advanced Highers, only 22% of the DHH leavers did.

• Post-school destinations. There was good news about the post-school destinations of DHH school leavers, as they entered positive destinations (i.e., post-16 education, employment or training) in the highest proportion among school leavers with ASN. However, when we looked at their destinations, we found that most of them went into further education (42% in 2010/11), and that they were not well represented in higher education (only 17% of the DHH school leavers entered higher education, as compared to 33% of leavers with visual impairment and 38% of school leavers with no ASN).

• Participation in higher education. Data on the proportion of DHH young people in higher education are based on self-assessment and are UK-wide, so comparisons with previous data on the destinations of leavers from publicly-funded schools should be treated with caution. Official statistics compiled and published by HESA showed that in 2009/10 students who declared that they were deaf or hard of hearing made up 0.33% of all UK undergraduates and 0.37 of all UK postgraduates. There were more DHH women than men in higher education, although there was no marked gender difference in schools. In 2011/12, 62% of the first year DHH undergraduates were female.

• First destinations of graduates. There was very good news regarding the first destinations of DHH graduates. In 2009/10 they had the lowest unemployment levels amongst disabled groups, and their employment rates were only slightly lower than those of non-disabled graduates. The most positive finding was that they entered graduate-level jobs (particularly
professional and associate professional occupations) in higher proportions than their non-disabled peers.

- **Participation in further education.** Figures on the proportion of DHH young people in further education are also based on self-assessment. Data compiled and published by the Scottish Funding Council shows that in 2010/11 DHH young people made up 0.55% of all students in at further education institutions in Scotland. This slightly higher percentage is in line with data on post-school destinations, which showed that most DHH school leavers entered further education.

- **Participation in national training programmes.** There was no data on the proportion of DHH young people on national training programmes, as Skills Development Scotland does not collect information on the trainees' particular types of disability.

- **Employment rates and Access to Work awards.** While there was no information the employment rates of DHH people in the 18-24 age group, an analysis of Labour Force Survey estimates revealed that between 2008 and 2012 the employment rates of all working-age DHH people were amongst the highest of people with disabilities. Statistics on Access to Work awards showed that between 2010 and 2013 DHH people were the largest category of recipients, along with people with visual impairments. Data from other sources showed that, in spite of this, their employment rates were much lower than those of non-disabled people (56 - 58% of DHH people were estimated to be in employment, as opposed to approximately 80% of non-disabled people, according to Riddell et al., 2010).

This comprehensive review of statistics published by various institutions and agencies on the participation of DHH children and young people in education, training and employment was intended to help us understand this group's education and employment outcomes. We have seen that some institutions are better than others at collecting information on people with disabilities, and that comparisons are often hampered by the lack of consistency of definitions and recording methods. However, the information which is in the public domain has allowed us to see that DHH children and young people had relatively higher attainment levels and better employment outcomes than other disability/ASN groups, but at the same time they mostly lagged behind their non-disabled peers.
Appendix 3  Schedule used in interviews with young people who are deaf or hard-of-hearing

Interview schedule

Name: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________ Place: ___________________________

Interviewer: ___________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give project leaflet and explain consent form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check for consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check for consent to record the interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personal background

1. Can you tell me something about yourself? *(Probes: How old are you? What are you doing these days?)*
2. What have you been doing since you left school?

School background

3. Which school did you go to? Why did you choose this school?
4. Did you ever change schools? *(If yes) Why?*
5. Can you tell me about your school experience? *(Possible probes below)*
   a. Did you use mainly speech or sign? Was this your preferred way of communication? Did you use different ways of communication in different contexts?
   b. Did you have support to develop your preferred way of communication?
   c. What kind of support did you get? Who has supported you? *(Probes: learning support, TOD, academic staff, equipment, e.g. FM system (radio aid) or Soundfield system.)*
   d. How did you get along with other children?
   e. What worked really well when you were in school?
   f. What was particularly difficult when you were in school?
   g. What would you have changed if you could?
   h. Were you happy at school? *(If educated in different settings) Were you (happy/unhappy) in all settings?*

6. When did you leave school?
7. What were the highest qualifications you had at school?
Post-school transitions of people who are deaf or hard of hearing: Appendices

Post-school transition(s)

8. How did you decide what you were going to do when leaving school? (Probes: work, apprenticeship, training, college, university). Did you have a clear idea about what you wanted to do?

9. How did you find out what options were available for you when leaving school?

10. When you were at school, did someone help you plan for what you were going to do after leaving school? (If yes) Who? How did they help you plan for the future? When did the planning process start? Were your parents involved?

11. Did anyone else besides people at school give you help and advice?

12. Did someone at school tell you of support options available after leaving school (Disabled Students’ Allowance in higher education, communication support in colleges, Access to Work)? (If not) How did you find out?

13. What worked well and what was particularly difficult when you were leaving school?

14. With hindsight, is there anything that could have been done differently?

Current situation

(If in education)

15. Can you tell me about your college/university career to date? (Probes: What year are you in? What do you study? Is this the first course you have been on at college/university?)

16. Why did you choose this college/university?

17. Why did you choose this course?

18. What kind of support are you getting from the college/university? (Probe: Disability Office, Additional Support for Learning Tutor, Personal Tutor, Student Support Office, adjustments made.) Are you satisfied with the quality of support?

19. Is there anyone else who supports you whilst you study? (Probe: family, friends?)

20. (If in HE) Can you tell me what you know about Disabled Student’s Allowance? Are you getting DSA? (If yes) What is DSA being used for? Is it adequate to cover the support you need? Can you tell me how you got DSA?

21. To summarise, can you tell me what has worked well, and what has been particularly difficult at college/university?

22. If you could, what would you change?
23. What are you planning to do after you graduate/gain this college qualification? *(Probes: post-graduate studies, internship, work?)*

24. Have you used the Career Guidance Service within the college/university? Is anyone else helping you?

25. *(If in last year)* Are you currently looking for work?

**(If in employment)**

26. Can you tell me about the work you are doing at the moment? *(Probes: job title, responsibilities)*

27. Do you work full-time or part-time? *(If part-time)* How many hours a week do you work? Would you have liked to work more hours?

28. What kind of contract do you have? *(Probes: permanent or temporary)*

29. How long have you been in this job? Did you have another job before?


31. Have you told your employer about your deafness? *(If yes)* When? What sort of reaction did you get?

32. What kind of support do you get from your employer/colleagues/others?

33. Have you heard of Access to Work? Are using ATW? *(If yes)* Are you satisfied with ATW?

34. To summarise, what works well in your current job and what is particularly difficult? *(Probe: barriers – time; travel to work; attitudes)*

35. If you could, what would you change?

36. Are you enjoying the work you are doing? Is this your dream job and are you planning to stay in it, or are you looking/planning to look for another job?

**(If in training or looking for work)**

37. Can you tell me what you are doing at the moment? *(Probes: work experience programme, supported employment, training, voluntary work?)*

38. Have you done some training recently? *(Probes: Apprenticeships, Work Programme, Training for Work, Get Ready for Work?)* *(If yes)* Where did it take place? What did you think of it? Did you have any communication support?

39. Have you had a job before? *(If yes, probe about type of work, why s/he stopped working.)*
40. What strategies are you using trying to find a job (Probes: websearches, social networks, JobCentre (Disability Employment Advisor), Career Service?)

41. How long have you been looking for work? Have you applied for many jobs?

42. What do you think has been the most difficult aspect of looking for work?

43. Have you heard of Access to Work? Have you used ATW? (If yes) Were you satisfied with ATW?

44. What would you change if you could?

45. What difference do you think the recession might be making? How is it affecting you specifically?

About your identity and social network

46. How would you describe yourself? Is being deaf an important aspect of who you are? (If yes) Do you see yourself as a member of a deaf community?

47. What do you do in your free time?

48. Who do you mainly socialise with? (Probes: friends, co-workers, partner, family, clubs, groups, societies?)

49. Can you tell me about your living arrangements?

50. Can you tell me something about your family? (If appropriate) When you were living at home, how did you communicate with your family and friends?

Where do you see yourself in 5 years’ time? (Probes: professionally, personally, geographically). How do you think the equality legislation will help you achieve what you want to achieve?

Could you tell me what your current postcode is?

THANK YOU!
Bibliography


**Glossary of acronyms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGCAS</td>
<td>Association of Graduate Careers Advisory Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASN</td>
<td>Additional Support Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AtW</td>
<td>Access to Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSL</td>
<td>British Sign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>Coordinated Support Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEA</td>
<td>Disability Employment Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHH</td>
<td>Deaf or Hard of Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA</td>
<td>Disability Living Allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSA</td>
<td>Disabled Students’ Allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWP</td>
<td>Department for Work and Pensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>Further Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRfW</td>
<td>Get Ready for Work training programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HESA</td>
<td>Higher Education Statistics Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Hearing-impaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HID</td>
<td>Hearing Impairment Department (in mainstream schools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNC</td>
<td>Higher National Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HND</td>
<td>Higher National Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>Individualised Educational Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET</td>
<td>Not in Education, Employment or Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ</td>
<td>National Vocational Qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODI</td>
<td>Office for Disability Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RON</td>
<td>Record of Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAAS</td>
<td>Student Awards Agency for Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCoD</td>
<td>Scottish Council on Deafness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCQF</td>
<td>Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>Skills Development Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEBD</td>
<td>Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMD</td>
<td>Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQA</td>
<td>Scottish Qualifications Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSE</td>
<td>Sign-supported English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVQ</td>
<td>Scottish Vocational Qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToD</td>
<td>Teacher of the Deaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCAS</td>
<td>Universities and Colleges Admissions Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>