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Notes

Language used in the report

Deaf and hard of hearing people

The term *deaf and hard of hearing* is used to denote people with all types and degrees of hearing loss. When discussing administrative and survey data on people with hearing loss, we use the terms employed in the respective datasets (i.e., *hearing impairment, deaf/hearing impairment, deaf/partially hearing, difficulties in hearing*), which tend to reflect a medical, rather than social model of disability. Similarly, when reporting figures published by official bodies, such as the Office for Disability Issues, we use the terms employed in the original reports.

Disabled people

According to Equality Act 2010, disabled people are people with physical or mental impairments that have substantial and long-term adverse effects on their ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities.

Pupils with additional support needs

According to the Education (Additional Support for Learning) (Scotland) Act 2004, a child or young person has additional support needs if they would be unable to benefit from school education without the provision of additional support. This category includes, but is not limited to, pupils with disabilities.
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Introduction

Disabled people are at high risk of social exclusion, starting from the early stages of education. In many cases, the risk of social marginalisation increases as they grow into adults, as young disabled people are less likely to participate in post-16 education and training (Directorate-General for Education and Culture [DG-EAC], 2012). This has significant consequences for the employment rates and net income of working-age disabled people. In the past five years, the employment rates of disabled people in the UK who report a ‘work-limiting disability’ and at the same time are classed as ‘disabled’ have been less than half of those of non-disabled people (Hills at al., 2010; Riddell, Edward, Weedon & Ahlgren, 2010; Meager & Higgins, 2011). According to a recent Labour Force Survey (April-June 2010, UK), out of all disabled people, only half are in employment, while the rest are either looking for work (6.6%) or are economically inactive (42.8%). The UK Initial Report on the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (ODI, 2011a) mentions that compared to non-disabled people, twice as many adults with disabilities in Great Britain live in persistent poverty.

The reasons for this are believed to lie with the environmental and attitudinal barriers encountered by disabled people at school and work. The social model of disability (Oliver, 1990) proposes that disability is not an inherent consequence of impairment, but rather of the social, economic and cultural aspects of environment which may impede on a disabled person’s functioning. Once these barriers are removed, the individual is no longer disabled. The social model of disability is central to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN, 2008), which was ratified by the UK Government in 2009 and seeks to eliminate all barriers to disabled people’s full participation in society.

There has been little recent research on the employment rates of people who are deaf and hard of hearing (hereafter DHH) in the UK. In 2006 the Royal Institute for Deaf People reported that out of the 870 DHH working-age respondents to their survey, only 63% were employed (Royal National Institute for Deaf People [RNID], 2006). Between 2002 and 2008, the Office for Disability Issues reported employment rates ranging between 56 - 58% for hearing impaired people, whereas approximately 80% of non-disabled people were in employment (Riddell et al., 2010). Although clearly not as disadvantaged as people with other types of impairment (such as people with mental health conditions or with learning disabilities – see Meager & Higgins, 2011), DHH people seem to face barriers in finding and staying in employment. This situation is echoed elsewhere. For instance, in 2005 63% of all hearing impaired graduates of Swedish special schools for the deaf (aged 25-64) were in employment, as opposed to an estimated 78% of the general population (Rydberg, Coniavitis Gellerstedt & Danermark, 2010).

The access of DHH people to the labour market is further complicated by the socio-economic changes of the recent decades, which have seen a decrease in manufacturing sector jobs and growth in service sectors. Technological advances and an increase in short-term contract positions require a highly skilled and flexible workforce (Punch, Hyde & Creed, 2004). As a consequence, full-time employment positions for adolescent school leavers have become scarce, and most young people engage in vocational training, further or higher education. This period of training may amount to an extended transition of up to ten years (Weedon & Riddell, 2010). For DHH young people, as well as for all young people with disabilities, the transition from school to work is likely to be particularly

1 According to Disability Discrimination Act 2005.
challenging. Without appropriate support, they are at risk of stalled transitions, which, in turn, may lead to failure in achieving other traditional markers of adulthood, such as independent living arrangements, marriage and parenthood (Riddell, Baron & Wilson, 2001).

Recognizing the difficulties faced by young disabled people in their transition from school to work, the Scottish Government has taken steps towards providing support for young school leavers. The Education (Additional Support for Learning) (Scotland) Acts 2004 and 2009 place duties on further and higher education institutions to support young people’s transition from school to post-school provisions. Roles and responsibilities of all the agencies involved in post-school transitions are outlined in documents such Partnership Matters: A Guide to Local Authorities, NHS Boards and Voluntary Organisations on Supporting Students with Additional Needs in Colleges and Universities in Scotland (Scottish Government, 2009a), 16+ Learning Choices Policy and Practice Framework: Supporting All Young People into Positive and Sustained Destinations (Scottish Government, 2010a) and Post-16 Transitions Policy and Practice Framework: Supporting All Young People to Participate in Post-16 Learning, Training or Work (Scottish Government, 2012f).

The present report starts with an overview of the recent trends in education legislation for children and young people with disabilities, as well as trends in equality legislation, benefits legislation, and skills policies. We also reviewed current benefit schemes, governmental employment schemes, and national training programs. The report continues with an analysis of the attainment and post-school destinations (employment, training, further/higher education, and non-positive destinations) of DHH young people, young people with other disabilities and additional support needs, and young people with no disabilities or additional support needs.
Section 1 - The policy context

1.1 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 (RON), 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 1), 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

---

2 Disability Discrimination Act 1995 has since been replaced by the Equality Act 2010.
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 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 1: 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 forthcoming *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, 2012h). 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 segregated 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).

Transition planning features in many other governmental policy documents, ranging from documents related to post-16 education to documents related to the achievement of the National Outcome Indicator 10 (i.e., increase the proportion of school leavers in positive and sustained destinations).

First in 2005, and again in 2007 and 2009, the Scottish Government published Partnership Matters, a guidance document which aims to clarify the ‘roles and responsibilities of all agencies that support students with additional support needs studying, or intending to study, at college or university’ (Scottish Government, 2009a). The guide underlines the fact that lack of effective communication between relevant agencies is ‘one of the major barriers to be experienced by young people and their parents or carers in the transition from school to college or university’ (p. 74). And because ‘college or university is just one possible, although important, stage in the person’s journey towards adulthood and independent living’ (p. 75), the guide also discusses transitions from college or university into employment, and gives examples of good practice.

16+ Learning Choices (Scottish Government, 2010a) is a framework for ‘implementing and delivering post-16 learning’ to all young people who are making a transition to further learning, training or employment during the Senior Phase of the Curriculum for Excellence. It was piloted in 2008, and became universal in Scotland in 2010. The framework applies to all 16-18 year old school leavers, but gives added attention to those who ‘face significant barriers to learning’ and those at risk of moving into negative destinations. It is considered ‘an integral part of Curriculum for Excellence’ and it is ‘central to facilitating the delivery of the national indicator for positive and sustained destinations’ (p. 3).

The framework states the central role of schools in post-16 transitional planning and at the same time emphasises the need for multi-agency collaboration and data sharing. It outlines the roles and responsibilities of other agencies, such as local authorities, Skills Development Scotland, colleges, Jobcentre Plus and other public, private and third sector providers of learning and support. Figure 2 shows the range of professional who are likely to be involved in post-16 transitions planning.
According to the framework, successful transition planning should include personalisation and choice, access to information, advice and guidance, and access to financial support. It is recommended that school leavers are made an offer of post-16 learning ‘well in advance of their school leaving date and before leaving any subsequent episode of learning during the Senior Phase’ (p. 3). An offer of post-16 learning can be any of the following:

- education in school
- full or part-time further education
- full or part-time higher education
- national training programmes
- employment
- personal/skills development (which includes Get Ready for Work Lifeskills and Activity Agreements)
- volunteering.

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).

In Scotland, the importance of post-16 transition planning for young people who require additional support was first highlighted in the Beattie Report (Scottish Executive, 1999), and it was later fully explored as part of the strategy to reduce the proportion of young people who are not in education, employment or training (i.e., More Choices, More Chances, Scottish Executive, 2006a).

More recently, the Scottish Government Economic Strategy (Scottish Government, 2011f) announced Opportunities for All (Scottish Government, 2012d), 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, 2012f) and the *Post-16 Transitions Data Practice Framework* (Scottish Government, 2012e). The new post-16 transition model incorporates the guidelines of newly-developed strategy frameworks, such as the Career Strategy, Opportunities for All, Youth Employments 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, 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 *16+ Learning Choices*, added attention is given to transition planning for young people with ASN.

There is also an increased emphasis on the need for consistent identification, tracking and monitoring of young people though various stages of transitions. The *Post-16 Transitions Data Practice Framework* sets out the data-sharing roles and responsibilities of all partners involved in supporting post-16 transitions in Scotland. 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* will 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, 2012i). 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, 2012i, 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, 2012c), 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 and benefits legislation, as well as compulsory employment schemes lies with Westminster, while some responsibilities for skills, training and economic development are devolved.

### 1.2 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 to 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 were 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 has also held a series of online seminars on issues raised by disabled people such as getting justice and independent living, as part of their role as ‘independent mechanisms’ in 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.

### 1.3 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 (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, have 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 8th 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).

### 1.4 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 public body of the Scottish Government, the voluntary sector (organization 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 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% 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 conductive 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 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).

---

3 Figures exclude Remploy clients.
1.5 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; in Scotland, Skills Development Scotland, established in April 2008, offers career advice, funding and training, as well as work with the employers.

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 collaboration between Jobcentre Plus and Skills Development Scotland, which supports disabled people with low skills enter the labour market. 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 on 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, 2013a).

Modern Apprenticeships is available to those who are in employment, and is paid for 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 2 to SCQF 5. Wage incentives of up to 2000 pounds are offered to those who employ 16-19 year-olds.

---

4 Get Ready for Work was available to 16-19 year-olds who seeked to improve their vocational and core skills. 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 complete Lifeskills are eligible to join the mainstream Get Ready for Work programme.

5 Training for Work offered vocational training to people aged 18 and over, and 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 a specific area.
Section 2 - Methodology

The present study analyses the educational and employment outcomes of deaf and hard of hearing young people in Scotland, by looking at their transition processes from compulsory schooling to training, employment, and Further or Higher Education. The following research questions are addressed:

- What are the post-school destinations of DHH young people in Scotland and how do these compare with those of non-disabled young people and young people with other types of additional support needs?
- What barriers are encountered by DHH young people in accessing post-school education, employment and training opportunities?
- How do DHH young people’s post-school destinations impact on their ability to achieve other important markers of adulthood, such as independent living arrangements and the formation of independent relationships?
- What factors promote ‘successful’ post-school transitions?

To address these questions, we will draw on three strands of data, which will be analysed in light of recent trends in Scottish and UK legislation and policy regarding DHH people’s human rights, education, training, employment and benefits. The three strands are:

1. a comparative secondary analysis of official statistics on the post school education, employment and training destinations and outcomes of DHH young people, young people with any additional support needs, and young people with no additional support needs;
2. semi-structured interviews with 30 DHH young people aged 18-24. Interview questions focused on their school experiences, post-school transition experiences, the support they received and barriers they encountered after leaving school, and well as issues related to identity and agency. The interviewees vary in their levels of educational attainment, employment status, preferred mode of communication (manual vs. oral), socio-economic status, ethnicity, gender and geographical location;
3. key informant interviews with policy-makers and professionals working with DHH young people.

The findings of this study will be discussed in the context of other studies on youth transitions, as well as previous research on educational and employment outcomes of DHH people in the UK and abroad.

The interim report contains the secondary analysis of official statistics and an overview of the semi-structured interviews with DHH young people, which are currently in progress.
Section 3 - Analysis of official statistics on the attainment, post-school destinations and employment outcomes of young people who are deaf or hard of hearing

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 prevalence\(^6\) 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, 2013a). We continue with an overview of the attainment levels of pupils who left publicly-funded Scottish schools in 2010/11 (Scottish Government, 2012g). The attainment data for the 2011/12 cohort is due to be published in June, and could not be included in the present report. We also looked at attainment data from previous years (Scottish Government, 2010d, 2011d and 2012g), 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 prevalence\(^7\) 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. The prevalence\(^8\) of DHH students in Further Education Institutions in Scotland is 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

---

\(^6\) 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.
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 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’.

3.1 Pupils with hearing impairment and with other types of additional support needs 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 3: Reasons for support for pupils with Additional Support Needs, 2012

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 recorded as having ASN (for instance, in 2010 and 2011 the number of pupils receiving support for ASN was 69,587 and 98,227, respectively). This increase is due to improved recording and the counting of children with plans other than IEPs and CSPs. 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 3 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 Figure 4, 2,253 pupils, representing 0.34% of all pupils in Scotland, were recorded as receiving support for hearing impairment. 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 4: Gender distribution of pupils who receive support for particular types of need, 2012**

The Scottish Government does not publish a breakdown of pupils identified as disabled by local authority. However, Figures 5 shows wide variation across local authorities with regard to pupils in mainstream schools who are in receipt of support for their hearing impairment through Co-ordinated Support Plans, Individualised Educational Programmes and other types of support. The

---

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.
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 6 below). The relatively high percentage of pupils with hearing impairments in its mainstream schools may reflect high levels of deprivation and prevalence of disability.

Figure 5: 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 6 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 6. 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.
This section provided a snapshot of the DHH pupils’ prevalence 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;
- 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.

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

The data presented in this section are 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 have not been 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 1 below.

### Table 1: Qualifications in Scottish schools and SCQF levels

<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>

### Figure 7: School leavers with Additional Support Needs, 2010/11

- Other: 1,637
- Social emotional and behavioural difficulty: 1,547
- Specific learning disabilities: 1,437
- Learning disability: 879
- Moderate learning difficulty: 627
- Autistic spectrum disorder: 449
- English as an additional language: 380
- Physical health problem: 380
- Unknown: 271
- Physical or motor impairment: 255
- Language or speech disorder: 242
- Looked after: 202
- Visual impairment: 139
- Hearing impairment: 103

**Source:** *School leaver attainment and SQA attainment, Scottish Government* (2012)

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.
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 7). 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.

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 8 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 8: Highest qualifications\textsuperscript{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, as percentage of total qualifications obtained by each ASN category, 2010/11.](image)

\textbf{SOURCE: SCHOOL LEAVER ATTAINMENT AND SQA ATTAINMENT, SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT (2012)}

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 9 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 9 above, 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 9: 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hearing impairment</th>
<th>Any Additional Support need</th>
<th>No Additional Support need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No NQ Qualifications @ Level 2 or better</td>
<td>1-4 @ SCQF Level 3</td>
<td>1-4 @ SCQF Level 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 @ SCQF Level 5</td>
<td>1-4 @ SCQF Level 6</td>
<td>1+ @ SCQF Level 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+ @ SCQF Level 3</td>
<td>5+ @ SCQF Level 4</td>
<td>5+ @ SCQF Level 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+ @ SCQF Level 6</td>
<td>5+ @ SCQF Level 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: SCHOOL LEAVER ATTAINMENT AND SQA ATTAINMENT, SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT (2012)
1. Less than 5 pupils with hearing impairment obtained qualifications at SCQF Level 7, and the exact number was
repressed for disclosure reasons. However, we allowed for two pupils in order to show that some pupils achieved
qualifications at this level.
2. Because of the undisclosed figures and rounding up of percentages, numbers may not add up to 100%.

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 10, which shows a comparison between the achievement levels of school
leavers with hearing impairment and those no additional need, over a period of three years.

Table 2: 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 2012g)

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 made 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 10. 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 2). 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
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(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.

Figure 10 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 10: 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:
  o left school with no qualifications in far greater proportion (13% vs. 1.5%);
  o were twice as likely to leave school with one to four Standard Grade qualifications at 3-4 (18% vs. 9%);
  o 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.

### 3.3 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). Until 2011, data on initial and sustained destinations was published separately, in December (initial destinations) and June (follow-up destinations). However, following a consultation with users of school statistics, certain changes were made to the publication schedule of the Scottish Government. Now data on school leavers’ initial and sustained destinations is published only once a year, in June, as a supplement to *Summary statistics for attainment, leaver destinations and healthy living*. As a consequence, information on the post-school destinations of the 2011/12 cohort is not available at the time of writing this report. 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 Government, 2011e).

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)
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(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 3 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.

Figure 11: 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

SOURCE: INITIAL SCHOOL LEAVER DESTINATIONS DATA SET 2010/11, SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT (2011b)
### Table 3: 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 11 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 disorders (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 12) 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). Figure 12 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 12: Destinations of school leavers with and without ASN, as percentage of all leavers in each group, 2010/11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No ASN</th>
<th>Hearing impairment</th>
<th>Visual impairment</th>
<th>Physical or motor impairment</th>
<th>Language or speech disorder</th>
<th>Autistic spectrum disorder</th>
<th>SEBD</th>
<th>Specific learning disabilities</th>
<th>Learning disability</th>
<th>Moderate learning difficulty</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed Not Seeking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed Seeking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 12 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 7), we expect a considerable degree of fluctuation from year to year in the proportions of young people in different destinations. Figure 13 below demonstrates this.

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 4).

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 10).

Figure 13: Destinations of school leavers with hearing impairment and with no ASN, as percentage of all leavers in each group, 2007/8 to 2010/11

![Figure 13](image_url)

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 Figure 13.

Table 4: 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 (Table 2).
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).

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 their destination of choice 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.
- Compared to school leavers with no support needs, in 2010/11 hearing-impaired leavers entered positive destinations to a similar degree. However, their preferred 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.

It is important to keep in mind that these figures reflect only the initial destinations of school leavers from publicly-funded Scottish schools, three months after leaving school. We do not know whether these destinations were sustained, as the survey data on their follow-up destinations (nine months after leaving school) are not broken down by type of support needs.

In the following sections we examine in more detail the prevalence of DHH young people in major post-school destinations, and we supplement the data published by the Scottish Government with information from other sources.

### 3.4 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
- another disability, impairment or medical condition,

as well as ‘no known disability’, which includes those who have been coded ‘no known disability’, ‘information refused’, ‘information not sought’, or ‘not known’. 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 14 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.

**Figure 14: 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**

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.

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 5 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, on one hand, the discrepancy between the numbers of students who identify themselves as DHH and those who receive support for hearing impairment in Scottish schools, and on the other hand, the fact that a large proportion of DHH young people enter higher education later, through non-traditional routes.

Figure 15 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 5 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 20 in the next section) demonstrates that DHH undergraduates are in fact less likely to progress to postgraduate study. Therefore the slightly higher prevalence 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 15: 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

Table 5: 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>Level of Study</th>
<th>Deaf or a serious hearing impairment</th>
<th>Known to have a disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>All undergraduate</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>8.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All postgraduate</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>6.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Gap in data</strong></td>
<td><strong>Postgraduate</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>First year undergraduate</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>8.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First year postgraduate</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>7.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>First year undergraduate</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>9.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First year postgraduate</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>7.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 5).
Figure 16 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 (Section 3.2 of this report), we found that there was no marked difference between the proportions of male and female hearing-impaired pupils. This proves that female DHH students are overrepresented in higher education, both at undergraduate and at postgraduate level.

**Figure 16: Gender distribution of UK-domiciled higher education students with hearing impairment, any disability and no disability, 2011/12**

![Bar chart showing gender distribution](chart.png)

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

Figures 17 and 18 show the percentages of students in receipt of Disabled Students’ Allowance from the Student Awards Agency for Scotland over a period of six 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 17: 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

Note. Numbers smaller than 5 have been suppressed.

Figure 18: Scottish-domiciled students in receipt of Disabled Students’ Allowance by disability, 2011/12

Note. Numbers smaller than 5 have been suppressed.

Figure 17 shows the percentages of Scottish-domiciled recipients of DSA over a period of five years, up to 2010/11. In 2011/12 there was an improvement in the way data was recorded (see Figure 18). There were almost twice as many categories of disability, and this provided more information on the
nature of difficulty of DSA recipients. One improvement was that a new category, ‘Deaf/blind’, was created, thus separating the deafblind DSA recipients from other students with multiple disabilities.

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 6 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 6: Scottish-domiciled DHH students in receipt of DSA, 2006/7 to 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of DSA recipients</td>
<td>3,385</td>
<td>3,625</td>
<td>4,065</td>
<td>4,275</td>
<td>4,435</td>
<td>4,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHH DSA recipients</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


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.

DSA has been proven to have a positive effect on the continuation rates of disabled students in higher education. The Higher Education Funding Council for England analysed the dropout rates of disabled first year full-time students over a six year period (Table 7), and found that disabled students in receipt of DSA were significantly 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. On the other hand, the non-continuation rates of disabled students who did not receive DSA were higher than those of non-disabled students.

### Table 7: 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></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 in 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
prevalence 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 prevalence 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 of further education. Further research is needed to confirm whether this is indeed the case.
- Unlike other disabled students, more DHH postgraduates than undergraduates declare disability.
- Female DHH students are overrepresented in higher education, both at undergraduate and postgraduate levels.
- 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.

3.5 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 has not been 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 19 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 prevalence of disability amongst Higher Education students.

Table 8 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 5 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 proves that the findings of this survey are representative of the wider population of DHH undergraduates in the UK.

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**.

Table 8: UK-domiciled DHH respondents to Destinations of Leavers from Higher Education Survey, 2005/6 to 2009/10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</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 19: Respondents to Destinations of Leavers from Higher Education Survey by disability type, 2009/10

![Chart showing respondents to destinations of leavers from higher education survey by disability type, 2009/10.](chart)

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

Figure 20 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 20: Destinations of DHH graduates, compared to disabled and non-disabled graduates, as percentage of all graduates in each group, 2009/10**

![Diagram showing destinations of DHH graduates, compared to disabled and non-disabled graduates, 2009/10](image)


Figure 21 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.

**Figure 21: Destinations of 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**

![Diagram showing destinations of DHH graduates compared to non-disabled graduates, 2005/6 to 2009/10](image)

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 22: Unemployment rates of DHH, disabled and non-disabled graduates of UK Higher Education institutions, 2005/6 to 2009/10

Figure 22 shows 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 23 below shows the proportions of DHH, disabled and non-disabled graduates in the 2009/10 cohort in each of the nine occupational groups.

Figure 23 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.

Figure 23: Occupations of employed DHH graduates, compared to disabled and non-disabled graduates, as percentage of all graduates in each group, 2009/10

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 24), 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.

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 25 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 proves beyond doubt that a graduate level qualification brings a significant improvement to a DHH young person’s employment prospects.
Figure 24: 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


Figure 25: 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.5), 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.

### 3.5 Further Education

Figure 26 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 26: 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**

In 2010/11, school leavers with hearing impairment represented 0.22% of all those who entered further education on leaving school. It is interesting to compare this figure with the percentage of deaf/hearing impaired of all further education students at Scottish Colleges (0.55%, shown in Figure 27). In the school leavers’ data set, only those who received support are recorded as hearing-impaired; on the other hand, the ‘deaf/hearing impaired’ students in further education are those who consider themselves deaf or hard of hearing. Therefore, the discrepancy between the two...
percentages may suggest that only a relatively small proportion of those with hearing impairment receive support in schools.

**Figure 27: Further Education students at Scottish Colleges, by disability status, as percentage of all students, 2010/11**

![Bar chart showing disability status of Further Education students in 2010/11](chart.png)

**SOURCE:** SCOTTISH FUNDING COUNCIL, THROUGH INFACT
Figure 28: Scottish colleges in order of percentage of DHH students, 2010/11

SOURCE: SCOTTISH FUNDING COUNCIL, THROUGH INFACT
3.7 Training

Figure 29 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. Compared with school leavers with no ASN, hearing impaired leavers have been overrepresented on training programmes up to 2010/11, when less than 5 hearing impaired leavers entered training. In the next section we see that this steep drop in training 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 29: 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

![Figure 29](chart.png)

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

**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 30 shows the prevalence of disabled people on the national training programmes delivered by Skills Development Scotland (SDS) between 2010 and 2012. SDS does not collect data on the particular types of disability of people in training; therefore we don’t know how DHH people are represented on these programmes. Less than 1% of people on Modern Apprenticeships, Get Ready for Work and Training for Work disclosed disability. Disabled people seem to be much better represented on Training for Work (3.72 - 5.48%), the programme aimed at people who are 18 or older and have been out of work for 13 weeks or more.
3.8 Employment

Figure 31 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 32 below), we can see that this age group has been most severely affected by the economic crisis in 2008. There could be two reasons for this. 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\textsuperscript{10} 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.

\textsuperscript{10} Figures exclude Remploy clients.
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.

Table 9 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 32: Employment rate by age group, Scotland, 2004 to 2011

![Graph showing employment rate by age group for Scotland, 2004 to 2011.](image)

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

Table 9: 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</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>14.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>67.30</td>
<td>24.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>69.20</td>
<td>24.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>35.60</td>
<td>10.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>55.50</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>44.80</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>64.20</td>
<td>16.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>38.60</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>57.60</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 33: Employment rates of working-age people in Great Britain by type of impairment, 2010

![Graph](image)

SOURCE: SAYCE (2011) BASED ON THE LABOUR FORCE SURVEY 2010 QUARTER 4

Figure 33 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 34 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 35 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 34: Individuals in receipt of Access to Work awards between April 2012 and January 2013

SOURCE: ACCESS TO WORK: OFFICIAL STATISTICS, DEPARTMENT FOR WORK AND PENSIONS (JANUARY 2013)

Figure 35: Access to Work awards granted between April 2012 and January 2013, by type

SOURCE: ACCESS TO WORK: OFFICIAL STATISTICS, DEPARTMENT FOR WORK AND PENSIONS (JANUARY 2013)

Note. A person may receive more than one type of award.
Table 10 demonstrates that since 2010/11 the total number of Access to Work awards has decreased, while the percentage of DHH recipients has increased. Figure 36 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 10: 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>

SOURCE: ACCESS TO WORK: OFFICIAL STATISTICS, DEPARTMENT FOR WORK AND PENSIONS (APRIL 2010 TO JANUARY 2013)
Note. Access to Work statistics are published quarterly. The figures above are totals per financial year.

Figure 36: Largest categories of ATW award recipients, as percentage of total, 2010 to 2013

SOURCE: ACCESS TO WORK: OFFICIAL STATISTICS, DEPARTMENT FOR WORK AND PENSIONS (APRIL 2010 TO JANUARY 2013)
Note. The category ‘Other’, which was also among the largest, is not shown.

3.9 Jobseekers

Figure 37: 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

3.10 Young people who are unemployed and not seeking employment or training

Figure 38: 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
3.11 Benefit claimants

Figure 39: 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

Figure 39 shows a comparison of the proportions of 16-24 year old 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. Figure 38 is 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).
Section 4 - Semi-structured interviews with young people who are deaf or hard-of-hearing

Up to date, 29 of the 30 planned interviews have been completed. Some of the people we interviewed are young people who took part in a previous study conducted by the University of Edinburgh researchers (i.e., the Deaf Achievement Scotland Survey), and others were people who we contacted through NDCS members’ mailing lists.

The interviews were semi-structured (see the interview schedule in the Appendix), and most were conducted face-to-face, in the respondents’ preferred mode of communication (i.e., spoken English or BSL). In a few cases respondents expressed their preference to answer the questions in writing. They received the interview schedule by e-mail, and upon completion they answered follow-up questions, also by e-mail, so as to ensure that the ‘e-mail interviews’ were as rich in information as the face-to-face interviews. The face-to-face interviews took place at the University of Edinburgh, or at the institution where the respondents studied, or, in a few cases, in the respondents’ homes. Permission was sought to audio-record the spoken interviews and videotape the signed interviews. In one case, the parent of a young person with learning difficulties was interviewed along with the young person.

Table 11 provides an overview of the participants’ characteristics, i.e. their gender, age, employment status (employed, seeking employment, student, etc), highest qualification, urban/rural residence, index of deprivation (which is used as a proxy for socio-economic status), ethnicity, preferred method of communication (speech or British Sign Language) and presence of other impairments/support needs. We made every effort to ensure that the participants’ demographic, socio-economic and attainment characteristics match the social profiles of the wider DHH population.

In order to determine whether a respondent resides in an urban or rural area, we used the Scottish Government 6-fold Urban-Rural Classification, which breaks down settlements, as follows: 1 Large Urban Areas (Settlements of over 125,000 people); 2 Other Urban Areas (Settlements of 10,000 to 125,000 people); 3 Accessible Small Towns (Settlements of between 3,000 and 10,000 people and within 30 minutes’ drive of a settlement of 10,000 or more); 4 Remote Small Towns (Settlements of between 3,000 and 10,000 people and with a drive time of over 30 minutes to a settlement of 10,000 or more); 5 Accessible Rural (Areas with a population of less than 3,000 people, and within a 30 minute drive time of a settlement of 10,000 or more.); 6 Remote Rural (Areas with a population of less than 3,000 people, and with a drive time of over 30 minutes to a settlement of 10,000 or more).

In order to measure the relative level of deprivation of the area where a respondent lives, we used the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD2012). SIMD is a statistical tool which produces a ranking of small areas in Scotland, by measuring seven different aspects of deprivation: employment, income, health, education, access to services, crime and housing. We used the quintile ranking, in which quintile 1 is the most deprived, and quintile 5 is the least deprived.
### Table 11: DHH interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th>Highest qualification</th>
<th>Urban/rural classification</th>
<th>SIMD 2012</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Communication method</th>
<th>Other ASN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Employed (graduate level)</td>
<td>HE graduate</td>
<td>5 (accessible rural)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Looking for work</td>
<td>Postgraduate degree</td>
<td>1 (large urban)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Looking for work</td>
<td>HE graduate</td>
<td>1 (large urban)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Employed (non-graduate level)</td>
<td>SVQ Level 3</td>
<td>1 (large urban)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>non-white $^{11}$</td>
<td>speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Postgraduate student</td>
<td>HE graduate</td>
<td>2 (other urban)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>HE student</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (large urban)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Employed (non-graduate level)</td>
<td>HE graduate</td>
<td>2 (other urban)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>FE student</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NVQ Level 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>BSL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>HE student</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (other urban)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Employed (non-graduate level)</td>
<td>SVQ Level 2</td>
<td>1 (large urban)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>non-white $^{12}$</td>
<td>speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Employed Distance HE student (non-graduate level)</td>
<td>Highers</td>
<td>2 (other urban)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Looking for work</td>
<td>HE graduate</td>
<td>1 (large urban)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>HE student</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (large urban)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Looking for work</td>
<td>Standard Grades at 3-4</td>
<td>5 (accessible rural)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^{11}$ Ethnicity not given for disclosure reasons.

$^{12}$ Ethnicity not given for disclosure reasons.
Table 11 (continued): DHH interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Highest qualification</th>
<th>Urban/rural classification</th>
<th>SIMD 2012</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Communication method</th>
<th>Other ASN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Unavailable for employment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SVQ 3</td>
<td>2 (other urban)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>BSL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Employed (Apprenticeship)</td>
<td>(non-graduate level)</td>
<td>MA Level 2</td>
<td>4 (remote small town)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>FE student</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Intermediate 2</td>
<td>2 (other urban)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>(non-graduate level)</td>
<td>NQ (Level 5 or 6)</td>
<td>5 (accessible rural)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>HE student</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6 (remote rural)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>HE student</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (other urban)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Looking for work</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A-levels at C</td>
<td>1 (large urban)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>BSL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>(non-graduate level)</td>
<td>MA Level 3</td>
<td>2 (other urban)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Employed (Apprenticeship)</td>
<td>(non-graduate level)</td>
<td>Intermediate 2</td>
<td>2 (other urban)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>FE student</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SVQ 1</td>
<td>3 (accessible small town)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>HE student</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (large urban)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>(non-graduate level)</td>
<td>Intermediate 2</td>
<td>2 (other urban)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Employed (Apprenticeship)</td>
<td>(non-graduate level)</td>
<td>NVQ 2</td>
<td>2 (other urban)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>HE student</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6 (remote rural)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>BSL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>(graduate level)</td>
<td>HE graduate</td>
<td>5 (accessible rural)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 5 - Conclusions

Although this is a study of deaf and hard of hearing people’s post-school transitions, the multitude of factors which have a bearing on achieving successful transitions to adulthood make it a very complex topic, which cannot be fully understood outside the wider context of recent developments in equality legislation, the ongoing reform of the welfare system in the UK and the general state of the economy. Against this backdrop we need to explore deaf and hard of hearing people’s particular support needs and characteristics as a group, and look at this through the theoretical lens of sociological understandings of transitions.

The interim report sets the stage for this study, through a comprehensive analysis of the current policy context and though a secondary analysis of data on the attainment, post-school destinations and outcomes of DHH young people. Information on DHH people is not considered in isolation, but through constant comparisons with data, research and policy pertaining to young people with other disabilities and/or support needs, as well as the data on people with no disabilities or additional support needs.

We started by discussing Scottish Government’s efforts to reform post-school transitions policy and practice, in a drive to increase the overall number of school leavers in positive destinations, which is considered to contribute towards the ultimate goal of achieving economic growth. However, we have seen that a lot remains to be done to improve transition practices, particularly with regard to school leavers with disabilities and complex support needs. The uncertainty that seems to surround disabled people’s transitions to adulthood seems to be aggravated by the recent economic crisis and the Coalition Government’s’ reform of the welfare system, which consists of a complete overhaul of the benefits and employment system. On the other hand, recent developments in human rights legislation seek to strengthen disabled people’s position in society and on the labour market.

Snapshots of DHH people’s journey through the education system and beyond are provided by our analysis of official statistics collected and published by a variety of public bodies, including the Scottish Government, the Higher Education Statistics Agency, and the Department of Work and Pensions. We found limitations and gaps in the way data on DHH children and young people is recorded; definitions varied from institution to institution, making comparisons difficult.

We found that there is no information on the total number of DHH children and young people in Scotland. All we know is the number of DHH children who receive additional learning support in Scottish publicly funded schools, and comparisons with data from other sources seem to suggest that they 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.

There seems to be a lot of variation in the attainment levels of DHH school leavers, as this is a highly heterogeneous group. However, as a group, they seem to fare better than children with other types
of support needs, although they significantly lag behind school leavers with no additional support needs.

In terms of post-school destinations, there was good news: in 2010/11 DHH school leavers entered positive destinations in the highest proportion amongst leavers with ASN. However, the vast majority entered further education courses, and they were not as well represented in higher education.

There are indications that those who do enter higher education fare very well. Data published by AGCAS show a very positive picture. In the last 5 years, the employment rates of DHH graduates have been higher than those of graduates with disability as a group. Compared with their non-disabled peers their employment rates are lower, but DHH graduates are more likely to enter graduate-level employment than their non-disabled peers.

This report explores the wider context of young DHH people’s post-school journeys. The next stage of the research project, consisting of the analysis of interviews with DHH young people and professionals involved in their transitions will add more depth to our understanding of the factors which contribute to successful transitions to adulthood and independent living.
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## 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>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 Advisors</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>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>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>ODI</td>
<td>Office for Disability Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RON</td>
<td>Record of Needs</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 Disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</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>UCAS</td>
<td>Universities and Colleges Admissions Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix - Schedule used in interviews with young people who are deaf or hard-of-hearing

Interview schedule

Name:  
Date:  
Place:  
Interviewer:  

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