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## 1 Discussion guides

## Discussion Guide 1 – Interview with Principal

### School Profile - Context

[Note for interviewer: The table below will be pre-populated (where possible) for each school visited to provide context for the interview. If there are any gaps in information, please check/confirm with the school at interview]

Table Error! No text of specified style in document..1: School Profile

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| x | x |
| Name of School | x |
| Special School or Mainstream Post-Primary |  |
| Geography (by county) |  |
| Urban/Rural |  |
| School Ethos |  |
| Male / Female / Co-ed |  |
| DEIS/Non DEIS |  |
| Number of pupils |  |
| Number of pupils in receipt of SNA Support  |  |
| Profile of type of needs that are being catered for by the SNA support |  |
| Class Type (whether school has special classes or not)  |  |
| Number of SNA |  |

Source: RSM PACEC, 2017

### Supporting Young People with Disabilities to Prepare for Life after school

Preparedness for Life after school

* How prepared do you believe that young people with disabilities are for life after school?
* What support do you believe that young people with disabilities **need** to help prepare for life after school?
* What support do young people with disabilities **get** to help prepare for life after school? Who provides this?

[Note for interviewer: record any supports mentioned - both those provided by SNAs and other – including what the support is and who provides it]

Specifically, considering supports provided by SNAs to pupils with disabilities:

* How did the SNA facilitate preparation for life after school?
* Which of the supports they provided best helped prepare young people with disabilities for life after school?
* What challenges exist for SNAs in preparing pupils with disabilities for life after school?
* If there was scope to refocus SNA resource - in terms of preparedness of pupils with disabilities for life after school - what would you do differently? How else could the resource be used (in preparing students with disabilities for life after school)?
* What would support SNAs in fulfilling their role (in preparing pupils with disabilities for life after school)?
* **Good Practice**: In terms of preparedness of pupils with disabilities for life after school, what would you say are the key characteristics of effective SNA support?

[Note for interviewer: encourage respondent to describe good practice support and also to explain how this would be beneficial]

## Discussion Guide 2 – Interview with Staff

### Respondent Background

[Note for interviewer: when school appointments are being made, the principal will be asked to nominate staff members who have a good understanding of the role of the SNA this is a brief / “ice-breaker” section; main focus of the interview is section 1.2]

* What is your role within the school?
* Please briefly explain how your role is connected with the SNAs

### Supporting Young People with Disabilities to Prepare for Life after school

Preparedness for Life after school

* How prepared do you believe that young people with disabilities are for life after school?
* What support do you believe that young people with disabilities need to help prepare for life after school?
* What support do young people with disabilities get to help prepare for life after school? Who provides this?
* [Note for interviewer: record any supports mentioned - both those provided by SNAs and other – including what the support is and who provides it]

Specifically, considering supports provided by SNAs to pupils with disabilities:

* How did the SNA facilitate preparation for life after school?
* Which of the supports they provided best helped prepare young people with disabilities for life after school?
* What challenges exist for SNAs in preparing pupils with disabilities for life after school?
* If there was scope to refocus SNA resource - in terms of preparedness of pupils with disabilities for life after school - what would you do differently? How else could the resource be used (in preparing students with disabilities for life after school)?
* What would support SNAs in fulfilling their role (in preparing pupils with disabilities for life after school)?

Good Practice

* In terms of preparedness of pupils with disabilities for life after school, what would you say are the key characteristics of effective SNA support?

[Note for interviewer: encourage respondent to describe good practice support and also to explain how this would be beneficial]

## Discussion Guide 3 – Focus Group with SNA

[Note for interviewer: when school appointments are being made, the principal will be asked to help identify staff to participate in this focus group this is a brief / “ice-breaker” section; main focus of the interview is section 1.2]

### Respondent Background

* What is your role within the school?
* How many pupils with a disability do you support in the school? How many in the Senior Cycle?
* How many of these pupils will be leaving school in this academic year?

### Supporting Young People with Disabilities to Prepare for Life after school

Preparedness for Life after school

* How prepared do you believe that young people with disabilities are for life after school?
* What support do you believe that young people with disabilities **need** to help prepare for life after school?
* What support do young people with disabilities **get** to help prepare for life after school? Who provides this?

[Note for interviewer: record any supports mentioned - both those provided by SNAs and other – including what the support is and who provides it]

Specifically, considering supports provided by SNAs to pupils with disabilities

* How did the SNA facilitate preparation for life after school?
* Which of the supports they provided best helped prepare young people with disabilities for life after school?
* What challenges exist for SNAs in preparing pupils with disabilities for life after school?
* If there was scope to refocus SNA resource - in terms of preparedness of pupils with disabilities for life after school - what would you do differently? How else could the resource be used (in preparing students with disabilities for life after school)?
* What would support SNAs in fulfilling their role (in preparing pupils with disabilities for life after school)?

Good Practice

* In terms of preparedness of pupils with disabilities for life after school, what would you say are the key characteristics of effective SNA support?

[Note for interviewer: encourage respondent to describe good practice support and also to explain how this would be beneficial]

## Discussion Guide 4 – Interview with Parents of Young People with Disabilities

### Respondent Profile

* Could you tell me a little about your son/daughter?
* What does he/she do now (education, training, employment, adult day service etc.)? Has this been the same since leaving post-primary school? If no, what has changed?
* Please indicate category of disability

[Note to interviewer: this and other profile information*[[1]](#footnote-1)* may be known prior to the focus group as part of the registration process to identify any accommodations needed etc.]

* When did he/she leave school?
* What type of school did he/she attend (confirm if they attended more than one school / when they transferred etc.)
* What has his/her experience of post-primary school been?
* For how long did your son / daughter receive SNA support?

### Supporting Young People with Disabilities to Prepare for Life after school

Preparedness for Life after school

* How prepared do you believe that your son/daughter was for life after school?
* What support do you believe that your son/daughter **needed** to help prepare for life after school?
* Did your son/daughter get the support they needed to help them prepare for life after school?
* What support did your son/daughter **get** in school to help prepare for life after school? Who provided this?
* [Note for interviewer: record any supports mentioned - both those provided by SNAs and other – including what the support is and who provides it]

Specifically, considering supports provided by SNAs to pupils with disabilities

* How did the SNA facilitate preparation for life after school?
* Which of the supports they provided best helped prepare young people with disabilities for life after school?
* What challenges were there for SNAs in preparing your son/daughter for life after school?

Good Practice

* In terms of preparedness of pupils with disabilities for life after school, what would you say are the key characteristics of effective SNA support?

[Note for interviewer: encourage respondent to describe good practice support and also to explain how this would be beneficial]

### Supporting Young People with Disabilities – After School

Life after school – current supports

* What support do you believe that your son/daughter **needs** to actively participate in life now?
* What support does your son/daughter **get** now? Who provides this?

[Note for interviewer: record any supports mentioned including what the support is and who provides it]

Reflecting on preparation for life after school and support provided in school

Given what your son/daughter is currently doing/engaged in and the support they now require, and thinking back to the supports provided to your son/ daughter in school (particularly by SNAs) - please consider if there is anything that could have been done differently:

* Did your son/daughter get the support they needed in school?
* Do you believe SNA supports have helped prepare students with disabilities for life after school?
* Did it equip them for their current occupation?
* What could have been done differently? Is there anything else that the SNA scheme could do differently to help prepare students for life after school?
* What difference would this have made to your son/daughter in terms of what he/she is currently doing?

## Discussion Guide 5 – Key Informant Interviews

### ****Organisation/Respondent Profile****

* How many people with disabilities does your organization employ / provide services to/engage in training/education?
* Of these, how many are post-primary school students who had left school within the last 3 years?
* What is your role?
* Please briefly explain how your role is connected with the supporting young people with disabilities

### Supporting Young People with Disabilities to Prepare for Life after school

Preparedness for Life after school

* When young people with disabilities come to your organization, how prepared do you believe that they are for life after school?
* What support do you believe that young people with disabilities **need** to help prepare for life after school?
* Do they get the support they need to help them prepare for life after school?
* What support do young people with disabilities **get** in school to help prepare for life after school? Who provides this?

[Note for interviewer: record any supports mentioned - both those provided by SNAs and other – including what the support is and who provides it]

Specifically, considering supports provided by SNAs to pupils with disabilities

* How did the SNA facilitate preparation for life after school?
* Which of the supports they provided best helped prepare young people with disabilities for life after school?
* What challenges were there for SNAs in preparing young people for life after school?

Good Practice

* In terms of preparedness of pupils with disabilities for life after school, what would you say are the key characteristics of effective SNA support?

[Note for interviewer: encourage respondent to describe good practice support and also to explain how this would be beneficial]

### Supporting Young People with Disabilities – After School

Life after school

* What support(s) did / does you/your organization provide to young people with disabilities to enable them to engage in what they are now doing (work/day services/education)?
* between leaving school and now?
* now?

 [Note for interviewer: record any supports mentioned - including what the support is and who provides it]

* How do these supports compare with supports provided in school?
* To what extent are the supports provided in school and post-school complementary?
* Do the supports in school provide adequate preparation for life after school?
* Are supports required post-school to bridge the gap between school leaving and engaging in life after school?

Reflecting on preparation for life after school and support provided in school

Given the support that young people now require, and thinking back to the supports provided in school (particularly by SNAs) - please consider if there is anything that could have been done differently:

* Did the young people get the support they needed in school?
* Do you believe SNA supports have helped prepare students with disabilities for life after school?
* Did it equip them for what they are currently doing?
* What could have been done differently? Is there anything else that the SNA scheme could do differently to help prepare students for life after school?
* What impact would this have had on young people in terms of what they are currently doing?
* What difference/impact would this have had on the level and amount of support that you are providing to young people with disabilities?

## Discussion Guide 6 – focus groups with young people

### ****Respondent Profile****

* When did you leave school?
* What type of school did you attend (confirm if they attended more than one school / when they transferred etc.)
* Please indicate category of disability

[Note to interviewer: this and other profile information*[[2]](#footnote-2)* may be known prior to the focus group as part of the registration process to identify any accommodations needed etc.]

* What are you currently doing/engaged in (education, training, employment, adult day service etc.)? Has this been the same since leaving post-primary school? If no, what has changed?

### Supporting Young People with Disabilities to Prepare for Life after school

Preparedness for Life after school

* How prepared do you think you were for life after school? How difficult / easy did you find leaving school and moving to your present setting?
* What support did you feel you **needed** to help prepare for life after school?
* What support did you **get** in school to help prepare for life after school? Who provided this?

[Note for interviewer: record any supports mentioned - both those provided by SNAs and other – including what the support is and who provides it]

* Did this support meet your needs?

Specifically, considering supports provided by SNAs to you

* How did the SNA help you to prepare for life after school?
* Which of the supports they provided best helped you to prepare you for life after school?
* What challenges were there for SNAs in preparing for life after school?

Good Practice

* In terms of preparedness of pupils with disabilities for life after school, what would you say are the key characteristics of effective SNA support?

[Note for interviewer: encourage respondent to describe good practice support and also to explain how this would be beneficial]

### Supporting Young People with Disabilities – After School

Life after school

* What support did you **get** after leaving school? Who provides this?
* between leaving school and engaging in current occupation?
* to support them in current occupation?

[Note for interviewer: record any supports mentioned - including what the support is and who provides it]

* How do these supports compare with supports provided in school?

Reflecting on preparation for life after school and support provided in school

Given your current occupation and the support that you now require, and thinking back to the supports provided in school (particularly by SNAs) - please consider if there is anything that could have been done differently:

* Did you get the support you needed?
* Do you believe SNA supports helped you to prepare for life after school?
* Did it equip you for your current occupation?
* What could have been done differently? Is there anything else that the SNA scheme could do differently to help prepare you for life after school?
* What impact would this have had on you in terms of current occupation?

## Discussion Guide 6 (simplified) – focus groups with young people

A simplified version of the discussion guide for young people was developed to ensure that this was easily understood and accessible for those being consulted.

The simplified version included the seven areas for discussion below.

1. When did they leave school and the type of school(s) they attended?

2. What support they had in school?

3. How did the SNA help them?

4. How did they feel about leaving school?

5. Could other things have been done to help them in school?

6. What are they doing now?

7. What support do they get now?

## 2 School visits – consultation with staff and parents of young people with disabilities

## Profile of Consultees in Schools

We conducted one day visits to 10 schools (8 post-primary and 2 special). Across the 10 visits we interviewed principals (10) and other relevant staff[[3]](#footnote-3) (18), conducted focus groups with 31 SNAs and completed telephone interviews with 19 parents of young people with disabilities. The table below provides a summary of who was consulted in each school.

Table Error! No text of specified style in document..2: School Visits - Consultees

|  | School | Date of Visit | School Type | Interview with Principal | Interviews with Staff | Focus group with SNAs | Interviews with parents of young people with disabilities (x2) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Post-Primary School, Co Cork | Wed 18th Jan | Post-Primary | Yes - Interviewed together | Yes | Yes |
| 2 | Special School, Co Westmeath | Thursday 19th Jan | Special | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 3 | Post-Primary School, Co. Dublin | Monday 23rd Jan | Post-Primary | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 4 | Post-Primary School, Co Carlow | Wed 25th Jan | Post-Primary | Yes - Interviewed together | Yes | Yes |
| 5 | Special School, Co Dublin | Monday 30th Jan | Special | Yes - Interviewed together | Yes | Yes |
| 6 | Post-Primary School, Co Donegal | Tuesday 31st Jan | Post-Primary | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 7 | Post-Primary School, Co Westmeath | Wed 1st Feb | Post-Primary | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 8 | Post-Primary School, Co Kilkenny | Thurs 2nd Feb | Post-Primary | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 9 | Post-Primary, Co Galway | Mon 6th February | Post-Primary | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes - 1 Parent  |
| 10 | Post-Primary, Co Donegal | Wed 8th Feb | Post-Primary | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Source: RSM PACEC, 2017

## Profile of Schools Visited

Table Error! No text of specified style in document..3: Profile of 10 School Visited

|  | County | Type | Ethos | Boys/ Girls /Mixed | DEIS Status[[4]](#footnote-4) | No. Pupils | Special Classes Offered[[5]](#footnote-5) | SNA Allocation[[6]](#footnote-6) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Cork | Post-Primary | Inter Denominational | Mixed | DEIS | 256 | Yes | 5 |
| 2 | Westmeath | Special | Catholic | Mixed | Non DEIS | 86 | - | 14.5 |
| 3 | Dublin | Post-Primary | Inter Denominational | Mixed | Non DEIS | 1,226 | No | 6 |
| 4 | Carlow | Post-Primary | Inter Denominational | Mixed | DEIS | 217 | Yes | 3 |
| 5 | Dublin | Special | Catholic | Mixed | Non DEIS | 155 | - | 22 |
| 6 | Donegal | Post-Primary | Inter Denominational | Mixed | DEIS | 385 | No | 9 |
| 7 | Westmeath | Post-Primary | Inter Denominational | Mixed | Non DEIS | 1,294 | No | 1 |
| 8 | Kilkenny | Post-Primary | Catholic | Boys | Non DEIS | 682 | No | 5 |
| 9 | Galway | Post-Primary | Inter Denominational | Mixed | Non DEIS | 307 | No | 7 |
| 10 | Donegal | Post-Primary | Catholic | Girls | Non DEIS | 929 | Yes | 10 |

Source: RSM PACEC 2017

## Representativeness of School Visited

Two special schools and eight post-primary schools were visited as part of this exercise.

### Post-Primary

The table below compares the profile of the eight post primary schools visited with the profile of all post primary schools in Ireland to consider representativeness. When considering representativeness it must be noted that the sample of post-primary schools (8 schools of a population of 735 post-primary schools) is very small and therefore there was no expectation that a fully representative sample would be achieved.

However, despite this very small sample size we took steps to ensure that this has included all of the main characteristics of schools.

The table shows that the sample of eight post primary schools:

* is broadly representative of all schools across the characteristics of gender, DEIS status and special classes
* provide a mix of geographic coverage: there is representation from 7 of the 26 counties (these 7 account for 53.2% of post-primary schools in Ireland) including counties in the north, south, east and west of Ireland
* include schools from the 2 most common types of school ethos: Catholic and Interdenominational, although the former are underrepresented and the latter are overrepresented in the sample
* include schools with varying numbers of SNA posts, with a mean of 4.23 SNA posts per post-primary school compared to the population mean of 3.58 SNA posts per post-primary school

Table Error! No text of specified style in document..4: Post Primary School Visits Representativeness

| Characteristic | Population | Sample |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Gender – School Level\*: | N | % | N | % |
| Boys | 104 | 14.1% | 1 | 12.5% |
| Girls | 138 | 18.8% | 1 | 12.5% |
| Mixed | 493 | 67.1% | 6 | 75.0% |
| Total | 735 | 100.0% | 8 |  100.0% |
|   |
| DEIS Status[[7]](#footnote-7)\*\*: | N | % | N | % |
| DIES Schools | 184 | 25.0% | 3 | 37.5% |
| Non-DEIS Schools | 551 | 75.0% | 5 | 62.5% |
| Total | 735 | 100.0% | 8 |  100.0% |
|    |
| County\*: | N | % | N | % |
| Carlow | 11 | 1.5% | 1 | 12.5% |
| Cork | 87 | 11.8% | 1 | 12.5% |
| Donegal | 27 | 3.7% | 2 | 25.0% |
| Dublin | 188 | 25.6% | 1 | 12.5% |
| Galway | 47 | 6.4% | 1 | 12.5% |
| Kilkenny | 16 | 2.2% | 1 | 12.5% |
| Westmeath | 15 | 2.0% | 1 | 12.5% |
| Other counties | 344 | 46.8% | 0 | 0% |
| Total | 735 | 100.0% | 8 |  100.0% |
|   |
| Special Classes[[8]](#footnote-8)\*\*\*: | N | % | N | % |
| Yes | 194 | 26.4% | 3 | 37.5% |
| No | 541 | 73.6% | 5 | 62.5% |
| Total | 735 | 100.0% | 8 |  100.0% |
|  |
| Ethos\*: | N | % | N | % |
| Catholic | 349 | 47.5% | 2 | 25.0% |
| Church of Ireland | 23 | 3.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Inter-Denominational | 330 | 44.9% | 6 | 75.0% |
| Methodist | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Jewish | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Quaker | 2 | 0.3% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Multi-Denominational | 29 | 3.9% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Total | 735 | 100.0% | 8 |  100.0% |
|  |
| Number of SNA Posts[[9]](#footnote-9)\*\*\*\*: | N | % | N | % |
| Low (i.e. allocation of <=1.5) | 198 | 28.1% | 1 | 12.5% |
| Medium (i.e. allocation of >1.5 AND <=5) | 356 | 50.5% | 3 | 37.5% |
| High (i.e. allocation of >5) | 151 | 21.4% | 4 | 50.0% |
| Total | 705 | 100.0% | 8 | 100.0%  |
|  |
| Mean number of SNA Posts\*\*\*\*: | 3.58 | 4.23 |

Source: RSM PACEC 2017 supplemented with

\*Data on Individual Post-Primary Schools 2015/16 (DES, 2016); \*\*DEIS school list 2016 2017 school year (DES, 2016); \*\*\*Special Classes in Primary and Post Primary Schools Academic Year 16/17 (NCSE, 2016); \*\*\*\*SNA and Resource Teaching Hours Allocations for Post Primary Schools 2016/17 (NCSE, 2016)

### Special Schools

Two special schools were visited.

The characteristics of these schools compared to the characteristics of all special schools is illustrated below.

When considering the characteristics below it is important to note that the sample of special schools is 2 out of a population of 138 special schools; therefore, there was no expectation that a representative sample would be attained.

One school was located in Dublin and the other in Westmeath. Both schools are: mixed gender; and Catholic.

Table Error! No text of specified style in document..5: Special School Visits Representativeness

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Characteristic | Population | Sample |
| Gender – Pupil Level[[10]](#footnote-10)\*: | N | % | N | % |
| Boys | 5,464 | 67.7% | 131 | 54.4% |
| Girls | 2,606 | 32.3% | 110 | 45.6% |
| Total | 8070 | 100.0% | 241 | 100.0% |
| DEIS Status[[11]](#footnote-11)\*\*: | N | % | N | % |
| DIES Schools | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Non-DEIS Schools | 138 | 100.0% | 2 | 100.0% |
| Total | 138 | 100.0% | 2 | 100.0% |
| Ethos\*: | N | % | N | % |
| Catholic | 113 | 88.3% | 2 | 100.0% |
| Church of Ireland | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Inter-Denominational | 1 | 0.8% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Methodist | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Jewish | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Quaker | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Multi-Denominational | 14 | 10.9% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Other / Unknown | 10 | 7.8% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Total | 138 | 100.0% | 2 | 100.0% |
| Number of SNA Posts[[12]](#footnote-12)\*\*\*: | N | % | N | % |
| Low (i.e. allocation of <=12) | 32 | 27.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Medium (i.e. allocation of >12 AND <=28) | 59 | 50.0% | 2 | 100.0% |
| High (i.e. allocation of >28) | 27 | 22.9% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Total | 118 | 100.0% | 2 | 100.0% |
| Mean number of SNA Posts\*\*\*: | 20.09 | 18.25 |

Source: RSM PACEC 2017 supplemented with data as cited at Table 0:3 page 22

3 Key informants - consultation

In total we consulted with almost 50 people; these included representation from:

* Adult Day Service Centres – 11 staff
* Further Education – 12 representatives of Further Education Colleges, second level colleges adult literacy organisations
* Higher Education – 24 representatives of Higher Education including universities and Institutes of Technology, the Disability Advisors Working Network (DAWN[[13]](#footnote-13)), Association for Higher Education Access and Disability (AHEAD)
* Employers – 2 employer representative organisations, Irish Small and Medium Enterprises Association (ISME) and Irish Congress of Trade Unions (ICTU)

The table below sets out the key informants who were consulted.

Table Error! No text of specified style in document..6: Key Informant Consultation

| Area | Organisation | Number  | Format | Date | Profile of Consultees |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Adult Day Services | Adult day service, Cork  | 2 | Interview | 20 Feb 2017 | Consultees included:Keyworkers (n=3);Resource Worker (n=1);Programme Facilitator (n=2);Service Manager (n=3);Instructor (n=1);CEO (n=1). |
| Adult day service, Westmeath | 2 | Interview | 21 Feb 2017 |
| Adult day service, Dublin | 3 | Interview | 21 Feb 2017 |
| Adult day service, Carlow | 2 | Interview | 23 Feb 2017 |
| Adult day service, Athlone | 2 | Interview | 28 Feb 2017 |
| Further Education[[14]](#footnote-14) | Institute of Further Education, Dublin | 1 | Interview | 30 Jan 2017 | Consultees included:Principal (n=4);Deputy principal (n=1);Adult Literacy Organiser (n=2);Support roles (n=3);Educational Psychologist (n=1);Adult Guidance (n=1). |
| City of Dublin Education and Training Board  | 2 | Interview | 27 Jan 2017 |
|  |  |  |  |
| National Learning Network  | 1 | Written submission | 10 Feb 2017 |
| Institute of Further Education,  | 2 | Focus group at meeting in Naas | 15 Feb 2017 |
| Institute of Further Education,  | 1 |
| Second Level School | 1 |
| Adult Educational, Guidance and information Service | 1 |
| Adult Education Service | 1 |
| Adult Education Service | 1 |
| Education, training and work experience programme | 1 |
| Higher Education[[15]](#footnote-15) | Disability Advisors Working Network (DAWN),  | 23 | Focus group with 23 DAWN members and representative of AHEAD in Dublin | 20 Feb 2017 | Professional organisation for Disability Officers who are primarily responsible for supporting learners with disabilities in Higher Education in Ireland. Includes Disability Officers whose role is to meet with students with disabilities, assess their needs and liaise with academic staff and exams office to ensure that student needs are accommodated. |
| Institute of Technology | 1 | Written submission | Feb 2017 | Disability Officer |
| Employers’ represent-atives | Irish Congress of Trade Unions  | 1 | Interview  | 9 Feb | Consultees included:Disability Committee member (n=1);HR/Member Services Officer (n=1) |
| Irish Small and Medium Enterprises Association | 1 | Interview | 16 Feb |

Source: RSM PACEC, 2017

* We sought to engage with other key informants. However in some cases this was not possible for a variety of reasons (including lack of: availability, ability to contribute due to their specific role, knowledge of SNA scheme)).

## 4 Young people with disabilities- focus groups

## Arrangement of Focus Groups

To arrange the focus groups, we engaged with a wide network of contacts as follows.

### ****Young People in Adult day services****

To assist with arranging focus groups with young people in adult day services, RSM PACEC profiled the total population, the number of school leavers with disabilities who entered Adult Day Services or progressed from Rehabilitative Training (RT) in the last two years[[16]](#footnote-16) (as a proxy for service users) and the schools visited as part of this research by CHO area. The category of disability of the young people who are service users was also considered. In this dataset (2,251 school leavers with disabilities who entered Adult Day Services or progressed from Rehabilitative Training in the last 2 years ), four categories account for 90%+ of all the young people with disabilities; one category Intellectual Disability (ID) on its own accounts for almost half.

The table below sets out the proposed approach to arranging the focus groups with young people. There were two main stages involved in the development of this table as set out below.

Part 1: Population Weighting

The total population across the Community Healthcare Organisation (CHO) areas (for 2014/15 and 2015/16) were ranked from 1 to 9.

The population of school leavers with disabilities who entered Adult Day Services (in 2014/15 and 2015/16) in each of the CHO areas were ranked from 1 to 9.

Population of school leavers who progressed from Rehabilitative Training (in 2014/15 and 2015/16) in each of the CHO areas were ranked from 1 to 9.

From this analysis, six of the nine Community Healthcare Organisation (CHO) areas were identified as having the highest total population, the highest numbers of young people who are service users, and including at least one school visited as part of this research. Therefore this provided six areas as potential locations for the focus groups with young people, these areas are set out in the table below.

## Part 2: Category of Disability

The four main categories of disabilities were; Autism (16.4%), ID (49.2%), ID & Autism (15.9%), ID and Physical & Sensory disabilities (10.8%).

RSM PACEC then calculated the proportion of each category of disability in each of the CHO areas to identify which were most prevalent in each area. This allowed for targeted focus groups with young people by category of disability in each of the CHO areas.

From the Part 2 analysis above, a category of disability for each focus group was proposed – again taking into account the prevalence of each category amongst young people who are service users in the area.
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| CHO Area\* | LHO | School Visits\*\* by RSM PACEC (Jan 2017) | Proposed Location / Area for Consultation | Population Ranking[[17]](#footnote-17) | Category of Disability (young people) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Targeted | Rationale |
| Area 2 | Galway, Roscommon and Mayo LHOs | Post-Primary School, Co Galway | Galway | Total Population: 6School Leaver and RT population: 6 | ID  | 150 young people (2 years data) in this area with ID in adult day services; 2nd highest no. of all areas |
| Area 4 | Kerry LHO, North Cork LHO, North Lee LHO, South Lee LHO and West Cork LHO  | Post-Primary School, Co Cork | (West) Cork | Total Population: 2School Leaver and RT population: 1 | Autism  | 186 young people (2 years data) in this area with autism in adult day services; Highest number of young people with Autism (50.4% of all)) |
| Area 5 | South Tipperary LHO, Carlow/Kilkenny LHO, Waterford LHO and Wexford LHO | Post-Primary School, Co KilkennyPost-Primary School, Co Carlow | Carlow/ Kilkenny | Total Population: 5School Leaver and RT population: 2 | ID | 139 young people (2 years data) in this area with ID in adult day services; 3rd highest no. of all areas.ID is the largest disability category in this area. |
| Area 7 | Kildare/West Wicklow LHO, Dublin West LHO, Dublin South City LHO and Dublin South West LHO | Special School, Co Dublin | Dublin S/SW/W | Total Population: 1School Leaver and RT population: 3 | ID & Physical and Sensory | Area ranked 1st in terms of number of young people with ID and Physical/Sensory disabilities in adult day services (18.5% of all, 45 in total over 2 years) |
| Area 8 | Laois/Offaly LHO, Longford/Westmeath LHO, Louth LHO and Meath LHO | Special School, Co WestmeathPost-Primary School, Co Westmeath | Westmeath | Total Population: 3School Leaver and RT population: 4 | ID & Autism | Area ranked 2nd in terms of the number of young people with ID & Autism (15.6% of all, 56 in total over 2 years ) |
| Area 9 | Dublin North LHO, Dublin North Central LHO and Dublin North West LHO | Post-Primary School, Co Dublin | Dublin N/NW | Total Population: 4School Leaver and RT population: 5 | ID | ID is the largest disability category in this area (50.2%, 111 young people in adult day services over 2 years)) |

Note: 2 other school visits\*\* and 3 other CHO areas\* not included in this table: these areas have lowest total population and lowest population of RT/School Leavers

Source: RSM PACEC, 2017 (including data from HSE)

Based on this profile, the NDA accessed the contact details of eight adult day services from the Health Service Executive (HSE) and passed these details on to RSM PACEC.

The centres were contacted by email followed by a call to the day service manager to establish if they were interested in taking part in the study and to begin putting arrangements in place. In most cases this was possible; in a small number of cases there was a requirement to seek approval from a research ethics committee.

Visits were undertaken to 5 Adult Day Service Centres in weeks commencing 20 and 27 February.

### ****Young People in Further Education Sector****

Contacts were identified via stakeholders in the area of Further Education including through key informants in:

* National Learning Network
* City of Dublin Education and Training Board
* Education and Training Boards Ireland
* Cavan Institute

Key informants issued the invitation to relevant young people with disabilities on behalf of RSM PACEC and thereafter facilitated arrangements for them to attend.

Options for groups that were explored were:

* Killester College of Further Education
* Blackrock Further Education Institute (BFEI)
* Ballyfermot College of Further Education
* Cavan Institute

Due to timing (mid-term w/c 20 February) and low numbers of students within the target group, the focus groups in Killester and BFEI did not go ahead. Focus groups in Ballyfermot College of Further Education and Cavan Institute were held on 1st March 2017.

### ****Young People in Higher Education Sector****

We identified contacts in Higher Education including AHEAD and through the DAWN network, including a list of Disability Officers in Higher Education Institutes in Ireland.

An email was sent to disability representatives (i.e. Disability Officers) in a number of Higher Education Institutes across Ireland. The email introduced the study, provided further information relating to the proposed focus group with young people with disabilities in Higher Education, requested a venue to hold the group, and requested assistance with issuing invitations and consent forms to potential attendees.

A number of Higher Education Institutions expressed interest in assisting with the research however in some cases, it was not possible to proceed due to the need for approval via a research ethics committee (and the time it would have taken to secure this). Two Higher Education institutions (DCU and Letterkenny IoT) were willing to assist with the research by providing a venue and promoting the group by issuing invitations to students with disabilities via email. However despite encouragement from the disability officers there was not sufficient interest in either institution to hold a group.

In lieu of a focus group, young people in Higher Education at two institutes were offered the option to contribute to the study over the phone or through written submission.

### ****Young People in Employment****

Potential participants were invited to participate via a range of contacts including:

* Email issued by the Irish Congress of Trade Unions Disability Committee to committee members asking them to forward an invitation from RSM PACEC to employees inviting them to attend a focus group;
* Email / information issued by disability sector organisations (NCBI, DeafHear) to young people known to them in the target group;
* Email issued by EmployAbility Services Galway to young people known to them in the target group;
* Email forwarded by NLN to two colleges with students from the target group;

Various other disability sector organisations, employability service organisations, consultees in the Further Education and Higher Education sectors, and the Public Sector Equality Learning Network were also contacted.

WALK (an organisation which supports young people with a disability to find employment) was also approached to help identify young people known to them in the target group. These were contacted by WALK and a focus group was conducted with young people in employment on 28 February.

## Practical Arrangements and Research Ethics

This section discusses the ethical considerations and practical arrangements for the research.

### Recording of interviews and focus groups

All interviews/groups were recorded through an audio recording and/or hand-written notes. All participants were informed in advance that information would be recorded and would inform the report.

Consent to record the interview/group was received from all participants before the consultation. Names or any other identifying information were not associated with the recording or the transcript. The recordings are stored securely within the RSM PACEC offices.

### Practical Arrangements – Focus Groups with Young People with Disabilities

****Registration****

Eligible participants[[18]](#footnote-18) were supplied with a copy of the information sheet and registration form in advance of the focus groups.

The information sheet fully informed all participants of the rationale and scope of the study being conducted as well as how any information they provided would be analysed and used as part of the report.

The registration form collected some background information about the participants including:

* Questions to confirm they are in the target group
* Contact details
* Age
* Category of Disability(ies)
* Characteristics of last school attended (Special or Post primary)
* Name of last school attended (to access school profile information incl. ethos, gender, SNA allocations, geography etc.)
* Question to confirm whether or not they required any accommodations to take part in the group

The information gathered as part of this registration form was used to develop a profile of the young people with disabilities participating in the research and the schools they attended.

****Securing Consent****

Part of the registration form included a consent form which was used to secure consent from the young people; the consent form also contained a proxy consent form which could be completed by the proxy of young people with disabilities.

Young people or their appropriate proxy completed the registration and consent forms before the group took place and returned these directly to RSM PACEC or, in the case of adult day services, to their centre manager who passed information on to RSM PACEC.

If the participant did not provide assent to proceed (i.e. if they protested or chose not to comply with the procedure) at any stage then their participation will ceased immediately, fortunately this was never the case.

Consent forms were collected ahead of the meetings.

****Reasonable Accommodations****

In line with Guidelines for Including People with Disabilities in Research’[[19]](#footnote-19) and taking the approach outlined in ‘Ask Me: Guidelines for Effective Consultation with People with Disabilities’[[20]](#footnote-20) we ensured that all focus group / meeting venues were accessible[[21]](#footnote-21) with suitable public transport and parking services as well as suitable building / room facilities (including seating arrangements, presentation methods).

Following the approach outlined in ‘Ask Me: Guidelines for Effective Consultation with People with Disabilities’[[22]](#footnote-22), we planned for inclusion by seeking information in advance of consultations of any specific requirements either directly from those being consulted (on the registration form) or via contacts (for example in Further Education, Higher Education and Adult Day Service Centres) who facilitated arrangements for focus groups.

Generally, accommodations were already in place in the centres/locations visited or were not required by the young people.

Ensuring Material Used in the Research was Accessible

We have conserved the guidelines in set out in Ethical Guidance for Research with People with Disabilities[[23]](#footnote-23) regarding promoting inclusion and participation of people with disabilities in research and ensuring accessibility.

Taking the approach outlined in ‘Ask Me: Guidelines for Effective Consultation with People with Disabilities’[[24]](#footnote-24) relating to making contact and supporting people with disabilities participate we asked people with disabilities what their support needs are so that we could plan for this.

Furthermore, material used in relation to the research was developed with the target audience in mind. This included:

* Invitations to participate in the research
* Information sheet
* Registration form (where required)
* Consent form (where required)
* Discussion Guide: a simplified version of the discussion guide for young people was developed to ensure that this was easily understood and accessible for those being consulted

This material was developed by RSM PACEC with the assistance of the advisor prior to engagement with young people.

Out of Pocket Expenses

In line with Guidelines for Including People with Disabilities in Research[[25]](#footnote-25) and taking the approach outlined in ‘Ask Me: Guidelines for Effective Consultation with People with Disabilities’[[26]](#footnote-26) out of pocket expenses were offered to participants at the groups.

Prior to all groups, through consultation with adult day service centre managers and participants, we identified whether participants would require reimbursement for any out of pocket expenses incurred, as a result of their participation in the study and provided this where required.

## Profile of Focus Groups

We conducted 8 focus groups and 3 telephone interviews with young people:

* who have left school within the last 3 years[[27]](#footnote-27)
* with disabilities
* who had SNA support (in Senior Cycle)

The details of these are presented in the table below. These include:

* 5 groups with 21 young people in Adult Day Services
* 2 groups with 8 young people in Further Education
* 3 telephone interviews with 3 young people in Higher Education
* 1 group with 4 young people in employment

The table below sets out the breakdown of the focus groups with young people with disabilities.
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| Target Group | Date | Venue | Disability Category | Attendees | SNA Support | Left school within the last 3 years[[28]](#footnote-28) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Further Education | 1st March | College of Further Education | Mixed | 2\* | Yes | Yes |
| Further Education | 1st March | College of Further Education | Mixed | 6 | Yes | 1 participant left school more than 3 years ago  |
| Adult day services | 23rd February  | Adult day service, Carlow | Mixed  | 5 | Yes | Yes |
| Adult day services  | 21st February | Adult day service, Dublin  | Majority ID[[29]](#footnote-29) | 5 | Yes | Yes |
| Adult day services  | 21st February | Adult day service, Westmeath | Majority ID[[30]](#footnote-30) | 5 | Yes | 1 participant left school more than 3 years ago |
| Adult day services  | 20th February  | Adult day service, Cork  | Autism Spectrum Disorder | 1\*\* | Yes | Yes |
| Adult day services  | 28th February | Adult day service, Athlone  | Mixed | 4 | Yes | Yes |
| Employee  | 28th February | Drogheda | Mixed | 4 | Yes | 3 Participants left school more than 3 years ago |
| Higher Education | 28th February | Institute of Technology | Physical Disability | 1 Phone Interview[[31]](#footnote-31) | Yes | Yes |
| Higher Education | 28th February | University | Physical and Sensory Disabilities | 2 Phone Interviews[[32]](#footnote-32) | Yes | Yes |

Source: RSM PACEC, 2017

\*Note: Four young people registered to attend this group but only two attended

\*\*Note: Five young people registered to attend this group but only one attended

The table below sets out the number of groups in each sector and the overall number of young people with disabilities attending these groups.

Table Error! No text of specified style in document..9 Number of Focus Groups and Participants by Sector

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sector | Number of Focus Groups | Number of Young People Attending | % of Young People Attending |
| Adult Day Services | 5 | 20 | 57% |
| Further Education | 2 | 8 | 23% |
| Higher Education | 3 telephone interviews[[33]](#footnote-33) | 3 | 9% |
| Employment | 1 | 4 | 11% |
| Total | 8 | 35 | 100% |

Source: RSM PACEC, 2017

The table above shows that overall 8 focus groups and 3 telephone interviews (in place of 2 focus groups) were held with overall participation of 35.

## Profile of Young People Consulted

This section sets out the overall profile of young people with disabilities consulted with through focus groups and telephone interviews.

Overall, 35 young people with disabilities were consulted.

### Age and Category of Disability

The table below sets out the profile of young people by category of disability and age.

The age of participants ranged from 17 to 27. Most participants that completed the registration form (35.5%) were 20 years old, this was followed closely by respondents of 19 years of age (25.8%).

The table shows the most common categories of disability among participants, including:

* An intellectual disability (51.6%)
* A physical disability (22.6%)
* A difficulty with learning, remembering or concentrating (16.1%)
* Asperger’s Syndrome (12.9%)
* Autism Spectrum Disorder (12.9%)
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Category of Disability | Age |
| 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | Other | Total[[34]](#footnote-34) |
| N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| An intellectual disability | 1 | 3.0% | 1 | 3.0% | 4 | 12.1% | 3 | 9.1% | 5 | 15.2% | 2 | 6.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 16 | 48.5% |
| A physical disability | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 3.0% | 4 | 12.1% | 1 | 3.0% | 1 | 3.0% | 1 | 3.0% | 7 | 21.2% |
| A sensory disability, for example deaf, hard of hearing, sight loss | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 3.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 3.0% |
| A physical and sensory disability | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Mental health issue(s) | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 3.0% | 1 | 3.0% | 1 | 3.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 9.1% |
| A difficulty with learning, remembering or concentrating | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 6.1% | 2 | 6.1% | 1 | 3.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 5 | 15.2% |
| A difficulty with pain, breathing or any other chronic illness or condition | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Autism Spectrum Disorder | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 9.1% | 1 | 3.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 4 | 12.1% |
| Asperger’s Syndrome | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 3.0% | 2 | 6.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 3.0% | 1 | 3.0% | 4 | 12.1% |
| Other | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 6.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 3.0% | 2 | 6.1% |
| Total Respondents[[35]](#footnote-35) | 1 | 3.0% | 1 | 3.0% | 8 | 24.2% | 11 | 33.3% | 6 | 18.2% | 4 | 12.1% | 2 | 6.1% | 33 | - |

Source: RSM PACEC, 2017 Last School Attended

34 of the young people consulted provided further details of the last school that they attended:

* 21 attended a mainstream post-primary school and
* 13 attended a special school

### Post Primary Schools Attended by Young People Consulted

19 different post-primary schools were attended by the 21 participants that provided further details of the last school they attended (where this was a post-primary school).

None of the post primary schools attended by young people were visited as part of the school visits conducted in another strand of this research.

The characteristics of these 19 schools compared to the all post primary schools are illustrated below.

When considering the characteristics below it is important to note that the sample of schools is 19 out of a population of 735 post primary schools and therefore there was no expectation that a representative sample would be attained.

The table shows that the sample of schools:

* is broadly representative of all schools across the characteristics of gender, DEIS status, ethos and special classes
* provide a mix of geographic coverage: there is representation from 9 of the 26 counties (these 9 account for 51.2% of post-primary schools in Ireland)
* include schools with varying numbers of SNA posts, with a mean of 5.21 SNA posts per post-primary school compared to the population mean of 3.58 SNA posts per post primary school
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 **Mainstream Post-Primary**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Characteristic | Population | Sample |
| Gender – School Level\*: | N | % | N | % |
| Boys | 104 | 14.1% | 3 | 15.8% |
| Girls | 138 | 18.8% | 3 | 15.8% |
| Mixed | 493 | 67.1% | 13 | 68.4% |
| Total | 735 | 100.0% | 19 | 100.0% |
|   |
| DEIS Status[[36]](#footnote-36)\*\*: | N | % | N | % |
| DIES Schools | 184 | 25.0% | 7 | 36.8% |
| Non-DEIS Schools | 551 | 75.0% | 12 | 63.2% |
| Total | 735 | 100.0% | 19 | 100.0% |
|    |
| County\*: | N | % | N | % |
| Louth | 19 | 2.6% | 3 | 15.8% |
| Cork | 87 | 11.8% | 1 | 5.3% |
| Donegal | 27 | 3.7% | 1 | 5.3% |
| Dublin | 188 | 25.6% | 4 | 21.1% |
| Longford | 9 | 1.2% | 1 | 5.3% |
| Cavan | 11 | 1.5% | 3 | 15.8% |
| Westmeath | 15 | 2.0% | 3 | 15.8% |
| Laois | 8 | 1.1% | 1 | 5.3% |
| Offaly | 12 | 1.6% | 2 | 10.5% |
| Other counties | 359 | 48.8% | - | - |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Characteristic | Population | Sample |
| Total | 735 | 100.0% | 19 | 100.0% |
| Gender – School Level\*: | N | % | N | % |
| Boys | 104 | 14.1% | 3 | 15.8% |
| Girls | 138 | 18.8% | 3 | 15.8% |
| Mixed | 493 | 67.1% | 13 | 68.4% |
| Total | 735 | 100.0% | 19 | 100.0% |
|   |
| DEIS Status[[37]](#footnote-37)\*\*: | N | % | N | % |
| DIES Schools | 184 | 25.0% | 7 | 36.8% |
| Non-DEIS Schools | 551 | 75.0% | 12 | 63.2% |
| Total | 735 | 100.0% | 19 | 100.0% |
|    |
| County\*: | N | % | N | % |
| Louth | 19 | 2.6% | 3 | 15.8% |
| Cork | 87 | 11.8% | 1 | 5.3% |
| Donegal | 27 | 3.7% | 1 | 5.3% |
| Dublin | 188 | 25.6% | 4 | 21.1% |
| Longford | 9 | 1.2% | 1 | 5.3% |
| Cavan | 11 | 1.5% | 3 | 15.8% |
| Westmeath | 15 | 2.0% | 3 | 15.8% |
| Laois | 8 | 1.1% | 1 | 5.3% |
| Offaly | 12 | 1.6% | 2 | 10.5% |
| Other counties | 359 | 48.8% | - | - |
| Total | 735 | 100.0% | 19 | 100.0% |
|   |
| Special Classes[[38]](#footnote-38)\*\*\*: | N | % | N | % |
| Yes | 194 | 26.4% | 8 | 42.1% |
| No | 541 | 73.6% | 11 | 57.9% |
| Total | 735 | 100.0% | 19 | 100.0% |
|  |
| Ethos\*: | N | % | N | % |
| Catholic | 349 | 47.5% | 10 | 52.6% |
| Church of Ireland | 23 | 3.1% | 1 | 5.3% |
| Inter-Denominational | 330 | 44.9% | 8 | 42.1% |
| Methodist | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Jewish | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Quaker | 2 | 0.3% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Multi-Denominational | 29 | 3.9% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Total | 735 | 100.0% | 19 | 100.0% |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of SNA Posts[[39]](#footnote-39)\*\*\*\*: | N | % | N | % |
| Low (i.e. allocation of <=1.5) | 198 | 28.1% | 1 | 5.3% |
| Medium (i.e. allocation of >1.5 AND <=5) | 356 | 50.5% | 13 | 68.4% |
| High (i.e. allocation of >5) | 151 | 21.4% | 5 | 26.3% |
| Total | 705 | 100.0% | 19 | 100.0% |
|  |
| Mean number of SNA Posts\*\*\*\*: | 3.58 | 5.21 |

Source: RSM PACEC 2017 supplemented with:

\*Data on Individual Post-Primary Schools 2015/16 (DES, 2016);

\*\*DEIS school list 2016 2017 school year (DES, 2016);

\*\*\*Special Classes in Primary and Post Primary Schools Academic Year 16/17 (NCSE, 2016)

\*\*\*\*SNA and Resource Teaching Hours Allocations for Post Primary Schools 2016/17 (NCSE, 2016)

### Special Schools Attended by Young People Consulted

6 different special schools were attended by the 13 participants that provided further details of the last school they attended (where this was a special school).

One of the special schools attended by young people was visited as part of the school visits conducted in another strand of this research.

The characteristics of these 6 special schools compared to all special schools is illustrated below.

When considering the characteristics below it is important to note that the sample of special schools is 6 out of a population of 138 special schools and therefore there was no expectation that a representative sample would be attained.

The profile below shows that the sample of special schools is:

* is broadly representative of all schools across the characteristics of gender, DEIS status
* provide a mix of geographic coverage: there is representation from Carlow (n=1), Dublin (n=3), Louth (n=1) and Westmeath (n=1). These 4 counties account for 44.9% of special schools in Ireland
* include schools with varying numbers of SNA posts, with a mean of 25.36 SNA posts per special school compared to the lower population mean of 20.09 SNA posts per special school
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|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Characteristic | Population | Sample |
| Gender – Pupil Level[[40]](#footnote-40)\*: | N | % | N | % |
| Boys | 5,464 | 67.7% | 440 | 66.7% |
| Girls | 2,606 | 32.3% | 220 | 33.3% |
| Total | 8070 | 100.0% | 660 | 100.0% |
| DEIS Status[[41]](#footnote-41)\*\*: | N | % | N | % |
| DIES Schools | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Non-DEIS Schools | 138 | 100.0% | 6 | 100.0% |
| Total | 138 | 100.0% | 6 | 100.0% |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ethos\*: | N | % | N | % |
| Catholic | 113 | 88.3% | 6 | 100.0% |
| Church of Ireland | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Inter-Denominational | 1 | 0.8% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Methodist | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Jewish | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Quaker | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Multi-Denominational | 14 | 10.9% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Other / Unknown | 10 | 7.8% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Total | 138 | 100.0% | 6 | 100.0% |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of SNA Posts[[42]](#footnote-42)\*\*\*: | N | % | N | % |
| Low (i.e. allocation of <=12) | 32 | 27.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Medium (i.e. allocation of >12 AND <=28) | 59 | 50.0% | 4 | 66.7% |
| High (i.e. allocation of >28) | 27 | 22.9% | 2 | 33.3% |
| Total | 118 | 100.0% | 6 | 100.0% |
| Mean number of SNA Posts\*\*\*: | 20.09 | 25.36 |

Source: RSM PACEC 2017 supplemented with:

\* Data on Individual Schools 2015/16 (DES, 2016);

\*\*DEIS school list 2016 2017 school year (DES, 2016);

\*\*\*SNA Allocations and Teaching Posts for Special Schools 2016/17 (NCSE, 2016)

## 5 Young people with disabilities

## scale and characteristics

## Introduction

In this section, we define the target population for this research and estimate the number of young people in that target population.

## Target Group – Definitions

This research is concerned with a very specific target group with the following characteristics: young people:

* **Who have left school within the last 3 years** –School leaving age in Ireland is either 16 or 18 and 19. A full breakdown is provided later in this section.
* **With disabilities** – this includes young people who have any form of disability as categorised by the National Council for Special Education[[43]](#footnote-43):
* Assessed Syndrome
* Autism / Autism Spectrum Disorders
* Emotional / Behavioural Disturbance
* Hearing impairment
* Moderate general learning disability
* Multiple disabilities
* Physical disability
* Severe emotional / behavioural disturbance
* Server / profound general learning disability;
* Specific speech and language disorder
* Visual impairment
* Borderline or mild general learning disability
* Who had SNA support (in Senior Cycle) – This has a number of elements:
* **Senior Cycle** - Senior cycle (upper secondary education) is the non-compulsory period of education and is usually taken by students between the ages of 15 and18[[44]](#footnote-44)
* **SNA Support**- SNA supports students who have significant need for care support and who would not be able to attend school without such additional support[[45]](#footnote-45). Students who may be approved access to SNA support are those: who have significant care needs arising from a disability or medical condition; and whose professional reports indicate that the student’s care needs are so significant that they will need adult assistance to be able to attend school and to take part in education[[46]](#footnote-46). It is the school’s responsibility to apply for SNA support for students. The application is sent to the NCSE

## Estimating the Number of Young People with Disabilities who left School in the Last 3 Years

### Total Number in Senior Cycle

There is no publicly available source that provides a precise number of young people who have left school in the last 3 years. The section below sets out the estimate arrived at for this, detailing the data sources used and the assumptions made.

The DES Annual Statistics Report 2015/2016 details the number of pupils in post primary school and special school in Senior Cycle. This information is detailed below.

Table 5.1: Number of pupils in Post Primary School Senior Cycle

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Type of Institution Attended  | Total Number | % of total |
| Special School | 2,482 | 1.5% |
| Secondary School | 90,238 | 56.2% |
| Vocational School | 41,395 | 25.8% |
| Community and Comprehensive | 26,487 | 16.5% |
| Total | 160,602 | 100% |

Source: Department of Education and Skills Annual Statistics Report 2015/2016 – Section 3 – Table 3.3.

In total, there are 160,602 people in school who are in Senior Cycle.

### Total Number in Senior Cycle by Age

The table below shows the breakdown of the number in senior cycle by age as per the definition provided at the beginning of this section.

Table 5.2: Number of pupils in Post Primary School Senior Cycle by Age

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Type of Institution  | Age  |
| 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 and over |
| Special School | 802 | 686 | 675 | 290 | 27 | 2 | 0 |
| Secondary | 12,787 | 32,412 | 30,126 | 14,238 | 573 | 50 | 52 |
| Vocational | 6,018 | 15,416 | 13,521 | 5,535 | 484 | 132 | 289 |
| Community and Comprehensive | 3,823 | 9,961 | 8,771 | 3,725 | 175 | 15 | 17 |
| Total | 23,430 | 58,475 | 53,093 | 23,788 | 1,259 | 199 | 358 |

Source: Department of Education and Skills Annual Statistics Report 2015/2016 – Section 3 – Table 3.3.

As can be seen from the table above most senior cycle pupils are aged 15 and 18 with a smaller number completing senior cycle at an older age.

Current School Leavers

In calculating the number of school leavers per year the following assumptions have been made:

* **Assumption 1:** The number of people leaving mainstream post primary school at 16 is 9.4% of population – this is based upon the statistics included in the Department of Education and Skills Post-Primary Pupils Database 2015[[47]](#footnote-47)
* **Assumption 2:** No young people in special school leave at 16

Using the assumptions above the following estimates about the number of young people that leave school each year are made.

Pupils leaving at 16 – Post Primary (excluding Special Schools)

The law in Ireland dictates that attendance at school is compulsory until the age of 16. This means that all pupils must complete the Junior Certificate, however progression onto the Leaving Certificate is voluntary and therefore non-compulsory[[48]](#footnote-48).

Using the 9.4% leavers’ rate at 16 and only considering those in post primary (i.e. not including those in special school) we estimate that 5,432 young people left school at 16 in 2015/2016.

Table 5.3: Number of pupils leaving at 16

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total in post primary school at 16 | 57,789 |
| Total leavers at 16 | 5,432 |

Source: Department of Education and Skills Annual Statistics Report 2015/2016 – Section 3 – Table 3.3.

Pupils leaving at 17+ – Post Primary (excluding Special Schools)

The traditional Leaving Certificate examination is the terminal examination of post-primary education and is taken when students are typically 17 or 18 years of age[[49]](#footnote-49).

The Economic and Social Research Institute (ESRI) conduct an annual leavers’ survey however the most recent data relates to 2011/2012. In the ESRI survey the number of school leavers each year is calculated by counting the number of pupils who complete the Leaving Certificate.

We have applied this methodology to the 2015/2016 figures. These are presented in the table below.

**Assumption 3:** Only those completing Leaving Certificate – Year 2, Leaving Certificate Applied – Year 2, Leaving Certificate Vocational – Year 2 and those completing a repeat of Leaving Certificate – Year 1 are leaving mainstream post primary school. We have used these qualifications only for two reasons: 1. They are the qualifications used in the ESRI research and 2. They are identified by DES as the ‘terminal examinations’ in post primary school i.e. the final exams taken before leaving.

Table 5.4: Number of pupils leaving at 17+

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Qualification | Estimated Number of School Leavers |
| Leaving Certificate - Year 2 | 36,952 |
| Leaving Certificate Applied - Year 2 | 2,638 |
| Leaving Certificate Vocational - Year 2 | 15,963 |
| Repeat Leaving Certificate - Year 1 | 1,658 |
| Total | 57,211 |

Source: Department of Education and Skills Annual Statistics Report 2015/2016 – Section 3 – Table 3.3.

Table 5.2 indicates that there are 77,705 young people in mainstream post primary school aged 17 or older. The data in table 5.4 estimates that of these 57,211 left school in 2015/2016.

Pupils leaving at 17+ – Special Schools

As very few pupils in special school complete the Leaving Certificate, we have completed a separate calculation for this group.

Table 5.2 show that there are 994 students in special schools aged 17+. It is clear from the table that the majority of students leave special school aged between 17 and 18 with only a small number remaining at 19+. Using historic data from 2014/2015 and the data from 2015/2016 we have compared the number in each age category from one year to the next and calculated that 66.7% of young people in special school leave at 17+. This means that we estimated that in 2015/2016 of the 994 pupils in special school aged 17+, 673 leave school that same year.

**Assumption 4:** We have assumed that the level of school leavers remains consistent across the last three years.

Table 5.4: Number of pupils leaving special school 17+

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total in special school 2015/2016 aged 17+ | 994 |
| Total leavers at 17+ | 673 |

Source: Department of Education and Skills Annual Statistics Report 2015/2016 – Section 3 – Table 3.3.

Total School Leavers

Using the above analysis we estimate that in 2015/2016 a total of **63,316** young people left school.

### Total School Leavers in last 3 years

**Assumption 5:** We have assumed the number of school leavers in the last 3 years is broadly the same as in 2015/2016. Therefore, to calculate the total number in the last three years we have simply multiplied by three.

Therefore, an estimate for the total number of people who have left school in the last 3 years is **189,948.**

### Number of School Leavers with Disabilities

There are a variety of data sources for the number of young people with disabilities in Ireland. Whilst several organisations, for example the Department of Education and Skills, Disability Federation Ireland and National Council for Special Education all have information on young people with disabilities the metrics which they record and measure are not aligned. Based on available data, we have developed an estimate of the number of young people with disabilities using recent robust data underpinned by a number of assumptions.

For the initial analysis, we have used the Census 2011 data. Both the NCSE and the Disability Federation Ireland use the Census 2011 data in their current statistical reports and in their estimations of the population.

Census Ireland 2011 indicates that 13% of the population of Ireland are classified as having a disability. Looking more specifically at the age range which includes the age group that this research is focused upon, 8% of those aged 15-24 are classified as having a disability.

**Assumption 6:** We have assumed that the proportion of those aged 15-24 with a disability (i.e. 8%) still applies to the current population and that the 8% rate applies evenly to each age-group (by year).

Using the estimated total population of school leavers calculated in section 5.3.3 we estimate that the number of school leavers in the last 3 years with a disability is 15,196.

Table 5.6: Number of School Leavers in the last 3 years with disabilities

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total number of school leavers in the last 3 years | 189,948 |
| Proportion of those estimated to have a disability | 8% |
| Total number of school leavers in the last 3 years estimated to have a disability | 15,196 |

Source: total number of school leavers: DES Annual Statistics Reports 2012-2015, Proportion of people with disability: Census 2011 and Disability Federation Ireland.

The number of school leavers with disabilities in the last three years is approximately 15,196. The profile of these leavers means that they left school between the ages of 16 – 21. Given that the profile left school in the last 3 years the age range now included in the research target group is 16 – 24.

## Estimating the Number of Young People with Disabilities in Senior Cycle, who have left school in the last three years and had SNA support

### Total Number of SNA in Senior Cycle

There is no data available on the exact number of young people that have access to an SNA and therefore further assumptions have been made.

In January 2016, there were 11,925 SNA available to allocate across all schools in Ireland[[50]](#footnote-50). Of those the latest information states that 4,647 were working in post primary or special schools[[51]](#footnote-51).

First, we consider the number of pupils (in total and with disabilities) and allocation of SNAs by year groups in school and between Junior and Senior Cycle.

Table 5.8: Proportion of SNAs per Year Group

| Year Group | Cycle | No of Pupils 2015/2016[[52]](#footnote-52) | Estimated No with Disabilities[[53]](#footnote-53) | % total with Disabilities | Estimated number of SNAs[[54]](#footnote-54) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Junior Certificate Yr1 | Junior | 57,657 | 4,613 | 15.3% | 711 |
| Junior Certificate Yr2 | Junior | 57,212 | 4,577 | 15.2% | 706 |
| Junior Certificate Yr3 | Junior | 55,318 | 4,425 | 14.7% | 683 |
| Junior Certificate Schools Prog Yr1 | Junior | 5,795 | 464 | 1.5% | 72 |
| Junior Certificate Schools Prog Yr2 | Junior | 5,765 | 461 | 1.5% | 71 |
| Junior Certificate Schools Prog Yr3 | Junior | 5,587 | 447 | 1.5% | 69 |
| Transition Year | Senior | 40,451 | 3,236 | 10.7% | 499 |
| Leaving Certificate Yr1 | Senior | 40,256 | 3,220 | 10.7% | 497 |
| Leaving Certificate Yr2 | Senior | 36,952 | 2,956 | 9.8% | 456 |
| Leaving Certificate Applied Yr1 | Senior | 3,117 | 249 | 0.8% | 38 |
| Leaving Certificate Applied Yr2 | Senior | 2,638 | 211 | 0.7% | 33 |
| Leaving Certificate Vocational Yr1 | Senior | 17,181 | 1,374 | 4.6% | 212 |
| Leaving Certificate Vocational Yr2 | Senior | 15,963 | 1,277 | 4.2% | 197 |
| Repeat Leaving Certificate | Senior | 1,658 | 133 | 0.4% | 20 |
| Special School | Senior | 2,482 | 2,482 | 8.2% | 383 |
|  |  | 348,032 | 30,126 | 100.0% | 4,647 |

Source: Department of Education and Skills Annual Statistics Report 2015/2016 and RSM PACEC

The table above shows that of the 4,647 SNAs within Post Primary and Special School, around half (2,335) are estimated to be working with young people in Senior Cycle.

Whilst 2,335 SNAs are working with young people in Senior Cycle not all are working with leavers. Therefore, considering only those leavers (i.e. those identified as completing the terminal examinations as per Assumption 3) we estimate the number of SNAs assigned to leavers as:

* **Assumption 7:** In mainstream schools, it is the number working with young people in Leaving Certificate Year 2 (456), the number working with young people in Leaving Certificate Applied Year 2 (33), the number working with young people in Leaving Certificate Vocational Year 2 (197) and the number working with those repeating Leaving Certificate Year 1 (20)
* **Assumption 8:** For special schools, it is assumed that the number of SNAs follows the same proportion as for pupils. i.e. of the 8,070 pupils in special schools in 2015/2016, 2,482 are in Senior Cycle this represents 30.7% of the total population. Given this we estimate that there are 30.7% of the 383 SNAs in special schools assigned to Senior Cycle pupils for example 118 SNAs. In Section 5.3 we estimated that the number of Senior Cycle pupils leaving each year from Special School was 67% therefore, we assume that 67% of the SNA in Senior Cycle are working with leavers. This equates to 79 SNAs

Table 5.9: SNAs assigned to Leavers and Special School 2015/2016

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total assigned to leavers[[55]](#footnote-55) | 706 |
| Total assigned to special school leavers[[56]](#footnote-56) | 79 |
| Total number of SNAs assigned to leavers | 785 |

Source: Department of Education and Skills Annual Statistics Report 2015/2016 – Section 3 – Table 3.3.

Table 5.9 shows the estimate for the number of SNAs working with pupils who are leaving school. This is 17.2% of the total SNAs allocated to Post Primary Schools and Special Schools.

### Estimating the Target group

In the previous section it was estimated that 785 SNAs were working with leavers in schools in 2015/2016. Data from the NCSE on the profile of distribution of SNAs to school in 2015/2016 indicates that SNAs work on average with 3 young people each and therefore the ratio of SNAs to young people is 1:3[[57]](#footnote-57). Given this it can be estimated that the 785 SNAs work with approximately 2,355 students annually. Extending this across the three years we can estimate that the target population is 7,065.

The number of school leavers in the last three years, who have a disability and had support from an SNA is estimated at **7,065.**

## Validating the Estimate

Analysis in section 5.3 estimates that there are approximately 15,196 young people with disabilities who have left school in the last three years.

To test this assumption, we consider Census 2011 data which shows that in the age categories 15-19 and 20-24 a total of 44,513 people have disabilities. Based on our analysis we estimate that 35% (n=15,196, base=44,513) of those aged 15-24 with disabilities have left school in the last three years. This does not appear to be unreasonable.

Separate analysis in section 5.4 estimated that there are approximately 7,065 young people who left school in the last three years, who have a disability and who had SNA support.

Comparing this with the numbers estimated in section 5.3, this represents 46.5% of the number who left school in the last three years and have a disability (15,196). This does not appear to be unreasonable.

## Profile of the Target Group

Having established the target group, we have estimated the profile of the target group by category of disability. The detail of the data sources used and the assumptions made are included in the sections.

### Target Group by Category of Disability

There are several sources of information in relation to the category of disabilities. In Section 5.3 we used the Census 2011 to calculate the estimated total number of young people with disabilities. The Census data is robust however it only categorises the type of disability in 4 broad categories (Physical & Sensory, Intellectual Disability, Mental Health and Chronic Illness).

The National Council for Special Education has a more comprehensive breakdown of the type of disabilities. It provides a breakdown of the proportion of young people in post primary schools and special schools by the type of disability. There are several caveats and assumptions made in relation to this data.

**Assumption 9:** This data is based on 2015 school profile information and we have assumed the proportions of students with disabilities have remained broadly the same over the last three years.

* The NCSE data only takes account of those young people with a recognised diagnosis and whose disability have been formally recognised by the Department of Education and Skills
* The NSCE data only includes those students who have declared their disability

Even with these caveats the data from the NCSE does include all pupils who are eligible to receive SNA support, as it records those with a professional diagnosis, therefore it can be assumed that the data is aligned well to the target group.

Another reason for using the NCSE Data is that it records a separate category for those young people with multiple disabilities. This ensures that there is no risk of double counting in the data set.

Applying the proportions set out by the NCSE to the estimated population above estimate the number of school leavers in the last 3 years with a disability by the category of disability. The four most common categories of disability are borderline / mild general disabilities (43.9%), emotional/behavioural disturbance (14.5%), autism / autism spectrum disorders (12.8%) and physical disability (12.8%); these account for around 80% of the population of young people/school leavers in the last 3 years.

Table 5.12: Target Group by Category of Disability

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Category of Disability | Proportion[[58]](#footnote-58) | Estimated number within the Target Group |
| Assessed Syndrome | 0.3% | 21 |
| Borderline / mild general learning disabilities | 43.9% | 3102 |
| Autism / Autism Spectrum Disorders | 12.8% | 904 |
| Emotional / Behavioural Disturbance | 14.5% | 1024 |
| Hearing impairment | 2.1% | 148 |
| Moderate general learning disability | 0.8% | 57 |
| Multiple disabilities | 4.4% | 311 |
| Physical disability | 12.8% | 904 |
| Severe emotional / behavioural disturbance | 2.0% | 141 |
| Severe / profound general learning disability | 0.0% | 0 |
| Specific speech and language disorder | 5.3% | 374 |
| Visual impairment | 1.0% | 71 |
| Total |  | 7,065 |

Source: RSM PACEC

Comparing the profile of disabilities presented in the table above to those involved in the focus groups in this research study (discussed in section 4.4), there is a fairly close alignment with 44.4% involved in the research having a Borderline / mild general learning disabilities and, 11.1% having Autism / Autism Spectrum Disorders and 25.9% having a physical disability. Though the categories used are not like for like which makes direct comparison difficult.

### Target Group by Destination

There are a limited number of data sources in relation to the destinations of young people once they leave school.

One of the most robust data sources is the 2011 which profiles those with disabilities by age and economic status. For this element of the analysis we needed to use two age categories to cover all those included in the target group, namely 15-19 and 20-24.

The table below presents an overview of the target group by destination after school. This is based on the economic status of the group per the Census 2011.

**Assumption 10:** We assume that the proportion in the various categories of economic status are broadly the same across the three years.

Table 5.13: Economic Status of Target Group

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Economic Status | Proportion | Number in Target Group | Sub-Category | Estimated Number |
| Employed | 14.1% | 996 | n/a | n/a |
| Unemployed | 16.2% | 1145 | n/a | n/a |
| Student | 56.8% | 4013 | Adult Days Services:  | 2,580 (37% of all) |
| Higher Education:  | 401 (6% of all) |
| Further Education:  | 494 (7% of all) |
| Other: | 538 (8% of all) |
| Not Economically Active[[59]](#footnote-59) | 12.1% | 855 | n/a | n/a |
| Other[[60]](#footnote-60) | 0.8% | 57 | n/a | n/a |
| Total |   | 7,065 |  |  |

Source: RSM PACEC

Most of the target group we sought to consult are classed as students in the census data. This include more than one category of educational facility and therefore further analysis is needed to understand how many are in estimated to be in each.

The following assumption has been made in calculating this:

**Assumption 11:** We have assumed that the economic status ‘student’ includes those in Higher Education, Further Education, those in adult day services and those in training centres.

The following presents our basis for estimating the sub-categories in the table above.

* **Higher Education:** The Census 2011 indicates that for those young people who have a disability and are aged between 15-19 and 20-24 10% are enrolled in higher education courses[[61]](#footnote-61). If the rate can be uniformly applied to the other years within the target group we can estimate that 401 young people with disabilities, who left school in the last three years and who had SNA support are currently in Higher Education
* **Further Education:** The Census 2011 indicated that for those young people who have a disability and are aged between 15-19 and 20-24 12.3% are enrolled in further education courses[[62]](#footnote-62). If the rate can be uniformly applied to the other years within the target group we can estimate that 494 young people with disabilities, who left school in the last three years and who had SNA support are currently in Further Education
* **Adult Day Services:** In Ireland, day services for adults with disabilities are provided to approximately 18,000 service users[[63]](#footnote-63). HSE data[[64]](#footnote-64) for 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 sets out the number of school leavers with disabilities who entered adult day services[[65]](#footnote-65). The data indicates that over the two previous years an average of 860 school leavers per year entered adult day services. These young people could be aged between 16 and 22. It is important to note that we have not included those who have progressed to adult day services from rehabilitative training as it was not possible to determine the age profile and the number who had left school in the last three years. Therefore, assuming that an average of 860 school leavers enter adult day services each year we have assumed that in total 2,580 young people with disabilities, approximately aged between 16 and 22 have entered adult day services in the last three years
* The figures detailed above are based on the estimates and assumptions and indicate that around 70% of young people who have a disability and who received SNA support are in employment (14%) or a student at Higher Education (6-7%), Further Education (6-7%), Adult Day Services (37%) or other (8%).
* This is broadly aligned with and supports the rationale for the groups consulted as part of this research: (5 adult day services (58% of consultees), 2 Further Education (22% of consultees), 2 Higher Education (8% of consultees), 1 employee (11% of consultees)).
1. Age, gender, type of disability, geography etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Age, gender, type of disability, geography etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Including: Teaching staff; SEN Co-ordinator; Deputy Principal [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Delivering Equality of Opportunity in Schools (DEIS) the Action Plan for Educational Inclusion, was launched in

May 2005 and remains the Department of Education and Skills policy instrument to address educational disadvantage

The action plan focuses on addressing and prioritising the educational needs of children and young people from

disadvantaged communities, from pre-school through second-level education (3 to 18 years). DEIS provides for a

standardised system for identifying levels of disadvantage and an integrated School Support Programme (SSP).

(Source: <http://www.education.ie/en/Schools-Colleges/Services/DEIS-Delivering-Equality-of-Opportunity-in-Schools-/>) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Special classes catering for a specific category of disability are offered at a number of post-primary schools.

The NCSE provides a list of Special Classes in Mainstream Schools, this lists 310 special classes in 194 post primary

schools (with 99,945 pupils). Therefore 25.6% of overall post-primary schools in 2015/16 (n=735) [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
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7. Delivering Equality of Opportunity in Schools (DEIS) the Action Plan for Educational Inclusion, was launched in May 2005 and remains the Department of Education and Skills policy instrument to address educational disadvantage. The action plan focuses on addressing and prioritising the educational needs of children and young people from disadvantaged communities, from pre-school through second-level education (3 to 18 years). DEIS provides for a standardised system for identifying levels of disadvantage and an integrated School Support Programme (SSP). (Source: <http://www.education.ie/en/Schools-Colleges/Services/DEIS-Delivering-Equality-of-Opportunity-in-Schools-/>) [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
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10. The gender profile of the population of pupils has been used as Special Schools are rarely gendered [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
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