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# Summary of the overall situation and challenges

From the disability perspective, there have been several positive developments in the indicators related to EU2020 strategic targets, which go hand in hand with the overall situation in Slovak society. At the same time, compared to 2016 when several significant policy changes took place, 2017 has not brought as many policy developments. Several policy proposals are now under the discussion, which have not come into force yet, especially the *Action Plan on Transition from Sheltered Workshops to the Open Labour Market*, and the significant amendment of the Act on Social Services.

As stated in the Country Report: “*Slovakia witnessed a marked improvement in its labour market in 2015 and 2016, not least due to strong job creation*.” The number of unemployed registered job-seekers with disabilities has decreased after a three-year period of increase. Expenditure on the active labour market measures for persons with disabilities has risen after several years of sharp decline, although, as stated in the Country Report, insufficient financing for active labour market policies (0.16 % of GDP in 2015) remains challenging for Slovakia. Another positive development is that the call to support the transition of young people with disabilities into the labour market within the Youth Guarantee has finally been launched. Preparation of the Action Plan on the Transition from Sheltered Workshops to the Open Labour Market seems also promising with regards to better access of people with disabilities to the labour market. On the other hand, the employment rate of persons with disabilities remains far below the employment rate of total population, and there still are difficulties in introducing individualised support to disabled job-seekers.

In the area of education there is a lack of data to assess the dual education scheme from a disability perspective. It is worth mentioning that, despite an increasing proportion of pupils with disabilities educated in mainstream schools compared to special schools, Slovak legislation does not recognise the term ‘inclusive education’ and there is no commitment within the RNDP to prepare a policy document on inclusive education of children and pupils with disabilities.

Finally, in the area of social inclusion, there remains a challenge concerning the process of deinstitutionalisation of long-term care social services. In particular, the process is still project-based (and project funded) rather than systemic. Preparation for a new deinstitutionalisation project funded from the ESIF in the programming period 2014-2020 is only just under finalisation, whereas the previous one has finished in 2015 – at this stage there are no significant and systematic activities concerning deinstitutionalisation taking place in Slovakia. Some positive changes have occurred in informal care support, with increases in the allowance for informal carers and the safeguard income limit for cared for persons in 2017. Moreover, with an aim to help young parents to reconcile their parenting and employment, a new type of social service titled childcare facility for a child under the age of three (regardless of having a disability or not), was legally introduced since March 2017.

# Assessment of the situation of disabled people with respect to the Europe 2020 headline targets

## Strategic targets

Table 1: Europe 2020 and agreed national targets for the general population

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Europe 2020 targets | National targets[[1]](#footnote-2) |
| Employment | 75% of the 20-64 year-olds to be employed | 72% |
| Education | Reducing the rates of early school leaving below 10% | 6% |
| At least 40% of 30-34–year-olds completing third level education | 40% |
| Fighting poverty and social exclusion | At least 20 million fewer people in or at risk of poverty and social exclusion | 170,000 |

Relevant disability ta**r**gets from national strategies or sources:

There are disability related objectives in the *National Program on Improvement of Living Conditions for Persons with Disabilities for years 2014-2020* (Národný program rozvoja životných podmienok osôb so zdravotným postihnutím na roky 2014-2020;

hereinafter ‘National Disability Program’),[[2]](#footnote-3) although they are not quantifiable as targets:

* to ensure within the ALMP the inclusion of people with disabilities in the labour market especially by increasing the accessibility and availability of public employment services and counselling, as well as pay more attention to the employment of people with disabilities in an open labour market.
* To ensure for persons with disabilities the right on education without discrimination and on the basis of equal opportunities to set inclusive education system at all levels including lifelong learning.
* To ensure appropriate living standards and social protection of persons with disabilities (e.g. accessible and barrier-free housing).

### 2.1.1 A note on the use of EU data

Unless specified, the summary statistics presented in this report are drawn from 2015 EU-SILC micro data.[[3]](#footnote-4) The EU-SILC sample includes people living in private households and does not include people living in institutions. The proxy used to identify people with disabilities (impairments) is whether ‘for at least the past 6 months’ the respondent reports that he/she has been ‘limited because of a health problem in activities people usually do’.[[4]](#footnote-5) Responses to this question vary between countries and national data sources are added for comparison, where available.

In 2015 there was a break in the German data (with significantly reduced prevalence estimates). As Germany is a very large country, this affected both the German national indicators and EU average indicators for this year. For example, the EU28 average disability prevalence indicator decreased between 2014 and 2015 but increased, as in previous years, if Germany is excluded. A similar trend is evident for the EU average employment rate of persons.

Table 2: Self-reported ‘activity limitations’ as a proxy for impairment/disability (EU-SILC 2015)

Source: EUSILC UDB 2015 – version of October 2017

Note: the Slovakian disability prevalence estimates are above the EU28 average, notably for older persons. This might affect the estimation of comparative outcome indicators based upon them.

In subsequent tables, these data are used as a proxy to estimate ‘disability’ equality in the main target areas for EU2020 – employment, education and poverty risk.[[5]](#footnote-6) The tables are presented by disaggregating the estimated proportion of people who report and do not report limitations for each indicator (e.g. among those who are employed, unemployed, at risk of poverty, etc.).

## Employment data

Table 3: Most recent employment data, aged 20-64

Source: EUSILC UDB 2015 – version of October 2017

Table 4: Employment rate data, by age group

Source: EUSILC UDB 2015 – version of October 2017

Table 5: Trends in employment by gender and disability (aged 20-64)

Source: EUSILC UDB 2015 – version of October 2017 (and preceding UDBs)

The table above shows a comparison of national employment trends for disabled and non-disabled women and men, and compares this with the EU2020 headline indicator for the EU as a whole.

Alternative data on disability and employment provided by the national expert:

National data on employment of people with disabilities vary to a great extent, among each other and in time. Until May 2011, the main data source on employment of people with disabilities was the quarterly Labour Force Survey (LFS), which has still been conducted by Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic. The survey is not specifically aimed at people with disabilities. Participants in this survey are asked whether they have been officially recognised as disabled. However, the question does not specify which of the two assessment mechanisms shall be addressed:

1. the assessment for the purposes of the non-contributory cash benefits for the compensation of the social consequences of severe disability,[[6]](#footnote-7) involving a functional disorder of at least 50%. There are approximately 448,000 people based on the functional assessment without any age limitation.
2. The assessment mechanism of reduced work capacity,[[7]](#footnote-8) applied to claimants aged 18+ until old age pension to provide them with disability pension. In this case, being disabled refers to reduced work capacity by more than 40%, and severe disability refers to reduced work capacity by more than 70%. In September 2016, there were 247,334 disability pensioners (against 240,445 disability pensioners in March 2014).

The following national LFS data on disability and employment have been provided by the Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic.

Graph: Employment data by age and disability (2015)

*Source: LFS UDB 2015 (Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic, October 2016)*

There is another source of national data on the employment of people with disabilities, namely the Social Insurance Agency (SIA). The SIA operates a register of people receiving disability pension (i.e. these are administrative not survey data). As shown in the following table, the number of employed persons with disabilities according to the SIA is almost twice as high as the Statistical Office estimate.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Economic status of persons with disabilities by Statistical Office and SIA (March 31)** | | | | | |  |
|  | **2013** | | **2014** | | **2015** | |
|  | *SIA* | *LFS* | *SIA* | *LFS* | *SIA* | *LFS* |
| **Persons receiving disability pension** | 237,073 | n/a | 240,455 | n/a | 244,958 | n/a |
| **Of which**  **Employed** | 70,514 | 38,700 | 75,445 | 57,100 | 78,838 | 62,900 |
| **Unemployed** | n/a | 9,500 | n/a | 12,500 | n/a | 10,800 |
| **Economically inactive** | n/a | 239,100 | n/a | 257,500 | n/a | n/a |

*Source: LFS, SIA*

The table indicates that, based on the administrative data, both the number of people with disabilities (persons receiving disability pension) as well as the number of employed people with disabilities has slightly increased in given period. However, this is a marginal increase from 31.38% in 2014 on 32.18% of employed persons receiving disability pension in 2015.

### Unemployment

National administrative rules and definitions of ‘unemployment’ vary, and these may affect the way in which disabled people are categorised in different countries. The following tables compare national data with the EU2020 headline indicator for the EU.

Table 6: Most recent unemployment data, aged 20-64

Source: EUSILC UDB 2015 – version of October 2017

Table 7: Unemployment rate data, by age group

Source: EUSILC UDB 2015 – version of October 2017

Note: there has been considerable variance between years in the Slovakian unemployment estimate for the youngest age group (the smallest sample category), although it remains very high.

Table 8: Trends in unemployment by gender and disability (aged 20-64)

Source: EUSILC UDB 2015 – version of October 2017 (and preceding UDBs)

Fluctuations in the gendered tends for people with impairments should be treated with caution, although the pattern is somewhat similar for those without. It is difficult to interpret the Slovakian disability trends precisely. An indicative trend line is shown for illustration only.

Alternative data on disability and unemployment from national sources:

The alternative national data (LFS data) on disability and unemployment have been provided by the Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic.

Graph: Unemployment data by age and disability (2015)

*Source: LFS UDB 2015 (Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic, October 2016)*

Besides that, there are administrative data on registered job-seekers, collected by the Central Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family (COLSaF). Based on that data, the share of disabled job-seekers on total population of job-seekers was in 2016 just 3.59%. The following table shows the numbers of disabled and non-disabled registered job-seekers between 2013 and 2016.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Average number of registered job-seekers** | | | | | |
|  | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **Change between 2015 and 2016 in %** |
| **All job-seekers** | 415,006 | 385,661 | 354,582 | 300,988 | -15,11% |
| **Disabled job-seekers** | 11,659 | 12,800 | 12,917 | 10,800 | -16,39% |

*Source:Správa o sociálnej situácii obyvateľstva za rok 2016.[[8]](#footnote-9)*

### 2.2.2 Economic activity

Table 9: Most recent economic activty data, aged 20-64

Source: EUSILC UDB 2015 – version of October 2017

Table 10: Activity rate data, by age group

Source: EUSILC UDB 2015 – version of October 2017

Table 11: Trends in activity rates by gender and disability (aged 20-64)

Source: EUSILC UDB 2015 – version of October 2017 (and preceding UDBs)

Alternative data on disability and economic activity provided by the national expert:

**Table: Economic activity rate, employment rate and unemployment rate of PWD**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2015 – non-disabled |
| Economic activity rate | 15,1 | 17,6 | 21,4 | 20,1 | 59,7 |
| Employment rate | 12,0 | 14,0 | 17,2 | 16,6 | 67,7 |
| Unemployment rate | 20,4 | 20,1 | 19,6 | 17,4 | 11,5 |

*Source: Labour Force Survey – LFS, UDB 2012-2015 In: Vybrané indikátory sociálnej situácie osôb so zdravotným postihnutím [Selected indicators of social situation of PWD] (2016). Bratislava: Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic.*

**Graph: Economic activity data by age and disability (2015)**

*Source: LFS UDB 2015 (Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic, October 2016)*

## Education data

EU statistical comparisons are more limited concerning the education of young disabled women and men in the EU2020 target age groups. Data is available from EU-SILC (annually) as well as the Eurostat Labour Force Survey ad-hoc disability module (for 2011), but with low reliability for several countries on the key measures.[[9]](#footnote-10) Using a wider age range can improve reliability but estimations by gender remain indicative. EU trends are evident but administrative data may offer more reliable alternatives to identify national trends, where available. Confidence intervals for the disability group are wide on both indicators at the national level but reliable at the EU level. An average over several years may provide a more robust national indication.

There was also a change from ISCED 1997 to ISCED 2011 qualification definitions in 2014 although some Member States continued to use the older definition in 2015.

### Early school leavers

The EU-SILC sample for the target age group (aged 18-24) includes the following number of people reporting activity ‘limitation’ (as a proxy for impairment/disability).

Table 12: EU-SILC sample size in the target age group 18-24 versus 18-29

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Age 18-24** | | **Age 18-29** | |
|  | No activity ‘limitation’ | Activity ‘limitation’ | No activity ‘limitation’ | Activity ‘limitation’ |
| **EU sample** | 32,733 | 2,673 | 54,418 | 4,840 |
| **National sample** | 1,590 | 125 | 2,610 | 215 |

Source: EUSILC UDB 2015 – version of October 2017

Table 13: Early school leavers aged 18-24 (indicative based on above sample size)

Source: EUSILC UDB 2015 – version of October 2017

Note: The confidence intervals for disability group are large and so the reliability is low. It may be more useful to consider an average of several years

Alternative data on disability and early school leavers provided by the national expert:

The data on early school leavers are provided by annual averages of quarterly Labour Force Survey (LFS). However, these data comprise the whole population aged 18-24 and there is not any category of early school leavers with disability in generally published data.

The following charts shows the national LFS data provided by the Statistical Office of the SR on a special request in October 2016. The year averages show the proportion of young PwD at the age of 15-29 disaggregated by the education level and the economic status.

Economically active 15-29-year olds with disabilities by the education attainment level (%)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Education | LFS 2012 | LFS 2013 | LFS 2014 | LFS 2015 |
| Lower secondary and less (ISCED 0-2) | 0.5 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 0.9 |
| Upper secondary (ISCED 3-4) | 10.6 | 10.6 | 10.3 | 8.1 |
| Tertiary (ISCED 5-6) | 2.2 | 0.9 | 2.2 | 3.8 |
| **Total**[[10]](#footnote-11) | **13.4** | **12.7** | **13.1** | **12.9** |

*Source: LFS UDB 2012-2015 (Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic, October 2016)*

Employed 15-29-year olds with disabilities by the education attainment level (%)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Education | LFS 2012 | LFS 2013 | LFS 2014 | LFS 2015 |
| Lower secondary and less (ISCED 0-2) | 0.5 | 1.4 | 0.4 | 0.9 |
| Upper secondary (ISCED 3-4) | 8.5 | 9.3 | 8.6 | 7.0 |
| Tertiary (ISCED 5-6) | 2.8 | 0.7 | 2.3 | 3.6 |
| **Total**[[11]](#footnote-12) | **11.8** | **11.3** | **11.3** | **11.5** |

*Source: LFS UDB 2012-2015 (Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic, October 2016)*

Unemployed 15-29-year olds with disabilities by the education attainment level (%)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Education | LFS 2012 | LFS 2013 | LFS 2014 | LFS 2015 |
| Lower secondary and less (ISCED 0-2) | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 1.0 |
| Upper secondary (ISCED 3-4) | 19.1 | 16.3 | 17.6 | 13.4 |
| Tertiary (ISCED 5-6) | 0.0 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 4.7 |
| **Total**[[12]](#footnote-13) | **19.8** | **18.1** | **20.6** | **19.0** |

*Source: LFS UDB 2012-2015 (Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic, October 2016)*

It can be assumed that the highest proportion of early school leavers with disability will be among economically inactive population but there is no type of data disaggregated by education.

### Tertiary education

The EU-SILC sample for the target age group (aged 30-34) includes the following number of people reporting activity ‘limitation’ (a proxy for impairment/disability) although the number of missing observations is larger than the number of observations for activity limitation.

Table 14: EU-SILC sample size for the target age group 30-34 versus 30-39

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Age 30-34** | | **Age 30-39** | |
|  | No activity ‘limitation’ | Activity ‘limitation’ | No activity ‘limitation’ | Activity ‘limitation’ |
| **EU sample** | 23,233 | 2,793 | 49,559 | 6,572 |
| **National sample** | 879 | 116 | 1,865 | 293 |

Source: EUSILC UDB 2015 – version of October 2017

Table 15: Completion of tertiary or equivalent education (indicative based on above sample)

Source: EUSILC UDB 2015 – version of October 2017

The survey sample is not sufficient to provide robust trend data disaggregated by gender in the narrow EU2020 target age group. In general, the achievement of tertiary education was higher for women than for men in both disabled and non-disabled groups.

Table 16: Trends in tertiary education by disability (aged 30-34)

Source: EUSILC UDB 2015 – version of October 2017 (and preceding UDBs)

Fluctuations in trends for people with impairments should be treated with caution at the national level. A linear trend line is shown for illustration only (the rapid upward trend merits further investigation, for example in relation to changes in ISCED qualification definitions).

Alternative data on disability and tertiary education provided by the national expert:

The following national LFS data on 30-39-year-olds with disability and tertiary education disaggregated by economic status have been provided on the special request on October 2016 by the Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic.

**Table: PwD aged 30-39 with tertiary education by economic status (%)[[13]](#footnote-14)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **LFS** | **Economically active** | **Employed** | **Unemployed** |
| 2012 | 1,5 | 1,7 | 0,7 |
| 2013 | 3,1 | 2,9 | 3,9 |
| 2014 | 7,0 | 8,2 | 2,1 |
| 2015 | 3,8 | 4,4 | 1,3 |

*Source: LFS UDB 2012-2015 (Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic, October 2016).*

## Poverty and social exclusion data

EU SILC data provides indicators of the key risks for people with disabilities. In addition to household risks of low work intensity, there are risks of low income (after social transfers), and material deprivation. These three measures are combined in the overall estimate of risk. The risks for older people do not include work intensity (Eurostat refers to the age group 0-59 for this measure). The survey does not distinguish ‘activity limitation’ (the proxy for impairment/disability) for children under the age of 16. Relevant data provided by the national expert is added where available.

Table 17: People living in household poverty and exclusion by disability and risk (aged 16-59)

Source: EUSILC UDB 2015 – version of October 2017

Table 18: People living in household poverty and exclusion by disability and gender (aged 16+)

Source: EUSILC UDB 2015 – version of October 2017

Table 19: Overall risk of household poverty or exclusion by disability and age (aged 16+)

Source: EUSILC UDB 2015 – version of October 2017

Table 20: Trends in household risk of poverty and exclusion by disability and age (EU-SILC 2015)

Source: EUSILC UDB 2015 – version of October 2017 (and previous UDB)

Alternative data on disability and risk of poverty or social exclusion provided by the national expert:

The Statistical Office of the SR provides some additional data based on the EU-SILC monitoring.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Selected EU SILC households with disabled members´ indicators (in %) | | | | | | |
| *Indicator* | *EU SILC 2013* | | *EU SILC 2014* | | *EU SILC 2015* | |
| *Disabled* | *Non-disabled* | *Disabled* | *Non-disabled* | *Disabled* | *Non-disabled* |
| Average equivalent disposal income (in €) | 572 | 636 | 584 | 655 | 584 | 629 |
| Low work intensity of household | 14.4 | 6.9 | 12.5 | 7.0 | 12.4 | 5.6 |
| Material deprivation | 30.3 | 18.3 | 29.1 | 18.0 | 28.1 | 14.4 |
| Severe material deprivation | 12.6 | 7.8 | 12.1 | 8.3 | 12.1 | 6.2 |
| Income from work as a part of general income | 61.9 | 84.3 | 64.0 | 86.1 | 64.1 | 86.1 |
| Income from social benefits as a part of general income | 37.2 | 14.6 | 35.4 | 13.0 | 35.3 | 13.0 |
| Households without dependent children | 68.1 | 46.8 | 73.0 | 52.5 | 72,3 | 49,8 |

*Source: Statistical Office of the SR (Informácie, 2015, unpublished document).*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Selected EU SILC individuals with disabilities´ indicators (in %) | | | | | | |
| *Indicator* | *EU SILC 2013* | | *EU SILC 2014* | | *EU SILC 2015* | |
| *Disabled* | *Non-disabled* | *Disabled* | *Non-disabled* | *Disabled* | *Non-disabled* |
| Risk of poverty | 12.3 | 11.2 | 11,2 | 11.4 | 10,9 | 10,5 |
| Material deprivation | 29.9 | 20.0 | 27.8 | 18.9 | 27.9 | 16.3 |
| Severe material deprivation | 12.6 | 8.5 | 11.6 | 8.5 | 12.5 | 6.8 |
| Risk of poverty and social exclusion | 22.7 | 17.0 | 20.5 | 160 | 21.0 | 15.2 |
| Family status  - single  - married  - widow/widower | 13.5  57.2  21.0 | 42.0  50.2  3.4 | 13.6  57.1  21.1 | 37.6  53.0  3.5 | 14.1  56.7  21.0 | 38.5  52..0  3.2 |

*Source: Statistical Office of the SR (Vybrané indikátory, 2016, available at:* [*https://www.employment.gov.sk/sk/rodina-socialna-pomoc/tazke-zdravotne-postihnutie/kontaktne-miesto-prava-osob-so-zdravotnym-postihnutim/)*](https://www.employment.gov.sk/sk/rodina-socialna-pomoc/tazke-zdravotne-postihnutie/kontaktne-miesto-prava-osob-so-zdravotnym-postihnutim/))*.*

# Description of the situation and trends in relation to each target area

General note:

When referring to indicators derived from EU-SILC data it is relevant to note that prevalence estimates for self-reported disability (limitation) in Slovakia are higher than the EU average, notably among older people. This may have some effect on outcome indicators of employment, education and poverty risk. In all sections of this report comparisons are made with administrative data from national sources (which cover a smaller population group and tend to indicate less positive outcomes).

## Employment

Compared to other EU member states, in Slovakia, the EU SILC data indicate a fairly strong employment rate for the general population and for persons declaring some level of impairment (limitation). In fact, the disability employment gap on this measure is proportionally narrower than in most countries and the activity rate appears relatively high. The 2017 EU Alert Mechanism identified structural unemployment in Slovakia as a key challenge, which affects people with disabilities too. Indeed, EU data suggests that while unemployment falls below the EU average for the general population it rises above for people with disabilities. This suggests that there is a need to assess unemployment support policies also from a disability perspective.

The EU SILC data vary to a great extent from the national data – mainly due to different methodological approaches (self-reporting in case of EU SILC, versus survey/ registry of PWD on grounds of the administrative assessment) and different methodology between EU-SILC and LFS (e.g. sample age, sample size, frequency of data collection, weights) and also available data structure.

The data presented in section 2.2 show that in Slovakia most people with disabilities are economically inactive but only a minority are employed (in contrast to total population where most people are employed). According to the national LFS data the tendency of transfer to inactivity has been obvious mostly in the age category 50+. The proportion of working as well as unemployed PwD aged 50+ is still the highest among all age categories. While the total share of working PWD aged 15-29 years was 11.5% in 2015 (compared to 11.3% in 2014), share of those aged 50+ increased to 42.6% (compared to 35.2% in 2014). Similarly, total share of unemployed PWD aged 50+ reached almost 43%, while amongst non-disabled population, the largest share of unemployed was aged between 15-29 years (almost 30%).

A potential explanation for persistent high economic inactivity among people with disabilities is that not much political attention has been paid to this group over the past three years. Instead, the focus was on the long-term unemployed in general. In fact, recent CSRs also point to the problem of long-term unemployment, stating that “It particularly affects marginalised Roma, low-skilled and young people.” (CSR, 2017)

However, legally speaking, most people with disabilities are not long-term unemployed in the sense that they would be registered job-seekers for more than one year. On the contrary, most of them are not registered, i.e. they are economically inactive. The reason for not registering is that there is no incentive to do so – e.g. whereas for other unemployed people, mandatory insurance levies are paid by state on grounds of their registration as job-seekers, these are paid for PWD by state on grounds of their recipiency of disability pension.

Consequently, although in 2016, Slovakia adopted the *Action plan to support integration of long-term unemployed in the labour market*,[[14]](#footnote-15) its measures are focused on the registered long-term unemployed, and therefore they have only a very small impact on PWD outside the labour market. The only exception is the measure No. 6 of the Action plan „to prepare ESIF-funded call for proposals to support provision of individualised employment services for long-term unemployed, including people with disabilities, by agencies of supported employment“.[[15]](#footnote-16)

Nor was the issue of high economic inactivity of PWD addressed in the Concluding observations of the UN Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Instead, these suggested to step up the efforts for the transition from sheltered workshops into the open labour market. .

The data presented in section 2.2 also show one worth mentioning development related just to the sub-group of PWD who are unemployed registered job-seekers, namely that in 2016, after a three-year period of rise, number of disabled registered job-seekers fell down by 16.39%. However, more evidence would be needed to explain this development. Particularly, it is not clear for what reasons so many disabled registered job-seekers dropped out – whether they did so because of getting a job (which could be the case considering that the labour market in Slovakia is currently in a good condition), or they became economically inactive (i.e. they asked for deletion from the register). The counter-argument against the explanation of decreased number of disabled registered job-seekers by their integration into the labour market is that in past three years, no major intentional efforts to re-design active labour market measures to support employment of PWD took place. On the contrary, even the number of paid allowances to set up new workplaces (allowance to set up sheltered workshop/workplace and the self-employment allowance) declined again in the last year (for more details see part 4.1).

To conclude, based on the data describing economic activity of PWD in section 2.2, it is unrealistic to expect that with the current employment rate of PWD (at about 32% according to the SIA) Slovakia could meet the national 2020 target (72%).

## Education

Compared to other EU Member States, the EU SILC data presented in the section 2.3 indicate that Slovakia has a relatively low rate of early school leaving among the general population with a moderate disability equality gap. By contrast, the same data suggests a significant disparity in the tertiary education rate for persons with disabilities, where the disability gap stands out as proportionally wider than would be expected from the EU trend.

Because of the gap the measures proposed in NRP which focuses on educational outcomes, teacher’s salaries, teacher’s continuing education, preschool capacities and the system of dual education are also relevant for persons with disabilities seem also very relevant from the disability perspective.

Early school leavers

According to the EUSILC UDB 2015 data, the proportion of early school leavers with disabilities aged 18-24 is at EU 2020 target. Moreover the proportion of youth aged 18-24 without disabilities is far below the EU 2020 and national targets.

However, according to the EUSILC UDB 2015 data, the proportion of early school leavers seems to be higher among youth with disabilities than in the group of non-disabled young population. It differs in 6.5 percentage points among 18-24-year olds.

To find out reasons of this trend further research would be useful which would be focused on early school leavers with disability by the type and level of disability

On the other hand, according to the LFS data, the number of early school leavers aged 18-24 has been increasing steadily and in 2013 it exceeded the national target of 6%.

The EUSILC UDB 2015 data show much higher proportion of early school leavers than LFS data. With an exception of LFS 2013, the national LFS data have shown the proportion of economically active low-educated (ISCED 0-2) people with disabilities aged 15-29 below 1% since 2012.

Concerning people with disabilities, it should be noted that the LFS data do not bring the specific category on early school leavers with disabilities aged 18-24 (or 18-29). Their proportion can be only assumed based on the proportion of persons with low-education (ISCED 0-2) but these data are not disaggregated by age. Moreover, these LFS data are not complete because the proportion economically inactive persons with disabilities with low education is not available.

Besides, as in section 3.1, the difference between LFS and EU SILC data has methodological reasons (self-reporting in case of EU SILC, versus survey/ registry of PWD on grounds of the administrative assessment, sample age, sample size, frequency of data collection, weights).

In general, early school leaving is not a discussed topic itself in NRP 2017. Rather following reasons for early school leaving are the issues. It can be assumed that early school leavers are mostly people from socially disadvantaged background. Worsening their and their families social conditions might have caused this increase but there is no research on it. Also the lack of access to pre-primary education can cause their gaps in school readiness, worse learning outcomes and cause leaving school early in the end.

**Tertiary education**

Generally, the EUSILC UDB 2015 European and national data show continuing positive trends in tertiary education attainment among persons with disabilities.

Moreover, a surprising trend has been noticed at the national level. The proportion of tertiary educated persons with disabilities exceeds the levels of university/college educated persons without disabilities (PwD aged 30-34 exceeds in 9.7 p.p. and PwD aged 30-39 exceeds in 3.4 p.p.).

At the national level, the proportion of tertiary educated person with disabilities has risen by 11 p.p. (from 33.2 to 44.9) within the period 2014-2015, which has been the steepest increase since 2008. Such a trend has not been noticed among persons without disabilities at the national level nor has it been within the EU data. It is possible that a change in ISCED classification (to include ‘short-cycle’ tertiary courses) has some effect or the trend may be affected by for the decision of persons with disabilities to attend tertiary education rather than remaining unemployed (mainly those without severe disabilities). These hypotheses require further research.

According to the LFS national data on disability and tertiary education there has been an increase of economically active PwD with tertiary education at 5.5 pp in 2012-2014 followed by the decline by 3.2 p.p (from 7% to 3.8%) in 2015.

As it was mentioned in previous sections, the EUSILC UDB data vary in a great extent from the national LFS data mainly due to the different methodology approaches (e.g. sample age, sample size, frequency of data collection, weights)[[16]](#footnote-17) and available data structure.

As among early school leavers, presented national data on education levels comprise only economically active population without disaggregation by age. There has been no specific data on economically inactive population with disabilities provided by the Statistical Office of the SR by October 2016. Specifically, due to these reasons there has been a large difference in proportion of early school leavers with disabilities and PwD with tertiary education between EU-SILC data and the national LFS data.

## Poverty and social inclusion

The 2017 EU Joint Employment Report considered Slovakia to be one of the ‘best performers’ in relation to poverty risk. The EU level indicators suggest a comparatively low rate of relative poverty for persons with disabilities too, before and after social transfers, including for those with more severe impairments (one of the lowest rates in the EU). In-work poverty rate also appears moderately low.[[17]](#footnote-18)

As shown in the graphs in section 2.4, in 2015 in total 19,4% of persons with moderate and 24.7% of persons with severe disabilities in Slovakia lived in households in general risk of poverty and social exclusion. That was above the national average rate among non-disabled persons (15.0% in total), but below the EU average (20.8% in total). Moreover, as shown in the graphs, the general situation of the disabled persons in age of 16-64 in risk of household poverty or social exclusion was slightly increased (from 24.7% in 2014 to 25.5% in 2015).

Differences in the household risk of poverty and social exclusion slightly increased between men and women with disabilities, when by women the rate remained practically the same (20.2% in 2015 compared to 20,3% in 2014) while slight increasing - from 20.64% in 2014 up to 22% in 2015 - by men. The lowest rate of household poverty and social exclusion risk was observed among both non-disabled men (14,9%) and non-disabled women (15,1%) in contradiction to rate of almost 25% of severely disabled people. While situation of non-disabled persons in the household risk of poverty and social inclusion became in 2015 slightly improved in comparison to 2014 (by one percentage point), situation of disabled persons became slightly worsened, mainly by disabled men. This may be explained by a rapid economic growth in Slovakia which was more profitable rather for non-disabled population than for the disabled in 2015.

Situation between 2014 and 2015 has not changed markedly in relation to the most prevalent risk factor of poverty and social exclusion. In both types of households - with and without disabled member/s - a low income contributed to poverty and social exclusion most intensively (14.2% of households with PWD and 10.8% those without). Impact of a low work intensity of households remained comparable to situation in 2014 (13,2% in 2015 in comparison to 13.8% in 2014 by PWD households; and 5.2% in 2014 in comparison to 5,1% in 2014 by households without PWD). We can suppose a positive impact of generally increased employment rate in Slovakia from 65.9% in 2014 to 67.7% in 2015.[[18]](#footnote-19)

Comparably to the general population, the overall risk of household poverty or social exclusion remained higher among PWD in working age (25.5%) in comparison to the older PWD population (14.2%). The latter group was only one out of all compared groups with increased risk of household poverty and social exclusion between 2014 and 2015 (from 24.7% to 25.5%). On the other hand, differences between years 2014-2015 are not very significant and there is no detailed analysis to explain them seriously, mainly, if they are not changes which would be a trend.

# Assessment of policies in place to meet the relevant headline targets

In the following section, we refer to four significant documents from 2016 which have strong impact on policies in each target area (employment, education, and poverty or social inclusion) from a disability perspective, namely:

* The *National Reform Program of the Slovak Republic 2017* (Národný program reforiem Slovenskej republiky 2017; hereinafter only “NRP 2017”) approved in April 2017, and its accompanying Action Plan;
* The *Manifesto of the Government of the Slovak Republic for years 2016-2020* (Programové vyhlásenie vlády SR na roky 2016-2020; hereinafter only “The MG”)[[19]](#footnote-20) approved on 26 April 2016;
* *Concluding observations on the initial report of Slovakia* adopted by the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities at its fifteenth session (29 March - 21 April 2016) (hereinafter only “Concluding observations”);[[20]](#footnote-21)
* The *Report on fulfilment of provisions related to the National disability program 2014-2020[[21]](#footnote-22) for the period 2014-2015 and a draft of its actualisation* (Správa o plnení opatrení vyplývajúcich z Národného programu rozvoja životných podmienok osôb so zdravotným postihnutím na roky 2014-2020 za roky 2014-2015 a návrh na jeho aktualizáciu; hereinafter only “RNDP”).[[22]](#footnote-23)

## Employment

In this section, four developments will be discussed, which are relevant in the context of Europa 2020 employment rate target for Slovakia. These are:

1. preparation of the Action plan on the transition of PWD from sheltered workshops into the open labour market on grounds of the recommendation of the UN Committee,
2. statement of the NRP on the inappropriate structure of the ALMPs;
3. stabilisation of the expenditures to support employment of PWD after a period of sharp decrease;
4. still persistent lack of evaluation studies to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of disability specific ALMPs, and the assessment of these ALMPs in the context of the NRP and the UNCRPD.

***Ad A: preparation of the action plan on transition from sheltered workshops***

The most significant policy development in Slovakia in 2016-2017 with regards to support of employment of PWD has been the initiative of the MOLSaF to adopt the Action plan on the transition of PWD from sheltered workshops into the open labour market. This initiative stems from the recommendation in the Concluding Observations of the UN Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, addressed to Slovakia in April 2016. There might be some synergies between the recommendation, the initiative, and the NRP for 2017.

In particular, the recommendation of the UN Committee on grounds of which the new initiative to adopt the action plan emerged, was as follows:

“*74. The Committee recommends that the State party step up efforts on the transition from sheltered workshops to an open labour market for all. The process must include an action plan, timetable, budget and training for public and* *private sector employers, including on the provision of reasonable accommodation.”[[23]](#footnote-24)*

Similarly to that, the MG also specifically states that ‘*the government will intensify its efforts to include PWD into the labour market, mainly through support of identification of job vacancies in an open labour market.*’

To address this issue, the MOLSaF initiated creation of a working group to prepare the Action plan on the transition of PWD from sheltered workshops to the open labour market (hereinafter “the action plan”), which consists of various stakeholders, including representatives of persons with disabilities, employers, local and regional municipalities, non-governmental initiatives. The aim of the discussions in the working group was to re-define sheltered employment and employment in the open labour market, and propose measures to include as many PWD as possible in the open labour market. The draft of the action plan was prepared by the working group at the end of 2017. Consequently, the draft will be subject to reviews at the ministry and interdepartmental fora. It is likely to come into force in 2018.

***Ad B: inappropriate structure of the ALMPs***

Besides that, the main focus of the NRP for 2017 is on integration of the long-term unemployed into the labour market, and reducing regional disparities. It highlights the positive development in terms of job creation – 2016 was the second most successful year in history.

From the disability perspective, following statement from the NRP seems of high relevance, albeit it does not explicitly mention disability specific ALMPs:

*“The most used instruments to activate the unemployed differ from those most used in foreign countries, and are not targeted on prioritised groups. A larger share of the ALMP expenditure is directed to the short-term unemployed (approximately 60 %), with around 40 % of resources retained for worse employable groups of the long-term unemployed.”*

In this context, the implication of the NRP for the action plan on the transition from sheltered workshops into the open labour market could be that the action plan would also include measures to support integration of those PWD who are outside the labour market for a long time into the open labour market. However, possible outcomes seem in this respect uncertain, because the ministry prefers to focus only on PWD now working in sheltered workshops, leaving those currently out of work aside.

***Ad C: Stabilisation of the expenditures to support employment***

Furthermore, in previous reports on the European Semester 2015/2016 and 2016/2017, we pointed to the problem of dramatic decrease in the expenditure on active labour market policies to support employment of PWD, and in number of newly set up subsidised workplaces. Data for 2016 show that the tendency to decreased expenditure has stopped (see the following table), although the number of newly set up workplaces remained decreasing. Part of the explanation is that the financial support per each workplace has increased as the total labour costs which are a base to calculate the allowances grew. As a result, total expenditure for disability specific ALMPs increased, although the number of newly created workplaces for PWD dropped down again. Furthermore, besides the expenditures on the ALMPs, there was even another foreseen expenditure to specifically support participation of young PWD (and young people leaving foster care facilities) in the labour market. A call for proposals[[24]](#footnote-25) to support transition of young people with disabilities has been financed via ESF and the Youth Guarantee, as well as the state budget. The call has been launched[[25]](#footnote-26) on December 30, 2016 with the total allocation of EUR 15 million.

In short, as is also shown in the following tables, the overall situation in terms of expenditure and the types of available support has slightly improved over the last year, although far more funding goes to the maintenance of jobs than to the creation of the new ones.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The expenditure on ALMP for persons with disabilities in years 2012-2016 (in EUR)** | | | | | |
| *Intervention* | *2012* | *2013* | *2014* | *2015\** | *2016* |
| The allowance to set up a sheltered workshop or a sheltered workplace[[26]](#footnote-27) | 17,657,000 | 14,217,647 | 12,640,458 | 2,929,705 | 1,310,103 |
| The allowance to maintain employees with disabilities at work[[27]](#footnote-28) | 885,000 | 418 569 | 38,786 | 33,049 | 39,544 |
| Self-employment allowance[[28]](#footnote-29) | 4,742,000 | 2,464,961.28 | 431,094 | 390,473 | 385,398 |
| Allowance to cover expenses related to work assistant[[29]](#footnote-30) | 4,288,000 | 4,121,03 | 3,220,722 | 3,255,677 | 4,206,871 |
| The allowance to partially cover operating expenses of sheltered workshops and sheltered workplaces[[30]](#footnote-31) | 13,568,000 | 14,715,025.64 | 20,258,100 | 23,614,157 | 26,633,613 |
| Total | 40,870,000 | 35,937,505 | 22,443,579 | 30,223,061 | 32,575,529 |

*Source: Správa o sociálnej situácii obyvateľstva za rok 2013* a*za rok 2016 [Report on the Social Situation of the Population of Slovak Republic for year 2013 and 2016].[[31]](#footnote-32)*

In 2015, the Central Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family (COLSaF) made certain changes in their reporting. Whereas until 2014 they referred to sums of funding under agreement (incl. money contracted but not spent yet), in 2015 reference was made to actual spending in the period. Consequently, the total sums seem decreased very much in 2015 (especially in case of allowance to set up a sheltered workshop / workplace), although a real decrease in funding was probably not as steep. Therefore, comparison with previous years should be addressed with caution.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of created / subsidised workplaces in years 2012-2015** | | | | |  |
| *Intervention* | *2012* | *2013* | *2014* | *2015* | *2016* |
| The allowance to set up a sheltered workshop or a sheltered workplace | 2,026 | 1,710 | 284 | 545 | 368 |
| The allowance to maintain employees with disabilities at work | 453 | 174 | 31 | 29 | 28 |
| Self-employment allowance | 536 | 296 | 96 | 90 | 75 |
| Allowance to cover expenses related to work assistant | 610 | 623 | 585 | 831 | 990 |
| The allowance to partially cover operating expenses of sheltered workshops and sheltered workplaces | 6,013 | 6,809 | 9,728 | 9,808 | 9,723 |
| Total\* | 3,625 | 2,803 | 991 | 1,307 |  |

*\**The allowance to partially cover operating expenses of sheltered workshop sheltered workplace was not included in the calculation. The reason is that in contrast to other allowances, this is paid to the employer quarterly, so the same workplace can be included in the statistics more than once.

*Source: Správa o sociálnej situácii obyvateľstva za rok 2013* a*za rok 2016 [Report on the Social Situation of the Population of Slovak Republic for year 2013 and 2016]*

***Ad D: lack of evaluation studies***

In terms of the impacts of these measures on labour market participation of PWD, a recent study on the effectiveness of Slovak public employment services and active labour market policies under the ‘Value for Money’ project (IFP, 2016)[[32]](#footnote-33) as the evaluation of policy measures only emphasised that in comparison with other countries of V4[[33]](#footnote-34) as well as the EU, less people with disabilities participate in the labour market, and the employment rate of PWD in Slovakia is among the lowest in the EU. There are no regular or occasional studies focusing on the effectiveness and efficiency of disability specific ALMPs as they were described in the above two tables.

When assessing the disability specific ALMPs in relation to the NRP, one of its statements seems particularly relevant. More specifically, the NRP points to inappropriate focus of the ALMPs on short-term rather than long-term unemployed. Similar tendency of unbalanced focus can also be observed in the disability specific ALMPs, although in this case, it is between technical support versus individualised counselling. As shown in the above two tables, all the allowances defined in the Act No. 5/2004 Col. On Employment Services are related to technical equipment of a new workplace and the operating costs of existing sheltered workshops / workplaces, rather than individualised counselling, job-coaching, supported employment. Even the contribution for a work assistant can only be provided once the person starts a job. Moreover, as reported in previous years, there still has been no financial mechanism to cover the costs for services provided by agencies of supported employment which are non-public providers of employment services especially for persons with disabilities. This was also subject to criticism by the DPOs in the final report of the project “*Podpora spolupráce MNO pri účasti na implementácii a monitoringu uplatňovania Dohovoru OSN o právach osôb so zdravotným postihnutím” (Support of the involvement of the NGOs in the process of implementation and monitoring of the UNCRPD)*, which was coordinated by the Slovak Disability Council as an umbrella DPO in autumn 2015.[[34]](#footnote-35) It is expected that the action plan also addresses this issue. In short, the prioritised target group for the NRP is long-term unemployed, but the response needed for this group and for PWD seem to be the same –individualised employment services and targeted training.

The measures to support employment of PWD are also to be re-designed in the action plan with an aim to fulfil the recommendation of the UN Committee to promote the transition from sheltered workshops into the open labour market. In particular, in current settings, borderline between sheltered and open work environment in Slovakia is blurred, and most sheltered workshops do not in fact fit into what is typically considered segregated work environment. To illustrate that, in 2016, there were 1,570 sheltered workshops, of which only 14 were employing more than 20 employees with disabilities.[[35]](#footnote-36) Still, in order to be eligible for the support within disability specific ALMPs, employers have to claim for the status of sheltered workshop / sheltered workplace. Therefore, the action plan should specify in more detail the criteria for both work environments. It should also propose additional measures to support employment of PWD in the open labour market, with a particular emphasis on supported employment and individualised counselling.

## Education

This part will discuss three main issues that are mostly reflected in NRP and UN Recommendation:

1. Inclusive education of pupils with disabilities with the help of teachers’ assistants (financing);
2. Pre-school capacities;
3. The system of dual education.

***Ad 1: Inclusive education***

It should be stated that the NRP 2017 does not focus explicitly on the inclusive education of pupils with disabilities. This issue is addressed with the regards to the inclusion of “children and pupils with specific needs” and “inclusion of pupils from socially disadvantaged background”.

Still, the inclusive education if pupils with disabilities remains the most important issue of compulsory education in Slovakia in 2017.

Special issues of pupils with disabilities and their inclusion to mainstream schools are discussed in the National Disability Program.

The support of teacher’s assistants and other special education professionals at mainstream preschools and schools remains the most significant tool in inclusion of children and pupils with disabilities.[[36]](#footnote-37)

Although the Ministry financially supports (via municipalities) creation of teachers’ assistant positions within the *measure 4.7.3* of NDP related to the *individual support of children and pupils with disabilities in education* the high demand for teachers’ assistants has not been met yet. It was mainly due to the low budged which does not allow to meet the needs of all applicants.

There were 1,728 teachers’ assistants at mainstream primary schools (public, private, religious) in September 15, 2015. The same number of primary school’s teachers’ assistants was reported also in 2016. But in 2017 this number increased to 1,916. Moreover, there were 116 pre-school teacher’s assistants in 2016, which meant steep decrease since 2015. There were 286 pre-school teacher’s assistants in 2015. The number of pre-school assistants increased to 158 in 2017.[[37]](#footnote-38)

These trends of steadily fulfilment of one of the UN CRPD Committee’s recommendations: “Ensure that all children with disabilities who so require have access to personal assistance and allocate resources for this purpose” was probably caused by the redefinition of financing the teacher’s assistants in § 4a of the amendment of the Act No. 597/2003 on Financing of Primary Schools, Secondary Schools and School Facilities adopted in June 2017. The Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport of the SR together with the Ministry of Interior can allocate funds to public schools for teacher’s assistant personal expenses. The funds are allocated according to the number of pupils with disabilities at public schools, type and level of disability, having allocated funds in previous year and barriers to education (e.g. communication, orientation and adaptation problems, architectonic barriers).

On the other hand, according to the National Council of Persons with Disabilities the Ministry of Education should be obliged to allocate these funds to all applicants whose pupils with disabilities need assistance at schools. For the sustainability of funding of teacher’s assistants, the Ministry of Education proposed in the document “The Objectification Model of Number of Professional (Non-teaching) Staff at School” to gradually raise schools’ funds for teacher’s assistants’ wages so that the number of successful applicants will be close to 100%.

Moreover, the National Disability Council suggested to the Ministry to set out clear rules for teacher’s assistant’s duties, including his/her care of pupil with disability personal needs in accordance with the disability during lessons. This suggestion was partially accepted. The Ministry sets these rules in the methodical instruction.[[38]](#footnote-39)

***Ad 2: Pre-school capacities***

According to the NRP 2017 the preschool capacities continues to be an issue in mainstream pre-school education but again, without any specification to children with disabilities. The overall participation in early childhood education and care still lags behind the EU average. The goal is to reach a 95% participation rate of 4-5-year-olds in pre-school education by 2020.[[39]](#footnote-40)

But the number of unsuccessful preschool applicants increased from 1,679 to 13,482 with slight the decline to 12,486 in 2016 in the period of 2004-2015. The published data do not show how many applications for admission of children with disabilities pre-schools receive, what number they reject and for what reasons.

With regards to the UN CRPD Committee recommendation “Ensure available, accessible and inclusive preschool education for all children with disabilities”, lack of pre-school capacities is one of the reasons of low attendance of children with disabilities in mainstream preschools. According to the Statistical Yearbook,[[40]](#footnote-41) there were 496 children with disabilities attending mainstream pre-primary education in September 2016. Compared to 2015 it was decrease in 96 children. In 2017 there, the number from 2016 increased to 550 children. On the other hand, the number of children in special pre-schools has doubled in 10 years since 2006 to 1,416 children.

Parents prefer special preschools mainly due to their better readiness for children with various specific needs.

Other barriers in inclusion mainstream preschools are the lack of teacher’s assistants in preschools and lack of teachers trained in the issues of pupils with disabilities inclusive education.

A slight improvement in relation to the inclusion support (at pre-primary level) has been made within the new State Educational Program for children with disabilities at pre-primary education. It was prepared by the [National Institute for Education](http://www.statpedu.sk/en/Home.alej) in cooperation of special education experts and released on May 2017 by the Ministry of Education, Science and Sport. This disability-specific program has been based on general State Educational Program for pre-primary education which came into force in September 2016.[[41]](#footnote-42) The State Educational Program for children with disabilities specifies the educational process of children with regards to various types of disabilities at special preschools, special classes at mainstream preschools and in individual integration at mainstream preschools.[[42]](#footnote-43)

This new Programme met with lots of criticism among school professionals. The Slovak Chamber of Teachers in cooperation with other teachers’ professional organisations and Platform of Families of Children with Disabilities criticized the content of this Programme: its strict settings do not help inclusion and create barriers in mainstream preschool accessibility which can result in segregation of children with disabilities. In fact, many mainstream preschools do not have capacities to create inclusive environment for education of children with various types of disabilities in line with all requirements of this State Educational Programme for Children with Disabilities.[[43]](#footnote-44) To be allowed to educate a child with disabilities, the pre-school facilities now have to employ teachers’ assistants as well as other specialists in relation to the type of disability of the child, and teachers’ education in disability issues should be ensured as well.

***Ad 3: The system of dual education***

According to the NRP 2017 only 1% of all secondary vocational students joined the system of dual education. In NRP 2017 it still continues to be addressed without any explicit reference to disability topics.[[44]](#footnote-45)

In relation to the disability issues it is questionable to what extent students with disabilities are able to benefit from the system of dual education. In the upcoming period, the NDP with its targets and measures remains the key policy document in this area.

To conclude, any more detailed assessment of developments in pre-school education as well as the developments in the system of dual education from disability perspective is challenging. There has been a lack of available data concerning preschool education (such as the number (or proportion) of accepted applications of children with disabilities) and dual education (such as the number of pupils with disabilities joined in the dual education).

Regarding the pre-school education, it should be noted that according, to the Statistical Yearbook data, parents prefer special preschool education for their child with disabilities than mainstream preschools. It can be assumed that it is mainly due to the lack of mainstream pre-school capacities as well as gaps mainly in spatial (e.g. architectonical barriers) and staff conditions (e.g. staff readiness to teach and take care of a child with disabilities, lack of teachers’ assistants) in mainstream preschools.

In primary education, despite the gaps in financing the education and lack of teachers’ assistants the number of pupils with disabilities in mainstream primary schools has doubled in 10 years since 2006 to 26,781. In September 2017 further increase to 27,868 pupils with disabilities was recorded. Mostly pupils with developmental learning disorders are those who prefer to choose mainstream primary schools. They make more than a half of all pupils with disabilities.[[45]](#footnote-46)

## Poverty and social inclusion

With regard to social inclusion, the NRP 2017 constitutes in chapter No. 4.3.2 “Social inclusion” some tasks in both, social assistance for PWD (to improve the effectiveness of the instruments for social integration of PWD - mainly an increase of care allowance to the net minimum wage until 2020, particularly for the working-age recipients), as well as in the area of social services for care dependent persons (adoption and implementation of a new social service co-funding system based upon a care dependency level). In order to fulfil these intentions, the Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Family of the Slovak Republic took some steps, namely:

* Since March 2017 a new type of social service titled a childcare facility for a child under the age of three/nursery service (regardless of having a disability or not), was legally introduced. The solution to bring the nursery service into the competence of the MOLSAF (rather than the Ministry of Health of the Slovak Republic) mirrors a governmental priority to approach the issue primarily as a matter of work-life balance rather than care for small children only. Although young families with children with disabilities are by no means excluded from the adopted service scheme, it is not clear yet, whether and what kind of supportive and additional measures[[46]](#footnote-47) should be adopted to allow their participation. In the first half of 2017 only two nursery service providers were registered in the Central registry of social services´ providers.[[47]](#footnote-48)
* The update of the activities of the “*working group on* *social services*” (since March 2016 up to June 2017) focused on preparation of a fundamental amendment of the Act on social services. The amendment will cover mainly new funding rules in social services for care dependent persons. These legislative changes should be finished in 2017 and the amendment of the act is expected to come into force from 2018.
* The activities of the *national projects*: (1) following the national project focused on deinstitutionalisation of traditional residential services for care dependent persons in the programming period 2007-2013, the ministry is finishing preparation of a new DI project in the current programming period to continue in this process and to transform the pilot experience into the more systematic one (to include into the DI process more long-term care residential providers). (2) At the same time, it plans to launch a new project which will be aimed at systematic support of quality in the social services. (3) The national project to support funding of home care service has been running since early 2016 with its termination in July 2018.

Similarly to the NRP 2017, the MG 2016-2020 also sets as a priority an optimisation and better targeting of *disability related financial allowances* (direct payments), including the revision of the health and needs assessment procedures to enable maximum social inclusion of persons with disabilities. In relation to that, since March 2017 amount of a disability nursing allowance (care allowance to care-givers for persons with disabilities aged 6+) has been increased, and the safeguard limit on the income of cared for persons has been increased, too. There is a plan to increase the care allowance up to the net minimum wage until 2020, particularly for the working-age recipients to improve their social and economic status and social rights.

Other provisions are focused to area of *social services*, mainly long-term care services for care dependent persons, namely:

* the Government will pay particular attention to the care of older persons, especially to effective linking health and social care services (long-term care services);
* there remains an effort to introduce a single medical and social needs assessment procedure in order to enhance effectiveness;
* the process of deinstitutionalisation will be continuing;
* remuneration of employees in social services will be addressed, since the employees in social services belong to the least paid workers overall in Slovakia.

In December 2016 the Slovak Government approved the first report on implementation of the *NDP for years 2014-2015 and its updating for period up to 2020.* The report provides information from all relevant stakeholders about their supportive programs and provisions in all areas covered by the National Disability Program. Moreover, the report reflects on the UN CRPD *Concluding Observations* andincorporates some new disability-related goals and provisions for the coming years. Next report will be prepared from March 2018.

Concerning the area of social inclusion and support of independent living, the report contains commitments to support home- and community-based services in all regions (in accordance with recommendations No. 56, 58 of the Concluding observations of the UN Committee for Human Rights of Persons with Disabilities, 2016[[48]](#footnote-49)). Moreover, recommendation No. 26 became a basis for a new NDP measure dealing with the early diagnosis and interventions for children with disabilities. The UN Committee recommended to Slovakia “*to provide and implement a timetable to ensure that the implementation of the deinstitutionalization process is expedited, including by putting in place specific additional measures to ensure that community-based services are strengthened for all persons with disabilities, in particular women with disabilities and older persons with disabilities. Furthermore, the State party should ensure that the use of European structural and investment funds complies with article 19 and that new follow-up national action plans on the transition from institutional settings to community-based support are initiated with the comprehensive involvement of organizations of persons with disabilities and civil society organizations, including in the area of monitoring. The Committee also recommends that the State party no longer allocate resources from the national budget to institutions and that it reallocate resources into community-based services in accordance with the investment priorities of the European Regional Development Fund (art. 5.9 (a) of European Union regulation No. 1303/2013)*” (Article No. 56, Concluding Observation, 2016).

Correspondingly, in the Commission Staff Working Document – CRS 2017 is stated, that “*The long-term care system remains in Slovakia underdeveloped*” (Commission SWD, 2017, p. 24) and progress from institutional care to community based one is too slow, including still insufficient support for independent living.

In accordance with the abovementioned statements and recommendations the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development of the Slovak Republic continues through the EFRD, namely the Integrated Regional Operational Program its financial support of deinstitutionalisation of the existed social services facilities, with an aim to support their reconstruction and modernisation. In May 2017 the call for deinstitutionalisation projects´ applications was issued and some new call for applications to support community-based innitiatives is prepared since March 2018.[[49]](#footnote-50) Another DI initiative refers the ESF, namely to the Operational Program Human Resources through which totally 96 social services facilities will be supported in their transformational process by the national project “*Deinstitutionalisation of social services facilities – Support of transformational teams*”, up to 2023. Currently, there are some finalising administrative procedures to launch it as a continuation of the DI national project from previous years.[[50]](#footnote-51)

Despite some improvements in the field of deinstitutionalisation and community-based care in Slovakia, a clear national strategy of deinstitutionalisation is missing. Current and forthcoming DI initiatives are rather project- than systematic-based. Therefore, a need to adopt a Strategic Framework on developing social services up to 2030 in Slovakia, was highlighted in the document “The National priorities for improving of social services in years 2015-2020” (National, 2014)[[51]](#footnote-52) and remains still topical.

## Synergies between developments in the different areas

Slovakia makes some efforts to sustain some synergies between different policy areas which might have an impact on situation of PWD, namely:

* The proposal of the *Action Plan on The Transition from Sheltered Workshops to the Open Labour Market* contains a measure to conduct a research on the participation of people living in residential social care settings in the labour market in context of deinstitutionalisation of social services.
* *Synergies between parenting and working policies* (work-life balance)

To increase employment participation of young parents (including young parents with children with disabilities) some reconciliation measures were and will be adopted. Since January 2016 an amount of the allowance for child care provided by non-public providers was increased from 230€/monthly up to 280€/monthly. Moreover, there is an ambition to set up early childhood education facilities for children under the age of three as a new type of social service since January 2017 (for more details see section 4.3).

* *Synergies between education and work (the Dual education)*

As mentioned also in the previous report, there is a space to interlink education and work and support the transition of young people with disabilities from school to work within the dual education system. However, after the first year of this scheme, it is not clear how pupils with disabilities benefited of it.

Some initial steps have been done to improve *synergies between social services, health care and education in* the *early intervention system.* This issue has been raised in the Concluding observations in a following way:

“*25. The Committee is concerned that there is a significant lack of early intervention and early diagnosis services in the health, social and educational areas and that financial support for families with children with disabilities requiring early intervention is insufficient.*

*26. The Committee recommends that the State party develop a holistic and comprehensive network of health and social care services for the early diagnosis and intervention for children with disabilities, in close consultation with their representative organizations, and increase financial support for their families using public resources.”*

In September 2016 the *Platform on families of children with disabilities (Platforma rodín detí so zdravotným znevýhodnením)* was set up and next, since 2017 the *Association of providers and supporters of early intervention services (Asociácia poskytovateľov a podporovateľov včasnej intervencie)[[52]](#footnote-53)* has been registered and started its activities. Up to June 2017 the Association has brought together totally 15 providers of early intervention service and started to prepare quality standards for this type of social service, including personal standards with an aim to bring together experts from health, social and education systems.

Besides that, the measures to include long-term unemployed in the labour market should be also open to economically inactive people – a major group of persons with disabilities in terms of their economic status.

# Review of the European Semester from a disability perspective

## Progress on disability-specific Country Specific Recommendations (CSRs)

There were no disability specific CSRs for Slovakia in 2017 and disability was not mentioned in the Commission’s recommendation.[[53]](#footnote-54) There is reference in the preamble to ‘difficulties in introducing individualised support to the long-term unemployed and to vulnerable groups due among others to a high caseload’ (p.4) and this policy challenge should be considered very relevant to persons with disabilities (see below).

## Progress on other CSRs from a disability perspective

**CSR Recommendation 2:**

“*Improve activation measures for disadvantaged groups, including by implementing the action plan for the long-term unemployed and by providing individualised services and targeted training. Enhance employment opportunities for women, especially by extending affordable, quality childcare. Improve the quality of education and* *increase the participation of Roma in inclusive mainstream education”.*

Apparently, the main challenges as well as the recommendation in the area of employment and education remain more or less the same over the last year. It is also relevant to introduce better targeted activation measures for PWD, especially in relation to the UN concluding observations calling for an action plan of transition from sheltered to an open labour market (for more details see section 4.1). Individualised services are needed very much for persons with disabilities, since supported employment is not funded within active labour market measures at all.[[54]](#footnote-55)

In relation to the education outcomes and quality, according to the current legislation the teachers in special schools and special classes for children and pupils with disabilities are classified into the higher salary class 2 with the salary difference of approx. 40 EUR in average in comparison to salaries at mainstream school. On the other hand, the teachers in mainstream class can receive extra money when the proportion of individually integrated pupils with disabilities reaches at least 30% of all pupils in the class. There are no data on the effectiveness of educational process in both special and mainstream education.

Despite the teachers’ salaries in both special and mainstream schools have been gradually increasing it is questionable whether this increase makes the profession of special education for new teachers more attractive. The salaries of new teachers are still below the national average of 912 EUR in 2016 and 921 EUR in Q. 1st – 2nd 2017.[[55]](#footnote-56)

Educational outcomes improvement relates to all pupils in general, being one of the most discussed issues of education system in Slovakia. The educational outcomes have been measured by various testing procedures. The international comparison is offered by the *PISA testing.* Pupils with disabilities (and other special educational needs) at special primary schools and special classes of mainstream schools were included into the PISA 2015 testing. Their tests were called “Une Heure”, took 60 minutes and were easier to fill out. The pupils had to be able to fill out the tests independently.[[56]](#footnote-57)

In the exam “Testing 9 – 2017” totally 36 535 pupils were tested. The proportion of pupils with disabilities has increased in comparison to Testing 9 2016. In 2017 pupils with disabilities made 8.4% of all tested pupils (absolutely 3,054 pupils with disabilities).[[57]](#footnote-58)

External part of Maturita 2016/2017 (School Leaving Exam) was written by 39,670 secondary school students. Four percent of them (absolutely 1,592) were students with disabilities.[[58]](#footnote-59)

There are neither published outcomes specifically related to pupils with disabilities in PISA, nor from the exams *“Testing 9*” and *Maturita*.

To sum up, based on the above, the professional development, raising awareness on disability issues among teachers, as well as the support of teacher’s assistants and their professional development stay the most important challenges to support mainstream education of children and youth with disabilities.

## Assessment of disability issues in the Country Report (CR)

The 2017 Country Report included some direct references to disability policies, such as the increase in carers’ or severe disability allowances, and with cross reference to the UN CRPD Committee recommendations on the slow pace of progress in deinstitutionalisation. This type of cross-referencing may be considered a good example of joined up analysis between EU and UN observers. However, disability is not referred to directly in several key themes where the situation of persons with disabilities is of note.

*Employment*

The Country Report on the one hand highlights some improvements “on the back of an economic recovery”. On the other hand, it points to persistently high unemployment especially among the low-skilled, young workers, marginalised Roma and mothers with young children. Unemployment is also concentrated in central and eastern parts of the country.

The CR states that “*LTU – long-term unemployment is a major risk for the low-skilled and young.”* There is a lack of data to verify whether disability is another risk factor. However, as mentioned in part 3.1, a large group of PWD remains economically inactive rather than unemployed.

Besides that, the CR refers to a recent study on the effectiveness of Slovak public employment services and active labour market policies under the ‘Value for Money’ project (IFP, 2016)[[59]](#footnote-60) as “a step forward in terms of improving the evaluation of policy measures”. From the disability perspective, the study emphasises that in comparison with other countries of V4[[60]](#footnote-61) as well as the EU, less people with disabilities participate in the labour market, and the employment rate of PWD in Slovakia is among the lowest in the EU.

The low capacity of public employment services to provide personalised services may be one of the explanations why most PWD remain economically inactive rather than registered job-seekers. Therefore, it is worth considering to including people with disabilities, especially those living in the institutions, in the list of “those furthest from the labour market” in the Country Report.

***Education***

Within the *education area* the CR 2017 mainly points to the lacks in inclusive education, deterioration of students’ basic skills and persistence of the educational inequalities, low participation in early childhood education and care, early school leaving rate, attractiveness of teaching profession and labour market relevance of vocational education and training (dual vocational education and training). Neither of these topics reveals specific disability-related issues.

*Inclusive education* is very actual and often discussed issue but only within the context of misplacement of children to special schools solely on their socially disadvantaged background. According to the State School Inspection and the Public Advocate of Rights there have been some practical difficulties in putting the reform into practice, e.g. the use of appropriate screening tests, re-diagnosis, placement back from special schools into mainstream schools, securing parental consent. Extra pedagogical staff to support the reform is planned to be added by two ESF projects.

Students’ *basic skills deterioration* and remaining the educational inequalities has been discussed in CR 2017 in the context of PISA. Average performance is significantly below the EU average. The proportion of low achievers is high mostly among the pupils from social disadvantaged background. As it was mentioned in chapter 4.2, there are no published PISA results of pupils with disabilities.

*Low participation in early childhood education and care* is discussed in CR 2017 mainly within the context of Roma children (approx. at 34%). Generally, the participation rate in early childhood education and care among whole population of pre-school aged children is below the EU average (approx. 77.4% in 2014). The accessibility of mainstream early childhood education and care for children with disabilities (for details see chapter 4.2) is not mentioned in CR 2017, chapter Education.

Slovakia belongs to the states with the lowest *rate of early school leavers,* but regional disparities are high and the rate has been increasing since 2010. Mostly children from socially disadvantaged background are expected to leave school early, what causes their worse labour market prospects.

According to the CR 2017 some initial steps have been take in making the *teaching profession more attractive*. Teacher’s salaries have been lower in international comparison, and nationally compared to salaries of workers with similar qualification levels. In September 2016 salaries increased by 6% and a further increase by 6% agreed in collective bargaining is expected in September 2017. The CR 2017 does not deal with the salaries of teachers at special schools (for details see the part 5.2). Improvements in initial teacher’s training, practical training and the further professional development also in the disability issues are needed.

The *dual vocational education and training* started its second year of implementation. According to the CR 2017 the interest of employers in dual education is growing but it does not seem to be attractive for pupils or to certain schools. The data published in CR 2017 show that in 2016/2017 school year 293 companies signed up to the scheme offering 2,763 apprenticeship places. Due to the low demand only 1,121 contracts were signed in 142 companies. There are no data related to participation of pupils with disabilities in this system.

The Country Report deals mainly with the education of children and pupils from socially disadvantaged background.

*Social protection*

The CR 2017 pays special attention to a long-term care system in Slovakia which has still been considered underdeveloped. The document highlights some positive steps adopted in public support of informal caring in home settings (increasing rate of care allowance for care – givers; increasing the safeguard limit on the income of care – takers; and providing state pension insurance for informal carers without any time limit). On the other hand, the CR 2017 raises a critique referring to only a slow transition from institutional to community-based care and still not sufficient support for independent living of PWD following relevant UN Committee´ s Concluding Observations.

Despite the fact that social services provided to care dependent persons in their natural (home) settings are declared as a national priority in social services (National, 2014) the home care services remain only a weak element of the system of community-based services. Thanks to national projects funded from ESF which have been focused on support of home care services for care dependent persons, a total number of recipients has increased since 2015. However, access to home care services for all in need has been still limited and residential care has been increasingly preferred.

# Assessment of the structural funds ESIF 2014-2020 or other relevant funds in relation to disability challenges

The *Operational Program Human Resources* which covers all relevant fields, namely employment, education, as well as social inclusion issues, has become the most important program from the disability perspective for period 2014-2020.

The Operational Programme is run under the auspices of Monitoring Committee, and its commissions for different priority axes. One of the members of the Commission for priority axes 2, 3, 4[[61]](#footnote-62) at the Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Family, is a representative of Slovak Disability Council as an umbrella organisation associating organisations of people with various types of disabilities.

Worth mentioning is ESF call “*Education of representatives of disabled peoples’ organisations on the rights of people with disabilities*’’,[[62]](#footnote-63) within the investment priority 4.1, and specific target 4.1.2. Indicative allocation is EUR 500,000. The call was announced on June 9, 2017, and the deadline for the proposals in the 1st round was September 21, 2017.

1. **Examples of national projects in employment area**

*National project: Youth Guarantee*

Slovakia has implemented youth guarantee programme to address high rate of youth unemployment. Report on the implementation of youth guarantee in 2015[[63]](#footnote-64) does not specifically mention young people with disabilities but, based on the data from COLSaF, participation of young people with disabilities in related measures can be estimated as follows:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **All participants** | **Disabled participants** | **Financial allocation (eur)** |
| Praxou k zamestnaniu / Through traineeship to employment | 290 | 4 | 750 616 |
| Absolventská prax / Graduates practice | 2 203 | 9 | 1 203 811 |
| Total | 2 493 | 13 | 1 954 427 |

*Source: COLSaF,[[64]](#footnote-65) 2015.*

*Note: There have been additional measures within the Youth Guarantee since 2016. For these, the data have not been available yet.*

Apart from that, a call for proposals was launched to specifically support transition of young people with disabilities from school to work with the total budget of EUR 15 million.[[65]](#footnote-66) This specific measure might have positive impact on increased participation of young PWD in the Youth Guarantee, and in the labour market.

*National project: Support of Employment of Persons with Disabilities (Podpora zamestnávania občanov so zdravotným postihnutím).[[66]](#footnote-67)*

The national project is running in period 01.01.2015 – 31.12.2019, and is operated by the Central Office of the Labour, Social Affairs and Family. It covers all Slovak regions except of the Bratislava region. The total budget allocated is 50 mil €. The project is a continuation of similar national projects such as Support of maintenance of persons with disabilities at work[[67]](#footnote-68) (Podpora udržania pracovných miest občanov so zdravotným postihnutím). This project is specifically focussed on people with disabilities and is designed to cover expenses of active labour market measures for persons with disabilities in accordance with the act on employment services. Participation of PWD in these measures as well as funding was shown in the tables in part 4.1.

1. **Examples in education area**

*National Project: School open for all[[68]](#footnote-69)*

The call for this project was released on October 5, 2016 by the Ministry of Education,Science, Research and Sport within the Operational Programme “Human Resources”, the priority axis “Education”. The project will be operated by The Methodology and Pedagogy Centre. The specific goal is to “increase inclusion and equal access to quality education and improve children and pupils’ outcomes and competencies”. The target groups include: children and pupils of primary schools, including those with special education needs; teachers; specialists at schools and parents.

*“Dopytovo – orientovaný projekt”: V základnej škole úspešnejší [More successful at primary school][[69]](#footnote-70)*

The call for proposal was released on December 30, 2016 by the Ministry of Education,Science, Research and Sport within the Operational Programme “Human Resources”, the priority axis “Education”. The specific goal is to “increase inclusion and equal access to quality education and improve children and pupils’ outcomes and competencies”. Eligible institutions are primary schools and municipalities. Primary schools for pupils with disabilities are eligible only for the activity connected with financing teachers’ assistants for pupils with disabilities. The target group include pupils of primary schools including pupils with special educational needs.

**Examples in the social inclusion area**

There are some project-based activities, namely:

1. following the terminated national project focused on *deinstitutionalisation of traditional residential services for care dependent persons* in the programming period 2007-2013, preparation for continuation of the project for period up to 2020 is finalised;
2. a new national project focusing on *quality issues in social services* is under preparation, too;
3. the national project to support funding of *home care service*[[70]](#footnote-71) has been running since early 2016 with termination in June 2018.

# Recommendations

As has been stated in previous sections, the basic strategic documents influencing disability developments in Slovakia (the Manifesto of the Government of Slovak Republic, The National Reform Program, even so the CSR and the SWD), do not directly refer to disability related issues. Instead, other target groups have become political priorities for the upcoming year (primarily the unemployed youth, the long-term unemployed, the low-skilled and the Roma). On the other hand, in Slovakia, there are already some strategic documents in force, which address explicitly disability issues, mainly the *National Disability Program.* The Programidentifies the main priorities for disability policies up to 2020, detailed commitments for different public authorities and other stakeholders and proposes mechanism to monitor and evaluate progress in meeting these commitments.

Taking into account above mentioned national documents which frame public policy in Slovakia, we recommend:

In the *area of* *employment:*

* To address high rate of economic inactivity among PWD, and especially those living in institutions, by including these groups in the priority target groups of employment policies, as well as EU funded measures to support participation of the long-term unemployed in the labour market.
* To ensure that these measures are also open for people who are outside the labour market for long, irrespective of the duration of their status as registered job-seekers (for more details, see section 3.1)
* To introduce additional measures to promote individualised counselling, job coaching, supported employment for PWD (for more details, see section 4.1, Ad B)
* To increase investments in the support of workplace adaptations and setting up workplaces for PWD (for more details see section 4.1, Ad C)
* To promote systemic / targeted approach in ensuring better access of PWD to the open labour market by adoption and implementation of the Action Plan on the Transition of PWD from Sheltered workshops into the Open Labour Market and its measures, in line with the recommendation of the UN Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (see section 4.1, ad A)
* To assess the efficiency and effectiveness of disability specific ALMPs as a starting point for potential adjustments in order to increase labour market participation of PWD (for more details, see section 4.1, Ad D).

In the *area of education*:

* To improve data collection with regards to mainstream pre-school education, e.g. the number of applications of children with disabilities in total vs. the number of rejected applications, reasons of rejection, etc. and the number of pupils with disabilities in the system of dual vocational education (for more details see section 4.2, Ad 2 and Ad 3).
* To strengthen financial support of teachers’, special education teachers’ and teachers’ assistants’ and professional development support (mainly related to the disability issues) remains one of the main challenges. .(for more details see section 4.2, Ad 1 and Ad 2)
* to include pupils with disabilities in the CSR in context of inclusive education, i.e. “*increase the participation of Roma,* ***as well as pupils with disabilities and in particular those with intellectual disabilities*** *in inclusive mainstream education.’’* (for more details see section 4.2, Ad 1)

In the *area of social inclusion:*

* To speed up the use of the ESIF funding for *deinstitutionalisation of social services, as well as implementation and evaluation of quality standards in social services (see section 4.3).*
* To prepare and adopt a *new comprehensive system of disability assessment* to create a common ground for assessing the disability consequences in people’s lives and to provide them with comprehensive rather than fragmented public support (see section 4.3).
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