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The [Academic Network of European Disability experts](http://disability-europe.net/) (ANED) was established by the European Commission in 2008 to provide scientific support and advice for its disability policy Unit. In particular, the activities of the Network support the development of the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 and practical implementation of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in the EU.

This country report has been prepared as input for the European Semester from a disability perspective.

*Note:*

*The statistics provided in October 2017 are based on the EU-SILC 2015. This is the most recent microdata available to researchers for analysis from Eurostat. This report may be updated as new data becomes available.*
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# Summary of the overall situation and challenges

The far-reaching policy challenges and questions raised by the 2016 ‘Brexit’ referendum are only beginning to be addressed and, in the case of disability policies, hardly discussed. There remains grave political uncertainty about future policy direction and harmonisation of national policies in relation to EU strategies or the single market. Article 50 TFEU was triggered in March 2017 with the intention to leave the Union towards the end of the current budget period in 2019 (possibly with a transitional period thereafter). We assume continued UK participation in the European Semester cycle until at least that point. In 2017, the main focus for the Country Specific Recommendations has remained unchanged for the past two years.

Following a long period of deferment, the UK has now completed its first cycle of dialogue with the UN Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. This has raised a number of recommendations relevant to achieving the EU2020 goals, and reinforcing the findings of the UN Committee’s investigation into claims of systematic rights violation arising from national welfare reforms. Devolved regional government is likely to become more significant in some areas of disability policy making, notably in Scotland.

The employment situation remains paradoxical. The general employment rate is well above the EU average but the disability employment rate is below the EU average.

As noted in previous reports, the UK Government publishes excellent and reliable official statistics on disability and employment, and sets a target to halve the disability employment gap. The measures to address this are outlined in the 2017 NRP but present significant policy challenges. Supply side policies are not sufficiently matched by demand side policies.

Young disabled people are over-represented among early school leavers and those who are NEET or without tertiary educational qualifications in adulthood. There is a need to ensure that they benefit fully from investments in basic skills, apprenticeships and the widening of participation in higher education.

There are wide equality gaps for disabled people at risk of household poverty, particularly for people of working age, and including those in work. This risk is underlined by major reforms of the disability benefit system and employment activation policies. National and international concern about the consequences of austerity policies for disabled people has been heightened by the uncertainties and economic consequences of Brexit. Strong and supportive social policies are needed to reinforce the position of disabled people and other marginalised groups during this transition.

# 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-1)** |
| Employment | 75% of the 20-64 year-olds to be employed | To halve the disability employment gap |
| Education | Reducing the rates of early school leaving below 10% | No target in NRP |
| At least 40% of 30-34–year-olds completing third level education | No target in NRP |
| Fighting poverty and social exclusion | At least 20 million fewer people in or at risk of poverty and social exclusion | Existing numerical targets of the 2010 Child Poverty Act and Child Poverty Strategy 2011-2014 |

Relevant disability targets from national strategies or sources:

The UK remains the only EU Member State not to publish headline targets in the Europe 2020 framework.

In August 2015 the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions announced a Government target to halve the employment gap between disabled and non-disabled people, equivalent to ‘getting 1 million more disabled people into work’.[[2]](#footnote-2) This commitment appeared to be based on research published by Scope in 2014 under a similar title,[[3]](#footnote-3) and by the Trades Union Congress in 2015.[[4]](#footnote-4) It is not clear whether this target refers to Great Britain or to the whole of the United Kingdom. The commitment is prominent in the 2017 NRP, although not quantified as a target.

The current national disability strategy *Fulfilling Potential: making it happen*[[5]](#footnote-5) was published in 2013, together with an Action Plan[[6]](#footnote-6) and an ‘Outcomes and indicators framework’ in Annex, which refers to headline and supporting indicators on education, employment and income (see below). These were further defined, and populated with data, in a separate Technical Annex document,[[7]](#footnote-7) updated under the previous Coalition Government in September 2014.[[8]](#footnote-8) There were strategy commitments to policy actions under each heading in the Action Plan but not quantifiable targets. No updates have been published since 2014.

The relevant strategy indicators were similar to the EU2020 indicators in the following respects:

**Employment** - ‘The employment rate gap between disabled and non-disabled people’

**Education** - ‘The gap in educational attainment between disabled and non-disabled young people at three key stages – GSCE, A-Level (or equivalent), and degree level’.

Amongst the supporting indicators, the following relevant items are in development:

* ‘the proportion of 16 year olds in full-time education’;
* ‘the proportion of young people in higher education at age 19’;
* ‘students who do not continue in higher education after their first year’;
* ‘young people Not in Education Employment or Training (NEET)’.

**Income** - ‘The gap between the proportion of individuals in families where at least one person is disabled living in low income, and individuals in families where no-one is disabled living in low income’, and, ‘The gap between the proportion of children living in families in low income with a disabled member, and children living in families in low income where no-one is disabled’.

The Scottish Government published its Delivery Plan on the CRPD in December 2016, following pubic consultation.[[9]](#footnote-9) This covers the period to 2021 and includes a section on ‘Measuring progress’ although it does not include actual measures. There are commitments to consult with disabled people’s organisations on suitable targets for workforce participation.

The Disability Strategy of the Northern Ireland Executive 2012-2015 (extended to March 2017) did include a baseline indicator set, although without quantifiable targets.[[10]](#footnote-10)

The Welsh Government maintains a Framework for Action on Independent Living as part of its Strategic Equality Plan, for which Outcome Measures were published in 2014-15.[[11]](#footnote-11) These included some measures of employment rates and access to services.

### 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.[[12]](#footnote-12) 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 they have been ‘limited because of a health problem in activities people usually do’.[[13]](#footnote-13) 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 UK disability prevalence estimates fall below the EU28 average in all categories. This might affect the estimation of 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.[[14]](#footnote-14) 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.).

In the UK, the cross-sectional EU-SILC data has been collected from the sample of the national Family Resources Survey (FRS) since 2012, before which it came from the sample of the General Household Survey or General Lifestyle Survey. Since 2015 all of the longitudinal data used by EU-SILC comes from the FRS sample.

## 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:

In addition to the FRS/SILC survey, relevant data on employment is available from the quarterly national Labour Force Survey (LFS). These data are for Great Britain.[[15]](#footnote-15) The questionnaire prompt for the disability section was altered in 2010 and the wording of the question was changed in 2013. This affects the comparability of historical data.[[16]](#footnote-16) The 2010 change raised national prevalence estimates for disabled people, resulting in an 8 per cent increase in their reported economic activity. The 2013 change was designed to provide more accurate estimates in line with the Equality Act definition of disability, and is also in line with the SILC questionnaire – referring to people with a ‘(current) physical or mental health condition(s) or illnesses lasting or expected to last 12 months or more; and the condition(s) or illness(es) reduce their ability to carry out day-to-day activities’. The new LFS methodology indicates larger equality gaps than previously reported.

The last update to the national disability strategy *Fulfilling Potential* was in 2014. This showed that the revised LFS methodology produced closely comparable estimates with the FRS/SILC estimates for the same year.[[17]](#footnote-17) The Framework included a number of subsidiary employment indicators,[[18]](#footnote-18) explained in our 2015 report but not since updated.

The most up to date source is the Office for National Statistics (ONS) quarterly release of *Labour market status of disabled people*, published as part of the general *UK Labour Market* release (Table A08), using quarterly LFS data. This covers the age range 16-64 rather than 20-64 and the tables are disaggregated by gender. The most recent release includes 2017 Quarter 2 estimates and provides five year comparable trends since the disability definition was harmonised.[[19]](#footnote-19)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reported employment rates of disabled men and women aged 16-64** | | | | |
|  | **Non-disabled Men and Women** | **Disabled Men and Women** | **Disabled men** | **Disabled women** |
| **Apr-Jun 2013** | 77.1% | 43.6% | 45.8% | 41.9% |
| **Apr-Jun 2014** | 78.6% | 44.9% | 46.7% | 43.5% |
| **Apr-Jun 2015** | 79.4% | 45.9% | 48.3% | 44.0% |
| **Apr-Jun 2016** | 80.1% | 47.9% | 49.3% | 46.8% |
| **Apr-Jun 2017** | 80.6% | 49.2% | 50.0% | 48.6% |

Adapted from Table A08: Labour market status of disabled people, 16 August 2017 (Source: LFS 2013-17, using the Harmonised Standard definition of disability)

This indicates an employment equality gap of 31.4 percentage points for the age group 16-64 in 2017, down from 32.2 in 2016 (declining from 33.3 in 2015 and 33.5 in 2014) This compares to 33.2 in the 2015 EU SILC data, for those aged 20-64. The LFS comparison with FRS/EU-SILC appears to be robust.

In general, the UK Government continues to publish high quality official statistics on disability and employment, which could be easily incorporated in its European Semester assessments and used to monitor the Government’s stated target to halve the disability employment gap. This national LFS data could be easily disaggregated for the age group 20-64 to mirror the EU strategy measure from a disability perspective, up to date and on a quarterly basis.

### 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

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. The UK disability trends in unemployment are difficult to interpret precisely. Indicative polynomial trend lines are added for illustration only*.*

Alternative data on disability and unemployment from national sources:

The national disability strategy *Outcomes and Indicators Framework Progress Report 2014* included a subsidiary indicator for unemployment (as part of Table 2.21 on economic activity). It also included indicators for ‘Individuals who are not in work who would like to work’ and ‘Working age people who have never worked’, although these did not indicate particularly large differences overall between disabled and non-disabled people.[[20]](#footnote-20) These were not disaggregated by gender and covered the age group 16-64, whereas the EU2020 target relates to the age group 20-64. These have not been updated since 2014.

Following the data on employment, the ONS quarterly release on the *Labour market status of disabled people* includes estimates of unemployment for the age group 16-64, and disaggregated by gender. As highlighted earlier, these are based on LFS data using a methodology consistent with EU-SILC since 2013.[[21]](#footnote-21) The most recent data on this basis is shown in the following table.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reported unemployment rates of disabled men and women aged 16-64** | | | | |
|  | **Non-disabled Men and Women** | **Disabled Men and Women** | **Disabled men** | **Disabled women** |
| **Apr-Jun 2013** | 7.1% | 13.5% | 14.6% | 12.5% |
| **Apr-Jun 2014** | 5.6% | 12.7% | 14.5% | 11.0% |
| **Apr-Jun 2015** | 4.9% | 11.5% | 12.5% | 10.7% |
| **Apr-Jun 2016** | 4.3% | 10.0% | 11.7% | 8.6% |
| **Apr-Jun 2017** | 3.8% | 9.0% | 11.4% | 7.1% |

*Adapted from Table A08: Labour market status of disabled people, 17 August 2016 (Source: LFS, using the Harmonised Standard definition)*

This is the most reliable measure but it is important to note that indicators of unemployment are presented as *a proportion of the population who are economically active* (not of the whole working age population) and that the age group includes younger people. The SILC sample and definition indicates a rise in disabled people’s unemployment up to 2013 while the LFS indicates a fall since 2013.

### 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:

Using the same LFS data and official statistics defined for employment and unemployment national indicators of economic ‘inactivity’ (the inverse of ‘activity’) were reported in the *Progress Report 2014* supporting the disability strategy (Table 2.21, not since updated).[[22]](#footnote-22)

The ONS quarterly release on the *Labour market status of disabled people* does include estimates of economic ‘activity’ for the age group 16-64, and disaggregated by gender (based on the harmonised methodology since 2013).[[23]](#footnote-23) These data are closely comparable with the EU-SILC estimates, but for the age group 16-64, while the SILC data relate to those aged 20-64.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reported economic activity rates of disabled men and women aged 16-64** | | | | |
|  | **Non-disabled Men and Women** | **Disabled Men and Women** | **Disabled men** | **Disabled women** |
| **Apr-Jun 2013** | 82.7% | 50.5% | 53.7% | 47.8% |
| **Apr-Jun 2014** | 83.0% | 51.4% | 54.6% | 48.9% |
| **Apr-Jun 2015** | 83.2% | 51.9% | 55.2% | 49.3% |
| **Apr-Jun 2016** | 83.7% | 53.2% | 55.8% | 51.3% |

*Adapted from Table A08: Labour market status of disabled people, 16 August 2017 (Source: LFS, using the Harmonised Standard disability definition)*

The ONS quarterly statistical release provides the most reliable and up to date national disability estimates, disaggregated by gender and with comparisons to non-disabled people, using a rather similar question methodology to EU-SILC. These could be easily adapted to shadow the EU-SILC age range from a disability perspective.

## 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.[[24]](#footnote-24) 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** | 1,254 | 149 | 2,218 | 289 |

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:**

Eurostat defines ‘Early leavers from education and training’ with reference to LFS data[[25]](#footnote-25) and, in the UK, this can be disaggregated using the GSS Harmonised disability variable in the national LFS. The second quarter LFS for 2017 includes data for 757 young disabled people aged 18-24 (from an estimated population group of 700,363) compared to 149 in the EU-SILC 2015 sample.

Eurostat’s definition equates to those whose highest qualification is below the UK National Qualification Framework (NQF) Level 2[[26]](#footnote-26) and who were not in education or training during the past 4 weeks. The following weighted cross tabulation was derived from the UK Data Service for the purpose of this ANED report and is not an official statistic.[[27]](#footnote-27) On this measure, the risks of early leaving were 15.6% for disabled young people and 7.8% for non-disabled. The indicated gap is 8 percentage points but it could be higher if the majority of ‘other qualifications’ were found to be lower than Level 2.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Highest qualifications of 18-24 year olds not in current education or training (weighted estimates), 2017** | | | | |
| **Learning undertaken**  **within the past 4 weeks** | **Level of highest qualification held** | % Disabled | % Not Disabled | **% Total** |
| **Yes** | *NQF Level 4 and above* | 5.4 | 7.1 | 6.9 |
|  | *NQF Level 3* | 15.7 | 25.1 | 23.9 |
|  | *Trade Apprenticeships* | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
|  | *NQF Level 2* | 9.2 | 12.3 | 11.9 |
|  | *Below NQF Level 2* | 5.8 | 3.6 | 3.9 |
|  | *Other Qualifications* | 0.9 | 1.2 | 1.1 |
|  | *No Qualifications* | 2 | 0.7 | 0.9 |
| **No** | *NQF Level 4 and above* | 8.2 | 13.4 | 12.8 |
|  | *NQF Level 3* | 12.3 | 13.3 | 13.2 |
|  | *Trade Apprenticeships* | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
|  | *NQF Level 2* | 13.2 | 10.2 | 10.6 |
| **(early leavers)** | *Below NQF Level 2* | 12.2 | 5.1 | 5.9 |
| **(early leavers)** | *No Qualifications* | 3.4 | 2.7 | 2.8 |
|  | *Other Qualifications* | 9 | 2.3 | 3.1 |
| **Total** |  | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| **N=** |  | 700,363 | 4,925,358 | 5,625,721 |
| Crown copyright material is reproduced with the permission of the Controller of HMSO and the Queen’s Printer for Scotland | | | | |

Source: Quarterly Labour Force Survey, April-June, 2017 (using GSS Harmonised disability definition and person weights)

Finally, the *Progress Report 2014* supporting the disability strategy provided administrative data on the proportion of 16-18 with learning difficulties or disabilities who were NEET, estimating this at 15.6% in 2006, falling to 10.6% in 2012 (Table 1.13 and 1.14, not since updated).[[28]](#footnote-28)

### 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** | 1,088 | 168 | 2,214 | 334 |

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. The UK disability trends are difficult to interpret precisely. Indicative linear trend lines are added for illustration only*.*

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

There was no directly equivalent indicator in the UK national disability strategy indicator framework, but relevant supporting indicators were included in the 2014 progress report, including: Satisfaction levels with higher education course, Students who do not continue in higher education after their first year, number of first degree graduates.[[29]](#footnote-29) Most data was based on students’ self-identification of disability status, but there is missing data. This has not been updated since 2014.

The Eurostat definition of tertiary education refers to educational programmes at ISCED level 5 or 6, which equate with the UK’s National Qualifications Framework (NQF) Level 4.[[30]](#footnote-30) This includes some shorter professional and technical programmes equivalent to a Certificate of Higher Education, as well as degree level study.

The second quarter LFS for 2017 includes valid data for 688 disabled people aged 30-34 (compared to 168 in the EU-SILC 2015 micro data sample). The following weighted cross tabulation was derived from the UK Data Service for the purpose of this ANED report and is not an official statistic. It indicates that 31.5% of disabled people in the target age group had achieved the relevant qualification level, compared to 50.8% of non-disabled people (48.5% for the total age group) – a gap of more than 19 percentage points. This data is comparable with last year’s data.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Highest qualifications of 30-34 year olds (weighted estimates), 2017** | | | |
| **Level of highest qualification held** | **Disabled** | **Not Disabled** | **Total** |
| NQF Level 4 and above **(ISCED 5+)** | 31.5 | 50.8 | 48.5 |
| NQF Level 3 | 14.3 | 16.6 | 16.3 |
| Trade Apprenticeships | 2 | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| NQF Level 2 | 19.1 | 11.6 | 12.5 |
| Below NQF Level 2 | 13.3 | 7.1 | 7.8 |
| Other Qualifications | 7.9 | 7.6 | 7.6 |
| No Qualifications | 11.8 | 4.6 | 5.5 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| N= | 521,790 | 3,842,070 | 4,363,860 |
| Crown copyright material is reproduced with the permission of the Controller of HMSO and the Queen's Printer for Scotland | | | |

Source: Quarterly Labour Force Survey, April-June, 2017 (using GSS Harmonised disability definition)[[31]](#footnote-31)

## 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:

Following the harmonisation and development of EU-SILC data collection in the UK, using the sample of the national Family Resources Survey, any national indicators of poverty risk should be equivalent with EU-SILC estimates (at least from 2012 onwards). There is no better alternative source.

The *Progress Report 2014* on the national disability strategy indicator Framework included several indicators under the heading of ‘income’, with measures of household poverty and measures of children living in household poverty disaggregated by disability status of the child or another family member (this national disaggregation is not available at the EU level). The indicators were mostly populated until 2012, but have not been updated since.

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

## Employment

Compared to other EU Member States, the UK is characterised by a high general employment rate but a wide disability employment gap. In this respect the UK remain an outlier for poor disability employment outcomes among the stronger labour markets in Europe. Unemployment is low while economic inactivity among disabled people appears comparatively high. In its 2017 Concluding Observations, the UN CRPD Committee observed the ‘persistent employment gap and pay gap’ for disabled people in the UK, ‘especially women and persons with psychosocial and/or intellectual disabilities, as well as persons with visual impairments’.[[32]](#footnote-32)

The UK Government publishes regular official statistics on disability and employment, using its national Labour Force Survey, and announced in 2015 a target to halve the disability employment gap. This gap remains large, at more than 31 percentage points, although it has continued to narrow throughout the period of the crisis and the LFS data confirm a continued increase in the number of disabled people in paid work (as for the general population). As noted in recent CSRs, the headline labour market trends are positive but ‘there remains scope for improvement in the prospects for inactive, underemployed and low skilled workers’.[[33]](#footnote-33) Disabled people are over-represented in these categories. The national risk of low work intensity for disabled people in EU-SILC 2015 (32%) is among the highest in the EU (and compared to just 6.9% for non-disabled persons).

The trends identified in our previous analyses remain, although the situation improves slightly. The employment situation for disabled people in the UK is paradoxical. For the general population, the employment rate is higher than the EU average and on a positive trend for at least five years. It rose past its 2008 pre-crisis peak in October 2014 and reached an all-time record high in 2015, 2016 and again 2017.[[34]](#footnote-34). Despite this, disabled people’s employment remains below the EU average, although it continues to rise slowly, and the disability employment gap in the UK remains one of the widest in the EU, although it continues to narrow marginally.

The employment gap is particularly marked for people who report severe levels of impairment and it is more evident among disabled men (while the employment rate for disabled women approaches the EU average). UK disability employment rates track below the EU trend across the life course, with low levels of employment for younger and older disabled workers, and relatively weak employment gains for disabled people in mid-career adulthood. In such a high participation labour market the employment situation of disabled people does not present a positive picture and the government’s NRP commitment to halve the equality gap remains very challenging to achieve.

Findings were published in September 2015 from the third wave of the Life Opportunities Survey (LOS), a targeted national disability survey carried out in the period 2012-14. This also evidenced the employment gap at more than 30 points (33% compared to 69%),[[35]](#footnote-35) as well as reduced chances to hold a third level qualification or a senior or professional job. Findings from the previous wave, published in 2014, showed that the most commonly reported barriers to work were ‘Family responsibilities’, ‘lack of job opportunities’ and ‘lack of qualifications/ experience/skills’. The most common enablers to work were ‘modified hours or days or reduced work hours’ and ‘tax credits’. Educational disadvantage and job matching were significant challenges too.[[36]](#footnote-36) It is unfortunate that this longitudinal national disability survey has been discontinued.

## Education

According to comparative indications from EU-SILC, the disability education gap in the UK is not as extreme as the employment gap, although it is significant. This can be partly explained by the early leaving rate for the general population, which is moderately high by European standards. Concerns about skills have been expressed consistently in European Semester reviews but the risk of early leaving for both disabled and non-disabled young people has remained above the EU average in 2015, significantly more so for disabled people. National LFS data indicates the early laving rate for young disabled people to be twice that of other young people in 2017 (as shown earlier in Section 2.3.1).

National and EU data on UK qualifications are not always comparable (as noted in the 2014 CSRs), but young disabled people fare worse than the norm by a significant margin. They have been twice as likely as their non-disabled peers to fall out of education, employment and training altogether and are among the groups at highest risk of NEET.[[37]](#footnote-37) National LFS data suggest that the true proportion of early leavers amongst disabled young people could be as high as one in four, and less than one third of 30-34 year-olds held an ISCED 5+ qualification in 2017 compared with almost half of non-disabled people in the target age group.

Wide inequalities exist also between UK regions on the headline measure (to an extent found only in the Southern European states, as noted by OECD in 2011) with the highest rates of early leaving corresponding to regional patterns of poverty and social exclusion.[[38]](#footnote-38) This is true also for regional interaction of disability, poverty and education but survey sample sizes make it difficult to evidence this in the narrow EU2020 target age group.

Data from the third wave of the Life Opportunities Survey (a longitudinal national disability survey now discontinued) showed ‘less than a tenth of inactive adults with impairment at both waves having a degree, compared with a quarter of inactive adults without impairment’[[39]](#footnote-39) (although this covered the age range 16-64, including people who acquired impairment after completing their education). Nevertheless, administrative data suggests that the number of disabled students in higher education (identifying as disabled) continues to increase year on year.

There has been a considerable increase in the number and proportion of students entering first degree courses and declaring a disability status. This has been estimated as 56% increase between 2010-11 and 2015-16.[[40]](#footnote-40) Within this the key areas of growth have been in the identification specific conditions such as dyslexia/dyspraxia and a rapid increase in the number of students disclosing mental health conditions, which is placing a strain on college and university support systems. The latter increase was estimated at 220% in the same time frame.[[41]](#footnote-41)

SKILL (the National Bureau for Students with Disabilities) previously identified three NEET risk factors for young disabled people: lack of expectations and public role models; lack of information or guidance about learning options; lack of support at key transition points. They highlighted the importance of needs assessments, transport, flexible learning options and personalised learning support.[[42]](#footnote-42) Those supported in the past by the Disabled Students Allowance experienced high retention rates (higher than non-disabled students) but those without support were more likely than the average to drop out of higher education after the first year.[[43]](#footnote-43) This underlines the need for adequately resourced and personalised support, which may be challenged by recent reforms of the support system (see Section 4.2).

## Poverty and social inclusion

Compared to other EU Member States, the risks of relative poverty for disabled people in the UK are high and inequalities in this area have been raised as a matter of international concern. Deficit reduction and welfare reform policies have targeting disability-related benefit expenditure. These reforms pose significant poverty risks, given the existing disability equality gaps, the close association between poverty and low work intensity, and the protective effect of additional disability costs benefits. The link between austerity policies, welfare reforms and poverty risk for disabled people was highlighted in independent investigation by the UN CRPD Committee and echoed in its Concluding Observations in October 2017.[[44]](#footnote-44)

The pattern of inequality indicated by EU-SILC remains broadly unaltered from the previous year. There are wide equality gaps in the UK and these affect disabled people disproportionately, notably those of working age and including those who are in work.[[45]](#footnote-45) The risk of poverty or social exclusion is not so marked for people of retirement age, many of whom have acquired impairments later in life and for whom pension income has been less eroded. Adults of working age are at greater risk of relative household financial poverty (after social transfers) than the EU average, and this is more marked for disabled people of working age. Low work intensity is notable, with the non-disabled risk falling below the EU average but the disabled risk well above it. The same is true for material deprivation among people aged 16-64. It is true for both women and men, and the risk increases markedly with severity of impairment. The disability poverty gaps contradict the general picture.

Amongst the general population the proportion of workless households has been falling, and household work intensity is rising for some time (partly because of an increase in single lone parent households).[[46]](#footnote-46) At the same time, overall risk of household poverty and exclusion increased during the economic crisis, most dramatically for younger adults.[[47]](#footnote-47) The main poverty risks in the UK are associated with unemployment, under-employment, low pay and high housing rents and this is also the case for disabled people.

As reported in previous years, older disabled people are at less risk of poverty than younger disabled adults (and at less risk than the EU average). Many will have acquired impairments in old age, after accumulating lifetime contributory pensions and savings based on their employment careers during a period of economic growth and relatively high social protection. Among the working age population most people receiving long-term out-of-work benefits are disabled (or sick) and many have a mental health condition.[[48]](#footnote-48) On standard measures, disabled people in workless families are less likely to live in low income than non-disabled people and data suggest a reduction of income poverty risk over the period of the crisis (notably for child poverty risk). However, the way income poverty is measured underestimates the risk. The inclusion of benefits intended to mitigate the *additional* costs of living for disabled people has tended to overestimate their income. It was estimated in 2014 that excluding such benefits would raise the income poverty risk by 4 percentage points and increase child poverty.[[49]](#footnote-49) It is these benefits that have been cut.

For context, the Equality and Human Rights Council published a 2015 overview assessment, titled *Is Britain Fairer?*[[50]](#footnote-50) with both statistical and large-scale consultation evidence to support the data presented so far. The New Policy Institute published a report on *Disability and Poverty* in 2016. This confirmed the high disability poverty rate and its understatement in official statistics, noting that ‘almost half of people in poverty in the UK are in a household with a disabled person or are disabled themselves’.[[51]](#footnote-51) The main conclusion was that ‘Reducing poverty among disabled people has to be at the heart of any attempts to reduce poverty overall in the United Kingdom’. It drew attention also to high housing costs as a factor, as well as employment, skills gaps and low pay.

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

There was increased evidence of attention to disability issues in the UK’s 2017 NRP, with direct references to disability policies in relation to: childcare (p. 24-25), and employment support (p. 36). Specific sections were devoted to addressing the disability employment gap, both nationally (pp. 36-37) and within the remit of the Scottish Government (pp. 40-41). However, disability was not referred to in relation to education, poverty or social exclusion (where concerns have been highlighted).

## Employment

The 2017 Concluding Observations of the UN Committee on employment (Article 27 CRPD) identified ‘insufficient affirmative action measures and provision of reasonable accommodation’, expressing specific concern about the implementation of Work Capability Assessment and Employment and Support Allowance. This was linked explicitly to concern about meeting the non-discrimination obligations arising from Directive 2000/78/EC. The Recommendation called for consultation on a more effective employment policy approach and reform of the Work Capability Assessment, ‘in line with the human rights model of disability’.[[52]](#footnote-52)

The UK government’s policy approach to halving the disability employment gap is characterised by relatively hard measures towards job seekers and relatively soft measures towards employers. Activation is incentivised by tighter conditionality of work or skills-related activities for benefit claimants, including benefit sanctions, while disability exemptions have been reduced. Employers are encouraged and guided to develop more positive attitudes under a general duty of non-discrimination.

A Parliamentary (Work and Pensions Committee) enquiry was conducted in 2016 to examine the government’s disability employment target and the impact of associated welfare reforms.[[53]](#footnote-53) The same Committee reported in October 2015 on the lack of success in disability employment support. The much-anticipated White Paper on disability, employment and health was published in October 2016. This forms the basis for the disability employment policy reforms outlined in the 2017 NRP.

***Work and Health Programme***

As reported in the 2017 NRP, the main employment activation programme in the UK since 2011 (the Work Programme) was closed to new entrants in 2017. We reported on the programme statistics in 2015 and 2016 (around one in three of those entering this mainstream programme identified themselves as disabled).[[54]](#footnote-54) Phased implementation of the new Work and Health Programme began in November 2017 (contracted out to different service providers in different regions) targeting specialist support to disabled people and to long-term unemployed people.[[55]](#footnote-55) The new service will be more segmented, with tailored support for different target groups and a more intensive work search regime for jobseekers. A key objective is to simplify administration and incentivise both claimants and the independent providers who work with them.[[56]](#footnote-56)

The main focus is on those likely to achieve a job outcome within 12 months. For disabled job seekers this function replaces the Work Choice programme, from which lessons can be learned.[[57]](#footnote-57) Work Choice providers were paid by results to place job seekers. Higher rates were paid for those considered more ‘difficult’ to place, in order to counter the ‘creaming’ and ‘parking’ that often result from such initiatives. Work Choice was initially criticised for not delivering on its promises but outcomes began to improve.[[58]](#footnote-58) For the financial year ending March 2017 almost 16,000 people were referred to the programme, of whom 11,630 started. Revised contract definitions since 2015 makes outcome comparisons difficult but around 47% of programme starts appear to have resulted in a job outcome within 12 months (most of which were supported). This is a reduction on earlier years but seems to be a result of the definitional changes. Sustained job outcomes have risen continually but positive short-term job outcomes for people with mild to moderate mental health conditions or learning difficulties have not been matched by sustained job outcomes for these groups (people with visual or hearing impairments, a smaller group, have achieved stronger sustained job outcomes on average).[[59]](#footnote-59)

Policy learning for the new programme also took place through evaluation of Intensive Activity Programme (IAP) pilots for out-of-work benefit claimants carried out in 2015.[[60]](#footnote-60) This involved a focused curriculum of job search activity within 21 days of a claim. One of the lessons learned was a need for greater personalisation ‘to better accommodate the needs of claimants with health problems and disabilities, caring responsibilities and anxiety-type disorders’. In addition, a ‘Personalisation Pathfinder’ piloted a more flexible advisory approach for some disabled claimants using specialist manager and coaching roles. Work coaches will have an intensive role in the new scheme, ‘getting to know’ claimants and their employment support needs, and linking with local service providers, backed by a management ‘decision tree tool’.

The Youth Offer also included a Pre-Work Programme run by JobCentre Plus for which official data identify that ‘98,300 (25%) of those starting on work experience and 42,700 (22%) of those starting on sector-based work academy identified themselves as ‘having a disability’ (in total from January 2011-May 2016).[[61]](#footnote-61) The Youth Contract, introduced in response to the crisis, was closed in 2015. A ‘Youth Obligation’ was launched in April 2017 for 18-21 year olds claiming out of work benefits, which requires attendance at a sector-based work academy, traineeship or work placement. Existing data on these routes suggests that 29% of entrants to work experience declare a disability status.[[62]](#footnote-62)

***Access to Work scheme***

The 2017 NRP refers also to the Access to Work Programme (4.31) which helps to fund additional employment costs and workplace adaptations. Due to methodological issues there was a delay in statistical reporting last year, [[63]](#footnote-63) although the March 2016 indicated a slight decline in the number of people helped.[[64]](#footnote-64) Updated statistics were published in April 2017, which show that 25,025 people received funding, of whom about 60% are aged over 40 and the majority are women. The largest number of awards are for aids and equipment at work, followed by funding for support workers and help with travel to work.[[65]](#footnote-65)

The 2017 NRP describes ‘a real terms increase in funding’ for the scheme, although the statistical bulletins report awards rather than spending. In reality, expenditure fell sharply from the onset of the crisis but has risen again since 2012. The total number of awards appears to have stabilised but is not higher than it was in 2013-14 and remains well below the peak in 2009-10. This is assumed to be the result of change in guidance to advisors to place the emphasis on the duty of employers to make reasonable adjustments under the Equality Act 2010. Around 15% of the budget had been accounted for by 1% of claimants and, from October 2015, new individual claims were capped at £40,800 per year. The intention was to support more people overall by saving £3 million per year from those with the highest costs (previous claims above the cap are supported until 2018). Public campaigns highlighted how specific groups with high support needs were affected, notably deaf people relying on professional Sign Language interpreters at work.[[66]](#footnote-66)

## Education

In its 2017 Concluding Observations on education (Article 24 CRPD), the UN Committee expressed concern about the ‘persistence of a dual education system that segregates children with disabilities in special schools’.[[67]](#footnote-67) This concern reflects a relatively high proportion of children with additional assessed needs placed in such settings, and the UK’s treaty position that both mainstream and special schools exist as a part of the ‘general educational system’.[[68]](#footnote-68)

***SEN educational planning and support***

The majority of disabled children in the UK are placed in mainstream schools but a significant proportion of children with special educational needs attend special schools. In 2017 there were 1,037 special schools in England, ranging from fewer than 15 pupils to more than 300. Of these, the largest number were approved for the placement of children with moderate, severe learning or profound and multiple learning difficulties.[[69]](#footnote-69)

As previously reported, a revised system of individualised Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCP) was introduced in 2014.[[70]](#footnote-70) These set out assessed needs for a young person with Special Educational Need or Disability (SEND) and may continue up to the age of 25. All state-funded schools are required to admit a child whose EHCP names that school. The incidence of pupils with such plans has been stable in England for at least ten years at around 2.8%, although the overall incidence of pupils assessed as having special educational needs has fallen from 22.1% in 2007 to 17.2% in 2017.[[71]](#footnote-71)

The pilot evaluation for EHC plans indicated little change in eligibility for support compared to the previous statementing system (except for newly eligible 19-25 year olds) but with more demands on information gathering, some co-ordination challenges between agencies, and staffing capacity of SEND co-ordinators.[[72]](#footnote-72) An implementation update in March 2015 provided non-statutory advice that emphasised a need for cultural change to improve outcomes, including greater participation of children and their families in decision making.[[73]](#footnote-73) A revised version of the Coordinated Assessment Process and EHCP information pack, developed in pilot, was also published.[[74]](#footnote-74) At the end of 2016 the Council for Disabled Children published a resource of examples of good practice.[[75]](#footnote-75)

***School leaving***

The data presented earlier in Section 2.3 highlighted the challenge of early leaving and qualifications deficit for many young disabled people in the UK, compounding an already weak performance in early school leaving among the general population.

Young people in the UK may leave secondary schooling in the year of their 16th birthday, although in England they must remain in some form of work, education or training at least until their 18th birthday (e.g. in school, college, apprenticeship, employment, voluntary work).[[76]](#footnote-76) In developing this reform, the previous Government established a Young People’s Advisory Group, including 16 young disabled people (facilitated by the Council for Disabled Children).[[77]](#footnote-77) This de facto raising of the leaving age in England reduces the number of 16-18 year-olds identified as not undertaking learning ‘within the past 4 weeks’ (the criterion for the early leaving indicator) but does not affect 18-24 year-olds, or those in other parts of the UK.

Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA) is a small weekly incentive payment to support young people from lower income households who continue in further education.[[78]](#footnote-78) It was abolished in England as part of the post-2010 budget cuts (with support being devolved into college bursary funds) but was maintained by the devolved authorities in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. Equality Impact Assessments indicated only a small proportion of disabled claimants (4% in Northern Ireland, 5.3% in Wales) but pointed to the relative educational and financial disadvantage experienced by young disabled people, and the potential for ‘unintended discrimination’ in devolving bursary decisions to individual colleges in England.[[79]](#footnote-79)

***Apprenticeships***

Apprenticeships were flagged as a means to deliver on skills mismatches in the 2016 CSRs. As in the previous year, the 2017 NRP addresses the delivery of apprenticeships, with a commitment to create three million apprenticeships by 2020 and to improve on their quality. The Skills Funding Agency 2014 guidance on equality and diversity in apprenticeships includes a toolkit for employers of disabled apprentices.[[80]](#footnote-80) Disability Rights UK publish a guide for disabled people, parents and advisors on applying for apprenticeship schemes.[[81]](#footnote-81)

The Skills Funding Agency operates an ‘Equality and diversity good practice fund’ for further education providers.[[82]](#footnote-82) This funded 29 grants in 2015, which included targeted projects on ‘Identifying and disseminating best practice for apprentices with SEN’, ‘Advancing equality for disabled learners in workplace learning’, ‘Pathways to apprenticeships’, and other projects in which disability was mainstreamed.[[83]](#footnote-83)

The number of disabled people identified as participating in apprenticeships increased considerably between 2000 and 2012. The latest reporting period includes provisional data for 2015/16, showing that new starts have picked up again over the past two years and that an increasing proportion of disabled starters mirrors this trend.[[84]](#footnote-84) Overall, however, there was a decline in the number of reported starts in 2016/17.

**Table 21: Apprenticeship Programme Starts by Learners with Learning Difficulties and/ or Disabilities (2012/3 to 2016/17)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2012/13** | | **2013/14** | | **2014/15** | | **2015/16** | | **2016/17** | |
| **Learning Difficulty/ Disability** | 42,850 | *8.4%* | 38,170 | *8.7%* | 44,090 | *8.8%* | 50,110 | *9.9%* | 50,470 | *10.3%* |
| **No Learning Difficulty/ Disability** | 461,150 | *90.4%* | 395,930 | *89.9%* | 449,140 | *89.8%* | 443,380 | *88.0%* | 434,050 | *88.3%* |
| **Not Known** | 6,210 | *1.2%* | 6,340 | *1.4%* | 6,670 | *1.3%* | 10,240 | *2.0%* | 6,820 | *1.4%* |
| ***Total*** | 510,200 | *100%* | 440,400 | *100%* | 499,900 | *100%* | 503,700 | *100%* | 491,300 | *100%* |

*Source: Skills Funding Agency and Department for Business, Innovation & Skills (Apprenticeships demographics data tool)*

***Disabled Students Allowance***

Support for disabled students in tertiary education is primarily the responsibility of universities and colleges, who provide practical and academic support. Funding support is provided from central government. This amounted to £40m in England in 2017-18 which was doubled from the previous year as a form of transitional support.[[85]](#footnote-85) The government also provides non-binding guidance on developing inclusive teaching and learning methods.[[86]](#footnote-86)

The main mechanism for funding individual support has been Disabled Students Allowance (DSA).[[87]](#footnote-87) DSA was introduced in 1974 and updated in 1990. It funds equipment, non-medical help and a general allowance. According to the Higher Education Statistics Agency, 6.8% of full-time undergraduate students were in receipt of DSA in 2013-14 (81,455), up from 6.5% (77,260) in the previous year, and 3.4% of part-time undergraduates (6,665), down from 3.5% (7,205). This represents a substantial historic increase from 2.5% and 1.3% in 2002-3, respectively.The proportion is higher in England and Wales than in Scotland and Northern Ireland and it varies widely between different colleges - from 1.2% to 31.1% of full-time first degree students.[[88]](#footnote-88) Almost half are assessed as a having a ‘specific learning difficulty’ (mainly dyslexia).

Changes to DSA in England were planned for 2015,[[89]](#footnote-89) limiting government support to ‘higher specification or higher cost computers’ or ‘the most specialist Non-Medical Help’, and no longer meeting the costs of specialist/adapted student living accommodation. These policy changes affecting around 80% of students were postponed until 2016-17 after concerns raised in consultation with students and universities.[[90]](#footnote-90) Consultation in 2015 repeated the aim to place more responsibility on higher education institutions as the ‘primary provider’ of most types of accessibility and support.[[91]](#footnote-91) The controversial changes took effect in the academic years 2015/16 and 2016/17.[[92]](#footnote-92)

As with changes to Access to Work funding, the policy is decentralising - emphasising the anticipatory non-discrimination obligations of providers (under the Equality Act 2010) rather than the responsibilities of central government. The equality impact analysis, revised at the end of 2014, also emphasises that universities will need to do more in mitigation of the impact on disabled students.[[93]](#footnote-93) Universities do receive some core funding from a Student Opportunity Fund, which includes a disability element, and this increased by £5m in 2015-16, to £20m, although this is small compared to the existing budget (c.£150m).

## Poverty and social inclusion

As the statistical indicators suggest, socio-economic inequalities in the UK’s liberal market economy are wider than in most EU Member States, and the relative household risk of poverty or social exclusion for people of working age with severe impairments is striking. This risk is most strongly associated with low household work intensity but disability-related cash benefits have a protective influence. The poverty risks for older people are lower, on average, due mainly to the protective effect of past lifetime contributions and older pensions.

The Concluding Observations of the UN CRPD Committee in October 2017 highlight the impact of austerity measures and of reductions in social protection affecting disabled people in the UK. Notably, these refer to the tightening of eligibility criteria for out-of-work benefits and for disability-related costs resulting in reduced coverage. The Committee’s recommendations on social protection (Article 28 CRPD) call for wholesale evaluation and reform of Employment Support Allowance and Personal Independence Payment schemes, including their assessment methodology and budget allocation. Similar questions about the impact of welfare reforms on ‘disadvantaged and marginalized individuals and groups’ were raised in the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in its 2016 List of Issues.[[94]](#footnote-94)

As reported in 2016, attempts to reduce the national deficit by austerity measures have been encouraged by the EU CSRs but this has been pursued at the expense of significant reductions in disability benefit eligibility for working age people. The findings of the UN human rights investigation confirm civil society’s concerns that disabled people have been the ‘hardest hit’.[[95]](#footnote-95) The UK government response largely refutes the unequal impact of its reforms and was ‘proud of its record’ and affirming that policies seek to make work pay. It focused on defending levels of spending without adequately addressing levels of outcome inequality. As shown earlier in our report, the UK’s exceptional levels of income and risk inequality are the key feature that should be examined.

A caps on receipt of state benefits was introduced in 2012, set at average family income (lower for single adults without parenting responsibilities). It excludes state pensions, some contributory unemployment benefits and benefits targeting the additional costs of living with disability. The current government, elected May 2015, reduced this benefit cap, froze most working age benefits and cut Tax Credits for working families (mitigating this partly by setting a new mandatory National Living Wage).[[96]](#footnote-96) The current cap for a couple receiving Housing Benefit, with or without children, is now £384.62 per week outside London (442.31 in London).[[97]](#footnote-97) Mirroring the general policy approach to employment and training support, the policy direction is to shift responsibility for poverty risk reduction from the state towards employers and personal responsibility.

As reported in previous ANED country reports the welfare reforms most relevant to disabled people are the delayed implementation of Universal Credit (UC), the Work Capability Assessment (WCA) associated with Employment and Support Allowance (ESA)and the replacement of Disability Living Allowance (DLA) with Personal Independence Payments (PIP). Closure of the Independent Living Fund (ILF) in 2015 also ‘put seriously in peril’ independent living for a large number of disabled people,[[98]](#footnote-98) while constraints on Housing Benefit (HB) were shown to disproportionately affect households including disabled people.[[99]](#footnote-99)

***Universal Credit***

The replacement of Employment and Support Allowance (ESA) as the main out of work benefit for those unable to work is now underway with the phased implementation of non-contributory, means-tested Universal Credit (which replaces and integrates a bundle of six existing benefits, both in and out of work benefits). Initially, this affects new claimants only. The rates of payment for persons with limited capability for work are lower than the existing ESA rates. The process of Work Capability Assessment is essentially the same as that operating under the existing system.[[100]](#footnote-100) For those assessed as capable of work the scheme is characterised by a ‘claimant commitment’ to stronger work-related ‘requirements’ with benefit sanctions for non-compliance. In the transition to Universal Credit, single person disability premiums have been cut, a potential loss of more than £2,000 per year (although subject to transitional relief).[[101]](#footnote-101)

The long-running controversy around the assessment methodology for Work Capability Assessment and Personal Independence Payments continues, with concerns over the process, consistency and fairness reviewed in previous ANED reports (and subject to forthcoming ANED analysis in 2018).

***Personal Independence Payments***

The March 2016 Budget statement[[102]](#footnote-102) confirmed a failure to meet the government’s 2014 ‘Welfare Cap’ commitment, including the government’s reduced spending targets for the transition from Disability Living Allowance (DLA) to Personal Independence Payments (PIP). Real terms expenditure on these benefits continues to rise and is expected to be at least £3bn higher in 2019-20 than it was in 2009-10.

To meet the targets further changes to the formula for calculating the daily living component of PIP were introduced from January 2017 (formerly the ‘care’ component of DLA). In essence, the change is to reduce the points weighting given to persons who use an aid or appliance to carry out daily living tasks. This benefit targeting is expected to reduce payments to 640,000 claimants. Amendment to the regulations in March 2017 introduced further tightening of interpretation in response to tribunal judgements, which were expected to affect 336,500 people receiving the mobility component (282,500 of whom were expected to lose eligibility altogether).[[103]](#footnote-103)

***Tax-free childcare***

As previewed in the 2016 NRP Tax-free childcare (TFC) was introduced in 2017. This extends for an additional five years for disabled children compared to non-disabled children (up to the age of 17 rather than 12) and to a higher annual maximum (up to £4,000 rather than £2,000).[[104]](#footnote-104)

***Housing supply***

In 2015 we reported in detail on accessibility and inclusion issues in the supply of affordable homes, and the opportunity presented to increase the stock of accessible homes (this was also covered in ANED reporting on the EU ‘Social Pillar’ agenda). There is no evidence of policy progress on the issue from a disability perspective, nor the wider goal of delivering sufficient affordable housing in general. However, at the end of 2016 the Equality and Human Rights Commission used its initiative powers to launch a formal inquiry on housing for disabled people in Great Britain.[[105]](#footnote-105) This has drawn attention to the ‘chronic lack of accessible and adaptable housing available for disabled people in Britain’ in 2017. A report is expected in early 2018.

## Synergies between developments in the different areas

The synergies and tensions existing between the policy approaches to employment, education and poverty reduction for disabled people in the UK remain similar to those reported since election of a Conservative-led government in 2015. Despite international concerns about the relative situation of disabled people in the UK , the policy direction has continued with EU support for austerity policies. The additional risks now posed by Brexit heighten these concerns. The predominantly liberal market approach shifts responsibilities increasingly from the state towards employers, educational providers and families.

On the plus side, the headline disability employment gap has continued to narrow marginally but the pay gap and quality of employment outcomes for disabled people continues to lag behind. Educational attainment does not have the same protective effect on future employment and income for disabled people as it does for the general population.[[106]](#footnote-106) Delayed early leaving options in England, changes in the management of individual student planning and Disabled Students Allowance pose risks to educational outcomes.

Low work intensity among disabled people and their families is the main predictor of overall poverty risk, and this is consistent with the UK government’s renewed policy emphasis on employment activation. Nevertheless, the measures are very unevenly weighted to exert pressure on disabled people to enter the labour market without balancing pressures on employers. The effectiveness of the new Work and Health Programme and its interaction with reduced eligibility for disability benefits will be critical to meeting the government’s aspirational disability employment target. There remains no convincing evidence that this can be achieved.

A policy approach that is hard on jobseekers and soft on employers, combined with the consequences of welfare reforms, has penalised disabled people of working age disproportionately while devolving responsibilities for their protection from central government towards employers, service providers and disabled people themselves.

# Review of the European Semester from a disability perspective

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

As in the past two years there was no reference to disabled people, or any other marginalised group, in the CSRs for the UK although they have disability equality implications.

In 2017 the agreed CSRs for the UK included three specific recommendations.[[107]](#footnote-107) These are essentially the same as in 2015 and 2016, covering (a) continued action towards sustainable public finances, (b) planning reforms to increase housing supply, and (c) addressing skills through apprenticeships and further education. The challenges of inactivity, part-time and low wage jobs are raised in the text, along with child care and social care.

## Progress on other CSRs from a disability perspective

*Sustainable public finances*:

As we have reported in the past two years, the UK policy approach to deficit management has implications for the employment, education and social inclusion of disabled people. The most acute issues arise from the systematic reform of work and welfare policies, in which reduced eligibility for disability-related welfare benefits has been a policy priority. However, austerity measures have impacted very considerably on reductions in public funding for local government, translated into widespread cuts to community based support services. The escalating risk of a post-Brexit economic slowdown compounds the collateral risks to already marginalised groups and there is strong evidence that disabled people have been among the hardest hit.

A 2013 report from the Centre for Welfare Reform summarised how spending cuts targeted disabled people disproportionately.[[108]](#footnote-108) Its headline findings suggested that ‘Disabled people (8% of the population) bear 29% of all cuts’ and that ‘People with severest disabilities (2% of the whole population) bear 15% of all cuts’ (p. 6). Further, it estimated that ‘Disabled people will lose an average of £4,410 per person - this is 9 times more than the burden placed on most other citizens’ and that ‘People with severe disabilities will lose an average of £8,832 per person - this is 19 times more than the burden placed on most other citizens’ (p. 7).

In 2014 the Just Fair Consortium previously published a review of disability equality issues under austerity in the context of the UNCRPD.[[109]](#footnote-109) This included an analysis of the combined effects of housing, welfare and public spending reforms at that time. It drew attention to the impact of austerity-based policies on Articles 27 and 28 UNCRPD (and Articles 6, 7, 9 and 11 ICESCR). In particular, it called for a more evidence-based approach to disability policies and a more personalised support-oriented ethos to administration. Subsequent reforms since the election of the current government appear to have compounded rather than alleviated such concerns.

In the past year, examples of the impacts of austerity have been widely witnessed in civil society shadow reports to the UN CRPD Committee (the UK has so far drawn more of such reports than any other country examined by the UN).[[110]](#footnote-110) In its 2017 Concluding Observations the Committee drew specific attention to the ‘impact of austerity measures and anti-poverty initiatives introduced as a consequence of the financial crisis in 2008/09, which resulted in severe economic constraints among persons with disabilities and their families, particularly families with children with disabilities’.[[111]](#footnote-111)

*Improving housing supply*:

In 2015 we reported on this issue at some length in terms of the 2012 National Planning Policy Framework, dating from 2012.[[112]](#footnote-112) This guides local planners to consider the needs of disabled people in relation to transport (para. 35), the mix of housing types (para. 50), and in preparing local authority Strategic Housing Market Assessments (para. 159) which form the basis for local housing plans. They might, for example, take account of the need for the updated Building Regulations on Requirement M4.2 (accessible and adaptable dwellings) or M4.3 (wheelchair user dwellings). The Scottish government’s housing strategy *Homes Fit for the 21st Century*[[113]](#footnote-113) alsoincluded commitments to meet independent living needs, including both accessible and ‘specialist or adapted housing’.[[114]](#footnote-114)

In 2016, the CSR highlighted the National Infrastructure Plan. In 2017, our analysis remains the same.

*Addressing skills mismatches*:

As we reported in 2015 and 2016, this issue has become a perennial concern in the CSRs for the UK. The analysis presented earlier in Section 4.2 evidences concerns about the significant segmentation of special schooling that persists in the UK, as highlighted by the UN CRPD Committee. It draws attention also to reforms of individual support payments, devolving responsibility from central government to educational providers.

The proportion of apprenticeship starters has risen slowly, although the number declined slightly last year. The new Institute for Apprenticeships became operational in 2017. Its website was launched in October 2017 but a search of key terms reveals no reference to disability.[[115]](#footnote-115) The funding rules also do not refer to equality or non-discrimination criteria[[116]](#footnote-116) although it is clear that some of the occupation-specific Apprenticeship Standards include Commitment to Equality and Diversity as a competence.[[117]](#footnote-117) The leading role envisaged for employers needs to be tempered with public assurances around equal opportunities.

From April 2017 the funding basis for apprenticeships changed with the introduction of an ‘apprenticeship levy’ on large companies (as indicated in the 2016 NRP). Guidance was published and includes provision for ‘Extra support for employing apprentices with additional needs’.[[118]](#footnote-118) Any employer who recruits a 19-24 year-old with a local authority education, health and care plan (EHCP, as described earlier in Section 3.2) receives the higher rate normally funded for 16-18 year-olds. In addition, the training provider may receive a direct contribution to support the learning of any apprentice with additional learning needs. The amount is up to £150 a month, ‘plus additional costs based on evidenced need’, which reflects similar provision under the previous system.[[119]](#footnote-119)

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

The 2017 Commission Staff Working Document[[120]](#footnote-120) acknowledged the ‘large disability employment gap in the UK’ as a counter to positive employment rate trends, using indicative data from EU-SILC (p. 24). This is a welcome addition, as the previous CR failed to identify this prominent anomaly. The link with long-term unemployment could also be mentioned.

Similarly, it indicated the relatively high risk of poverty or social exclusion for disabled people, and the wide disability gap (p. 27). In this context, it is relevant to note the significant fall in % of GDP expenditure on disability social protection benefits indicated by Table C.3 of the 2017 Country Report (falling more than any other category for social protection in the period since 2010). Given the mounting evidence of international concerns about the impact of welfare reforms on disabled people in the UK, and the UN Committee’s recommendations to the EU on its responsibilities under Article 28 CRPD, it would be important to monitor this issue in the 2018 policy cycle.

The inclusion of key disability indicators is welcome, particularly as the previous 2016 Country Report did not mention the key policy challenge of closing the disability employment gap. On the other hand, the 2017 CR did not make any specific policy connections (e.g. the previous report made some connections with affordable housing stock and specific benefit changes). There is a need to mainstream both the situational indicators and commentary on policy reforms, from a disability perspective. The highlighted disability policy sections in the 2017 NRP provide a clear opportunity to do this in 2018, at least in relation to employment policies and childcare, but the consistent failure to address the disability consequences of welfare reforms should not be overlooked in the EU’s analysis – especially since the EU has supported the UK’s austerity policies. The fact that these impacts were flagged as systematic human rights abuses by the UN OHCHR merits attention in the 2018 CR.

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

It is unclear whether the UK will continue to participate in the EU funds budget but full participation can be anticipated at least until 2019 and. A total of €10.8billion was allocated to the UK budget for 2014-2020 from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and the European Social Fund (ESF).

In the previous funding period 2007-2013 it was difficult to assess the precise disability impact of spending spread across 22 different Operational Programmes. However, the National Strategic Reference Framework for 2007-2013[[121]](#footnote-121) did require all Programmes to take account of equal opportunities and the Programme Monitoring Committees were ‘expected to review progress on all aspects of equality and equal opportunities issues ranging from gender to race and from disability to age’. Guidance had been available since 2007 under the title *Helping disabled people back to work: ESF good practice guide*.[[122]](#footnote-122)

In February 2013 the High Court ruled that the UK Government had not fulfilled its Public Sector Equality Duty in deciding on the allocation of the Funds to regional authorities. This forced a full Equality Impact Assessment before re-confirming those allocations in 2014 (€6.9bn to England, €2.4bn to Wales, €895m to Scotland, €513m to Northern Ireland (and €10m to Gibraltar).

Disability was considered in this Impact Assessment, along with other protected grounds, by assessing per capita funding for each region against prevalence data – ‘For instance, if the allocation consistently provided the lowest amounts of funding per capita to areas with a high proportion of disabled people, it might be concluded that the policy negatively impacts on disabled people’.[[123]](#footnote-123) Specific questions were also raised about two regions with high disability prevalence that had experienced reductions in funding allocation in this round (Merseyside and South Yorkshire).

The analysis showed no correlation between prevalence of disability benefit claims and funding levels in less developed or transition regions, with some positive correlation in more developed regions (i.e. ‘areas with higher rates of disability have higher levels of funding’). The assessment concluded that disabled people were the only group favoured by the allocation but that this could ‘potentially help to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and help to foster good relations between disabled and non-disabled persons’ (p. 24). It found that Merseyside and South Yorkshire had low funding and high disability prevalence but were not out of place amongst other Transition regions.

Equality Impact Assessments were conducted in accordance with the Common Provisions Regulation. As noted in the Equality Impact Assessment for the UK Partnership Agreement, ‘When the Managing Authorities across the UK develop their Programmes for the ESI funds they will be undertaking regulatory functions and will therefore have to comply with the Equality Act and have regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty’. Additional principles of promoting and monitoring equal opportunities are included.[[124]](#footnote-124)

The Northern Ireland chapter referred extensively to disability equality, including CRPD. Public consultation in Wales drew suggestions from at least one disability organisation for strengthening disability in the equalities theme, and disability training.[[125]](#footnote-125) The Scottish Government’s Equality Impact Assessment Record (EIAR) highlighted that the focus on disability was not as strong as on gender in its proposals, that disability affects 20% of the population and that the ESF should target ‘young disabled participants with the support they may need to gain more advanced qualifications, and including provision for wrap-around support e.g. for college or apprenticeship places’.[[126]](#footnote-126) A complaints procedure will be established to address unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation within Structural Funds projects.

The UK Partnership Agreement targets young disabled people in the category of NEET, as well as disabled people in general in relation to employability and skills, and transition to work (prioritising ESIF Objectives 8, 9 and 10). Disabled people were not referred to under Objective 2 (Enhancing access to, and use and quality of, information and communication technologies) or Objective 7 (Promoting sustainable transport and removing bottlenecks in key network infrastructures).

Calls for proposals were launched in March 2015. Allocations are devolved to 39 different Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) in England, and to the devolved regional authorities in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. There is a national sub-committee concerning Equality and Diversity but no proceedings have been published. The project calls specifications make clear reference to disability as a legitimate target area for projects, for example in relation to employment but we have been so far unable to identify disability specific projects. A search of 270 open and closed calls in England indicated no reference to disability terms in the title or headline description of any call, although it is clear that many calls do make reference to disabled people as potential beneficiaries in their detailed texts (which are not searchable in a single system). We were unable to identify evidence of the direct involvement of disabled people’s organisations in planning for the 2014-2020 funding period.

# Recommendations

Our recommendations remain largely unaltered from the previous two years, although the 2017 UN CRPD Committee recommendations considerably strengthen the need for action on them.

**Sustainable finances**: Widespread public concern about the consequences of austerity policies for disabled people in the UK continues to grow. The UN CRPD investigation and recommendations has heightened the urgent need for review of the impact of fiscal consolidation and austerity policies on disabled people. Specifically:

* Consider the equality impact of revised benefit cap on disabled people and their families/households in light of recommendations by the UN CRPD Committee;
* Review the impact of withdrawing Housing Benefit Spare Room Subsidy on disabled people with high support needs at home;
* Review the impact of benefit reductions and sanctions resulting from the Work Capability Assessment gateway to Employment Support Allowance;
* Respond to the recommendations of independent reviews into the impact of reduced eligibility to Personal Independence Payments following transition from Disability Living Allowance;
* Ensure that the roll out of Universal Credit is subject to an Equality Impact Assessment that considers the impact of multiple benefit reforms on disabled people.

As well as assessing the equality impact of each of these single measures, it is essential that an assessment of cumulative effects is maintained to monitor the combined effects of deficit management on disabled people.

**Employment and skills gaps**: There is strong evidence that disabled young people are over-represented among early school leavers and those who are NEET or without tertiary educational qualifications in adulthood. There is a need to ensure that they benefit fully from investments in basic skills, apprenticeships and the widening of participation in higher education. Specifically:

* Review the provision of segmented/segregated school provision in light the recommendations by the UN CRPD Committee;
* Continue to report the participation and outcomes for young disabled people in apprenticeships, and ensure the sufficiency of compensation for additional disability costs within the new funding regime;
* Review the training completion and employment outcomes for young disabled people in the Youth Offer/Obligation;
* Review the changes to Disabled Students Allowance and their impact on recruitment, progress and completion of studies in higher education.

**ESIF**: There is a need to spread European funds beyond investments in individual skills development and towards investments also in accessibility that will enable individuals to participate.

* Report on the engagement with, and impact on, disabled people in the current ESIF funding period with reference to the ex-ante conditionality;
* Consider the potential of ESIF to develop greater accessibility for disabled people in relation to Objective 2 (information and communication technologies) and Objective 7 (sustainable transport and infrastructures);
* Consider the potential of ESIF to develop greater accessibility for disabled people in relation workplace accessibility and housing supply, whilst avoiding investments in institutionalised forms of housing support.
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