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Disability and the SDGs

The SDGs are built on the principle of leaving no one behind

• People with disabilities are the most disadvantaged and the most at risk of being left behind

• Disaggregation by disability status is necessary to ensure the equalization of opportunities and equitable development

• Due to lack of available and universally acceptable data collection tools, disability was not included in the MDGs

• Reliable and tested tools are now available
Requirements to disaggregate indicators by disability status

Data collection tools are needed to fulfil two specific data requirements:

• to describe disability as a continuum of functioning based on graded responses to questions in functional domains, and
• to define a cut-off (or a set of cut-offs) that can be agreed upon internationally to disaggregate the outcome indicators (e.g. access to education, employment) by disability status

This allows for the calculation of prevalence rates and for disaggregation.
Disaggregation tools have been developed by the Washington Group

- The Washington Group was established as a city group under the aegis of the UN Statistical Commission to:
  - address the need for population based measures of disability
  - foster international cooperation in the area of health and disability statistics
  - produce internationally tested measures to monitor status of persons with disability
  - incorporate disability into national statistical systems
- Countries have ownership
  - Representatives include the NSOs of 133 countries and territories, 7 international organizations, 6 organizations that represent persons with disabilities
Washington Group Data Collection Tools

Measuring difficulty functioning in universal basic activities
- Short set on functioning adopted in 2006
- Extended set on functioning for adults adopted in 2010
- Module on child functioning (in collaboration with UNICEF) finalized in 2016

Measuring participation and the effects of the environment
- Module on inclusive education (under development)
- Module on labor force participation (under development)
Washington Group Data Collection Tools: Short Set

Because of a Health problem:

1) Do you have difficulty **seeing** even if wearing glasses?
2) Do you have difficulty **hearing** even if using a hearing aid?
3) Do you have difficulty **walking** or **climbing** stairs?
4) Do you have difficulty **remembering** or **concentrating**?
5) Do you have difficulty with (self-care such as) washing all over or dressing?
6) Using your usual language, do you have difficulty **communicating** (for example understanding or being understood by others)?

Response categories:
No difficulty; Some difficulty; A lot of difficulty; Cannot do at all
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Testing of the Washington Group Short Set

Cognitive testing of the short set questions was carried out in 2006 in 15 countries (13 funded through a grant from the World Bank grant, 2 self-funded):

- Argentina, Brazil, Congo, Egypt, Gambia, India, Kenya, Lesotho, Mauritius, Mexico, Paraguay, Philippines, Tanzania, Uganda, Vietnam

This was followed by field testing in five countries:

- Argentina, Brazil, Gambia, Paraguay, Vietnam
Since then the Washington Group Short Set...

- has been used in censuses or surveys in over 65 countries
- has been promoted by international aid programs, (DFID/UK and DFAT/Australia), as the means to collect disability data in all programs and projects,
- has been introduced as the means for collecting disability data by the UN Statistical Division (UNSD) and the UN Economic Commission for Europe for the 2020 round of censuses.
- And both the US AID and UNICEF have developed disability modules that will operationalize the WG SS for their Demographic and Health Surveys and Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys respectively.
Disability prevalence USA: (n=16777; ages 18+) (NHIS: 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person with disability has:</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>at least 1 Domain is ‘some difficulty’</td>
<td>7511</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least 2 Domains are ‘some difficulty’</td>
<td>3672</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least 1 Domain is ‘a lot of difficulty’</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least 1 Domain is ‘unable to do it’</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Disaggregation in US NHIS data

**NHIS 2013: 18-64 years of age**  
Weighted %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability status:</th>
<th>Without disability</th>
<th>With Disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WG Short set:</strong> Cut-off is at least a lot of difficulty in at least 1 domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status Last Week=Working</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current every day smoker</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered by health insurance? (Yes)</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most common indicators that can be disaggregated by disability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Number</th>
<th>Description of indicator (more than 10 countries can produce)</th>
<th>Number of Countries (out of 32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td>Proportion of population below the international poverty line, by sex, age, employment status and geographical location (urban/rural)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td>Proportion of population living below the national poverty line, by sex and age</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.1</td>
<td>Proportion of population using safely managed drinking water services</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.1</td>
<td>Percentage of population with access to electricity</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6.1</td>
<td>Proportion of youth (aged 15-24 years) not in education, employment or training</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standardized Approach to Monitoring

- By standardizing disability data collection instruments it will be possible to provide comparable data cross-nationally for populations living in a variety of cultures;

- Data can be used to assess a country’s compliance with development goals and the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and, over time, improvement in meeting these goals
Mainstreaming disability statistics

- Questions can and need to be added to any ongoing data collections;
  - Can be used in any national or subnational survey (health, labor force, income & expenditure, DHS, MICS etc.)

- Once the questions become integrated into core statistical systems (e.g., the systems used to produce the SDG indicators) – disaggregating outcomes (education, employment etc.) by disability status becomes routine