

# Dissemination and utilization of disability data

putting implementation of  
the UN convention on the  
rights of persons with  
disabilities on the agenda

**New York 2017**  
**Steen Bengtsson**



## **The UN convention on the rights of persons with disabilities (UNCRPD)**

**UNCRPD was ratified by the Danish government in 2009**

**And the additional protocol was ratified in 2014**

**The government's point of view has been that UNCRPD did not demand any change in legislation**

**The government formulated (2013) a disability policy**

**Furthermore, a data and statistics overview was made**

**Now (2017) an anti-discrimination law is proposed**

## **As consequence of the ratification of UNCRPD: a breakthrough for disability statistics a**

**Traditionally we have made much less disability research  
in Denmark than they have in neighbouring countries**

**A breakthrough in the latest decade, in relation to the  
ratification of the UNCRDP**

**Two reasons for this breakthrough:**

- 1. UNCRDP § 31 that demands statistics gathered and  
research made on disability**
- 2. The establishment of a "watchdog" for the convention,  
the Danish Institute of Human Rights**

## **UNCRPD § 31**

**The documentation project: registration on person of**

- 1. Use of sheltered housing for persons with intellectual disabilities and for persons with mental health problems**
- 2. Use of support person for the same groups**
- 3. Use of sheltered employment for the same groups (mostly persons with intellectual disabilities)**

**(status: 50% of the municipalities covered)**

**Establishment of an analysis office in the social department**

## **UNCRPD § 31**

**SHILD (Survey of Health, Impairment and Living conditions in Denmark)**

**Survey of 20.000 persons, 16-64 years, in Denmark**

**Carried out first in 2012, then in 2016 and planned for every fourth year: 2020, 2024, ... as a panel**

**Resulting in a report for each wave**

**And used for secondary analyses currently**

**Earlier surveys (8.000 answers): 1961, 1995, 2006**

**- but SHILD is the first longitudinal survey**

## **Content of SHILD 2016**

**Definition: WG6, functional abilities, subjective disability, GALI**

**Questions on personality, health, health behaviour**

**Education and employment**

**Family: parents, children with disabilities, partner**

**Participation in near, informal and formal settings**

**Income and consumption of health products**

**Violence and discrimination against respondent**

**Use of public services**

## The importance of a “watchdog” for implementation of the convention

**While the government is using more research, it also tries to influence the results it brings more than earlier**

**This phenomenon is seen in all the fields that threaten to give a government expenses, such as environment, social conditions, etc.**

**An independent watchdog can better resist the pressure from the government than a research institute**

# **The Gold Indicators:**

**by the Danish Institute of Human Rights  
and the Social Research Institute**

<https://www.humanrights.dk/activities/our-work-denmark/disability/gold-indicators-crpd>

**Purpose of the Gold Indicators**

**Development of the Gold Indicators**

**Indicators that were selected**

**Reflection of reality not legislation**

**The difference principle**

**Dissemination strategy**

**Main results**



## Purpose of the Gold Indicators

**Simplicity:** just give a few numbers, not all the details that would be needed if it should cover the convention in its totality

**Overview:** select the most central and important points from the convention to describe the conditions of people with disabilities

**Development:** the instrument shall not only describe the essential points now, but also characterise the development that takes place over time

## Development of the Gold Indicators

The method was selected so as to create

- 1. Ownership of the disability organisations and the state and municipal administrations by involving them into the process**
- 2. Utilisation of the experience of researchers on people with disabilities by taking their advice in**
- 3. Official status by involving the “watchdog”, the Institute of Human Rights**

## **Development of the Gold Indicators**

**The process:**

**Meetings with the parties (ca. 20 persons)**

**Selection of the most central points**

**Preparation to find candidates to indicators**

**Meeting for each indicator**

**Finding main indicator and three sub indicators**

## **The ten indicators that were selected**

- Experience being discriminated against (discrimination, §5)**
- Disabled people appear in the press (awareness, §8)**
- Possible to use public transportation (accessibility, §9)**
- Risk of being imprisoned (freedom, § 14)**
- Experience having influence on own life (independence, § 19)**
- Early school leavers (education, § 24)**
- Being at good health (health, § 25)**
- Employed (employment, § 27)**
- Experience deprivation (social security, § 28)**
- Have voted in national elections (political participation, § 29)**

## Reflection of reality not legislation

**e.g. not right to vote, but percentage that voted**

**e.g. not right to disability pension, but percentage who actually suffers deprivation**

**e.g. not schemes for employment, but percentage who actually was in work**

**etc. , persons health, early school leavers, ...**

## The difference principle

**The indicators represent the difference between the situation for people with disabilities and others**

**E.g. percentage with disability that voted, minus percentage without disability that voted**

**E.g. percentage with disability who actually suffers deprivation minus percentage without disability who actually suffers deprivation**

**and so on**

## **Dissemination strategy**

**Publication just before municipal elections**

**A disability barometer on the internet**

**Kept simple as a point of departure, details below**

**A report (30-40 pages) describing the results more detailed**

## Main results

**Generally the results for disabled people are significantly below results for others – exemption: political participation: (pwd vote more often than others)**

**Most marked:**

**deprivation, health, influence on own life**

**Development 2012-2016:**

**Seems to be in negative direction on most indicators, but not enough to give significant results**