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**The D4D project**

The D4D project[[1]](#footnote-1) is a four-year Arts and Humanities Research Council project, running from 2016 to 2020. D4D is jointly run by Bath Spa University and Accentuate[[2]](#footnote-2) (a disabled people led NGO). These organisations are working co-productively, in keeping with principles articulated and promoted in the UN CRPD and the UK’s Disability Studies research community. Further to this, the project involves seven additional universities (Manchester Metropolitan University, University of Bristol, University of West of England, University College London, Liverpool Hope University, and Sussex University and the University of Louisville), and a large number of additional community partners. These community partners are also engaged in co-productive or collaborative practices where possible[[3]](#footnote-3).

D4D forms part of the UK national cross-research council ‘Connected Communities’ programme, which seeks to bring research and communities together and to better understand ‘the changing nature of communities in their contexts and the role of communities in sustaining and enhancing our quality of life.’[[4]](#footnote-4).

**Research focus**

The research project explores issues around disability and inclusion/exclusion across a range of contexts, with particular focus on education, employment and arts settings. Work in these areas has led to the gathering of evidence on wider social factors of relevance to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) examination; in particular into the way that health and social care policies and the implementation and delivery of welfare benefits impact on disabled people’s ability to realise their civil right to economic, social and cultural development.

In addition, this research is concerned not only with historical and current events, but also with the future of disabled people and communities. As such, we feel it important to raise issues with a view to emerging practices, where policy and legislation is yet to fully address protections to people’s civil rights. These are: the inclusion of disability considerations in emergency planning; and the impact of current debates and usage of cutting edge genetic screening technologies.

**Input into this ICCPR examination**

Researchers in the D4D project are acutely aware of the need to raise disabled people’s voices and issues in mainstream discussions regarding Human Rights. We note the United Nation Human Rights Committee’s (UN HRC) comments in General Comment 36[[5]](#footnote-5) regarding the relationship between rights in the ICCPR and those articulated in other Human Rights treaties, including the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN CRPD). We therefore consider that the issues raised in this contribution are appropriate within the context of this examination.

We do not comment on all aspects of this covenant relevant to contemporary issues facing disabled people in the UK. Instead we highlight evidence gathered and issues that have arisen through the course of this research so far that we consider of particular importance within the scope of the ICCPR. In addition, we feel it important that emerging issues that are likely to pose serious policy problems in the near future, be raised in the context of this covenant now. This is with a view to minimising the possibility that policies are implemented that fail to adequately protect the rights of disabled people or others who may experience similar barriers or existential issues.
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4.1 The impact of welfare reforms

**Issues and supporting evidence**

**Article 1 – The right to self-determination.**

1.1 Education

For the purposes of this document, we interpret this article as pertaining to the duties of State parties to promote the realization of its citizens rights to ‘freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.’[[6]](#footnote-6) The UK’s periodic review of the UN CRPD raised a number of issues pertaining to the impact of current state policies which impede the ability of citizens who consider themselves disabled people to realise their rights to economic and social self-determination. These included issues related to barriers to employment experienced by disabled people, and issues regarding education. We intend, at a later part of this examination process, to provide evidence regarding employment. Here, we present evidence from the D4D research interim project report. It focuses on the significant impact of current education policies on the abilities of disabled young people to develop and learn such that they are and will be able to realise their right to economic, social and cultural self-determination. This evidence may also be considered in relation to Article 24 (the rights of the child), as it pertains to the ability of children and young people to exercise their civil rights. Key findings of relevance here are explored below.

A. Inadequate staffing

A growing number of Special Educational Needs Coordinators (SENCOs) in both primary and secondary schools are teaching assistants, often termed as Assistant SENCOs. The training they have undertaken is variable. Seemingly driven by budgetary pressures, this reflects a loss of expertise and a reduction of status for Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND). Additionally, the growth of academies[[7]](#footnote-7) is leading to primary schools - in particular - to lose the consistent in-house support required for SEND students[[8]](#footnote-8). Instead, these students rely on visits from SENCOs based elsewhere. This impacts the quality of education and inclusion possible for children and young people with additional needs[[9]](#footnote-9). (For further evidence, please see references in the footnotes[[10]](#footnote-10).)

B. ‘Inclusion’ being inadequate

We are particularly concerned about the nature of inclusion. Within many institutions, students remain effectively segregated. Many SEND students are removed from all joint class settings. Even socially, opportunities to interact with other students are restricted. They become a marginalised community within the wider setting, subject to isolation and / or bullying. In many institutions the question of inclusion is reduced to issues of access. Some schools appear to feel that getting the students into classrooms constitutes inclusion. Genuine efforts to foster inclusion are few and far between.

There is an institutional trend away from social inclusion back towards large specialist / special schools. Once again, the driver seems to be around economic factors, with education authorities seeking to make cuts. Indeed, the 2019 NAO (National Audit Office Report) referred to ‘concerns that financial pressures and performance measures in the current system encourage …schools to be less inclusive’. Despite the additional funding being paid in by the government, the reports states that ‘on current trends, the support system is not financially sustainable’. The report suggests that education provision for 50% of SEND pupils is inadequate, with significant variation in terms of quality around the country – ‘but the government does not know enough about the reasons for the variation’.

Some of the emerging special schools are huge ‘super-schools’, in which children and young people with a range of conditions are placed together. Whether driven by ideology or economies of scale, this does not seem to us to constitute the best means of supporting every child. This arguably contributes to a wider tendency here, providing a quick fix to challenges faced by mainstream institutions through segregation. Behavioural issues are being agglomerated with a wide range of needs. Indeed, behaviour of distress in itself is likely to be given a clinical label – ADHD or ASD. Both treatment within schools and allocation to schools is being driven here by categorisation of condition rather than response to children and young people’s needs.

Additionally, such practices impact on the child’s ability to realise self-determination regarding social development, as they are actively inhibited from engaging with the full range of children and young people with whom they might otherwise build relationships. Such outcomes run counter to the Department for Education’s stated intention of aiming to ‘set an example as an employer and is developing policies that make opportunity equal for children and young people.’[[11]](#footnote-11)

C. The disproportionate exclusion of children and young people with additional needs from school:

Numbers of SEND students who are being excluded from school are rising. The 2019 NAO Report suggested that children and young people with SEND accounted for 45% of permanent exclusions[[12]](#footnote-12). The underlying reasons for such exclusions are not always transparent or consistent, and our impression is that this is often driven by pressures on schools to hit targets in terms of results, with some of those excluded seen as being liable to bring down average grades. In effect, SEND students are getting excluded because they are simply seen as being challenging, or seem unlikely to achieve high grades. This view aligns with that expressed in the 2019 NAO Report, which states that ‘the system incentivises mainstream primary and secondary schools to be less inclusive’. This relates both to budget fears and concerns that academic performance among these pupils will have a negative impact on school positions in government performance tables. Parents who challenge schools are perceived as being difficult, obstructive or even ‘toxic’.

We have come across several instances in which schools have treated mental illness or Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) as a behavioural issue. This has occurred even in cases where there is medical evidence to demonstrate that children and young people have been suffering from mental illness and/ or where they have been referred to Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS). There are instances where legal action has been instigated by schools against parents as a result of their child’s non-attendance. In such instances, we suspect that there is often an underlying purpose to pressurise parents into removing their children from such institutions. (For further evidence, please see references in the footnotes[[13]](#footnote-13).)

D. Lack of adequate support for mental health issues/distress:

There is a lack of access for young people in schools to support services. Support from Educational Psychologists (EPs) and trained counsellors is inconsistent, haphazard and not necessarily ordered by a clear hierarchy of needs. In many institutions SEND students continue to face bullying and ostracism, which may increase their need for support with mental health issues/distress. This appears to be reflected in reports, such that in November 2018 the NHS identified a steep rise in the number of children and young people dealing with issues of mental illness[[14]](#footnote-14). Comparing statistics from the previous NHS report (2004), a salient feature is an increase in emotional disorders (including anxiety and depression) [3.9% among 5-15 year olds in 2004 to 5.8% in 2017][[15]](#footnote-15).

There is a challenge to schools in terms of responding to this situation; a key problem being that there is not a coherent national policy that enables schools and support teams to devise clear strategies. While there is an acknowledgement of increasing issues connected to mental health, central policies have been muddied through the amalgamation of issues of mental health and issues of behaviour[[16]](#footnote-16). In our view the conflation of the two issues is not helpful in the construction of clear strategies for mental illness amongst young people in schools. While being of assistance to those working in schools to a certain extent, the 2018 report strikes us as being reductive, focusing on instrumental measures concerning control, and doing little to assist schools in the development of integrated, holistic policies. For effective strategies to emerge, there is a need to focus not only on the outcomes of mental illness but on the causes and underlying factors. The importance of this issue to Article 1 as the experience of mental health issues in childhood is demonstrated to impact not only on a person’s wellbeing in later life, but also on their life chances with regards to things such as educational attainment and employment. Lack of employment opportunities undeniably impacts on a person’s economic development.

Suggested questions for the List of Issues:

1. How does the State party intend to address issues in education, particularly those disproportionately impacting children and young people with SEND, in order to fulfil its duty to promote the realisation of people’s right to economic, social and cultural self-determination?

Specifically:

1. What are the State parties plans to address the staffing issues that negatively impacting on the education delivered to children and young people with SEND, and as such their educational attainment?
2. How does the State party intend to foster greater genuine inclusion for children and young people with additional needs into wider society?
3. How does the State party intent to address the hugely disproportionate exclusion rates experienced by children and young people with SEND, particularly given reports of problematic ‘zero-tolerance’ practices in some schools to deal with ‘bad behaviour’[[17]](#footnote-17)? Would the State party undertake to conduct an independent review specifically on the impact of current policies on children and young people with SEND?
4. What steps is the State party taking to ensure children have the mental health support they need as early as possible?
5. Does the State party intend to act on calls for Ofsted to have a specific duty to incorporate within inspections investigation into the health and well-being of both students and staff[[18]](#footnote-18)?

**Article 4 – States of emergency.**

2.1 Consideration of the needs of disabled people

Article 4 articulates a duty on the State parties to ensure that citizens are not discriminated against in times of public emergency. We interpret this as inclusive of ensuring no such discrimination takes place in the development and implementation of emergency planning. Whilst disabled people are not listed in the Article as a group requiring specific protections against such discrimination, we apply the inclusion of disability in General Comment 36 (regarding the right to life) to this article; particularly as this article pertains to the protection of life in emergency situations. We consider that an inattention to the needs of disabled people in situations of declared states of emergency may lead to a derogation of the right to avoid being ‘arbitrarily deprived of his life’[[19]](#footnote-19) on the basis of ‘discrimination solely on the ground of’ disability[[20]](#footnote-20).

The Civil Contingencies Act (2004) currently provides the legislation concerning the emergency powers and local arrangements in states of emergency for the protection of civilians. Definitions of ‘emergency’ in this legislation includes ‘an event or situation which threatens serious damage to the human welfare’, and ‘to the environment of the United Kingdom or region’[[21]](#footnote-21). Increasingly the UK is experiencing environmental emergencies resulting from changes in the climate.

Given increasing recognition of the existential threat posed by environmental emergencies, researchers within the D4D project wish to highlight that related concerns within disability communities. Though progress is being made with regards to increasing the inclusion of the needs of disabled people at a policy level with regards to emergency planning and resilience building, concerns remain regarding:

* The funding, monitoring and outreach elements of emergency plans relating to meeting the needs of disabled people who might be differently or additionally disadvantages as a result of disability in such situations;
* A lack of research in this field and engagement with disabled people is likely to inhibit the development of plans that will adequately meet the needs of disabled people with regards to having their right to life protected on an equal basis to non-disabled people[[22]](#footnote-22).

Suggested questions for the List of Issues:

1. Can the State party please outline how they intend to involve disabled people’s organisations and disabled people themselves in the planning and implementation of community resilience and emergency planning policy?
2. How does the State party intend to seek ways to empower disabled people to build their resilience against climatic shocks and stresses, not just for themselves but also for their communities?

**Article 6 – The right to life**

3.1 Suicide among people claiming welfare benefits

Though the D4D project is not focused on the impact of welfare reforms since 2010 on disabled people, engagement with the issue has been inescapable. In relation to Article 6, we wish to highlight the rise in suicide where difficulties accessing welfare benefits has been cited as the or a considerable factor in acts of suicide. We position this in relation to this article as we feel that systemic subjection to conditions that significantly contribute to suicide attempts contravenes part 1 of the article with regards to the right to not ‘be arbitrarily deprived of his life.’ This has been an issue of particular importance amongst disabled people who require financial support from the state for some years now; since the implementation of new assessment processes for disability and sickness related benefits around 2010.

Though these issues have been well documented in the UK’s UN CRPD optional protocol inquiry (2016) and periodic examination (2017), evidence continues to emerge supporting claims that systemic issues within the current welfare system that contribute to or drive people to suicidal acts[[23]](#footnote-23). From within the D4D project itself, research working with adults with long-term mental health issues and distress has highlighted the ways in which difficulties navigating the welfare system, fear of losing support and problems with welfare payments has contributed not only to the aggravation of mental health issues/distress, but also to suicide attempts by participants during the course of the research project[[24]](#footnote-24).

Adding to this is the more recent implementation of Universal Credit system. Whilst the implementation of Universal Credit was intended to simplify access to welfare, the way that it has been implemented has in fact led to significant increases in delays of payments. Reports are emerging of increased suicide across a wider proportion of society in which such difficulties were ‘the’ or a significant factor[[25]](#footnote-25).

Suggested questions for the List of Issues:

1. How does the State party intend to address the rise in suicides in which problems with accessing welfare payments in a timely manner are ‘the’ or a significant factor?

3.2 The premature deaths of people with autism and learning disabilities

We have also considered health inequalities and the premature deaths of people with autism and learning difficulties[[26]](#footnote-26). These deaths are tied to poor access to screening and medical support due to failures in communication and ableist assumptions about the value and quality of disabled people’s lives. This means that ‘do not resuscitate’ (DNR) is inappropriately used, often without dialogue with loved ones; and that people can receive substandard care in both community and hospital settings. We believe that broader systemic inequalities play a fundamental role in denying people with autism and learning disabilities the right to appropriate and timely medical support.

Suggested questions for the List of Issues:

1. How will the State party act to address the significant health inequalities that people with autism and learning disabilities experience?

3.3 – The threat to life resulting from inadequate debate and policy regarding genetic screening

Researchers in the D4D project wish to raise concerns regarding the way in which innovations in genetic screening are impacting on people’s choices to terminate pregnancy when disability is flagged through the screening process. We acknowledge that the scope of this Article does not extend to the right to life of foetuses where this conflicts with the rights of women and girls to have choice regarding the termination of pregnancy. However, we also note the Committee’s comment placing an obligation on State parties to ‘ensure the right to life extends to reasonably foreseeable threats and life-threatening situations that can result in loss of life.’[[27]](#footnote-27). This implies a duty on the part of State parties to acknowledge emerging threats to life and to act accordingly to protect those liable to be impacted.

Whilst we respect women’s rights to choice in pregnancy, we are concerned about the lack of discussion regarding the implementation of genetic screening. We note that part 4 of Article 6 highlights the right to protection where ‘deprivation of life constitutes the crime of genocide.’ We contend that there is the potential for genocidal impacts if this technology is not introduced with great care[[28]](#footnote-28), as has been demonstrated in countries where such screening is routine[[29]](#footnote-29). We here use the word ‘genocidal’ as the implications of this run wider than those on the lives of individuals; the absence of births of people with particular genetic conditions will effectively lead to their absence from society when those already living pass away.

Genetic screening can be an incredibly useful technology. However, we are mindful that is being implemented in a society that still experiences high levels of ableism that is likely to influence the choices made by individuals. We note the Committee’s comment that ‘Legal protections for the right to life must apply equally to all individuals and provide them with effective guarantees against all forms of discrimination, including multiple and intersectional forms of discrimination.’[[30]](#footnote-30) Debate is needed to find ways of balancing a woman’s right to choice with the very real and existential threat to a whole minority community if these technologies are employed in ways that devalue the rights of disabled people and disabled communities.

The D4D project has researched this issue with people with lived experience of genetic conditions. If this technology had been available prior to the rise of disability rights, numerous disabled people may have been denied their ‘inherent right to life’. Concerns have been raised that disabled people themselves are not playing an integral part in all ethical and policy decisions being made in relation to genetic screening. As consequence, there is fear that the unique perspective of those with lived experience of genetic conditions is not being valued in the way medicalised knowledge is respected.

“I fought it for a long time because it didn’t fit my own ideas about what was valued and perceived - not just as ‘tragic’ but also as ‘repulsive’. In an intelligent and diverse family I now realise how much ableist values had been part of my upbringing and education. Watching friend and family wrestle with these concepts - as well as how strangers ‘categorise’ me depending on whether I am using a white cane, a guide dog, training at the gym, teaching a class, etc is fascinating (though often exhausting)

We are the only people who can reflect an authentic level experience. We can explain about adapting and growing and engaging with the body and mind in ways those outside of the experience never could. We are essential for a reality check.” *Participant 3. Statement taken October 2019*

Participants further expressed concerns that there is a very real and increased chance that those with “life limiting” conditions will, in the future, have their rights diminished; in particular, their inherent right to life.

I think it is important to recognise and include the perspective of the ‘person affected’, often missing from discussions about genetic screening. I also feel it’s important to do so without assuming what the ‘person affected’ position might be and allowing for the full complexity of different opinions and experiences.

It is a difficult thing to think of yourself in terms of being something that might be considered throwaway but allowing myself to think in these terms the question that really arose for me was: who is making the decision that one life is worthwhile and another is not? Who decides the terms and criteria? *Participant 1. Statement taken August 2018*

Approaches that don’t seek out and elevate the importance of lived experience risk institutionalising discriminatory and prejudiced attitudes. Further, such approaches are not in keeping with the rights of disabled people articulated in the UN CRPD regarding the inclusion of people with lived experience in all stages of the policy cycle. Given the gravity of this issue and its potential to significantly limit diversity within future societies, we feel that it is important that these concerns are shared with the State party and that they are encouraged to seek greater collaboration with disabled people with regards to this issue.

Suggested questions for the List of Issues:

1. How does the State party intend to address the concerns of many disabled people that the progressive use of genetic screening in pregnancy won’t lead to a genocidal effect for people with particular genetic conditions?
2. How does the State party intend to engage with disabled people with regards to this issue, and ensure that the perspective of those with lived conditions is granted equal value with medical perspectives?
3. How does the State party intend to address the way that ableist attitudes might influence and prejudice the choices made by parents following genetic screening?

**Article 7 – The prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment**

4.1 The impact of welfare reforms

Article 7 states that ‘No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.’ Following from section 3.1, the D4D project wishes to highlight once more that many disabled people subject to assessment interviews for receipt of welfare payments feel the process to be inhumane and degrading. Whilst these issues were covered in some depth in the UK’s UN CRPD optional protocol inquiry and periodic examination, these issues persist. In addition to being reflected in the reports of the Equalities and Human Rights Commission[[31]](#footnote-31) and of leading Disability NGOs[[32]](#footnote-32), such issues are increasingly being reflected in literature produced by disabled writers and activists[[33]](#footnote-33). These works provide even greater insight into what it is to live the impacts of welfare reforms, highlighting that delays or the practice of sanctioning (withholding benefit payments due to alleged non-compliance) has led people to experience debt, hunger, homelessness, and contributed to experiences of sickness and deaths.

The persistence of these issues have been impressed on researchers in this project by many participants involved[[34]](#footnote-34), a situation reflective of research findings from both academic and NGO organisations[[35]](#footnote-35). This is of particular concern as some of the same issues seem to be present in the implementation of Universal Credit (see section 3.1). In November 2019, Gateshead Council in partnership with Fuse, the Centre for Translational Research in Public Health published a study that concluded that:

UC adversely affected claimant’s financial security, physical and mental health, social and family lives and employment prospects. Managing the UC claims process and increased conditionality, combined with the threat of sanctions, exacerbated long term health conditions and impacted so negatively on participant’s mental health that some had considered suicide[[36]](#footnote-36).

These findings reinforce a growing body of research evidence documenting the deleterious effects of the roll out of UC on claimants with vulnerabilities, disabilities and health conditions, amplifying calls for a halt, review and radical overhaul of UC by the UK government.
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