

# Washington Group Questions and Administrative Data

**Daniel Mont**

Center for Inclusive Policy

And

Washington Group on Disability Statistics



Washington Group on Disability Statistics  
Annual Meetings  
Rome, Italy  
November 2019

- 1) Can the Washington Group Questions be useful in administrative data?
- 2) Can administrative data be used to measure disability prevalence or disaggregate SDG indicators?

# Administrative Data

- Contains information considered necessary for running and monitoring government programs, and thus reflect the requirements and characteristics of those programs.
- Programs may be disability specific but they can also be general programs not primarily related to disability but collecting information relevant to disability issues, such as education management information systems (EMIS).

# Can the Washington Group Questions be useful in administrative data?

- **Not for eligibility purposes.** The questions are not specific enough. Their rates of false negatives and positives are fine for statistical purposes but not for the assignment of benefits.
- Yes, for monitoring how programs are reaching people with disabilities in general (Sightsaver example)
- Yes, as a screen for further attention (FEMIS example).

# Education Management Information Systems

- OpenEMIS – UNESCO Institute for Statistics
  - Includes questions on disability inspired by WG questions, and based on UNICEF template
  - Asks about difficulty in seeing, hearing, gross motor, fine motor, intellectual, communication, and behaviour/socialization
  - Scale is no impact on learning, some impact, or a major impact
  - Skip pattern to type of supports needed
  - Countries can modify types of difficulties to include various conditions. Prime example is albinism in some African countries.
- Fiji EMIS – similar approach

Can administrative data from disability programs/registry be used to measure disability prevalence or disaggregate SDG indicators?

For this to be the case a number of conditions must hold. If they don't, then the number of people identified as having a disability will not only be an undercount but will be a biased group

# Conditions for WG questions to be used for prevalence and SDG disaggregation

- **Knowledge of program**

- In India 94% of households with a disabled member hadn't heard of the Persons with Disabilities Act of 1995, and 60% of persons with disabilities in rural areas were unaware of the country's disability pension

- **Decision to apply**

- Have to perceive themselves as having a disability and also perceive the benefits from being certified as worth any costs
- Old people have separate programs
- In Vietnam, 3 levels of disability, but rate of mild disability by far lowest – has very few benefits

- **Ability to apply**

- May face physical or information/communication barriers

- **Disability determination criteria**

- For disability programs defined based on program eligibility criteria, for example ability to work. Adding WG questions to current procedures may seem redundant



# Can administrative data from non-disability programs be used?

For example – land ownership, marriage certification, contributory old age pensions, etc.

- Because of various environmental barriers, people with disabilities may not enter system
- Probably seen as too intrusive.
- Data sets are not updated regularly and disability status changes

# Conclusion

- WG questions (or WG inspired questions) can be useful in some administrative data systems – EMIS, HMIS, humanitarian response (HI study now ongoing), etc. For monitoring how people with disabilities are being reached, or for directing services.
- Not for use in disability prevalence
- For disaggregation – only if indicator refers only to population in the program. For education, not good for attendance, but good for drop-out rate.

Thank You