



1<sup>st</sup> Draft Policy Brief: St. Lucia

The conduct of Disability Assessments  
in Borrowing Member Countries –  
Caribbean Development Bank

December 03, 2021

Caribbean Development Bank  
P.O Box 408, Wildey  
St. Michael  
Barbados, W.I. BB11000

## Table of Contents

1. Summary of purpose .....	3
2. Quick Facts about the situational assessment of persons with disabilities .....	3
3. Key Recommendation- Strategic Priority Areas for Programme/Project Support in Short/Medium and Long-term .....	5
4. Key Monitoring and Evaluation Indicators:.....	7
5. Contact Agencies for Further Information.....	9

## List of Tables

Tables	Page Number
Table 3.1: Recommendations for Inclusion	5
Table 4.1: Disability Indicator by Measurement, Value and Source of Information	9

## 1. Summary of purpose

This policy brief provides a summary of the main findings of the situational assessment of persons with disabilities in Saint Lucia. The assessment was carried out using a mixed method approach: desk review, institutional assessment, quantitative research (a household survey) and qualitative research (focus group discussions and elite interviews). The brief ends with policy recommendations (short-term 2021-2022) medium-term (2023-2025) and long-term (2026-2030). Strategies to enhance the monitoring and evaluation systems are also provided.

## 2. Quick Facts about the situational assessment of persons with disabilities

The analysis of the quantitative data revealed many important findings. These include: -

1. Of all the 4320 persons interviewed by The Central Statistical Office of Saint Lucia in 2019, 4.6 % of them reported at least one disability.
2. The data reveals that most PWDs in the sample resided in Castries (86.5 %) while the smallest proportion resided in Canaries (1.1%).
3. Females accounted for more than half of the population of PWDs (53.1%).
4. About 48% of persons with disabilities in the sample were household heads.
5. Most of the PWDs in Saint Lucia (45.1%) had completed primary education, that is, grade 1 to 6; 12.1 % completed grade 7-9.
6. Persons between the 60+ age group accounted for the largest share of PWDs (57.0%)
7. Persons with disabilities have low internet access (47%)
8. A large proportion of persons with disabilities (43.3%) do not know how to use the internet while a similar proportion have no interest in using the internet (47.7%)
9. Approximately 22% (N=42) of PWDs can recall the last time being hit, attacked or assaulted by someone without a weapon.
10. This is a high incidence as it means that one in five persons with disabilities has suffered physical abuse.

The qualitative research revealed the following vulnerabilities that persons with disabilities face.

1. **Negative impact of COVID-19:** The pandemic has had a negative impact on all social groups, especially persons with disabilities. The pandemic has significantly increased the vulnerability of persons with disabilities.

2. **Lack of well- coordinated vaccination plan for persons with disabilities:** - There is a lack of a well - coordinated vaccination plan for persons with disabilities.
3. **Inadequate social protection:** All categories of interviewees lamented the inadequacy (both in monetary value and scope of services) of the social protection provided by the State to persons with disabilities.
4. **Inadequate physical infrastructure:** The participants from the focus group discussants and elite interviews highlighted the inadequate physical infrastructure for persons with disabilities. It is very difficult for persons with disabilities to navigate around their communities.
5. **Limited access to psycho-social support:** Respondents revealed that there was an urban- bias in the provision of psycho-social support.
6. **Inadequate health facilities:** Diagnostic, treatment and rehabilitative services are inadequate.
7. **Limited access to various levels of education:** children with disabilities have very few options to continue their education after leaving the Special Education Centres.
8. **Focus on their disabilities and not their abilities** Both caregivers and persons with disabilities lament that in most discussions and interactions with persons with disabilities, the focus is on their disabilities and not their abilities. Societal barriers and social perception limit persons with disabilities more than the actual disabilities
9. **High levels of stress for caregivers:** - Caregivers lamented that taking care of persons with disabilities is very stressful and challenging and called for more support for parents/caregivers.
10. **High Incidence of Sexual Abuse:** The participants in the focus group discussions (female caregivers and female young adults with disabilities) unveiled a culture of sexual abuse of persons with disabilities (PWDs) in the country.
11. **Invisibility and Voice-lessens:** The review of policies and programmes (Section 4), reviewed the PWDs are not included in the conceptualization, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Participants in the various sessions and elite interviewees all decried the low visibility and attention paid to the persons with disabilities.
12. **Inadequate communication with persons with disabilities:** There was evidence that there is a major problem with the timeliness, format and frequency of communication between persons with disabilities and providers of services for them.
13. **Expenditure:** it is estimated that of the ECD 11.6 million spent on public assistance in 2020/21, between ECD 337 - 581 thousand was received by households with a person with a disability. An average of 18.4 percent of the Ministry of Equity, Social Justice, Local Government and Empowerment budget over the period 2015/16 and 2020/21, varying between 26.2 percent in 2015/16 and 12 percent in 2019/20 is spent of services for persons with disabilities.

14. **Monitoring and Evaluation:** The following challenges impede effective monitoring and evaluation:  
Lack of basic monitoring and evaluation structures; Absence of dedicated monitoring and evaluation staff and addressing inconsistencies in the systems

### 3. Key Recommendation- Strategic Priority Areas for Programme/Project Support in Short/Medium and Long-term

In order to fulfil the UN2030 Agenda and ensure that persons with disabilities are not Left behind” urgent action is needed. In order to improve the adherence to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), interventions are needed at the macro, meso and micro levels. The main policy or programmatic are listed in the table below.

**Table 3.1: Recommended Actions**

Period	Recommended Actions
Short term (2021-2022)	Provision of food vouchers for persons with disabilities and their families.
	Implement free access to 24/7 helplines with psychiatrists, psychologists and counsellors to provide support to the persons with disabilities and their caregivers.
	Ensure that persons with disabilities can access and understand critical information that will improve the quality of their lives.
	Establishment of support groups for caregivers.
	<i>Nothing for us without us</i> ”- Increase dialogue between representatives of persons with disabilities and policy makers and service providers.
	Ensure that all children with disabilities are accessing learning and provide them with the appropriate devices and data to regularly access the internet.
Medium Term (2023-2025)	Complete a register of all persons with disabilities in St. Lucia
	Examine the means-tests in place for persons with disabilities to access the social protection programmes.
	Strengthen private and public partnerships for the delivery of services for persons with disabilities.
	Provision of employment opportunities for persons with disabilities.

Period	Recommended Actions
	Public education to increase public sensitivity to persons with disabilities.
	Expansion of educational services provided to persons with disabilities to include preparation of business plans and small business support
	Expansion of health services to take into account the various types of disabilities. Health services should include diagnostic, treatment and rehabilitation.
	Training sessions for all service delivery personnel to improve customer service and treatment of persons with disabilities.
	Sensitivity sessions about the treatment of victims for police men and women and personnel in the Justice System.
	Public education programmes warning about the punishment of sexual abuse.
	Build a shelter for victims of abuse
	Swifter hearing of alleged cases. A specified day would be allocated to cases involving persons with disabilities.
Long-term (2026-2030)	Increase value of the benefits that persons with disabilities receive from the social protection programmes.
	Social protection programmes must be more inclusive and “ <i>Think Family</i> ” to ensure that all vulnerable persons in the households are covered.
	State budgetary allocation: Scholarships for children with disabilities at all levels of the education system.
	Legislative reform: Swifter and harsher punishment for perpetrators of violence against persons with disabilities
	Physical access to buildings providing critical social services must be improved. Implementation of building codes is paramount.
	Road Safety for persons with disabilities must be increased as many roads are very dangerous for persons with disabilities
	Provision of low cost housing for persons with disabilities

Period	Recommended Actions
	More cohesive delivery of programmes and services

#### 4. Key Monitoring and Evaluation Indicators:

- Collaboration with regional partners including higher education institutions that have monitoring and evaluation and research capacity should be strengthened. This might include for example optimised use of the Sir Arthur Lewis Institute of Social and Economic Studies, UWI's Derek Gordon Databank as a central regional repository of all datasets related to persons with disabilities;
- Hosting of a joint regional training of census implementers in the Washington Group questions might be necessary to promote greater harmonisation and standardisation across the BMCs;
- There is a dire need to improve the timeliness of census data. One way this might be tackled is to revise and update its implementation design towards making it more risk adaptive;
- Ensuring comparability in terms of questions asked in the census and other national survey instruments is also key. The standardised use of definitions and measurements across national and regional instruments are therefore recommended;
- More appropriate training of interviewers who will interact with households with persons with disabilities. Such training would be trauma-informed and supported by the establishment of interview protocols for census staff. This recommendation is especially important as some household heads who are persons with disabilities may, for example, require interviewers who are also interpreters;
- Reporting, publication and data sharing of monitoring data on the legal status of building codes and regulations for enforcement should be given serious consideration;
- Regular collection of gender-specific data on children with disabilities must be promoted across the board;
- The close monitoring and evaluation of the PAP graduation strategy coming on stream is highly recommended. Lessons learnt should also be used to improve the graduation strategy and support its replication in the rest of the OECS.

A regional index to measure disability inclusion was developed by Senator Floyd Morris. It was composed of several indicators as listed in Table 4.1. Saint Lucia ranked 5<sup>th</sup> out of 10 selected Caribbean countries. While, Saint Lucia scored very well in its measures to prevent discrimination and injustice against children with disabilities, the index revealed that there is much room for improvement in other areas. Specifically, the

island scored very poorly on access to the health care system, information and equal opportunity for employment for persons with disabilities. Saint Lucia also scored poorly with regards to accessibility to buildings and legislative measures to prevent discrimination against persons with disabilities and average on measures to promote justice and ensure education is accessible for persons with disabilities. The table below provides more details of St. Lucia's performance on the regional disability index.

**Table 4.1: Disability Indicator by Measurement, Value and Source of Information**

Source	Year	Indicator	Value	Definition of Indicator
Report on Regional Disability Index	2019	Regional Inclusive Ranking	5	Ranking is done based on index score. The rank provided is out of a total of 10 countries.
Report on Regional Disability Index	2019	Number and quality of legislative measures to prevent discrimination against persons with disabilities	9.5	Excellent (33.5 -40), very good (26.9-33.5), good (20.2-26.8), average (13.5- 20.1), poor (6.8-13.4) and very poor (0-6.7)
Report on Regional Disability Index	2019	Number and quality of measures (including legislation) to prevent discrimination against persons living with a disability	13	Excellent (23.6-28), very good (18.9-23.5), good (14.2-18.8), average (9.5-14.1), poor (4.8-9.4) and very poor (0-4.7)
Report on Regional Disability Index	2019	Number and quality of measures to prevent gender discrimination against persons living with a disability	3.5	An arithmetic operation was done to create an ordinal performance strength scale which is represented by Excellent (8.5-10), very good (6.9-8.5), good (5.1-6.8), average (3.5-5.1), poor (1.8-3.4) and very poor (0-1.7)
Report on Regional Disability Index	2019	Number and quality of measures to prevent discrimination and promote justice for children with disabilities	8	Excellent (8.5-10), very good (6.9-8.5), good (5.1-6.8), average (3.5-5.1), poor (1.8-3.4) and very poor (0-1.7)
Report on Regional Disability Index	2019	Number and quality of measures to promote awareness on persons with disabilities	5	Excellent (8.5-10), very good (6.9-8.5), good (5.1-6.8), average (3.5-5.1), poor (1.8-3.4) and very poor (0-1.7)
Report on Regional Disability Index	2019	Number and quality of measures to ensure accessibility to buildings	7	Excellent (20.5-24), Very Good (16.5-20.4), Good (12.5-16.4), Average (8.5- 12.4), Poor (4.5-8.4) and Very Poor (0-4.4)
Report on Regional Disability Index	2019	Number and quality of measures to ensure access to information for persons with disabilities	0.5	Excellent (4.1-5), Very Good (3.3-4.0), Good (2.5-3.2), Average (1.7-2.4), Poor (0.9-1.6) and Very Poor (0-0.8)
Report on Regional Disability Index	2019	Number and quality of measures to promote justice for persons with disabilities	12.5	Excellent (24.1-29), Very Good (19.3-24.0), Good (14.5-19.2), Average (9.7- 14.4), Poor (4.9-9.6) and Very Poor (0-4.8).
Report on Regional Disability Index	2019	Number and quality of measures to ensure education	4.5	Excellent (10.5-12.0), Very Good (8.5-10.4), Good (6.5-8.4), Average (4.5-6.4), Poor (2.5-4.4) and Very Poor (0-2.4)



Source	Year	Indicator	Value	Definition of Indicator
		is accessible persons with disabilities		
Report on Regional Disability Index	2019	Number and quality of measures to ensure the health care system is accessible to persons with disabilities	1	Excellent (6.1-7.0), Very Good (4.9-6.0), Good (3.7-4.8), Average (2.5-3.6), Poor (1.3-2.4) and Very Poor (0-1.2)
Report on Regional Disability Index	2019	Number and quality to provide equal opportunity for employment for persons with disabilities	2	Excellent (10.5-12.0), Very Good (8.5-10.4), Good (6.5-8.4), Average (4.5-6.4), Poor (2.5-4.4) and Very Poor (0-2.4)
Report on Regional Disability Index	2019	Social protection for persons with disabilities	4	Excellent (6.6-8.0), Very Good (5.3-6.5), Good (4.0-5.2), Average (2.7-3.9), Poor (1.4-2.6) and Very Poor (0-1.3)
Report on Regional Disability Index	2019	Political participation of persons with disabilities	4	Excellent (4.1-5), Very Good (3.3-4.0), Good (2.5-3.2), Average (1.7-2.4), Poor (0.9-1.6) and Very Poor (0-0.8)
Report on Regional Disability Index	2019	Data collection on persons with disabilities	Not stated	Excellent (6.6-8.0), Very Good (5.3-6.5), Good (4.0-5.2), Average (2.7-3.9), Poor (1.4-2.6) and Very Poor (0-1.3)
Report on Regional Disability Index	2019	International corporation	1	Excellent (1.6-2.0), Very Good (1.3-1.5), Good (1.0-1.2), Average (0.7-0.9), Poor (0.4-0.6) and Very Poor (0-0.3)
Report on Regional Disability Index	2019	Monitoring process on persons with disabilities	6.5	Excellent (12.6-15.0), Very Good (10.1-12.5), Good (7.6-10.0), Average (5.1- 7.5), Poor (2.6-5.0) and Very Poor (0-2.5)

## 5. Contact Agencies for Further Information

1. Social Transformation in the Ministry of Equity, Social Justice, Empowerment, Youth Development, Sports and Local Government.  
Director's Email address - ttoussaint@gosl.gov.lc
2. National Council of and for Persons with Disabilities  
President's email address- president.ncpd.inc@gmail.com
3. Gender Relations in the Ministry of Education, Innovation, Gender Relations and Sustainable Development  
Director's email address: joseph.janey@gmail.com
4. St. Lucia Blind Welfare Association  
President's email: anthonymavril@hotmail.com
5. St. Lucia Chamber of Commerce

Email: info@stluciachamber.org

6. Royal Saint Lucia Police Force

Superintendent of Police Email: m.sealy8522@gmail.com

General Information Email: cop.sec@police.govt.lc

7. Cerebral Palsy Association

President's Email: nadhaj\_r@yahoo.com

General Information: info@cpastlucia.org

8. Vieux Fort Special Education

Principal's email: basilla.joseph200561@gmail.com

9. Interview with Senior Teacher of Lady Gordon Opportunity Centre

Senior Teacher's email: dpayne@lgoc.edu.lc

10. CTV

Managing Director's email: bernardfanis@gmail.com

11. The Ministry of Health

Permanent Secretary's email address: pshealth@govt.lc

12. Banker's Association of St. Lucia

President's email: carol.mangal@fcibc.com

13. National Emergency Management Organization

Director's email address: dgustave@gosl.gov.lc