Since the widespread use of UC, disabled people have become more invisible

**WCA: outcomes are only known for ESA claimants, and new claims are closed**. Based on the government's own stats, around 1% are leaving the WRAG each month and over 1% the SG. So ESA claimants are a diminishing group, with the more severely affected left in it. It means that the stats are meaningless, but remember Coffey saying that most disabled claimants undergoing a WCA go in the SG, which is why she wants to reform the WCA, but ESA assessments are really mainly reassessments, so the % going into the SG is likely to be high and to get higher.

**About UC: disabled people don’t exist as a distinct group**, but belong to conditionality groups, meaning attracting different levels of sanctions. So disabled people under UC are lumped with other groups and it is impossible to know how many of them are claiming UC and are being sanctioned.

**No stats on and monitoring of WCA outcomes for UC claimants**.

Although DWP has made accessible (through the Tool X-plore, so you have to construct your tables)  the No of claimants found to have LCWRA (equivalent of SG) under UC, and the number of claimants found to have LCW (WRAG) under UC, it transpires (according to DWP) that the number found to have LCW were only claimants moved from the WRAG to UC because of a change of circumstances so not people undergoing a WCA under UC.

**More importantly**, DWP does not publish the number or % of people undergoing a WCA and found to have neither LCWRA nor LCW, which under the old ESA system meant **being found fit for work**.   It is really important as the ratio between the 3 groups used to be a good indicator of the disability assessment contractors performance, and it was a very important part of the complaint and then the shadow report .

The number of MR is an overall number and **the publication of the MoJ on tribunal stats** does not differentiate anymore between the different UC claimants. They are all lumped together, disabled and unemployed people, working people, etc. We lost a crucial piece of information here.

Policies introduced are not monitored. For example, cuts to ESA WRAG. No evaluation of impact on disabled people and no evaluation on whether the cuts have incentivised DP into work (that was the government's argument)

No impact assessment of removal of uplift on disabled people on UC

Also monitoring of what was and is happening to DP during the pandemic.

No involvement of DP in national strategy

**Refusal to publish a report commissioned by the prime minister’s office** – into the effectiveness of its support for “vulnerable” claimants of universal credit.(they have a duty to publish)

**DWP outcome delivery plan:** DWP only planning to evaluate the impact of policies designed to help people move into work  <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/department-for-work-and-pensions-outcome-delivery-plan/department-for-work-and-pensions-outcome-delivery-plan-2021-to-2022>

Also the increased use of exemptions to avoid responding to **FOI requests**.

Also two **surveys**

**Life opportunity survey Data** on how disabled and non-disabled people participate in society. discontinued in 2015

**Fullfilling potential outcomes and indicators**Data measuring indicators in the Fulfilling Potential disability strategy outcomes and indicators framework. discontinued 2015

The **Claimant Service and Experience Survey** (CSES) was last published in 2019 and shows a decrease of satisfaction for ESA and PIP claimants <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/dwp-claimant-service-and-experience-survey-2018-to-2019--2/claimant-service-and-experience-survey-2018-to-2019>