



GÖTEBORGS
UNIVERSITET

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

POLICY FAILURES OF SINGAPORE'S INCLUSIVE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMMES

The inaccessibility of persons with disabilities to the
labour market in Singapore

Liändrie Steffens

Master's Thesis:	15 higher education credits
Programme:	Master's Programme in Political Science
Date:	05 January
Supervisor:	Jonas Hinnfors
Words:	9669

Abstract

The purpose of this thesis is to understand why the employment rate of persons with disabilities in Singapore is significantly low despite its extensive and generous inclusive employment programmes and the ratification and implementation of the UNCRPD; are these policy failures, what are the possible gaps in the inclusive employment policies and how does it comply with the UNCRPD Article 27 of Work and Employment. These questions are answered through the theoretical lens of policy failure and inclusive employment, and applying the policy failure measures as set forth by McConnell's "criteria of policy success and failure" as well as an in-depth analysis of the inclusive employment policies' eligibility criteria. The thesis found evidence that points to the failure of Singapore's inclusive employment policies namely the Open Door Programme and the Special Employment Credit scheme, and restrictive eligibility criteria for both employers and persons with disabilities hampering Singapore's progress towards inclusive employment. It is argued in this thesis that the inclusive employment programmes of Singapore are designed in such a way that is oppressive rather than inclusive.

Keywords: Persons with Disabilities, UNCRPD, Singapore, policy failure, inclusive employment policies.

Foreword and acknowledgement

I would like to thank my advisor Jonas Hinnfors for his support during this process. I would also like to thank Dr. Justin Lee from the Institute of Policy Studies in Singapore for helping me with useful data and insights into this thesis as well as all the Disable People's Organisations for providing me with their research, articles and insights into this topic.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations.....	1
Introduction	2
Background	4
Theory	6
What disability means.....	6
Inclusive Employment.....	7
Benefits of inclusive employment.....	10
Methodology.....	12
Policy Failure	12
Quality of data	15
Analyses	17
Programme failure criteria.....	20
Inconsistencies of eligibility criteria.....	20
Open Door Programme (ODP)	21
Job Redesign Grant	21
Training Grant	22
Recruitment, Job Placement and Job Support Services (JPJS)	23
Special Employment Credit (SEC).....	24
UNCRRPD Article 27 Compliance	24
Conclusion.....	26
Bibliography	28
Appendix	31

Abbreviations

DPA	Disabled People Association
DPO	Disabled Persons' Organisations
ICED	International Centre for Evidence in Disability
ILO	International Labour Organisation
JPJS	Job Placement and Job Support Services
LCSI	Lien Centre for Social Innovation
MOF	Ministry of Finance
MOM	Ministry of Manpower
MSF	Ministry of Social and Family Development
ODP	Open Door Programme
PwD	Persons with Disabilities
SEC	Special Employment Credit
SGenable	Singapore Enable
SSA	Social Service Agencies
TAFEP	Tripartite Alliance for Fair and Progressive Employment Practices
UNCRPD	United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
UNDESA	United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
VWO	Voluntary Welfare Organisations
WDA	Workforce Development Agency
WSG	The Workforce Singapore

Introduction

According to the World Health Organisation, approximately 15% of the world's population live with some form of disability along with one-fifth experiencing significant disabilities. This gives an estimate of around 1 billion people globally, making persons with disabilities the world's largest minority group. It is estimated by the UNDP that an approximate 80% of those are living in developing countries. The World Bank has estimated that persons with disabilities make up 20% of the world's poorest people and affects more women and older persons. These organisations have predicted that these numbers will continue to grow in the coming decades as a result of ageing populations and a rapid increase in chronic conditions such as diabetes and strokes. In countries where the life expectancy is above 70 years of age, persons spend an average of 8 years of their lives living with a disability.

However, persons with disabilities face a range of barriers, discrimination and exclusions from the labour market. The International Labour Organisation (ILO) has placed persons with disabilities of working age at 386 million, further estimating that the unemployment rate in some countries is as high as 80%. The ILO has further reported that persons with disabilities are twice as likely to be excluded from the labour market compared to their able-bodied counterparts, more likely to work part-time or to be self-employed and are significantly prevalent among groups with lower education. This is in contrast with the UNCRPD article 27 of work and employment which states that State's parties shall recognise the right of persons with disabilities to work on an equal basis to abled-bodied persons and earn a living through employment in an environment that is accessible and inclusive. Furthermore, article 27 states that State's Parties shall take the appropriate steps as well as through legislation, to ensure these rights.

Singapore signed the UNCRPD in 2012 and has implemented several extensive and generous policies promoting employment for persons with disabilities. In contrast to other countries where budget cuts to disability programs and benefits have dominated the disability discussions e.g. United Kingdom (Butler, 2018) and the United States (The Economist, 2018), Singapore has dramatically increased its social spending. Between 2013 and 2020, the country's social development expenditure increased from S\$24,179 billion to S\$41,590 billion (Analysis of revenue and expenditure Financial Year 2020:2020). Moreover, the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA) has estimated the unemployment rates of persons with disabilities in developing countries to be between 80% and 90%, whereas in

industrialised countries, to be between 50% and 70%. The Ministry of Manpower has stated that the employment rate of persons with disabilities stood at 28.6% (Ministry of Manpower, 2018) while the Straits Times in 2019 (Tai, 2019) and the Disabled People's Association states that it stood at only 4.9% (CRPD Parallel Report, 2019:2). Whether either of these rates were to be accurate, Singapore does not fall in the general paradigm of industrialised countries and therefore was chosen in this thesis to further analyse its inclusive employment policies.

Moreover, Singapore is ill-informed on its demographics of persons with disabilities. The International Centre for Evidence in Disability notes that a gap in evidence on how and what type of interventions and programmes are most effective, makes it difficult to implement inclusive policies successfully (Saran, White and Kuper, 2020:6). By addressing these gaps in evidence in the case of Singapore, the question is posed why the employment rate of persons with disabilities is significantly low despite the ratification and implementation of the UNCRPD; are these policy failures, what are the possible gaps in the inclusive employment policies and how does it comply with the UNCRPD Article 27 of Work and Employment.

Background

Singapore is a highly developed country in South-East Asia with a per capita GDP of \$88,991 in 2019 and a total population size of 5,39 million (Statistics Singapore, 2019). The employment rate stood at 80,3% and the unemployment rate at 2,3% in 2019. Although Singapore has illustrated significant willingness to fund social policies for persons with disabilities, the Straits Times in February of 2019 stated that the employment rate of persons with disabilities stood at only 4.9%. Despite these extensive and generous policies promoting employment for persons with disabilities along with Singapore's international standing as a highly industrialised city state, it seems unusual to have such a low employment rate in contrast to the labour force participation rate of 67.7%. However, according to the Ministry of Manpower (MOM), the employment rate stands at 28.6% with only 4.2% seeking employment (Ministry of Manpower, 2018).

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities is the only comprehensive core human rights treaty that recognizes and obligates signatories to “promote, protect and ensure the full and equal enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms by all persons with disabilities, and to promote respect for their inherent dignity” (UNCRP, 2006:4). The UNCRPD consists of 50 articles for the purpose of ensuring full and equal participation of all persons with disabilities to health, education, employment and inclusion in all societal aspects. Although these articles are necessary and have a critical role to play in the lives of persons with disabilities, this paper is of the view that for persons with disabilities, obtaining employment is particularly critical in order to gain independence. In many respects, employment serves as a gateway for accessing other primary resources such as housing, healthcare and transportation.

Singapore signed the UNCRPD in November 2012, ratified in July 2013 and came into effect in August of 2013 (Disabled People's Association, Singapore, 2015:5). In order to implement these legal obligations, set forth in the convention, Singapore drafted the 2nd Enabling Masterplan 2012 – 2016 (Enabling Masterplan, 2012) in the form of an action plan to improve the lives of persons with disabilities. However, Singapore's first Enabling Masterplan was from 2007 – 2011, 5 years prior to signing the convention although the convention was opened for signatories in 2006 already.

Under Article 27 of Work and Employment, the Enabling Masterplan includes 2 critical schemes to increase the employability of persons with disabilities, namely the Open Door

Programme (ODP) and the Special Employment Credit (SEC) (Enabling Masterplan 2, 2011). The ODP provides funding and support to Singapore based companies in encouragement to hire as well as train and integrate persons with disabilities.). The SEC takes on an incentive approach for companies to hire persons with disabilities by offering a credit of up to 16% of the employees' wages (Disabled People's Association, Singapore, 2015:36). These schemes are supported and funded by the Singapore Workforce and Development Agency, the Ministry of Social and Family Development and administered by SGenable (SGEnable).

In designing these inclusive employment policies, Singaporean policymakers rely heavily on the business case approach which focusses on incentivising employers to hire persons with disabilities rather than to enforce it through legislation (Lee, Mathews, Shing and Kuansong, 2017:1). Employers too adopt a business case approach to inclusive employment as they are likely to not employ someone with it making financial sense. Therefore, employers who are hiring persons with disabilities were mainly motivated by the incentives not afforded to them by abled-bodied employees. In this regard, it is argued by policymakers that a business case approach is needed in order to help get persons with disabilities into the labour market. According to Lee, Mathews, Shing and Kuansong (2017:5), there is space for the business case approach to inclusion, however, it should be acknowledged that it cannot be sufficient in itself.

Therefore, there is a need to evaluate these interventionist programs as a lot of information is available on disability, but a lack of evidence on which programs and interventions are most effective and how they should be implemented. The International Centre for Evidence in Disability (ICED) argues that evidence gaps on the effectiveness of interventions make it difficult to design and implement inclusive policies successfully to realise the rights of persons with disabilities (Saran, White and Kuper, 2020:6) as such policies intended to be inclusive can often time be oppressive (Lee, Mathews, Shing and Kuansong, 2017:1).

Theory

What disability means

In order to support the full inclusion of persons with disabilities, it is important to have a clear and commonly accepted definition and understanding of disability. This makes it possible to measure, monitor and determine strategies and policies to achieve the inclusion of persons with disabilities. Therefore, it is a difficult concept to define as it has historically meant different things and viewed with different lenses and attitudes. According to the UNCRPD, persons with disabilities

“include those who have long-term physical, mental, intellectual or sensory impairments which in interaction with various barriers may hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others” (UNCRPD, 2006:4).

There are four commonly used frameworks to describe disability which includes; the charity model, the medical model, the social model, and the human-rights model,

The charity model is one of the oldest ways of understanding disability. This model encouraged persons with disabilities to be supported in the form of charity such as donations, caretaking and protecting them and essentially being viewed as the “vulnerable other” (Jackson, 2018:3). The model does not recognise the capabilities or rights of persons with disabilities in ways such as providing them with financial independence through employment. From the 1800s to the late 1900s, it was common to segregate persons with disabilities in institutions such as workhouses or asylums that often consisted of large grounds outside of city boundaries (Jackson, 2018:3). In South Africa for example, there is still segregated employment in the form of protected workshops for the visually impaired in which persons live and work in a hostel and factory environment. Therefore, persons with disabilities are often segregated geographically and culturally, not being visible to the wider society

The medical approach has also been popular in the past to understand disability. This model views any form of disability as a consequence of deviation from the “normal” body functions (Berghs, Atkin, Graham, Hatton and Thomas, 2016:26). In this sense, an impairment is indicative of a physical abnormality that results in undesirable situations for the person and should be treated medically to reduce, prevent, or heal the impairment wherever it’s possible. This leads to the belief that persons with disabilities can and should be responsible to resolve their needs on an individual basis through medical attention and assistive devices (Jackson, 2018:4). Moreover, this model thus describes all persons with some form of impairment or

“abnormal bodily functions” as disabled, however, persons with similar impairments often experience the impact of their impairment on their lives in varying degrees.

In response to the medical model, was developed *the social approach* to disability. It is the society that disables physically impaired people.

“Disability is something imposed on top of our impairments by the way we are unnecessarily isolated and excluded from full participation in society.

Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation

In this sense, the social model is a response to the failures of society to integrate persons with disabilities equally. An example of this would be an individual in a wheelchair is not unable to be employed because he/she cannot walk, but because offices are not designed to be accessible for the person to enter the workplace. In this sense, the social model views disability in the frame of social oppression through barriers and exclusions imposed by society (Berghs, Atkin, Graham, Hatton and Thomas, 2016:36). This created a shift in the way people think or ought to think of disability creating an awareness of accessible infrastructure such as transportation, access to public buildings and employment offices, etc which unfortunately in most parts of the world been a slow work in progress (Jackson, 2018:5).

The human rights approach to understanding disability is slightly different from previous models. This model goes further than merely removing and overcoming barriers by emphasizing that the access and full participation to all aspects of life is a human right (Berghs, Atkin, Graham, Hatton and Thomas, 2016:36). In 1948, the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted and although many international treaties did, in fact, include persons with disabilities, these were framed in the context of the need to establish national anti-discrimination legislations (Berghs, Atkin, Graham, Hatton and Thomas, 2016:32). The 1980s were a particularly pivotal time in disability activism; 1981 was announced as the UN-decreed International Year of Disabled Persons along with 1983–1992 being the UN Decade of Disabled Persons (Jackson, 2018:7). Thereafter the UNCRPD was adopted in 2006 which also got the most numbers of signatures on its open day of all treaties by the UN (UNDESA). At the core of the human rights-based model is inclusivity as also seen in the UNCRPD.

Inclusive Employment

Inclusive employment refers to persons with disabilities having equal access to the open labour market working alongside able-bodied persons with access to the same benefits and career development opportunities. The process of inclusive employment includes all activities that

enable individuals to gain access to decent remunerated employment (Handicap International, 2011:11). However, there is no consensus on the definition or interpretation of inclusion. The Oxford English dictionary describes inclusion as “the fact or policy of providing equal opportunities and resources for people who might otherwise not get them, for example, people who are disabled or belong to minority groups.”

Employment is particularly important for persons with disabilities as it enables them to have access to other human rights and necessary activities such as mobility, healthcare, transport, social inclusion, etc. Without employment, they are unable to achieve full inclusion into society (Disabled People Association of Singapore, 2019:2).

Many studies have shown that there is a large macroeconomic cost from excluding persons with disabilities from the labour market. According to the International Labour Organisation, the exclusion of persons with disabilities can cost a country up to 7% of its GDP annually. Moreover, the International Centre for Evidence in Disability has shown that a country’s national product increases as persons with disabilities gain access to the labour market. In addition to these losses, many states would gain from inclusive employment as persons with disabilities would be independent and no longer rely on government funds or cash transfers to live (Disability at a glance, 2015:11). It is generally assumed that unemployment of persons with disabilities is only high in low to middle-income countries, however, even in industrialised countries, the unemployment rate is 2.5 times higher than those without (World Report on Disability, 2011:237). For this reason, it is important to know the barriers faced by persons with disabilities to inclusive employment.

Table 1: Summary of inclusive employment barriers

Barriers in finding employment	Barriers in entering the labour market
<p>Persons with disabilities often do not have access to job seeking and placement services.</p> <p>Due to a lack of funding and accessible education, many persons with disabilities cannot attend educational and vocational training, making them unqualified for many positions</p> <p>Many companies do not provide accessible recruitment opportunities or discourage persons with disabilities to apply.</p> <p>There are many prejudices regarding the capabilities of persons with disabilities causing them to be screened out during the recruitment process.</p> <p>Certain disabilities are often associated with certain types of positions, for example visually impaired people can only work in telecommunications, leading to many other careers being inaccessible as it's not deemed suitable or feasible.</p> <p>Policies do not always explicitly include non-discrimination clauses for persons with disabilities</p> <p>These barriers lead to persons with disabilities feeling discouraged and having low self-esteem resulting in them distancing themselves from the labour market.</p>	<p>Many employment and placement services lack the knowledge and skills to place persons with disabilities</p> <p>The work environment is often not physically accessible for example the door openings are not wide enough to fit a wheelchair or the computer does not have a speech program for a visually impaired employee.</p> <p>It is common for companies to not want to hire persons with disabilities due to discrimination and misconceptions</p> <p>When employed, many persons with disabilities face workplace discrimination.</p> <p>Employers often lack the knowledge of how to ensure reasonable accommodation and an inclusive work environment.</p> <p>Policies do not always provide guidelines for employers as to how they should ensure an inclusive environment.</p> <p>Persons with disabilities may struggle to reach their workplaces, such as inaccessible public transport or the visually impaired unable to have a driver's license.</p>

(*Handicap International, 2016:10; Bauwens, Bernard and Trublin, 2019:15; ESCAP, 2015:28*).

The UNCRPD outlines the following steps to be taken to achieve inclusive employment and overcome the above-mentioned barriers as stipulated in Article 27 of Work and Employment:

1. “*Prohibit discrimination* on the basis of disability with regard to all matters concerning all forms of employment, including conditions of recruitment, hiring and employment, continuance of employment, career advancement and safe and healthy working conditions”
2. “*Protect the rights of persons with disabilities*, on an equal basis with others, to just and favorable conditions of work, including equal opportunities and equal remuneration for work of equal value, safe and healthy working conditions, including protection from harassment, and the redress of grievances”
3. “Ensure that persons with disabilities are able to exercise their *labour and trade union rights on an equal basis* with others”

4. “Enable persons with disabilities to have effective *access to general technical and vocational guidance programs, placement services and vocational and continuing training*”
5. “*Promote employment opportunities and career advancement for persons with disabilities in the labour market, as well as assistance in finding, obtaining, maintaining and returning to employment*”
6. “*Promote opportunities for self-employment, entrepreneurship, the development of cooperatives and starting one’s own business*”
7. “*Employ persons with disabilities in the public sector*”
8. “*Promote the employment of persons with disabilities in the private sector through appropriate policies and measures, which may include affirmative action programs, incentives and other measures*”
9. “*Ensure that reasonable accommodation is provided to persons with disabilities in the workplace*”
10. “*Promote the acquisition by persons with disabilities of work experience in the open labour market*”
11. “*Promote vocational and professional rehabilitation, job retention and return-to-work programs for persons with disabilities.*”

“States Parties shall ensure that persons with disabilities are not held in slavery or in servitude, and are protected, on an equal basis with others, from forced or compulsory labour” (UNCRPD, 2006:20).

Benefits of inclusive employment

Disproving these misconceptions as well as illustrating why inclusive employment is important, many benefits of employing persons with disabilities can be seen. In 2015, the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) published a report *Disability at a Glance 2015: Strengthening employment prospects for persons with disabilities in Asia and the Pacific* which outlines the advantages for companies to hire persons with disabilities. Firstly, persons with disabilities provide a unique insight into product and service development for clients and customers who also have a disability. Secondly, it has been shown that persons with disabilities in comparison to abled-bodied colleagues have lower accident rates and higher retention rates. Another critical advantage that is often cited by the UN is that persons with disabilities are an “untapped source of skills and talent” in the form of transferable problem-solving skills that they have developed in everyday life facing challenges

with a disability. Lastly, a company's image is improved by hiring persons with disabilities as it may be appealing to customers and clients who are or have family members with disabilities (ESCAP, 2015:28).

Furthermore, the ILO Global Business and Disability Network has reported that inclusive employment contributes to increased productivity, corporate effectiveness and competitiveness in the workplace (Bauwens, Bernard and Trublin, 2019:20).

Methodology

Policy Failure

What one party perceives to be a success another may view as a failure. Understanding and declaring a policy to be a failure would be a simple task if there were a universal agreement of failure to be a breach of a universal benchmark (McConnell, 2015:226). A nearly impossible task with differing perspectives of public policies and policy performance being inevitable in open and democratic political systems (Smith, 1989:2) with policy opponents arguing that all or certain aspects have failed while policy supporters emphasise its aspects that have succeeded (McConnell, 2015:227).

The most influential earliest writings and *lenses* on policy failure regarded its failure or success as either technical issues easily resolved by a simple solution (Kerr, 1976), interpretations difficult to address in a coherent manner (Ingram and Mann, 1980; Edelman, 1964) or complex political administrative issues difficult to change (Smith, 1989; Pressman and Wildavsky, 1973). According to Howlett, Ramesh and Wu (2015:211) these perspectives have been highly influential however failed to move thinking forward on the matter by emphasising the limitations of either overly complex and overly simple accounts or subjective judgments. Thus a more systematic approach to analyses can be seen in the 1980s and 1990s which tended to combine these previous approaches.

McConnell (2010a) moved beyond these perspectives by identifying the commonalities in policy failures and successes arguing that the concept of failure brings about a relational issue – in relation to what is it a failure? (McConnell, 2015:227). McConnell (2010a:354) illustrates that objective judgements of a policy's failure or success can be made through a framework capturing a variety of outcomes measuring key indicators (Table 1). Moreover, Howlett (2012:545) emphasises that to determine whether a policy has failed, it is necessary to understand the origins of its failure or success which lies in the form of failure that occurred namely; process failure, programme failure and political failure.

The *process* refers to the different stages of policy-making during which the issues to be addressed are framed, options explored and finally, decisions are made (Marsh and McConnell, 2010:572). Process failure refers to the failure of the process of a policy's formulation, such as government failing to obtain authoritative approval for a policy initiative, failing to design the type of policy they had intended, failing to build support (McConnell, 2015:236), or simply fail to proceed from an idea to reality after successfully completing the policy process (Howlett,

Ramesh and Wu, 2015:215). Programme failure is often viewed to be synonymous with policy failure being determined by evidence based assessments. Programmes are the desired goals based on the assumptions of appropriate levels of government intervention in society that often take the form of financial subsidies and grant support, penalties and incentives, provision of healthcare services and the regulations of certain behaviours such as discriminatory practices (McConnell, 2015:236). Programmatic failure in this regard can range from the failure to achieve the desired outcomes, failure to be implemented as initially intended and failure to benefit the original target group (McConnell, 2015:236). As will be seen below, the case of the ODP and SEC falls into this form of failure. Lastly, politics in this regard plays an essential role in the making and shaping of public policies through its management of debates and conflicts (McConnell, 2015:236). The political failure of policy, failure to achieve results, refers to the damage of politicians’ reputations, damage to governance values and out of control agendas (McConnell, 2015:237).

The goal of this thesis is thus an evaluation of the ODP and SEC attempting to answer the following questions;

- ✓ Has policy failure occurred?
- ✓ What are the possible gaps and problems of the ODP and SEC?
- ✓ Is Singapore complying with the UNCRPD Article 27 of Work and Employment?

These questions will be answered through the following analytical framework. First, the ODP and SEC will be looked at through the lens of policy failure by making use of policy failure measures as set forth by McConnell’s (2015:233 - 235; McConnell (2010b: 106 - 108) “criteria of policy success and failure” (table 2). Thereafter, the inconsistencies in the ODP and SEC’s eligibility criteria will be looked at in more detail to establish the possible gaps of why these policies have failed. Each of these programs is then compared to how it's complying, or not complying, with the UCRPD Article 27 of Work and Employment.

Analytical Framework

	Policy Failure	Initiative	Indicators
ODP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy failure criteria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job redesign Grant • Training grant • Recruitment and Job support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eligibility restrictions for employees • Eligibility restrictions for PWD • Coverage • Compliance with UNCRPD
SEC		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wage Supplement 	

The first and third questions are dichotomous questions. The first aims to answer whether the SEC and ODP have or have not failed, which provides the setting to answer the second and main question. After establishing the possible gaps and problems of the ODP and SEC, the third question aims to look at whether the policies are complying with the UNCRPD Article 27.

Quality of data

As previously mentioned, the employment rates of persons with disabilities in Singapore are contradictory. Before looking at how these employment rates were calculated, it is important to note that there are different definitions of disability being used in these researches and calculations.

According to the Singaporean government, the official definition of persons with disabilities is, “those whose prospects of securing, retaining places and advancing in education and training institutions, employment and recreation as equal members of the community are substantially reduced as a result of physical, sensory, intellectual and developmental impairments.” In contrast to this, the Disabled Peoples Association (DPA) follows the UNCRPD definition of persons with disabilities, “Persons with disabilities include those who have long-term physical, mental, intellectual or sensory impairments which, when in interaction with various barriers, may hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others” (CRPD Parallel Report, 2019:6). Hence, the definition used by the DPA and UNCRPD includes persons with psychosocial disabilities whereas the Singaporean government excludes it. Nevertheless, the Ministry of Manpower (MOM) estimates a 28,6% employment rate and the Straits Times, from which the DPA uses their data on this matter, estimates 4,9%. Although psychosocial disabilities are excluded in the former definition, it seems unlikely that persons with psychosocial disabilities make up 23,7% of the 28,6% of persons with disabilities in the country. Thus, we look at how these calculations were made in order to eliminate the differing definitions as cause for the contradictory employment rates.

According to the MOM the employment rate in 2018 stood at 27.60% for persons aged between 15 – 39, 37.80% aged 40 - 49, 26,10% aged 50 – 64, 5.90% aged 65 and above, and 28,6% for all persons of working age (Employment Outcomes of Persons with Disabilities, 2018). The employment rates provided by MOM were conducted by doing a random survey of 33,000 households. Based on this survey, MOM further concluded that 67,2% of persons with disabilities are outside of the labour market. Those unemployed have cited their disability and poor health as the reason with some responding to feel discouraged or having education/training related problems.

In the Enabling Masterplan 2017 – 2021, it states that 140 persons were employed between 2014 – 2016 under the ODP. It also states that the number of persons placed in employment under the JPJS, a subprogram under the ODP, increased from 200 persons prior to 2014 to 500

in 2015. This is inconsistent and therefore unreliable. In 2018, nominated MP Anthea Ong asked for the official employment rate of persons with disabilities as a parliamentary question. The response was given by the Ministry of Social and Family Development (MSF) stating that 8600 persons with disabilities are employed across the public and private sector (Employment Rate of Persons With Disabilities, 2018).

The data given by the MSF was then used by the Straits Times to make calculations of the employment rate of persons with disabilities (Tai, 2019). It is estimated that there are 176 000 persons with disabilities of working age residing in Singapore. The Straits Times calculates that if 8600 persons were to be employed out of 176 000, this would mean that the employment rate stood at only 4,9% (Tai, 2019). The DPA concurs with this employment rate and uses it in their CRPD Parallel Report (2019).

The president of the DPA has told the Straits Times that the estimated employment rates are far below the expectations, especially given the extensive incentives and subsidies e.g. ODP and SEC, provided by the government to employers hiring persons with disabilities (Tai, 2019). Therefore, it is necessary in this thesis to look more closely at these incentives and subsidies i.e. the ODP and SEC.

The estimated employment rate of persons with disabilities calculated by the Straits Times makes use of the data provided by the MOM, and thus by the Singaporean government's definition. Yet, as can be seen, the data is still not reliable and for this reason, has not been the core focus of the analysis of the ODP and SEC.

Analyses

The following table analyses the degree of policy failure of the ODP and SEC from tolerable (minor) failure to outright (complete) failure in the various criteria below.

Table 2: Have policy failure occurred?

Criteria	Tolerable failure	Conflicted failure	Outright Failure
<i>Basis of claim</i>			
1. Original Objectives			Not achieved
2. Target group impact		Minute impact	
3. Results			Insignificant results, problem has not improved nor worsened
4. Source of Support/opposition		Government offices dedicated to employment support, however poor quality services & (11)	
5. Jurisdictional Comparisons			Fare dismally in comparison to other developed countries
6. Balance Sheet			No significant costs due to very few candidates claiming grants and support
7. Normative stance			Failed
<i>Policy as Programme</i>			
8. Implementation in line with objectives			Implementation not done on the scale of objective as very few candidates benefitted from schemes - No anti-discrimination legislation
9. Achieving desired outcomes			See above (1) <i>Original Objectives</i> (3) <i>Results</i>
10. Benefitting target group		Target group benefited, however very few persons, (2) <i>target group impact</i>	
11. Attracting support for programme			A significant amount of Disabled Persons Organisations criticise these programmes & (4).

Adapted from McConnell (2015:233 - 235; McConnell (2010b: 106 - 108).

The ODP and SEC as mentioned before, aims to promote the hiring, training as well as integration of persons with disabilities to achieve inclusive employment and consists of 2 grants and 1 service namely; Job redesign grant, Training Grant and the Recruitment, Job Placement and Job Support Services (JPJS). These (1) objectives have largely not been achieved which will be evident by looking at indicators 2 (target group impact) and 3 (Results)

The (2) impact on the target group, persons with disabilities, have been incredibly low. According to the Enabling Masterplan 2017 – 2021, the ODP only had 140 beneficiaries from 2014 to 2016. Additionally, the Enabling Masterplan 2017 – 2021, states that the number of persons with disabilities placed in employment through the JPJS and SGenable increased from approximately 200 persons prior to 2014 to 500 in 2015. This is contradictory to the former.

When looking at the employment rates of persons with disabilities, it is evident that the ODP and SEC are not making a significant impact. The Ministry of Manpower (MOM) stated that 28,6% of persons with disabilities of working age between the ages of 15 – 64 were employed in 2018. MOM further states that only 4.2% of those unemployed are seeking employment citing their disability and ill health as a cause (Employment Outcomes of Persons with Disabilities, 2018). However, the data adopted by the Disabled People's Association of Singapore and all organisations representing and advocating for the disability community concur with the Straits Times at 4.9% employment rate of persons with disabilities. On the other hand, the Disability Community Network (2020) estimates that almost 176 000 persons with disabilities are of working age and only 8600 employed, with only 270 out of 145,000 public sector employees. However, according to MOM, there are only about 100 000 persons with disabilities in the country, 3,4% prevalence rate. Additionally, when looking at the portion of the labour force that persons with disabilities constitute, 0,55%, the data does not seem to make sense. These are significantly different statistics. Although contradictory evidence is provided, it can be argued that the ODP and SEC did make an impact on the target group, however, this is minute in comparison to the amount of persons with disabilities still unemployed. With this lack of impact on the target group, it can be concluded that the results (3) are insignificant as the issue being addressed through these schemes has not improved nor worsened.

The failure of a policy can also be characterised by the (4 & 11) source of support or opposition for the policy (McConnell, 2010b:236). In this regard, SGenable, a government office, has been set up to support these initiatives and promote the employment of persons with disabilities

along with social service agencies. Yet, the DPA has found in its research that persons with disabilities feel that these agencies provide low quality services as they have low expectations of persons with disabilities recommending jobs with minimum wage and an attitude of “any job is good, as long as you have one” (CRPD Parallel Report, 2019:9). The Disability Community Network recounts the experience of a blind woman with a Master’s degree in counselling phoning SGenable for assistance, but was recommended sheltered workshop training instead

The Disabled People’s Association (DPA) is the only cross-disability non-profit organisation in Singapore which has in many reports criticised the ODP and SEC. In its “CRPD Parallel Report” (2019) the DPA draws attention to several factors of the ODP and SEC that are not inclusive. the exclusion of persons with psychosocial disabilities, the lack of consistency in the eligibility requirements, low quality and poorly trained staff for job matching services as well as no steps being taken to make employers aware of these programmes. Furthermore, the DPA argues that these schemes are not inclusive of the disability population as it is not aligned with the social model of disability as put forth by the UNCRPD.

This indicator of (5) jurisdictional comparison attempts to see if a policy has made a significant difference in comparison to other jurisdictions (McConnell, 2010b:98). A country’s employment rates of persons with disabilities is a common indicator of levels of inclusive employment practices and attitudes of employers (World Report on Disability, 2011:239; CRPD Parallel Report, 2019:6). Thus, it is important to look at the employment rates of persons with disabilities in other countries. The DPA emphasises that the low employment levels do not seem reasonable given Singapore’s international standing as a highly industrialised state (CRPD Parallel Report, 2019:6). Moreover, the UNCRPD obliges member states to implement anti-discrimination legislation which Singapore has not done. Instead, Singapore chose these incentivising policies to promote inclusive employment. This matter will be further discussed in criteria nr 8.

In order to accurately compare this criterion with another jurisdiction, it would be necessary to compare the ODP and SEC with similar practices of another jurisdiction. It is difficult to establish this as one would need to do a thorough comparison between inclusive employment programs. Therefore, here there was simply looked at the employment levels of persons with disabilities as well as the UNCRP obligation.

The issue of whether benefits outweigh the costs (6) is highly subjective (McConnell, 2010b:98). However, in the case of the ODP and SEC, it is safe to assume that there have thus far been very few costs associated with these policies. This is not because the benefits outweigh the costs, but instead, as so few candidates benefitted from these schemes as mentioned earlier in (2) target group impact.

Programme failure criteria

The implementation of the ODP and SEC has not been done in line with and on the scale of its objectives (8) as very few candidates benefitted from the schemes. As mentioned above (5) there is no anti-discrimination legislation as obliged by the UNCRPD. It is important to note that Singapore takes a business case approach (Lee, Mathews, Shing and Kuansong, 2017:1), therefore it does not comply with article 27 as a whole as the article states that “*all matters concerning all forms of employment*” should be implemented through legislation. Employers are by no means obligated to hire persons with disabilities or to fully cooperate with the ODP and SEC. Hence employers can and do discriminate against persons with disabilities during the recruitment process as well as whilst employed as there is no legislation prohibiting them from doing so (CRPD Parallel Report, 2019:7). According to the Ministry of Social and Family Development (MSF), it claims that Singapore has laws that protect employees from discrimination which includes all people, thus including persons with disabilities (MSF, 2020). The Tripartite Alliance for Fair and Progressive Employment Practice (TAFEP) provides guidelines on how to adopt more progressive and inclusive human resource practices. However, TAFEP is merely a non-binding guidelines, employers do not have to follow it (CRPD Parallel Report, 2019:7). Furthermore, implementation is encumbered by inconsistencies in the eligibility criteria of the ODP and SEC which will be thoroughly discussed in the following section. As the objective is to promote employability and inclusive employment of persons with disabilities as a response to the signing of the UNCRP, it is concluded that the implementation is not in line with the objective.

Inconsistencies of eligibility criteria

At each scheme, there will be looked at the eligibility restrictions for persons with disabilities and employers, coverage and how it complies with Article 27.

Open Door Programme (ODP)

The ODP as mentioned before, aims to hire, train as well as integrate persons with disabilities and consists of 2 grants and 1 service namely; Job redesign grant, Training Grant and the Recruitment, Job Placement and Job Support Services. According to the Enabling Masterplan 2017 – 2021, the ODP only had 140 beneficiaries from 2014 to 2016

Job Redesign Grant

This grant covers any costs incurred by employers to be used for the purchasing of assistive devices and equipment, modification to the physical work environment or bathrooms, consultancy costs for pre-employment support, redesigning of job scopes and processes as well as job assistance by coaches for persons with disabilities (SGEnable). This coverage is applicable for up to 90% of the costs, however, capped at S\$20 000. When looking at the subsidies and what qualifies to be covered under this grant, it begs the question as to why so few people benefitted from the ODP under the previous term of the Enabling Masterplan 2? Therefore, we look closer at the qualifying conditions for this grant.

Qualifying conditions for employers	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Employer must not have tapped on other government grants for the same project.• The Employer must be registered as an Open Door Programme employer.• The Employer must obtain approval for the job redesign application from SG Enable before commencement of the job redesign project.• The job redesign project must be completed <u>within 3 months</u> from the approval of the job redesign application.• Must have at least a 1 year contract with the employee
Qualifying conditions for PwDs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The person(s) with disabilities hired must be a Singapore citizen or Permanent Resident.• He/she must be certified to have any one of the following permanent disability: autism spectrum disorder, intellectual disability, physical impairment, hearing impairment and visual impairment.• The person(s) with disabilities must have started work at the time of the job redesign application or within 3 months from the approval of the application.

Here it is noted that the qualifying conditions for employers and persons with disabilities are quite restrictive making it difficult to qualify for the grant.

The grant is limited to persons with physical, sensory and intellectual disabilities, thus persons with psychosocial disabilities are excluded from the eligible list of disabilities for this grant (CRPD Parallel Report, 2019:6). Furthermore, the restriction of the employee having to already have started work by the time of application makes it difficult, discouraging and potentially impossible for a person with a disability to be hired. For example, if a wheelchair user should have already started their job by the time of application, but cannot access the office yet without modification, it is impossible for the employee to qualify for the grant and might discourage employers from hiring the person as the employer is also restricted to commencing modification prior to the approval of application from SGenabe. Additionally, the employee must hold a 1-year contract to be eligible for the grant. As seen in the barriers to inclusive employment, many employers still hold prejudices about the capabilities of persons with disabilities, therefore employers might not be likely to sign a contract of such a duration initially.

Training Grant

The training grant provides funding to encourage employers to support their employees with disabilities to upgrade their skills through training. The grant covers up to 95% of course fees when employers send employees with disabilities for training as well as the coworkers of persons with disabilities. The training grant also includes a training allowance of \$6.00 per hour.

Eligible institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training providers or institutions, Social service agencies, Special education schools (for programmes aimed at alumni members or adult non-schooling persons with disabilities), Non-profit organisations, Social enterprises, Associations, Companies
Qualifying conditions for employers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Registered or incorporated in Singapore • Operating from offices in Singapore • Financially sustainable to continue their operations in Singapore • Not receiving other forms of government funding for their proposed course fees and capability development funding.
Qualifying conditions for PwDs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Singapore Citizen or Singapore Permanent Resident. • Aged 16 and above. • Certified of permanent disability, autism spectrum disorder, intellectual disability, physical impairment, hearing impairment and visual impairment. • Not full-time students.
Qualifying conditions for coworkers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All trainees must fulfill a minimum of 75% attendance and meet assessment requirements (if any). • Citizens or Permanent Residents

The training grant is a rather inclusive scheme that includes employed as well as unemployed persons with disabilities and covers a significant portion of the costs of training opportunities. By also offering training to coworkers of employees with disabilities, the workplace is made more inclusive. However, as seen in the job redesign grant, it yet again excludes persons with psychosocial disabilities (CRPD Parallel Report, 2019:6).

Recruitment, Job Placement and Job Support Services (JPJS)

The purpose of this service is to help persons with disabilities find suitable employment. Specialists work with job seekers to understand his/her strengths, job interests and skills to plan their career pathways (SGEnable). The JPJS provides access to the disability employment portal on which employers and persons with disabilities can find each other and advisory services from occupational therapists and job coaches on the necessary workplace accommodations required and accessibility checks. For employers wanting to hire persons with disabilities, the JPJS also Screens and profiles persons with disabilities’ suitability for jobs.

Required Assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessments may include interviews with medical health professionals and caregivers to understand the profile of the jobseeker • Some job seekers may be recommended to go for training first to improve their job-readiness and employability
Qualifying conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Person(s) with disabilities must be a Singaporean citizen or permanent resident
Job Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support to employers and employees to identify potential areas of improvement to increase the productivity of PwDs

As discussed earlier, inclusive employment refers to persons with disabilities having equal access to the open labour market working as able-bodied persons. The JPJS however distinguishes between persons with disabilities and abled bodies persons by assessing the candidate medically, screening their profile and deciding what the candidate is suitable for. This is a discriminatory practice as a disability should not be a factor in someone's job application. Inclusive employment requires that persons with disabilities be treated the same as able-bodied persons. The JPJS which function is to assist persons with disabilities to find their way to inclusive employment is not making use of an inclusive approach to employment. According to the disability community network, the majority of persons with disabilities are employed in the community, social and personal services and hospitality, illustrating that persons with disabilities are often not in highly skilled positions.

Special Employment Credit (SEC)

Qualifying conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be a Singaporean citizen or Permanent Resident • Not earn more than \$4000 																						
Coverage	Eligible for 16% of the employees wages, since 2012 of all ages. An additional 6%, thu 22% for PwDs over 65																						
Income	<table> <thead> <tr> <th>Income</th> <th>SEC subsidy</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>\$500</td><td>85.00</td></tr> <tr><td>\$1,000</td><td>170.00</td></tr> <tr><td>\$1,500</td><td>255.00</td></tr> <tr><td>\$2,000</td><td>255.00</td></tr> <tr><td>\$2,500</td><td>255.00</td></tr> <tr><td>\$3,000</td><td>255.00</td></tr> <tr><td>\$3,250</td><td>191.25</td></tr> <tr><td>\$3,500</td><td>127.50</td></tr> <tr><td>\$3,750</td><td>63.75</td></tr> <tr><td>≥ \$4,000</td><td>0</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Income	SEC subsidy	\$500	85.00	\$1,000	170.00	\$1,500	255.00	\$2,000	255.00	\$2,500	255.00	\$3,000	255.00	\$3,250	191.25	\$3,500	127.50	\$3,750	63.75	≥ \$4,000	0
Income	SEC subsidy																						
\$500	85.00																						
\$1,000	170.00																						
\$1,500	255.00																						
\$2,000	255.00																						
\$2,500	255.00																						
\$3,000	255.00																						
\$3,250	191.25																						
\$3,500	127.50																						
\$3,750	63.75																						
≥ \$4,000	0																						

The (SEC) aims to incentivise employers to hire persons with disabilities by subsidizing wages of up to 16% (Disabled People’s Association, 2015:36). The special employment credit is as discussed before, a pure business case approach to hiring persons with disabilities. The SEC subsidizes the wages of persons with disabilities to incentivise employers. The subsidy can be up to 16% with an additional 6% for persons above the age of 65. Below are the amounts employers are eligible for depending on the salary of the employee.

This wage subsidy also shows alarming qualifying conditions. For example, employers only qualify when an employee with disabilities earn less than S\$4000 a month. In contrast to this, the average salary overall in Singapore is S\$4563. Thus an employer would not be encouraged to pay an employee with disabilities an equal remuneration as that of an able-bodied person. The Disability Community Network argues that this can be seen in the average wage of an employee with disabilities standing at between S\$1000 – S\$2800 a month – far less than the overall average of Singapore. The SEC in this sense does not promote inclusive employment or equal remuneration. Furthermore, The SC wage subsidy has been a yearly renewed program, employees with disabilities and employers have no guarantee that it will be renewed each year.

UNCRPD Article 27 Compliance

Although there are many restrictive criteria, the Job Redesign Grant complies with the UNCRPD Article 27 (i) “ensure that reasonable accommodation is provided to persons with disabilities in the workplace”. However, article 27 also includes (f) “promote opportunities for self-employment, entrepreneurship, the development of cooperatives and starting one’s own

business”. The grant does not make space for applicants starting their own business or working from home independently that too require special equipment or modification to their own work environment. The grant also states that a person with disabilities applying should be a Singaporean citizen or permanent resident, however nowhere in article 27 nor the convention does I state that one should fulfill these criteria. Foreign nationals have the right to choose and apply for employment in any other state, migrants with disabilities should not be excluded from this right. In the preamble of the convention, it states that the convention recalls the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. According to the Department of Statistics’ Yearbook of Statistics Singapore (2019:10), there were 3,471,936 Singaporean citizens, 522,347 permanent residents and 1,644,393 foreign nationals. This is a significant margin from the total population. According to the Humanitarian Organisation for Migration Economics (HOME), persons are subjected to extensive medical tests prior to being granted an employment pass which leads to the applications of persons with disabilities being declined.

The training grant complies with article 27 (d) “enable persons with disabilities to have effective access to general technical and vocational guidance programmes, placement services and vocational and continuing training,” and (k) to “promote vocational and professional rehabilitation, job retention and return-to-work programmes for persons with disabilities” (UNCRC, 2006:20). Nevertheless, again it can be seen that one only qualifies when holding citizenship or permanent residency. The train leaves no room for foreign nationals with disabilities who are already employed or who sustained an injury during their time in Singapore and may want to take up training. The UNCRC does not distinguish between nationals with disabilities and foreign nationals with disabilities.

The JPJS complies with article 27 (d) “enable persons with disabilities to have effective access to general technical and vocational guidance programmes, placement services and vocational and continuing training.” Although these analyses show and argue that the JPJS does not fully promote or provide placement services on an equal basis as able-bodied persons.

The SEC complies with article 27 overall as it promotes the employment of persons with disabilities, however as argued above, it promotes it weakly with distinctions between able-bodied and persons with disabilities.

Conclusion and future research

This thesis has compared the Open Door Programme (ODP) and Special Employment Credit (SEC) against McConnell's (2015:233 - 235; McConnell, 2010b: 106 - 108) "criteria of policy success and failure" and have concluded that these policies intended to promote inclusive employment have in fact failed. In doing so, the analyses revealed that there are some inconsistencies in the eligibility criteria of the ODP and SEC. These gaps were then looked at in more detail by looking at the eligibility criteria for both employers and (prospective) employees under each grant and services offered. Here, the findings indicate that there are significant issues with the *fine print* of these programmes as they are quite restrictive in many aspects. For example, a potential employee who needs the physical environment to be adjusted can only receive the Job Redesign Grant on the condition that he/she has already started employment and signed a 1-year contract. It is impossible for someone for example in a wheelchair to have already started work if he/she cannot even enter the workplace. Moreover, in the best case scenario when an employer truly wants to hire a specific person, the employer cannot start the redesigning or pay for it beforehand and then apply for reimbursement once the employee has started work as this would then deem the employer and employee ineligible for the grant. To a large extent, this causes employers to foresee that they would have to cover all costs related to an employee with a disability and the person as a burden or financial risk. Furthermore, the ODP suggests that persons employed should have a coach with them in the beginning, putting persons with disabilities on the spot and attracting unnecessary attention to them along with colleagues perhaps feeling uncomfortable. If persons with disabilities have the qualifications and their disability does not affect their job, they need not be treated any differently than able-bodied persons.

Similar restrictive and discriminatory criteria can be seen for the Special Employment Credit (SEC). Employers are only eligible for a wage supplement if the employee earns less than S\$4000 a month with the supplement becoming incredibly lower the higher the salary. The average salary in Singapore in 2019 was S\$4563. This reinforces the idea that employers should pay persons with disabilities less and incentivises employers to pay them less as this is the only way they will qualify for a wage supplement. This thesis has in its analyses illustrated that the ODP and SEC is rather oppressive instead of inclusive and does not have the right goal in mind but is viewing the accessibility of persons with disabilities to the labour market as a business case model which is ineffective when looking at the alarmingly low employment rate. These programs have been the result of an action plan, the Enabling Masterplan, to implement the

UNCRP. However, it is illustrated throughout this thesis that the steps taken to inclusive employment do not comply with the UNCRPD, most importantly in Singapore's lack of legislation protecting persons with disabilities.

Future studies could look more closely at methods and approaches to measure and explore the effectiveness of programs and interventions for persons with disabilities. The International Centre for Evidence in Disability (ICED) has emphasised the importance of evidence to inform policies, to implement interventions and programs that are effective. Future studies can explore ways to gather more information on the demographics of persons with disabilities in Singapore, such as surveys, gathering registrations of persons at DPOs, or even in the national census.

This thesis has shown that certain programs can be highly inclusive, however, implementation can be hampered by inconsistencies in the eligibility criteria. Currently, policy failure measures/criteria of policy success and failure, does not take into account the qualifying or eligibility criteria for such policies. Measures to assess the means or process to be taken in order to benefit from an interventionist policy such as the ODP and SEC could possibly be taken into account and added to future studies of policy failure.

Another topic for future studies could dig deeper into the issues of transparency and inaccurate information provided by the government. It has been noted in this thesis that often it is not a lack of data per se, but also the availability of it. This would help explain and provide a better understanding of the situations of ineffective policies

Furthermore, future studies could pay more attention to how the UNCRPD is being implemented and if a good level of compliance is achieved through such interventionist policies. This thesis has drawn attention to the fact that Singapore may have complied and implemented several aspects of article 27 of work and employment, however, has not taken the appropriate steps through legislation to ensure the rights of persons with disabilities as Singapore has no anti-discrimination legislation.

Finally, future studies can also look at the rights and employment prospects, or the exclusion of it, for migrants with disabilities. Singapore is a country with a large margin of foreign nationals. In 2019, 1,6 million foreign nationals lived in Singapore out of 5,7 million people. Hence, there is a large migrant population that may be disadvantaged or looked over when attempting to design and implement inclusive employment policies.

Bibliography

- Alice Bauwens; Hervé Bernard; Céline Trublin. Towards Inclusive Globalization: Policies and practices to promote the employment of people with disabilities. Lyon: Humanity & Inclusion, 2019.
- Banks, L.M. and Polack, S., 2014. The economic costs of exclusion and gains of inclusion of people with disabilities. *London: International Centre for Evidence in Disability*.
- Berghs, M.J. Atkin, K.M. Graham, H.M. Hatton, C. and Thomas, C. 2016. Implications for public health research of models and theories of disability: a scoping study and evidence synthesis.
- Butler, P. 2018. Welfare spending for UK's poorest shrinks by £37bn. *The Guardian*, 23 September. [Online]. Available: <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2018/sep/23/welfare-spending-uk-poorest-austerity-frank-field>
- Disability Employment [Online]. [n.d.]. Available: <https://employment.sgenable.sg/employers/open-door-programme/> [2020, September 15].
- Disabled People's Association, 2019. CRPD Parallel Report working group.
- Donald Trump's record \$4.75trn budget. 2019. *The Economist*, 11 March.
- Edelman, M. 1964. The symbolic uses of politics. *Chicago: University of Illinois Press*.
- Enabling Masterplan 2012–2016 Steering Committee, Enabling Masterplan 2012–2016: Maximising potential, embracing differences. Singapore: Ministry of Community Development, Youth, and Sports; 2012.
- ESCAP, U. 2011. Disability at A Glance 2015: Strengthening Employment Prospects for Persons with Disabilities in Asia and the Pacific.
- Handicap International, 2011. Inclusive employment: How to develop projects which promote the employment of people with disabilities and other vulnerable populations. *Handicap International*.
- Handicap International, 2016. Situation of wage employment of people with disabilities.
- Howlett, M, Ramesh, M. and Wu, X. 2015. Understanding the persistence of policy failures: The role of politics, governance and uncertainty. *Public Policy and Administration*, 30(3-4):209-220.
- Howlett, M. 2012. The lessons of failure: learning and blame avoidance in public policy-making. *International Political Science Review*, 33(5):539-555.
- Infographic: Employment Outcomes of Persons with Disabilities [Online]. [n.d.]. Available: <https://stats.mom.gov.sg/Pages/Infographic-Employment-Outcomes-of-Persons-with-Disabilities.aspx> [2020, November 10].
- Ingram, H.M. and Mann, D.E. eds. 1980. *Why policies succeed or fail* (Vol. 8). SAGE Publications, Incorporated.

- International Labour Organization, “Moving Towards Disability Inclusion” [Online]. [n.d.]. Available: http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_emp/---ifp_skills/ [2020, October 12].
- Jackson, M.A, 2018. Models of disability and human rights: Informing the improvement of built environment accessibility for people with disability at neighborhood scale?. *Laws*, 7(1),10.
- Kerr, D.H. 1976. The logic of ‘policy and successful policies. *Policy Sciences*, 7(3):351-363.
- Laws To Protect Rights Of PWDs [Online]. [n.d.]. Available: <https://www.msf.gov.sg/media-room/Pages/Laws-to-protect-rights-of-PWDs.aspx> [2021, January 02].
- Lee, J. Mathews, M. Shing, W.F. and Kuansong, Z., 2017. Beyond the Business Case: Different Models of Including People with Disabilities at Work. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, 37(4).
- Marsh, D. and McConnell, A. 2010. Towards a framework for establishing policy success. *Public administration*, 88(2):564-583.
- McConnell, A. 2010a. Policy success, policy failure and grey areas in-between. *Journal of Public Policy*:345-362.
- McConnell, A. 2010b. *Understanding policy success: Rethinking public policy*. Macmillan International Higher Education.
- McConnell, A. 2015. What is policy failure? A primer to help navigate the maze. *Public Policy and Administration*, 30(3-4):221-242.
- Ministry of Finance. 2020. Analysis of Revenue and Expenditure Financial Year 2020, February 2020. [Online]. Available: https://www.singaporebudget.gov.sg/docs/default-source/budget_2020/download/pdf/fy2020_analysis_of_revenue_and_expenditure.pdf
- Ministry of Social and Family Development. 2019. Employment Rate of Persons with Disabilities. [Online]. Available: <https://www.msf.gov.sg/media-room/Pages/Employment-rate-of-Persons-with-Disabilities.aspx>
- Ministry of Trade & Industry: Department of Statistics,. 2019. *Yearbook of statistics Singapore*.
- Pressman, J.L. and Wildavsky, A.B. 1973. How great expectations in Washington are dashed in Oakland. *University of California: Berkeley, LA, USA*.
- Saran, A. White, H. and Kuper, H. 2020. Evidence and gap map of studies assessing the effectiveness of interventions for people with disabilities in low-and middle-income countries. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 16(1): e1070.
- Smith, T.B. 1989. Analysis of Policy Failure: A Three Dimensional Framework. *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, 35(1):1-15.
- Tai, J. 2019. Just 5 in 100 people here with disabilities have jobs. *The Straits Times*, 11 February.

The Disability Community Network, 2020. A Collective Map of Needs, Community Assets, Service Gaps & Collaborative Opportunities. *Socialcollab.sg*.

UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs Disability: Disability and Employment.

[Online]. Available:

<https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/resources/factsheet-on-persons-with-disabilities/disability-and%20employment.html#:~:text=In%20developing%20countries%2C%2080%25%20to,between%2050%25%20and%2070%25>

UNO, 2006. Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) and Optional Protocol.

World Health Organization, 2011. *World report on disability 2011*. World Health Organization.

Appendix

Open Door Programme

Job Redesign Grant	
An initiative by the Singapore Workforce Development Agency (WDA) and the Ministry of Social and Family Development (MSF) administered by SGENable.	
Coverage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employers may claim up to 90% of the cost incurred (excluding GST). Capped at \$20,000 per PwD. Used for purchasing of; assistive devices and equipment, modification of the work environment or bathrooms, consultancy costs for pre-employment support and job assistance by coaches for PwDs
Qualifying conditions for employers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Employer must not have tapped on other government grants for the same project. The Employer must be registered as an Open Door Programme employer. The Employer must obtain approval for the job redesign application from SG Enable before commencement of the job redesign project. The job redesign project must be completed <u>within 3 months</u> from the approval of the job redesign application.
Qualifying conditions for PwDs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The person(s) with disabilities hired must be a Singapore Citizen or Permanent Resident. He/she must be certified to have any one of the following permanent disability: autism spectrum disorder, intellectual disability, physical impairment, hearing impairment and visual impairment. The person(s) with disabilities must have started work at the time of the job redesign application or within 3 months from the approval of the application.
Training Grant	
The Workforce Singapore (WSG) and the Ministry of Social and Family Development (MSF) provides funding to encourage employers to support their employees with disabilities to upgrade their skills through training.	
Coverage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employers receive funding up to 90% of course fees when they send their employees with disabilities or coworkers of PwDs for training programmes supported by SG Enable. Training allowance for PwD trainees of \$4.50 per hour
Eligible institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training providers or institutions, Social service agencies, Special education schools (for programmes aimed at alumni members or adult non-schooling persons with disabilities), Non-profit organisations, Social enterprises, Associations, Companies
Qualifying conditions for employers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Registered or incorporated in Singapore Operating from offices in Singapore Financially sustainable to continue their operations in Singapore Not receiving other forms of government funding for their proposed course fees and capability development funding.

Qualifying conditions for PwDs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Singapore Citizen or Singapore Permanent Resident. • Aged 16 and above. • Certified of permanent disability. • Not full-time students.
Qualifying conditions for coworkers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All trainees must fulfill a minimum of 75% attendance and meet assessment requirements (if any). • Citizens or Permanent Residents
From July 2020	
Coverage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in course fee subsidies from 90% to 95% • Increase in training allowance from \$4.50 per hour to \$6.00 per hour • Extension of training allowance beyond unemployed PwDs to include employed* PwDs • Introduction of a training commitment award of \$100 per completed course to encourage PwDs to take up training
Recruitment, Job Placement and Job Support Services	
Specialists from the JPJS partners work with job seekers to understand his or her strengths, job interests and skills to plan his or her career pathways	
Recruitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to disability employment Portal • Advisory from occupational therapists and job coaches on workplace accommodation and accessibility checks • Screening and profiling PwDs suitability for jobs
Required Assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessments may include interviews with medical health professionals and caregivers to understand the profile of the jobseeker • Some job seekers may be recommended to go for training first to improve their job-readiness and employability
Job Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support to employers and employees to identify potential areas of improvement to increase the productivity of PwDs

Special Employment Credit (SEC)

Employers are incentivised to hire PwDs by the SEC subsidising wages		
Qualifying conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be a Singaporean citizen or Permanent Resident • Not earn more than \$4000 	
Coverage	Eligible for 16% of the employees wages, since 2012 of all ages. An additional 6%, thu 22% for PwDs over 65	
Income	Income	SEC subsidy
	\$500	85.00
	\$1,000	170.00
	\$1,500	255.00
	\$2,000	255.00
	\$2,500	255.00
	\$3,000	255.00
	\$3,250	191.25
	\$3,500	127.50
	\$3,750	63.75
	≥ \$4,000	0

