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## **The inquiry**

The present inquiry examines alleged violations of article 24, on the right to education— i.e. the alleged structural exclusion and segregation of persons with disabilities from the mainstream education system on the basis of disability in Spain since 2011, when the CRPD was ratified by the country, until September 2014 when the inquiry was presented by the OPD SOLCOM[[1]](#footnote-1).

* Request registration: January 2015.
* Deadline for the State Party’s to submit its observations: 1 November 2015
* State Party’s submission of observations: 13 November 2015
* Consideration of the observations and establishing of the inquiry: 15th CRPD session (2016).
* Incorporation of an additional request over the same topic by the independent monitoring mechanism CERMI[[2]](#footnote-2) made on 24 May 2016.
* Information to the State Party: 30 June 2016
* Spain appointed the area head of the Human Rights Office of the Directorate-General for the UN and Human Rights at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation as the focal point.
* The country visit took place from 30 January to 10 February 2017. Two members of the Committee visited Madrid, León, Valladolid, Barcelona, Seville and Málaga; they interviewed more than 165 people, including civil servants from the central Government and from the 17 Autonomous Communities (regional governments), as well as representatives of OPDs and other CSOs, researchers, academics, judges and lawyers.
* Pursuant to rule 83 of its rules of procedure, the Committee gathered additional information from various sources, including surveys, and documentary evidence in a confidential way. (…)
* Summary of the findings

Based on the information, the Committee found violations of the right to an inclusive and quality education due to pre-existent discriminatory attributes of the education system in Spain that persist nowadays and mostly affect “persons with intellectual and psychosocial disabilities or multiple disabilities”.

These violations are primarily related to certain features of the education system that continue to exclude persons with disabilities, particularly those with intellectual or psychosocial disabilities or multiple disabilities who go through medical model assessments that hinder their participation in mainstream education and result in “segregation and denial of reasonable accommodation”. This segregation in Spain was already highlighted by the Committee in 2011 and “still affects around 20% of persons with disabilities”; despite existing initiatives and mechanisms to shift towards inclusive education, these “have not led to any major transformation in the education system”. “The difficulties pupils with disabilities encounter are resolved on an ad hoc basis” , and their educational future depends on the will and capacity of their parents.

* International human rights standards

***Art. 24 of the CRPD***

The right to education is provided for in article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which states that everyone has the right to education. Art. 24 of the CRPD does not establish new rights but clarifies that this means the right to inclusive and quality education; this confirmed by Art. 13 of CESCR and by Art. 23, 28 and 29 of the CRC. According to Art. 24 of the CRPD States parties have an obligation to respect, protect and ensure inclusive and quality education for all persons without distinction and throughout all levels of the education system, including extracurricular activities.

“The right to education (is) the right of all persons to learn in an education system that takes account of the needs of all persons, including those with disabilities, and in which all students are accepted by all schools regardless of their physical, intellectual, social, linguistic or other abilities”. Inclusive education involves “the elimination of discriminatory attitudes and systems” where diversity is valued because “it enriches the teaching and learning process and promotes human development.”

***Art. 4 of the CRPD***

According to Art. 4 of the CRPD, States parties undertake to “ensure that public authorities and institutions act in conformity with” the Convention (art. 4) Therefore, they must “take all appropriate measures to eliminate discrimination on the basis of disability **by any person, organization or private enterprise**” “. Outsourcing and decentralization do not in any way lessen States parties’ responsibility.

The “denial of reasonable accommodation constitutes discrimination, pursuant to article 2 of the CRPD and the Committee’s general comments [No. 2](https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRPD/C/GC/2&Lang=en) on accessibility and [No. 4](https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRPD/C/GC/4&Lang=en)”. In the same way, it “recognizes that the realization of economic, social and cultural rights is to be achieved progressively and requires States parties to take measures to the maximum of their available resources, without prejudice to immediately applicable obligations such as the elimination of discrimination and inequalities.”

* Contextual background to the inquiry

***Spanish Constitution:***

* Art. 96: “validly concluded international treaties (…) are part of the domestic legal order”.
* Art. 14: “Spaniards are equal before the law and may not in any way be discriminated.”
* Art. 27: “Everyone has the right to education; this includes persons with disabilities.”
* Art. 49: “the public authorities shall carry out a policy of preventive care, treatment, rehabilitation and integration of those with a physical, sensory or mental disability by giving them the specialized care they require, and affording them special protection (…)”.
* Royal Legislative Decree No. 1/2013 approves the text of the General Act on the Rights and Social Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities.

***Education:***

* Shared responsibility and joint work between the central Government (Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport) and the Autonomous Communities (education councils or departments). The cooperation is facilitated through the General Commission on Education facilitates the cooperation and is formed by a representative of each Autonomous Community.
* The Commission has some instruments related to disabilities such as the panel on special educational needs, the Autonomous Communities working group on special educational needs and the forum on education for persons with disabilities.
* Each Autonomous Community has its own education authority and collegiate bodies including regional school councils, regional vocational training councils, regional councils for higher education in the arts and university councils.
* The State regulates “the certification, issuance and recognition of academic and professional qualifications and the basic rules” based on Art. 27 of the Constitution.
* As per RD No. 2176/2011 and following Art. 33 of the CRPD the Spanish Committee of Representatives of Persons with Disabilities is the independent mechanism for monitoring implementation of the CRPD. The ombudsman is part of the monitoring.
* Main features of the legal framework governing the right to education in the State party

Whereas legislation “provides for inclusive education, it also contains provisions that permit exclusion on the basis of disability (…) National and regional legislation still contains provisions that are not in compliance with the Convention” and allows for segregated education such as:

* Art. 23 (2) of the Act on Social Integration of the Handicapped: “special education shall be provided temporarily or permanently to those handicapped persons who cannot be integrated into the ordinary education system.”
* Art. 18 (3) Royal Legislative Decree No. 1/2013: “such pupils [those requiring special assistance in their learning or with inclusive needs] shall be educated in special schools or substitute units only in exceptional cases where their needs cannot be met by applying the measures that allow for diversity in ordinary schools and taking account of the opinion of the parents or legal guardians”.
* Art. 74 (1) Organic Act on Education: “The schooling of pupils with special educational needs shall be governed by the principles of achievement of normality and inclusion and will ensure the absence of discrimination and equality of access to and continuation in the education system. Measures to ensure flexibility at the various levels of education may be introduced if deemed necessary. Enrolment in special schools or units may continue up to the age of 21 years and shall be resorted to only when the needs of the pupil cannot be met by applying the measures that allow for diversity in ordinary schools.”

The provisions and exceptions in the legislation result in the exclusion of students with disabilities that are segregated and are often separated from their communities “because of the location of special schools”. Those students face social stigma, and its performance and educational future has “very poor or very few prospects”.

The situation is worsened as – according to the same act - each Autonomous Community is responsible for the assessment and “can decide to develop or not its own legislative framework”. “As a result, national legislation does not guarantee uniform interpretation and implementation in keeping with the obligations and rights set forth in the Convention.” For instance, while some Autonomous Communities replaced “the standard exam at the end of compulsory secondary education with personalized assessments and reasonable accommodation” while others keep it, in detriment of pupils with disabilities.

The Spanish legislation establishes three modalities of compulsory education: (a) ordinary schools that include students with disabilities in the mainstream education system, (b) special schools and (c) “special units within ordinary schools offering a mixed education.” The education can be imparted through State schools, private schools and state-subsidized private schools.

The post-compulsory education is another issue, “the dropout rates (of the education system after completing secondary education) for boys and, especially, girls with disabilities are higher than the national average.” According to the Committee’s observation, the post-secondary system does not offer reasonable accommodation in most of the cases, leading students with disabilities to opt for distance learning, in disproportionate rates compared to mainstream students. The initiatives to promote inclusive education within this system are individual, “rarely codified and barely sustainable”:

* Findings
1. System of psychological/educational assessment to place children in the segregated education system, and available appeals for contesting that decision

The psychological/educational assessment of “learning difficulties” is conducted according to the Organic Act on Improving the Quality of Education is carried out following a medical model of disability between the ages of 6 and 12 years, or voluntarily after children in preschool education from 3 years old. The assessment determines what kind of the three modalities must be attended by the child; in theory, the process aims to “determine the reasonable accommodation that the pupil with disabilities requires. In practice, the system focuses on the pupil’s failings and deficiencies, resulting in their being stigmatized as unfit for mainstream education” and prevents mainstream schools from providing support measures and reasonable accommodation.”

“There are no clear guidelines on how to conduct an assessment” which results in “very different practices (…) with primarily functional diagnoses that are incompatible with the Convention” instead of focusing in identify and eliminate the barriers of mainstream education and ways to adapt the educational curriculum to allow the progress of pupils with disabilities. Topics such as socialization with classmates and extracurricular activities are not covered by such assessments. In terms of accessibility, some case children are provided with segregated transport as mainstream transport is not adapted to accommodate their needs-

“While current legislation allows parents to be involved in the schooling decision, in practice their views are ignored.” In case they do not agree, parents can “appeal with an administrative court. This is a very drawn-out administrative procedure, and while the ruling is pending the pupil must attend the unit or school to which they were assigned” on the contrary, the parents will be accused of “neglect” and face proceedings according to the Criminal Code, Art. 226. The Committee received cases of parents who “had been warned that their child would be sent to a special school if they tried to contest a decision to send the child to a special unit in a mainstream or mixed school.”

A judicial appeal is possible if the administrative one is unsuccessful; however, “seeking justice in the courts is a long and costly struggle with no guarantee of success”. Especially due to the “lack of sufficiently clear precedents” and the cost of the proceedings, that is usually covered by the parents. The specialized organizations that might offer support “lack resources and are not able to provide necessary follow-up”.

1. Characteristics, including type of disability, covered by existing laws and measures

Segregation and discriminatory exclusion in education environments disproportionally affect those “with intellectual or psychosocial disabilities, autism spectrum disorders, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, or multiple disabilities.”

The Committee notes that the statistics presented by the Government of Spain, where 99.6% “of the total number of pupils nationwide were studying in mainstream schools” do not reflect the reality of segregated education, as they include students attending special units or segregated classrooms within a mainstream school as part of the mainstream system’s population. In practice, children with intellectual disabilities in special classrooms are segregated despite being inside the facilities of a mainstream school, “since they spent more time in the support unit or special classroom than in the ordinary classroom” in fact, “88% of pupils with disabilities reportedly spend all their time in a special school”. In this regard, “The Committee noted on numerous occasions that it had erroneously been assumed, including in official statistics, educating students with disabilities in mainstream schools without the necessary reasonable accommodation constituted inclusive education.”

Even when few mainstream schools were carrying out one-off and pilot “encouraging programs” this was not the rule; exclusion and stigma are perpetuated even for those pupils with intellectual or psychosocial disabilities attending classes within the mainstream classroom as they are mostly “usually given work that was different from that given to the rest of the students and that was not necessarily related to the lesson (…) **denying their right to an inclusive and quality education, and denying all students the opportunity to learn about respect for difference and diversity** (…) despite clear examples that show that the inclusion of persons with disabilities, including intellectual and psychosocial disabilities, is achievable.

Pupils with visual impairments also face specific challenges; those who are members, are assisted by the non-profit foundation ONCE (Spanish National Organization for the Blind) “in the form of teaching support for Braille, adaptation of materials, rehabilitation techniques, and student counselling outside school hours.” However, “teachers and other school staff had not received the necessary training in inclusive education and human rights to be able to work with outside experts and advisers to create inclusive learning environments that encourage collaborative work and eliminate barriers to inclusion”.

1. Resources and budget for the education of persons with disabilities, especially children.

As “the allocation of funds is determined at regional level” there are “large disparities between the Autonomous Communities”. The funds are still “focused on maintaining special units and centres” and the resources required for the implementation of inclusive educations have not been identified. The Government have not researched about the “socioeconomic, political and cultural benefits of inclusive education, and there is no national policy or plan of action for the implementation of article 24.”

In the case of the already allocated resources, those are assigned to the schools rather than individuals; this means that “they are kept at the school even after the student has left”. As funds and resources cannot be reassigned, “students with disabilities cannot attend the school closest to where they live but must study at the place where the necessary assistive devices are available.” This results in students “being educated in remote and segregated environments” and impact the quality of education received.

The economic crisis faced by the Government and consequent rationalization of public spending led to the prioritization of funds destined to segregated education and to “the assignment of a greater number of students per assistant”. Therefore “the capacity to meet the needs of students with disabilities has diminished since they only receive qualified support a few hours per week”. There are associations working on the promotion of “access to educational services through financing and support”, some of them “perform functions delegated to them by the State party or receive subsidies and public funds”. However, they “usually operate in segregated systems” and the support, especially of those with more expertise, is “sometimes only available to families that can pay for it”.

According to persons interviewed during the visit, *(a) teachers* “lack of training in inclusive education and the rights of persons with disabilities”, the online training is not mandatory and “some of the teachers interviewed stressed that they felt «abandoned» having received no guidelines”. Regarding *(b)* *personal assistance and support,* they are usually paid by the families of the student or external associations. There have been cases where assistants have not been allowed in the classroom because they were not employed by the public authorities.” The *(c)Specialized professionals* sometimes “must move between schools” and the “fixed allocation of resources per school” impact their capacity to receive students. As each school decide over their resources, there are not enough specialized professionals with fixed schedules.

1. Reasonable accommodation for children with disabilities in mainstream schools

Resources, personalized support and reasonable accommodation are allocated “if a minimum number of students require similar support” in this regard, the Committee notes “ notes the general lack of understanding of the fact that denying reasonable accommodation constitutes discrimination, and that the duty to provide reasonable accommodation is immediately applicable and not subject to gradual implementation. In the same way, assistive devices are not always available for the students, and their individualized support offered to them “is determined on the basis of categories of disability, with no flexibility”. “For example, sign language would be offered only to persons with hearing disabilities, but not to persons with other types of disabilities who might also benefit from using it (…) and for whom, in particular cases, they could constitute a reasonable accommodation.”

1. Regime governing the accessibility of mainstream schools

Despite Royal Decree No. 132/2010 establishes the minimum accessibility requirements for schools, the efforts to fulfil them are not enough. Whereas physically accessible, schools miss accessible “communication tools, assessments and educational content”. Extracurricular activities and facilities are particularly affected by the lack of accessibility and “the Committee repeatedly heard that children with disabilities received less attention.

“One non-disabled teenager also pointed out that there were no extracurricular activities open to her class «because there are children with disabilities in the class who can’t do them, so they are cancelled for everyone». This notion feeds negative perceptions and stereotypes about persons with disabilities.”

The assessment system lacks accessibility, those following an adapted curriculum “usually do not obtain the same qualifications or educational certificates as other students” hindering their access to higher education, as they rely on external tests. With the exception of the National Distance Education University, “no adjustments to the standard compulsory and higher education exams are offered.”

1. The “best interests of the child” in the education system and the impact of existing laws and measures regarding the right to education on children with disabilities.

As the medical model is still predominant, “special education” in “special schools” is considered as the best interest of the child, neglecting the benefits of inclusive education for the interests of the child. In the same line, Children with disabilities are “not considered a subject of law” and their opinion is not taking into account; leading to detrimental situations as “children being made to change school every year, while others divided their week between two different schools”.

1. Opportunities for children with disabilities to opine on their education

While the assessors stated the contrary, according to the information collected children with disabilities are not usually listened to, for the assessment, “the child is observed in the classroom (…) but not asked questions, “their opinion is rarely taken into account and their disabilities are used as a justification for the administration’s position.”

1. Quality of education available to persons with disabilities, particularly children, in segregated and mainstream education systems

Having two parallel systems (mainstream and special education) impacts the future work and residential arrangements of children who assist one system or the other. The different qualifications awarded prevent the few students with intellectual, psychosocial or multiple disabilities who finish compulsory secondary education to access university, restricting them to follow vocational training courses.

Special schools frequently present themselves as “already inclusive” for pupils with “serious disabilities”. Whereas in mainstream schools, with some exceptions, different tasks are assigned to children with disabilities, neglecting their age and maturity. Educational plans are nor inclusive and there was no evidence of a personalized education plan for each student. Furthermore, there is no “indicators or estimates of the number of children with disabilities who have moved from the special system to the mainstream system, and on to the open job market”

“In general, stereotypes persist in (…) educational settings. In some cases, they develop into complete rejection and hostility. This being the case, parents of children with disabilities told the Committee that their children were “more susceptible to accidents” and that they were subject to violence and bullying in ordinary schools. The Committee noted the perception that pupils with disabilities, especially girls, were more “sheltered” from such violence in special schools. The Committee also received reports of parents of non-disabled children stopping their children from attending secondary school until a child with disabilities had been taken out of the class.”

These discriminatory practices have not been tackled by the system through awareness-raising, trained and other related activities oriented towards the schools’ communities.

1. Support for the parents of children with disabilities

“The financial, material, emotional and respite support provided to the families of children with disabilities has diminished. Parents who decide to fight for a pupil with disabilities to gain access to inclusive education quickly become highly stressed, exhausted and even desperate. Although they receive support from other parents (through support groups), organizations and specialized networks, such support is limited and inadequate. “

1. Inclusive education and its impact on social inclusion

Opportunities for pupils with disabilities over 21 years of age – when compulsory education is over – is usually narrowed down to “attending sheltered workshops or activity centres, staying at home or attending day centres for persons with disabilities aged between 17 and 70”. The general perception is that “long-term institutional care was the only possible future for some persons with disabilities once they reached adulthood”.

As mentioned, students with disabilities who accomplished compulsory education do not receive the same certification; therefore, they “do not have access to the educational programmes available to non-disabled adults” and in practice, the education system prepares them “to attend sheltered workshops”. This option is also perceived by parents as the “best-case scenario because the authorities had told them «not to get their hopes up»”. In their adulthood, former students with disabilities will not find “strategies for facilitating the social inclusion and workplace integration” and, if they work for the public sectors they will “require a regular medical assessment” that is not conducted over their peers without disabilities.

1. Domestic case law relating to the right to education of persons with disabilities

There is a general lack of awareness and knowledge about inclusive education as conceived in the CRPD. In fact, in 2014, “on Amparo application No. 6868/2012, (the Constitutional Court) recognized inclusive education as a principle but not a right” while rejecting the appeal of parents requesting the accommodation of their child in the mainstream school system. The court considered that the involuntary segregation of the boy was in his best interest due to his “serious disability”. According to the sentence, this was a legal, non-discriminatory act under the current system.

However, “several lower courts had recognized educational exclusion as discrimination in specific cases” and considered the “failure to exhaust «all possibilities for the pupil’s inclusion» as a violation of the right to equal treatment”. For instance, in another case, related to a 10-year-old autistic child enrolled in the special education system, the High Court of Justice of Catalonia determined that the administration’s violated his right to equal treatment as possible accommodations in a mainstream classroom were not examined.

“The Committee notes that, although the courts have invoked the Convention as a legal basis in several judgments, a lack of awareness of the standards of the Convention prevails.”

* Conclusions[[3]](#footnote-3)

75. (…) a structural pattern of discriminatory exclusion and educational segregation on grounds of disability has been perpetuated, by means of a medical model, which disproportionately (…) affects persons with intellectual and psychosocial disabilities and persons with multiple disabilities.

76. (…) in the Spanish education system there is no widespread recognition of the human rights model of disability and there is a lack of access to quality and inclusive education for persons with disabilities. Inclusion is (not understood as a) right. The Committee notes the scale and severity of the impact of this lack of access to inclusive education throughout the lives of persons with disabilities (…).

77. (…) One effect of the existing system is that it renders persons with disabilities invisible, leaving them outside the mainstream system, identifying them from their earliest years as “persons who cannot achieve what others achieve”. (…) which limits or blocks their access to the tools they need to live independently in the community and play a role in society and the labour market.

78. (…) the inadequacy of the measures taken to promote inclusive education for persons with disabilities, and the lack of predictability of the system for promoting and protecting the rights of persons with disabilities. (…) the competent authorities are unclear about the right to quality and inclusive education.

79. (…) excluding persons with disabilities from the mainstream education system continues to cause them and their families a high level of frustration, isolation and suffering, affecting all areas of their lives. (…) (This has) significant implications for personal development, independent living and the ability of persons with disabilities to participate and be included in the community (…).

**80. (…) The findings of the present inquiry are reliable and indicate grave or systematic violations within the meaning of article 6 of the Optional Protocol and rule 83 of the Committee’s rules of procedure. The Committee considers that the systematic denial of equal rights for persons with disabilities may take place either deliberately, namely with the State party’s intent to commit such acts, or as a result of discriminatory laws or policies, with or without such intent.**

81. (…) A comprehensive analysis (…) would address many of the violations highlighted in the report and could be used as the basis for devising a national action plan (…).

82. In accordance with its jurisprudence and its general comment No. 4 (2016), the Committee recalls that an inclusive system based on the right to non-discrimination and equal opportunities requires the abolition of the separate education system for students with disabilities. (…)The Committee, (recalls) its previous concluding observations [(CRPD/C/ESP/CO/1)](https://undocs.org/en/CRPD/C/ESP/CO/1)(…)

* Recommendations[[4]](#footnote-4)
1. Institutional and legal framework

(a) Ensure that the Convention is accorded the status in domestic law that it enjoys under article 96 (1) of the Constitution, and that it indeed constitutes, in accordance with article 10 (2) of the Constitution, a mandatory element in the interpretation of legal provisions relating to the basic rights of persons with disabilities;

(b) Finalize, without delay and within a fixed time frame, the alignment of its legislation with the Convention, as required by Act No. 26/2011.

 2. Right to education

(a) Clearly define inclusion and its specific objectives at each educational level;

(b) Envisage inclusive education as a right, not just a principle, and grant all students with disabilities, regardless of their personal characteristics, the right to access inclusive learning opportunities in the mainstream education system, with access to support services as required;

(c) Eliminate the exception for segregated education in legislation on education (…)

(d) Include a non-rejection clause for students on grounds of disability (…)

(e) Eliminate the educational segregation of students with disabilities (…)

(f) Guarantee to persons with disabilities the right to be heard, and take account of their views through effective consultations(…)

(g) Adopt the regulatory framework necessary for the effective implementation of legislation and the harmonization of the education system with the Convention at all levels (…)

**3. Distribution of competences**

 (a) Establish effective monitoring and review mechanisms to ensure that (…) application of article 24 comply with the State party’s obligations throughout its territory.

(b) Ensure that the education authorities of the Autonomous Communities are informed of their responsibilities regarding the rights of persons with disabilities, and to that end:

* Promote legislative and budgetary actions and measures (…)
* Ensure that students with disabilities gain admission to the mainstream education (…)
* Take the necessary practical steps (…) to remove all financial and structural obstacles, (for the) inclusive education system (…)
* Adopt measures for mandatory continuing vocational education and training, to prepare teachers to work in inclusive educational environments (…)
* Guarantee support and resources(…) for teachers, support personnel and other staff.

(c) Raise awareness and introduce measures to combat discrimination (…)

(d) (…) enhance the accessibility of complaints and legal remedies in cases of discrimination based on disability (…)

 (e) Ensure that the parents of students with disabilities cannot be prosecuted for neglect if they demand that their children’s right to inclusive education (…)

(f) Develop personalized systems for assessing and monitoring progress (…)

(g) Improve the collection of disaggregated data and information, (…) in line with [SDG 4](https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg4) (…)
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4. . To see the complete recommendations please refer to the [original document](https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRPD%2FC%2F20%2F3&Lang=en) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)