#### NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CLINICAL EXCELLENCE

## GUIDELINES EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM SCOPING

As outlined in the guidelines manual NICE has a duty to take reasonable action to avoid unlawful discrimination and promote equality of opportunities. The purpose of this form is to document that equalities issues have been considered in reaching the final scope for a clinical guideline.

Taking into account **each** of the equality characteristics below the form needs:

- To confirm that equality issues have been considered at every stage of the scoping (from drafting the key clinical issues, stakeholder involvement and wider consultation to the final scope)
- Where groups are excluded from the scope, to comment on any likely implications for NICE's duties under equality legislation
- To highlight planned action relevant to equalities.

This form is completed by the National Collaborating Centre (NCC) Director and the Guideline Development Group (GDG) Chair **for each guideline** and submitted with the final scope for sign off by the Chair of the Guidelines Review Panel (GRP) and the lead from the Centre for Clinical Practice.

1



#### **EQUALITY CHARACTERISTICS**

### Sex/gender

- Women
- Men

#### **Ethnicity**

- Asian or Asian British
- Black or black British
- · People of mixed race
- Irish
- White British
- Chinese
- · Other minority ethnic groups not listed

## Disability

- Sensory
- Learning disability
- Mental health
- Cognitive
- Mobility
- Other impairment

## Age<sup>1</sup>

- Older people
- Children and young people
- Young adults
- Definitions of age groups may vary according to policy or other context.

## Sexual orientation & gender identity

- Lesbians
- Gay men
- Bisexual people
- Transgender people

## Religion and belief

#### Socio-economic status

Depending on policy or other context, this may cover factors such as social exclusion and deprivation associated with geographical areas (e.g. the Spearhead Group of local authorities and PCTs, neighbourhood renewal fund areas etc) or inequalities or variations associated with other geographical distinctions (e.g. the North/South divide, urban versus rural).

## Other categories<sup>2</sup>

- Gypsy travellers
- Refugees and asylum seekers
- Migrant workers
- Looked after children
- Homeless people
- <sup>2</sup> This list is illustrative rather than comprehensive.

# GUIDELINES EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM: SCOPING

Guideline title: Diagnosis and management of headaches in young people and adults

### 1. Have relevant equality issues been identified during scoping?

- Please state briefly any relevant issues identified and the plans to tackle them during development
  For example
  - o if the effect of an intervention may vary by ethnic group, what plans are there to investigate this?
  - o If a test is likely to be used to define eligibility for an intervention, how will the GDG consider whether all groups can complete the test?

The scope considers all people aged 12 or over who receive healthcare in primary, secondary or tertiary settings irrespective of gender, ethnicity, disability, religion or beliefs, sexual orientation and gender identity or socio-economic status.

We will be considering young girls and women of reproductive age as a specific subgroup to incorporate issues such as management of menstrual related migraine, treatment during pregnancy and choice of contraception with migraine. No other specific sub-groups were identified during the stakeholder workshop or draft scope consultation.

## 2. If there are exclusions listed in the scope (for example, populations, treatments or settings) are these justified?

- Are the reasons legitimate? (they do not discriminate against a particular group)
- Is the exclusion proportionate or is there another approach?

Children aged under 12 years of age will be excluded from the scope as a guideline for the management of headaches in children is being developed separately.

#### 3. Have relevant bodies and stakeholders been consulted?

- Have relevant bodies been consulted?
- Have comments from stakeholders that highlight potential for discrimination or promoting equality been considered in the final draft?

Following the stakeholder workshop of the 7th of July 2010, the scope was revised to incorporate stakeholder comments. Registered stakeholders were also invited to comment on the draft scope during the consultation period (12th August to 9th September 2010), and the scope was revised again to address and incorporate relevant comments. All comments were responded to.

There were no comments raised highlighting areas of potential discrimination in either the workshop or the draft scope consultation.

3