

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CLINICAL EXCELLENCE

GUIDELINES EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM RECOMMENDATIONS

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 the recommendations of a clinical guideline.

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

- To confirm that equality issues identified in the scope have been addressed in the evidence reviews or other evidence underpinning the recommendations
- To ensure the recommendations do not discriminate against any of the equality groups
- To highlight areas where recommendations may promote equality.

This form is completed by the National Collaborating Centre and the Guideline Development Group **for each guideline** before consultation, and amended following consultation to incorporate any additional points or issues raised by stakeholders.

The final version is submitted with the final guideline, signed by the NCC Director, the Guideline Development Group (GDG) Chair, and the guideline lead from the Centre for Clinical Practice.

EQUALITY CHARACTERISTICS
<p>Sex/gender</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women • Men
<p>Ethnicity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asian or Asian British • Black or black British • People of mixed race • Irish • White British • Chinese • Other minority ethnic groups not listed
<p>Disability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensory • Learning disability • Mental health • Cognitive • Mobility • Other impairment
<p>Age¹</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Older people • Children and young people • Young adults <p>¹: Definitions of age groups may vary according to policy or other context.</p>
<p>Sexual orientation & gender identity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesbians • Gay men • Bisexual people • Transgender people
<p>Religion and belief</p>
<p>Socio-economic status</p> <p>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).</p>
<p>Other categories²</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gypsy travellers • Refugees and asylum seekers • Migrant workers • Looked after children • Homeless people <p>²: This list is illustrative rather than comprehensive.</p>

GUIDELINES EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM: RECOMMENDATIONS

Guideline title: Type 1 diabetes in adults

1. Have the equality areas identified in the scope as needing attention been addressed in the guideline?

Please confirm whether

- the evidence reviews addressed the areas that had been identified in the scope as needing specific attention with regard to equalities issues.
Please note this also applies to consensus work in or outside the GDG
- the development group has considered these areas in their discussions

Note: some issues of language may correlate with ethnicity; and some communication issues may correlate with disability

Of the issues considered at scoping:

- The recommendations which have emerged from the evidence favour the use of synthetic insulin rather than those obtained from animal sources.
- The evidence search found no educational programmes aimed at those with language, visual or learning difficulties. The issue of improving uptake and adherence with educational packages was debated by the GDG and forms the basis for one of the main research recommendations.

2. Do any recommendations make it impossible or unreasonably difficult in practice for a specific group to access a test or intervention?

For example:

- Does access to the intervention depend on membership of a specific group?
- Does using a particular test discriminate unlawfully against a group?
- Do people with disabilities find it impossible or unreasonably difficult to receive an intervention?

None of the recommended tests or interventions would be unreasonably difficult for specific groups, with the possible exception of language barriers impacting on benefit from educational packages. The barriers are surmountable with local implementation efforts. Research into improvements to existing Educational programmes is one of the GDG's research priorities. The guidance recommends that disabilities, including visual impairment, should be taken into consideration when planning and delivering care.

3. Do the recommendations promote equality?

Please state if the recommendations are formulated so as to promote equalities, for example by making access more likely for certain groups, or by tailoring the intervention to specific groups?

The recommendations make every effort to allow tailoring of interventions to the individual needs and circumstances of people with diabetes