

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

NICE guidelines

Equality impact assessment

Advocacy services for adults with health or social care needs

The impact on equality has been assessed during guidance development according to the principles of the NICE equality policy.

4.0 Final guideline (to be completed by the Developer before GE consideration of final guideline)

4.1 Have any additional potential equality issues been raised during the consultation, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed them?

- Disability

Issues around disability were raised during consultation. Specific disabilities, conditions or disorders were highlighted, in particular severe learning disabilities, Down's syndrome, autism and ADHD. Stakeholder comments were either focussed on how disability might affect particular recommendations or why particular conditions were not mentioned in the guideline. When developing the guideline the committee purposely decided not to make the recommendations condition specific so that they were inclusive, although specific examples have been used where it was felt to be beneficial. The committee felt that the guidance covers the needs of individuals with disabilities in the context of Advocacy and will help them to receive effective advocacy and this was explained to stakeholders. However, some changes were made in response to stakeholder comments in relation to disability. Recommendation 1.9.3 has been amended to mention training in specialised communication skills which will be relevant to those with severe learning disabilities. Recommendations 1.3.2, 1.3.4 and 1.7.4. were amended to cover information in accessible formats.

- Race

One stakeholder queried why the examples used in recommendation 1.7.10 were from the Black community and thought that the guideline should highlight that advocacy should be available, accessible and culturally sensitive to all ethnicity groups. In the response to the stakeholder, it was explained that the examples used in the recommendation came from an included study that looked at mental

4.1 Have any additional potential equality issues been raised during the consultation, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed them?

health advocacy in African and Caribbean men and from expert witness testimony which was sought about BAME communities because the committee did not feel that they had enough expertise in this area. The committee decided to amend the recommendation by adding a further example of culturally appropriate advocacy with another ethnic group: “working closely with a south Asian community group to share insights and improve access to advocacy.” Another stakeholder asked if a specific reference to Culturally Appropriate Advocacy training could be included. In response to this culturally appropriate advocacy was added as a bullet point to the recommendation on training, skills development and support for advocacy staff (1.9.3).

- Health inequalities

One stakeholder raised the issue of health inequalities during the consultation. The stakeholder felt that routinely investigating or discussing someone’s health inequalities could be unnecessarily intrusive and would not respect advocacy principles, good practice or GDPR. This was in relation to recommendations to 1.6.12 and 1.11.5. The committee however decided that the appropriateness of exploring peoples experience of health inequalities was already covered by the wording of the recommendations and did not need to be altered.

- Other definable characteristics (these are examples):

- any others identified

- People with sensory needs

- One stakeholder commented during the consultation that it should be made clear that physical accessibility includes making sure the environment is adapted to an individual’s sensory needs. In response to this, recommendation 1.6.1 on advocacy services being accessible was amended with the bullet point on places being physically accessible now reading “ensuring that meeting places are accessible in all respects”.

- Intersectionality

- One stakeholder raised the issue of intersectionality during the consultation. The stakeholder asked for text saying that some people fall into multiple groups to be added to Box 2 which covered Characteristics, life circumstances or life experiences relating to inequalities. The stakeholder also asked for a definition of intersectionality to be added to the terms used section of the guideline and links to definition added at the relevant points in the guideline. These changes were made to the guideline.

- Families

4.1 Have any additional potential equality issues been raised during the consultation, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed them?

Some stakeholders commented in regard to recommendation 1.7.1 that in some circumstances it may not be appropriate for Advocates to liaise with family members, in response to this, 'friends' was added to this recommendation and other recommendations (1.3.4 and 1.3.6) or instances in the text of the guideline document where family had been used and it was appropriate to add friends. Some stakeholders raised the issue of the legal position of family carers who are advocates for their relatives. The committee felt that the legal right to advocacy section of the guideline sufficiently covered the legal position of family carers. Some stakeholders raised the issue of recognising the role that family members play, acting as advocates for their relatives. The committee felt that it was necessary to add some text to the context section of the guideline to recognise the vital role that family members play in advocacy whilst also stating that the focus of the guideline was on a trained person whose sole involvement is as an advocate. In response to a stakeholder comment on family members who are carers having access to information on advocacy recommendation 1.3.4 on information provision to meet people's needs was amended to include providing information to families or carers.

4.2 If the recommendations have changed after consultation, are there any recommendations that make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access services compared with other groups? If so, what are the barriers to, or difficulties with, access for the specific group?

None of the revised recommendations will make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access services, compared with other groups.

4.3 If the recommendations have changed after consultation, is there potential for the recommendations to have an adverse impact on people with disabilities because of something that is a consequence of the disability?

None of the revised recommendations have the potential to have an adverse impact

on people with disabilities.

4.4 If the recommendations have changed after consultation, are there any recommendations or explanations that the Committee could make to remove or alleviate barriers to, or difficulties with, access to services identified in question 4.2, or otherwise fulfil NICE's obligations to advance equality?

None

4.5 Have any changes been made to the recommendations after consultation that remove, or reduce the impact of, any equality issues identified in sections 1-3?

Changes have been made to the recommendations after consultation and these are documented in section 4.1

4.6 Have the Committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the final guideline, and, if so, where?

Yes, the committee's considerations of equalities issues have been described throughout, in particular in Box 2 which covers Characteristics, life circumstances or life experiences relating to inequalities.

Updated by Developer: Tim Reeves

Date: 02/09/2022

Approved by NICE quality assurance lead: Kay Nolan

Date: 12/09/2022

