

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Oral health promotion: general dental practice

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

1.0 Scope: before consultation

1.1 Have any potential equality issues been identified during the development of the draft scope, before consultation, and, if so, what are they?

A potential equality issue identified in the draft scope is that the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of the interventions may vary according to the diversity of the population on the following characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010: age, gender, ethnicity, religion, and physical or mental disabilities.

Age: Men and older people are less likely to try to make a dental appointment (The Health and Social Care Information Centre 2011).

Race: The draft scope had noted that belonging to a family of Asian origin and living with a Muslim family in which the mother speaks little English as factors associated with severe tooth decay (Rayner et al. 2003).

Pregnancy and maternity: Pregnant and breastfeeding women are at increased risk of gum disease.

Other potential issues are: education level, fluency in English and socio-demographic factors.

The scope has acknowledged that wide variations in oral health exist across England, with the prevalence of tooth decay among children aged 5 years ranging from 12.5% in Brighton and Hove to 53.2% in Leicester (Public Health England 2013).

Additional factors associated with severe tooth decay include living in a deprived

area; being from a lower socioeconomic group or living with a family in receipt of income support (Rayner et al. 2003). The 'Adult dental health survey 2009' reports that there is a clear socioeconomic gradient. For example, people from managerial and professional occupation households have better oral health (91%) when compared to people from routine and manual occupation households (79%). It also reports that cost remains a barrier to accessing dental care, with 19% reporting this as the reason for delaying attendance.

In terms of population, adults and children who do not attend dentists will not be covered in this guideline.

1.2 What is the preliminary view on the extent to which these potential equality issues need addressing by the Committee? For example, if population groups, treatments or settings are excluded from the scope, are these exclusions justified – that is, are the reasons legitimate and the exclusion proportionate?

Appendix B of the scope outlines the issues the Committee need to take into account and the above issues will be brought to their attention for their consideration.

Completed by Developer: Lakshmi Murthy

Date: 14 March 2014

Approved by NICE quality assurance lead: Simon Ellis

Date: 14 March 2014

2.0 Scope: after consultation

2.1 Have any potential equality issues been identified during consultation, and, if so, what are they?

Stakeholders noted that certain types of oral diseases are known to be higher among some black and minority ethnic groups not just those from Asian background.

2.2 Have any changes to the scope been made as a result of consultation to highlight potential equality issues?

Following consultation, the scope was amended to reflect that certain types of oral disease are known to be higher among some black and minority ethnic groups not just those from Asian background.

2.3 Is the primary focus of the guideline a population with a specific disability-related communication need?

If so, is an alternative version of the 'Information for the Public' document recommended?

If so, which alternative version is recommended?

The alternative versions available are:

- Large font or audio versions for a population with sight loss;
- British Sign Language videos for a population who are deaf from birth;
- 'Easy read' versions for people with learning disabilities or cognitive impairment.

No

Updated by Developer: Lakshmi Murthy

Date: 6 June 2014

Approved by NICE quality assurance lead: Simon Ellis

Date: 6 June 2014

3.0 Guideline development: before consultation

3.1 Have the potential equality issues identified during the scoping process been addressed by the Committee, and, if so, how?

Section 1 of the draft guideline:

In recommendation 1 of the draft guideline it is stated that dentists and dental care professionals should ensure advice is tailored to meet individual needs, for example an individual's social and economic factors.

In recommendation 2 of the draft guideline it is stated, as part of a patient-centred approach to oral health, dentists and dental care professionals should ensure that they understand the cultural, environmental and economic barriers to good oral health.

In recommendation 3 of the draft guideline it is stated that as part of initial training and continuing professional development, dentists and dental care professionals should receive information and develop skills on conveying advice that promotes good oral health. This includes addressing health inequalities by tailoring interventions to people's specific needs, including their cultural, social and economic needs and other 'protected characteristics'.

Section 4 of the draft guideline:

In the considerations section of the draft guideline, the Committee recognised that for some people the cost of dental care may be prohibitive.

Section 5 of the draft guideline:

Under 'Recommendations for research', it is stated that 'All research should aim to identify differences in effectiveness among groups, based on characteristics such as socioeconomic status, age, gender and ethnicity'.

3.2 Have any **other** potential equality issues (in addition to those identified during the scoping process) been identified, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed them?

The Committee noted that those with mental illness and their children should be considered in the equality impact assessment.
The Committee noted in the considerations section that there are large inequalities in oral health and it varies according to factors such as age, ethnicity, socioeconomic group and geographical location.

3.3 Were the Committee's considerations of equality issues described in the consultation document, and, if so, where?

The committee's considerations of equality issues are within the recommendations and consideration sections of the draft guideline.

The draft guideline has also outlined that the recommendations should be implemented in light of duties set out in the [Equality Act 2010](#).

3.4 Do the preliminary recommendations 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?

No

3.5 Is there potential for the preliminary recommendations to have an adverse impact on people with disabilities because of something that is a consequence of the disability?

No

3.6 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 questions 3.1, 3.2 or 3.3, or otherwise fulfil NICE's obligation to advance equality?

No

Completed by Developer: Lakshmi Murthy

Date: 30 April 2015

Approved by NICE quality assurance lead: Simon Ellis

Date: 8 May 2015