

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND  
CARE EXCELLENCE**

**HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE DIRECTORATE**

**QUALITY STANDARDS**

**Quality standard topic:** Diabetes in pregnancy

**Output:** Equality analysis form – meeting 1

## **Introduction**

As outlined in the [Quality Standards process guide](http://www.nice.org.uk) (available from [www.nice.org.uk](http://www.nice.org.uk)), NICE has a duty to have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between people from different groups. The purpose of this form is to document the consideration of equality issues in each stage of the development process before reaching the final output that will be approved by the NICE Guidance Executive. This equality analysis is designed to support compliance with NICE's obligations under the Equality Act 2010 and Human Rights Act 1998.

Table 1 lists the equality characteristics and other equality factors NICE needs to consider, i.e. not just population groups sharing the 'protected characteristics' defined in the Equality Act but also those affected by health inequalities associated with socioeconomic factors or other forms of disadvantage. The table does not attempt to provide further interpretation of the protected characteristics. This is because it is likely to be simpler, and more efficient, to use the evidence underpinning the quality standard to define population groups within the broad protected characteristic categories rather than to start with possibly unsuitable checklists created for other purposes, such as social surveys or HR monitoring tools.

The form should be used to:

- confirm that equality issues have been considered and identify any relevant to the topic
- ensure that the quality standards outputs do not discriminate against any of the equality groups
- highlight planned action relevant to equality
- highlight areas where quality standards may advance equality of opportunity.

This form is completed by the NICE quality standards internal team at each stage within the development process:

- Topic overview (to elicit additional comments as part of active stakeholder engagement)
- Quality Standards Advisory Committee – meeting 1
- Quality Standards Advisory Committee – meeting 2

**Table 1**

<b>Protected characteristics</b>
<b>Age</b>
<b>Disability</b>
<b>Gender reassignment</b>
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>
<b>Race</b>
<b>Religion or belief</b>
<b>Sex</b>
<b>Sexual orientation</b>
<b>Other characteristics</b>
<b>Socio-economic status</b> Depending on policy or other context, this may cover factors such as social exclusion and deprivation associated with geographical areas or inequalities or variations associated with other geographical distinctions (e.g. the North/South divide, urban versus rural).
<b>Marital status (including civil partnership)</b>

**Other categories**

Other groups in the population experience poor health because of circumstances often affected by, but going beyond, sharing a protected characteristic or socioeconomic status. Whether such groups are identifiable depends on the guidance topic and the evidence. The following are examples of groups covered in NICE guidance:

- Refugees and asylum seekers
- Migrant workers
- Looked after children
- Homeless people.

# Quality standards equality analysis

## Stage: Meeting 1

### Topic: Diabetes in pregnancy

**1. Have any equality issues impacting upon equality groups been identified during this stage of the development process?**

- Please state briefly any relevant equality issues identified and the plans to tackle them during development.

Source clinical guidance, NG3 identifies that some minority ethnic groups have a higher prevalence of diabetes and are considered to be of greater risk of gestational diabetes.

In addition the guideline covers all women of childbearing potential, some of whom may be receiving diabetes care in a paediatric setting.

Following QSAC meeting 1 the following equality groups were identified as being of importance for the suggested statements: race, socio-economic status, those with mental health issues, people with language barriers and disability.

**2. Have relevant bodies and stakeholders been consulted, including those with a specific interest in equalities?**

- Have comments highlighting potential for discrimination or advancing equality been considered?

This is the second stage of the process which will look to elicit comments from stakeholders.

Standing members for Quality Standards Advisory Committees (QSACs) have been recruited by open advert with relevant bodies and stakeholders given the opportunity to apply. In addition to these standing committee members, specialist committee members from a range of professional and lay backgrounds relevant to diabetes in pregnancy have been recruited. The topic overview and request for areas of quality improvement have been published and wide stakeholder comment received, including from those with a specific interest in equalities.

**3. Have any population groups, treatments or settings been excluded from coverage by the quality standard at this stage in the process? Are these exclusions legal and justified?**

- Are the reasons for justifying any exclusion legitimate?

This quality standard will cover the management of diabetes and its complications in women (all females of childbearing potential) who are planning a pregnancy and those who are already pregnant. It will also cover areas where additional or different care should be offered to women with diabetes and their newborn babies.

This is consistent with underpinning source guidance (NICE guideline NG3).

There are no other exclusions at this stage.

---

**4. If applicable, do any of the quality statements make it impossible or unreasonably difficult in practice for a specific group to access a service or element of a service?**

- Does access to a service or element of a service depend on membership of a specific group?
- Does a service or element of the service discriminate unlawfully against a group?
- Do people with disabilities find it impossible or unreasonably difficult to receive a service or element of a service?

It is not anticipated that any of the statements will make it impossible or unreasonably difficult for any specific groups to access the service that are covered by the quality standard statements.

**5. If applicable, does the quality standard advance equality?**

- Please state if the quality standard, including statements, measures and indicators, as described will advance equality of opportunity, for example by making access more likely for certain groups, by tailoring the service to certain groups, or by making reasonable adjustments for people with disabilities?

Not applicable at this stage.

**6. Is an alternative format of the Information for the Public needed e.g. large font, easy read?**

No requirement identified at this stage.