

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE  
EXCELLENCE**

**NICE quality standards**

**Equality impact assessment**

**Pancreatic cancer**

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

**1. TOPIC ENGAGEMENT STAGE**

1.1 Have any potential equality issues been identified during this stage of the development process?
No equality issues have been identified at this stage.

1.2 Have any population groups, treatments or settings been excluded from coverage by the quality standard at this stage in the process. Are these exclusions justified – that is, are the reasons legitimate and the exclusion proportionate?
No population groups, treatments or settings have been excluded at this stage.

Completed by lead technical analyst \_\_\_\_\_Anna Wasielewska\_\_\_\_\_

Date\_\_\_\_\_13/02/2018\_\_\_\_\_

Approved by NICE quality assurance lead \_\_\_\_\_Mark Minchin\_\_\_\_\_

Date\_\_\_\_\_13/02/2018\_\_\_\_\_

## 2. PRE-CONSULTATION STAGE

2.1 Have any potential equality issues been identified during the development of the quality standard (including those identified during the topic engagement process)? How have they been addressed?

Statement 5 on nutritional management recommends prescribing enteric coated pancreatin. All pancreatic enzyme supplements are made from pork or beef products which may be unacceptable for some people due to their religion or beliefs. People with pancreatic cancer need to be made aware of the ingredients and make an informed decisions about taking or refusing the supplements.

2.2 Have any changes to the scope of the quality standard been made as a result of topic engagement to highlight potential equality issues?

No changes have been made to the scope of the quality standard at this stage.

2.3 Do the draft quality statements 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?

Statements 4 and 6 require adults with pancreatic cancer to be able to understand the messages and information given to them. Equality and diversity section highlights what support should be provided to people who do not speak English and who may have difficulties understanding healthcare professionals.

Statement 5 recommends treatment which may not be acceptable for some people due to their religion or beliefs. Equality and diversity section highlights the issue and makes all practitioners aware that the decision should be made by an individual.

2.4 Is there potential for the draft quality statements to have an adverse impact on people with disabilities because of something that is a consequence of the disability?

No specific equality issues or health inequalities were identified.

2.5 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 2.1, 2.2 or 2.3, or otherwise fulfil NICE's obligation to advance equality?

Equality and diversity sections for statements 4 and 6 highlight what support should be provided to people who do not speak English and who may have difficulties understanding healthcare professionals.

Completed by lead technical analyst \_\_\_\_Anna Wasielewska\_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_15/06/2018\_\_\_\_\_

Approved by NICE quality assurance lead \_\_\_\_\_Mark Minchin\_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_17/07/2018\_\_\_\_\_

© NICE [2018]. All rights reserved. Subject to [Notice of rights](#)

# Equality report EIA analysis form

## Pancreatic cancer

<b>Title/Topic</b>		Pancreatic cancer							
<b>If equality issues identified, how many?</b>		N/A							
<b>What was the breakdown of identified equality issues, by protected, socioeconomic, or 'other' characteristic?</b>									
<b>Age</b>	<b>Disability</b>	<b>Gender reassignment</b>	<b>Pregnancy maternity</b>	<b>Race</b>	<b>Religion or belief</b>	<b>Sex</b>	<b>Sexual orientation</b>	<b>Socio-economic</b>	<b>Other</b>
<b>How many issues had an impact on quality statements?</b>									
<b>If equality issues were identified, summarise what they were</b>									
<b>What was the breakdown of equality issues with an impact on quality statements?</b>									
<b>Age</b>	<b>Disability</b>	<b>Gender reassignment</b>	<b>Pregnancy maternity</b>	<b>Race</b>	<b>Religion or belief</b>	<b>Sex</b>	<b>Sexual orientation</b>	<b>Socio-economic</b>	<b>Other</b>
<b>If equality issues had impacts on recommendations, summarise these impacts</b>									