NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

NICE guidelines

Equality impact assessment

Safe Staffing for Nursing in Accident and Emergency Departments

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

1.0 Scoping (To be completed by the developer and submitted with the draft consultation scope)

1. Have any potential equality issues been identified during the scoping process (i.e. in the development of the scope)), and, if so, what are they?
Equality issues have been considered throughout the scoping process. **Ethnicity, age, disability, sexuality, socio-economic status, religious beliefs, non-English speakers and being a member of a social minority (e.g. migrants, asylum seekers, travellers) may all influence rates of access to accident and emergency departments. These factors may also influence the level of staffing required to provide safe care.**

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?
The impact of psychosocial complexity and case mix of patients on safe staffing levels is an integral part of the scoping document and will form an integral part of the evidence reviewed by the committee. **There are no exclusions within the scope that require justification.**

Approved by Developer: _____ Lorraine Taylor, Associate Director, Safe Staffing Guidelines Programme_____

Date: _____June 2014_____

2.0 Post scope consultation (To be completed by the developer and submitted with the final scope)

2. Have any potential equality issues been identified during the scoping process (i.e. consultation), and, if so, what are they?
The importance of psychosocial complexity and case mix of patients on safe staffing levels in accident and emergency departments was raised during the scoping process. A review question is included to allow the committee to fully consider the impact of all patient factors on safe staffing levels.

3. Have any changes to the scope (such as additional issues raised during the consultation) been agreed to highlight potential equality issues?
The importance of psychosocial complexity and case mix of patients on safe staffing levels in accident and emergency departments was raised during the scoping process. A review question is included to allow the committee to fully consider the impact of all patient factors on safe staffing levels.

4. Does the guideline address 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? 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 a population with learning disabilities or cognitive impairment.

The guideline does not address a population with a specific disability-related communication need.

Approved by Developer: _____ Lorraine Taylor, Associate Director, Safe Staffing Guidelines Programme_____

Date: _____July 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?

The Committee discussed the impact of age, disability and non-English speakers as factors that may influence the level of staffing required to provide safe care. The impact of psychosocial complexity and case mix of patients on safe staffing levels was acknowledged, and in particular the need for specialist input for people with learning disabilities, sensory impairment, dementia, severe mental illness and language barriers. It was also noted that children and older people should be separately considered as safe staffing requirements might be different for them.

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 discussed the impact of age, disability and non-English speakers as factors that may influence the level of staffing required to provide safe care. The impact of psychosocial complexity and case mix of patients on safe staffing levels was acknowledged, and in particular the need for specialist input for people with learning disabilities, sensory impairment, dementia, severe mental illness and language barriers. It was also noted that children and older people should be separately considered as safe staffing requirements might be different for them.

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

Yes; these considerations are included in the evidence to recommendations tables.

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?

The Committee agreed that none of the preliminary recommendations make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access the benefits of care compared with other groups.

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?

The Committee agreed that there is no potential for the preliminary recommendations to have an adverse impact on people with disabilities.

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?

The Committee agreed that recommendation wording could be strengthened to better address any potential barriers to or difficulties with access to the benefits of care experienced by specific groups, and the wording has been amended accordingly.

Approved by Developer: _____ Lorraine Taylor, Associate Director, Safe Staffing Guidelines Programme_____

Date: _____29th December 2014_____

4.0 Final guidance (to be completed by the developer and submitted with the second draft guideline after consultation and again with the 3rd submission before sign off)

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

Not applicable at this stage.

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

Not applicable at this stage.

7. 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?

Not applicable at this stage.

8. If the recommendations have changed after consultation, 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?

Not applicable at this stage.

9. 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 questions 12 and 13, or otherwise fulfil NICE's obligations to advance equality?

Not applicable at this stage.

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

Not applicable at this stage.

Approved by Developer _____

Date_____

5.0 Post Guidance Executive amendments – if applicable (To be completed by appropriate NICE staff member after Guidance Executive)

Outline amendments agreed by Guidance Executive below, if applicable:

Not applicable at this stage.

Approved by Developer _____

Date_____