

1.0.7 DOC EIA (2019)

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

NICE guidelines

Equality impact assessment

Stroke rehabilitation in adults (update)

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

2.0 Checking for updates and scope: after consultation (to be completed by the Developer and submitted with the revised scope)

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

- Age
- Disability
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race
- Religion or belief
- Sex
- Sexual orientation
- Socio-economic factors
- Other definable characteristics (these are examples):
 - refugees
 - asylum seekers
 - migrant workers
 - looked-after children
 - people who are homeless

1.0.7 DOC EIA (2019)

- prisoners and young offenders
- any others identified

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

Stakeholders highlighted use of certain terminology in the guideline products and how this could be improved. We will check and update terminology in the existing and new guidelines prior to publication where appropriate, for example:

- Use of 'person-centred care' instead of 'patient-centred care'
- Use of 'cognitive impairment' instead of 'cognitive deficit'
- Use of 'hemisensory inattention' instead of 'visual neglect'

2.3 Have any of the changes made led to a change in the primary focus of the guideline which would require consideration of a specific communication or engagement need, related to disability, age, or other equality consideration?

If so, what is it and what action might be taken by NICE or the developer to meet this need? (For example, adjustments to committee processes, additional forms of consultation)

No



Updated by Developer
Bernard Higgins
Date 27 January 2021

Approved by NICE quality assurance lead _____

Date _____

1.0.7 DOC EIA (2019)

3.0 Guideline development: before consultation (to be completed by the Developer before consultation on the draft guideline)

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

Terminology has been altered in line with Stakeholder suggestions. Note that the change has not necessarily been precisely as indicated in section 2.2. “Hemisensory inattention” does not, on reflection, serve as a replacement for “visual neglect” since it can apply to other sensory disturbances. We have used the term “visual inattention” after discussion with Topic Advisor.

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?

- Race: A recommendation has been made to consider the use of computer-based tools as an adjunct to conventional speech and language therapy for the purpose of helping people with word finding problems. The committee have noted in the discussion that the currently available programs do not cover those whose first language is not English. The Committee have acknowledged the problem but addressing it fully will be in the hands of the program developers. However, the program which was used in the main UK study (StepbyStep) does allow personalised wording to be added and family members of the Stroke survivor could therefore introduce words in the required language.
- Socio-economic factors: The recommendations on use of telerehabilitation will be easier to implement for people who can afford home computers or already possess one. It is also noted however, that for some people the cost of this will be offset by the removal of the need to travel to receive the relevant therapy. It will be necessary to weigh these factors against one another in individual cases.

3.3 Have the Committee’s considerations of equality issues been described in the guideline for consultation, and, if so, where?

Described in the “Other considerations to committee took into account” in the

1.0.7 DOC EIA (2019)

3.3 Have the Committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the guideline for consultation, and, if so, where?

relevant evidence reviews (*add section references once finalised*)

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?

As covered in section 3.2 above

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?

We do not think so

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 box 3.4, or otherwise fulfil NICE's obligation to advance equality?

None

Completed by Developer _____  _____ Bernard Higgins _____

Date _____ 22/02/2023 _____

Approved by NICE quality assurance lead _____

Date _____

1.0.7 DOC EIA (2019)

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

A stakeholder has made a number of comments suggesting that the guideline should include more about making reasonable adjustments for those with disability, particularly learning difficulties and autism. We have added a cross-reference to NG96: care and support of people growing older with learning disabilities.

- Race

In one comment a stakeholder suggests the guideline says more about how to ensure services are accessible to people with disabilities (see above) and BAME communities. The guideline already includes several recommendations which emphasise the importance of personalising rehabilitation and these are relevant to accommodating all ethnic groups. NICE's guidance on patient experience in adult NHS services comprehensively covers the importance of tailoring management to each individual and we have added a cross reference to this in recommendation 1.17.6 (which deals with community participation programmes).

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 recommendation changes are relevant here.

4.3 If the recommendations have changed after consultation, is there potential for the

1.0.7 DOC EIA (2019)

recommendations to have an adverse impact on people with disabilities because of something that is a consequence of the disability?
Not applicable

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?
Not applicable

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

Updated by Developer Bernard Higgins

Date 12.07.2023

Approved by NICE quality assurance lead Rupert Franklin

Date 31.10.2023