

1.0.7 DOC EIA

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

NICE quality standards

Equality impact assessment

Parkinson's disease

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?
--

The quality standard will not include people with juvenile-onset Parkinson's disease (before age 21) as this is a rare condition that requires specialist assessment and management.
--

Completed by lead technical analyst ___Melanie Carr_____

Date_29/3/17_____

Approved by NICE quality assurance lead ___Mark Minchin_____

Date___30/3/17_____

1.0.7 DOC EIA

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?

No equality issues have been identified at this stage.

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?

The draft quality statements do not make it more difficult for specific groups to access services.

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?

The draft quality statements will not have an adverse impact on people with disabilities.

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?

None

Completed by lead technical analyst: Melanie Carr _____

Date __12/6/17_____

Approved by NICE quality assurance lead ____Nick Baillie_____

Date ____27/7/17_____

1.0.7 DOC EIA

3. POST CONSULTATION STAGE

3.1 Have any additional potential equality issues been raised during the consultation stage, and, if so, how has the committee addressed them?

Stakeholders highlighted the importance of providing written information that meets the requirements of the Accessible Information Standard to adults with Parkinson's disease. Statement 2 includes written information on impulse control disorders. The committee agreed that a specific equality consideration was not needed as it is a legal requirement to comply with the standard.

3.2 If the quality statements have changed after the consultation stage, are there any 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?

The updated quality statements do not make it more difficult for specific groups to access services.

3.3 If the quality statements have changed after consultation, is there potential for the recommendations to have an adverse impact on people with disabilities because of something that is a consequence of the disability?

The updated quality statements do not have an adverse impact on people with disabilities.

3.4 If the quality statements 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 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3, or otherwise fulfil NICE's obligations to advance equality?

The committee did not feel further recommendations were required.

Completed by lead technical analyst: Melanie Carr _____

Date __ 8/11/17 _____

Approved by NICE quality assurance lead __ Nick Baillie _____

Date __ 5/1/18 _____

1.0.7 DOC EIA

4. After Guidance Executive amendments – if applicable

4.1 Outline amendments agreed by Guidance Executive below, if applicable:

No amendments made

Completed by lead technical analyst Melanie Carr _____

Date 31/1/18 _____

Approved by NICE quality assurance lead Nick Baillie _____

Date 31/1/18 _____