

**NICE PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMME GUIDANCE**

**PSHE**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the Programme Development Group  
Wednesday 16<sup>th</sup> April 2008**

**Thistle Euston, London**

Attendees:	<p><i>Programme Development Group (PDG) Members:</i> Anne Weyman (Chair), Ruth Joyce, Simon Beard, Mark Bellis, Chris Gibbons, Jonathan Cooper, Aylssa Cowell, Colleen McLaughlin, Anna Martinez, Joseph Quigley, Laura Cottey, Jasmin Mitchell, Tracey Phillips, Simon Blake, Anne Ludbrook.</p> <p><i>NICE:</i> Tricia Younger (TY), Geraldine McCormick (GM), Hilary Chatterton (HJC), Louise Millward (LM), Bhash Naidoo (BN), Sarah Dunsdon (SD).</p> <p><i>Contractors (National Collaborating Centre- Women and Children’s Health (NCC-WCH):</i> Anna Bancsi, Irene Kwan, Martin Dougherty, Lauren Bardisa-Ezcurra, Paul Jacklin, Leo Nherera.</p> <p>Observers: Rosemary Davidson.</p>
Apologies:	<p>Terri Ryland, Kathryn Cross, Kate Birch and Clare Smith.</p> <p><i>Contractors:</i> Jay Banerjee.</p>

Agenda Item		Action
<p><b>1. Welcome and introductions</b></p>	<p><u><i>Introductions and apologies</i></u></p> <p>The Chair welcomed the group to the second meeting.</p> <p>The Chair informed the committee that Leo Nherera had joined the National Collaborating Centre for Women’s and Children’s Health, and will be supporting the work on health economics.</p> <p><u><i>Declaration of interest</i></u></p> <p><i>Personal Pecuniary</i> Ruth Joyce</p> <p><i>Personal Family</i> None declared.</p> <p><i>Non Personal</i> Anna Martinez Anne Ludbrook Aylssa Cowell Simon Blake Simon Beard Colleen McLaughlin</p>	

	<p>Mark Bellis</p> <p><i>Personal non-pecuniary</i> Joseph Quigley Simon Beard Anne Weyman Colleen McLaughlin Jasmine Mitchell Laura Cottey Anna Martinez</p> <p><u>Minutes of last meeting</u> Aylssa Cowell was not present at the last meeting. <b>Action point:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend minutes of previous meeting.</li> </ul> <p>Ruth Joyce declared a personal pecuniary interest at the last meeting. <b>Action point:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend minutes of previous meeting.</li> </ul> <p><u>Matters arising</u></p> <p><i>Update on actions from last meeting:</i></p> <p>A list of current Government initiatives related to PSHE, alcohol education and sex and relationships education was circulated with the meeting papers.</p> <p><b>Action point:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PDG to inform the NICE team of any additional initiatives that should be added to the list. The ongoing Rose review and the Alexander review to be added to the list</li> </ul> <p>The Chair confirmed that consultation with young people will take place during the field testing of draft recommendations.</p> <p>Paula Pearce has been co-opted to the Group since the last meeting. Suggestions for additional co-opted members were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• from the PSHE Association</li> <li>• experience of learning disabilities</li> <li>• from further education.</li> </ul> <p>It was also suggested that the PDG seek expert testimony from</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Youth Alcohol Action review</li> <li>• Teenage pregnancy unit.</li> </ul> <p>TY explained that a co-opted member is able to play a full part in the PDG discussions and the drafting of recommendations. Experts may be invited to provide written and/or verbal testimony to inform the development of the guidance. Experts are not members of the PDG and play no part in the drafting of recommendations. .</p>	<p><b>NICE</b></p> <p><b>NICE</b></p> <p><b>PDG, NICE</b></p>
--	---	---

	<p><b>Action point:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NICE to follow up on co-opted member suggestions.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NICE</b></p>
<p><b>2. Making recommendations</b></p>	<p>The NICE team provided a brief overview of the NICE recommendation development process. It was noted that where there is strong evidence of harm or of an intervention being ineffective, the PDG should recommend that these interventions are discontinued.</p> <p>Draft recommendations developed in response to the qualitative review were discussed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommendations should focus on colleges as well as schools</li> <li>Recommendations for commissioners and other services e.g. police to be included.</li> <li>'Harm minimisation approach' requires a clear definition.</li> <li>In the first draft recommendation, wording to be changed to 'relevant' rather than 'realistic'.</li> <li>Clarify who should take action to support delivery of PSHE.</li> <li>Language relating to PSHE, alcohol education and SRE needs attention.</li> <li>Teachers working with specialist units to be included.</li> </ul> <p><i>Logic Model and Glossary</i></p> <p>The Chair suggested that the glossary is organised so that factual information is provided separately and related areas are put together rather than using an alphabetical list. The PDG also needed to decide which definitions it wished to use where more than one was current.</p> <p><b>Action point:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NICE team to amend glossary. PDG asked to send suggestions to HJC.</li> </ul> <p>The group commented on the draft logic model. The PDG agreed that further development and consideration was needed..</p> <p><b>Action point:</b></p> <p>A group of PDG members (Anna Martinez, Laura Cottey, Simon Blake, Ruth Joyce, Joseph Quigley) to work on the logic model and present for discussion at the next meeting.</p>	<p><b>HJC, PDG</b></p> <p><b>PDG members, NICE</b></p>
<p><b>3. Context setting for primary review</b></p>	<p>The NICE team explained the remit of the PSHE Primary review: School Aged Children 4 -11.</p>	
<p><b>4. Introduction of Primary review</b></p>	<p>The NCC WCH introduced the PSHE Primary review: School Aged Children 4 – 11.</p>	
<p><b>5. Consideration of primary review</b></p>	<p>The PDG considered the review.</p> <p>The Group raised concerns about::</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>search strategy.</li> </ul>	



	<p><b>Action point:</b> NICE team to draft and circulate preliminary recommendations.</p>	
<b>Health economics</b>	<p>Both effectiveness and cost effectiveness are considered when developing recommendations. The NICE approach to cost effectiveness will be on the agenda at the next meeting..</p> <p>National Treatment Agency and the Supporting People Programme may have published reports on the cost effectiveness of education.</p> <p><b>Action point:</b> NICE to follow up these suggestions. PDG members to alert NICE and the NCC-WCH team to studies of cost effectiveness.</p>	<p><b>PDG members</b> <b>NICE</b></p>
<b>Next steps</b>	<p>The primary review will be updated to address the issues discussed at the meeting and the revised review presented at the next PDG meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> June.</p> <p>The scope of the secondary review would be discussed at the next meeting and discussion of the secondary review itself would be deferred until the PDG meeting on 16 July.</p> <p><b>Action point:</b> NICE and the PDG Logic modelling group to further develop the logic model and report back to the next meeting..</p>	<p><b>NICE.</b> <b>Simon Blake</b> <b>Laura Cottey</b> <b>Ruth Joyce</b> <b>Anna Martinez,</b> <b>Joseph Quigley</b></p>
<b>AOB</b>	<p>DCSF has commissioned snapshot surveys for the SRE review</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Anna Martinez to send information on the SRE snapshot surveys to PDG.</p> <p>Ruth Joyce to report back on the snapshot survey for the drugs review at the next meeting.</p>	<p><b>Anna Martinez</b></p> <p><b>Ruth Joyce</b></p>

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING: Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> June 2008**  
**Royal College of Anaesthetists, Red Lion Square, London WC1R 4SG**