

**NICE PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMME GUIDANCE**

**PSHE**

**4th Meeting of the Programme Development Group  
Wednesday 16<sup>th</sup> July 2008**

**Royal College of Anaesthetists, London**

Attendees:	<p><i>Programme Development Group (PDG) Members:</i> Anne Weyman, Tariq Ahmed, Anne Ludbrook, Simon Beard, Mark Bellis, Jonathan Cooper, Aylssa Cowell, Anna Martinez, Joseph Quigley, Clare Smith, Jasmin Mitchell, Tracey Phillips, Kate Birch, Terri Ryland, Richard Ives (pm)</p> <p><i>NICE:</i> Mike Kelly (MK), Tricia Younger (from 3.15pm) (TY), Hilary Chatterton (HJC), Louise Millward (LM), Clare Wohlgemuth (CM), Bhash Naidoo (BN), Sarah Dunsdon (SD).</p> <p><i>National Collaborating Centre for Womens and Children's Health (NCC-WCH):</i> Anna Bancsi, Nina Balachander, Leo Nherera, Roz Ullman.</p> <p><i>Expert Advisor:</i> Harry Sumnall</p> <p>Observers: Rosemary Davidson.</p>
Apologies:	<p>Sarah Smart, Colleen McLaughlin, Ruth Joyce, Chris Gibbons, Kathryn Cross Laura Cottey, Simon Blake.</p> <p>NICE: Louise Millward, Mike Kelly, Una Canning.</p> <p>NCC-WCH: Irene Kwan, Jay Banerjee, Paul Jacklin</p>

Agenda Item		Action
1. Welcome and introductions	<p><u><i>Introductions and apologies</i></u></p> <p>The Chair introduced Clare Wohlgemuth from NICE who has joined the project team.</p> <p><u><i>Declaration of interest</i></u></p> <p><i>Personal Pecuniary</i></p> <p><i>Personal Family</i> None declared.</p> <p><i>Non Personal</i> Anna Martinez Anne Ludbrook Aylssa Cowell Simon Blake Simon Beard</p>	

	<p>Mark Bellis Kathryn Cross Clare Smith</p> <p><i>Personal non-pecuniary</i> Joseph Quigley Simon Blake Aylssa Cowell Anne Weyman</p> <p><b>Action point:</b> Terri Ryland to speak to NICE about her DOI.</p> <p><u>Minutes of last meeting</u> The minutes of the last meeting were agreed with no amendments.</p> <p><u>Matters arising</u></p> <p><i>Update on actions from last meeting:</i></p> <p>The glossary has been updated since the last meeting and was included in the papers.</p> <p><b>Action point:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PDG members to consider the glossary and send any further comments to NICE.</li> </ul> <p>The Chair informed the group that Richard Ives from Educari had been co-opted onto the group since the last meeting and would attend the afternoon session.</p> <p>Anna Martinez informed the group that the recommendations and survey results from the Government's SRE review would not be available until September.</p> <p><b>Action point:</b> NCC to produce effect size calculations for primary and community reviews and in future reviews wherever possible.</p>	<p>Terri Ryland</p> <p>PDG</p> <p>NCC-WCH</p>
<p>2. Presentation of the logic map</p>	<p>Mark Bellis presented his interpretation of the logic map which included the pathways that had been discussed by the group. This logic map may help overcome some of the difficulty of making links between education and health outcomes particularly at primary school level.</p> <p>The group suggested that primary school behaviour change should be focused at a more general level of healthy behaviours and the PDG agreed that there should be additional inclusions into the logic map such as FE Colleges.</p> <p>It was agreed that the next step would be to begin populating the boxes with examples including references. This would be done by mapping the evidence that the PDG have considered to date.</p>	

	<p><b>Action points:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The NICE team and a few PDG members to begin mapping the evidence into the model.</li> <li>• NICE to contact other members of the original group to see if they wished to be involved.</li> </ul>	<p>NICE, Mark Bellis, Harry Sumnall, Anna Martinez and Joseph Quigley</p>
<p>3. Community review</p>	<p>The NCC- WCH presented the main findings from the Community Settings review. It was noted that only studies based wholly in the community were included. 38 studies were currently included in the review and the majority of the studies were from the USA.</p> <p>The NCC- WCH described the findings from the cost effectiveness review. 2 papers met the inclusion criteria and they were presented to the PDG.</p>	
<p>4. Discussion of Community review</p>	<p>The group discussed the community review and included the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The definition of counselling varied across the studies and requires clarification.</li> <li>• The interventions in the reviews were delivered by trained therapists or health professionals who had undergone some training. This should be included in the glossary.</li> <li>• No evidence to date had been found on the role of fathers.</li> <li>• The duration of the interventions and the outcomes should be clarified.</li> <li>• No further information emerged from the studies on motivational techniques.</li> <li>• The role of parents needed to be considered further and the partnership between parents and schools is critical. The PDG to consider what the best way was to achieve this.</li> <li>• The calculation of effect sizes needed to be completed for 10 of the papers.</li> <li>• Clarity was required between studies comparing interventions and those not doing so.</li> <li>• Speakeasy programme not included in the review.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action point:</b> The PDG to send any studies which included fathers to the NCC.</p> <p><b>Action point:</b> The NCC to consider the duration of the intervention and the outcome.</p> <p><b>Action point:</b> Terri Ryland to send the report of the evaluation of Speakeasy programme to the NICE team.</p>	<p>PDG</p> <p>NCC-WCH</p> <p>Terri Ryland</p>

<p>5. Consideration of Community review</p>	<p>Key issues arising from the review for the PDG / NICE team to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Definition of 'community'.</li> <li>• Scope for further economic analysis based on the effectiveness papers.</li> <li>• Recruitment, uptake and compliance rates</li> <li>• Target groups for interventions</li> <li>• Community settings and style of delivery / maintenance of interest</li> <li>• Good practice across settings</li> <li>• Targeted versus universal interventions and recommendations and health equity and equality</li> <li>• Effect decay and the need for repetitive or sustained interventions in the light of the natural history of behaviour change</li> </ul> <p>Gaps in the research identified by PDG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effects of socio-demographic variables on the outcomes.</li> <li>• Fifth outcome from Every Child Matters. It was noted that this was not included in the guidance scope to keep the review manageable.</li> <li>• Interventions involving fathers</li> <li>• UK and European studies</li> </ul> <p><b>Action point:</b> NCC WCH to consider the evaluation of the C Card scheme.</p> <p><b>Action point:</b> NCC WCH to consider the parenting orders paper.</p> <p><b>Action point:</b> Tracey Philips to send the National Community forum report to the NICE. NCC to consider.</p> <p>Issues to consider when formulating recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategies to involve parents</li> <li>• Involvement of fathers</li> <li>• Over-professionalising bringing up children</li> <li>• Needs of parents</li> <li>• Roles and responsibilities (undertaking of work)</li> <li>• Settings</li> </ul> <p><b>Action point:</b> The term 'non formal settings' to be used rather than 'informal'</p>	<p>NCC-WCH</p> <p>NCC-WCH</p> <p>Tracey Philips</p> <p>NCC-WCH</p>
<p>6. Introduction to Health economics</p>	<p>A presentation was given by BN and Anne Ludbrook on health economics and its importance for NICE guidance.</p>	
<p>7. Primary review draft recommendations</p>	<p>The group discussed first draft recommendations and made suggestions for amendments.</p>	

**Next meeting: 11<sup>th</sup> September 2008, Royal College of Anaesthetists, Red Lion Square, London.**