# NICE PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMME GUIDANCE PROMOTION OF PHYSICAL ACTIVITY IN CHILDREN

## 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Programme Development Group

# Wednesday 30<sup>th</sup> January 2008

## Floor 24, City Tower, Piccadilly Plaza, Manchester M1 4BD

## **Minutes**

Attendees:	PDG Members Gordon Andrews, Vicki Birchwood, Barry Causer, Issy Cole-Hamilton, Ashley Cooper, Peter Cooper, Lindsey Dugdill, Martin Hagger, Chris Laws, Patricia Maude, Suzanne Priest, John Stevens, Gareth Stratton (Chair), Malcolm Tungatt, Kim Twine, Esther van Sluijs, Sarah Vaughan-Roberts, Jonathan Williams  NICE Hilary Chatterton, Hugo Crombie, Adrienne Cullum (via Teleconference), Simon Ellis, Mike Kelly, Bhash Naidoo Anthony Threlfall, Brian Travis  Contractors Stuart Biddle, Ric Fordham, Charlie Foster	
	Co-optees and Expert witnesses None  Observers Ben Bennett (NICE)	
Apologies:	PDG Members John Hutton, Paul Trueman  Contractors Nick Cavill	
Authors	Brian Travis, Simon Ellis, Hilary Chatterton, Anthony Threlfall	
File Ref		
Version	Final	
Audience	PDG members, NICE team, the public (via web publication)	

Item		Action
1	Welcome, Introductions and Aims of the Meeting	
	The Chair welcomed everyone to the fifth meeting. New attendees were introduced and apologies received.	
	<ul> <li>The Chair outlined the objectives of the day:</li> <li>discuss the findings of the Adolescent Girls effectiveness review</li> <li>develop draft recommendations and 'considerations' for Adolescent Girls</li> <li>discuss and revise Active travel draft recommendations</li> <li>make a final decision on the topic for the 'mystery review'</li> </ul>	
2	Declarations of Interests	
	The PDG, NICE and reviewers were asked to give verbal declarations of interests that were additional to their written declarations or specific to the topics for discussion today.	
	No verbal declarations of interest were received.	
3	Minutes of previous meeting (12 <sup>th</sup> December 2007)	
	The Chair asked the PDG Members for any accuracy amendments to the minutes of the previous meeting.	
	It was noted that differentiation between the focus of Key Stage 1 and the Early Years Foundation Stage should be clarified further as this is important when considering play. The Foundation Stage focuses on physical development, Key Stage 1 focuses on PE in the National Curriculum.	
	The Chair highlighted the following matters arising / action points that were not on the agenda:	
	The Executive Summary of the COI/Chris Holmes paper was	
	<ul> <li>circulated to the PDG in December</li> <li>The updated definition of 'curriculum-based' has been included in the latest version of the Glossary (tabled paper). PDG Members were reminded to continue to submit additional glossary</li> </ul>	PDG Members
	terms or possible amendments to the NICE Team NICE team to check the glossary terms and definitions against those in the recently published Physical Activity and Environment guidance to ensure consistency across NICE	NICE Team
	guidance Collated evidence statements document is a tabled paper The draft Active travel recommendations were circulated to the PDG for comment. The revised draft is tabled and further discussion is on agenda	
	<ul> <li>A commentary on the 36 papers informing the economic modelling has been completed and will be circulated to the PDG in due course.</li> </ul>	
	The draft under-8 recommendations have been revised following last meeting and will be circulated to the PDG in due course	

The Chair invited questions of clarification and there was a general discussion about the review methods and findings:  • the content of interventions and who was targeted are important, although papers contained very little detail  • some studies looked at social and cultural correlates and reducing negative barriers to change, as well as targeting children through computer interventions. However, is was difficult to identify what the studies addressed  • while there was a possibility of contamination between intervention and control groups, cluster randomisation in some studies gave a degree of protection  • baseline differences may have an effect on the findings  • the presence of an association between effectiveness and persons delivering interventions was queried. Studies with a strong parental component are included in the family review, most of the studies in this review were delivered by researchers	4	<ul> <li>Mystery review options paper was circulated to the PDG and the options will be discussed later in the agenda.</li> <li>In future only those papers that will be used on the day of a meeting will be tabled. Additional reading will be distributed either before a meeting or as handouts to be read after a meeting.</li> <li>Adolescent Girls Review – Presentation of Key Findings</li> <li>The findings of the adolescent girls review were presented to the PDG by the Collaborating Centre.</li> </ul>	NICE Team
alongside teachers. None of the studies involved adolescents in designing the intervention the description of one study (Marks et al 2006) will be revisited at the next meeting. Collaborating Centre to check and amend if necessary distinction between "curriculum-based" and "school-based" schools are a common element, the National Curriculum also promotes Physical Activity outside of the Curriculum itself the importance of after-school activities and extended school should be considered as this may be the only targeted exposure to Physical Activity many adolescent girls get separating out teacher-led involvement that is part of the National Curriculum and involvement that is reinforcing activities outside the Curriculum is difficult studies using self-report may be inaccurate, as participants may over- estimate the amount of Physical Activity undertaken some websites with grey literature had been searched the review does not pick up on the link between enjoyment and the impact of negative peer pressure. Enjoyment was a key issue in the qualitative review evidence suggests effectiveness is greater in older girls. All the identified studies targeted girls only and most focused on inactive girls, these factors may be more important than age while the 'stages of change' model is widely used, NICE's Behaviour Change guidance suggests it is not particularly good at predicting effectiveness the importance of self-efficacy was noted, a lack of confidence may be a key barrier to overcome	5	The Chair invited questions of clarification and there was a general discussion about the review methods and findings:  the content of interventions and who was targeted are important, although papers contained very little detail  some studies looked at social and cultural correlates and reducing negative barriers to change, as well as targeting children through computer interventions. However, is was difficult to identify what the studies addressed  while there was a possibility of contamination between intervention and control groups, cluster randomisation in some studies gave a degree of protection  baseline differences may have an effect on the findings  the presence of an association between effectiveness and persons delivering interventions was queried. Studies with a strong parental component are included in the family review, most of the studies in this review were delivered by researchers alongside teachers. None of the studies involved adolescents in designing the intervention  the description of one study (Marks et al 2006) will be revisited at the next meeting. Collaborating Centre to check and amend if necessary  distinction between "curriculum-based" and "school-based" schools are a common element, the National Curriculum also promotes Physical Activity outside of the Curriculum itself  the importance of after-school activities and extended school should be considered as this may be the only targeted exposure to Physical Activity many adolescent girls get  separating out teacher-led involvement that is part of the National Curriculum and involvement that is reinforcing activities outside the Curriculum is difficult  studies using self-report may be inaccurate, as participants may over- estimate the amount of Physical Activity undertaken  some websites with grey literature had been searched  the review does not pick up on the link between enjoyment and the impact of negative peer pressure. Enjoyment was a key issue in the qualitative review  evidence suggests effectiveness is greater in older girls	_

6	Adolescent Girls – Considerations and practical issues  Peter Cooper, Suzanne Priest and Vicki Birchwood each gave a short presentation detailing their experiences in encouraging adolescent girls to be more active, outlining some key issues and considerations for practitioners and others to consider.	
7	Adolescent Girls – Outline of areas to be considered  The PDG were provided with a framework to help facilitate the development of the recommendations.	
8	<ul> <li>Adolescent Girls – Group Work</li> <li>The PDG split into 3 smaller groups to: <ul> <li>identify issues with the evidence relating to Adolescent Girls</li> <li>draft recommendations, being specific as possible about actions, populations, audiences, impact on inequalities, and implementation issues</li> <li>identify key considerations</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
9	Adolescent Girls – Feedback from groups and whole group discussion to agree areas for draft recommendations, considerations and gaps  Each of the three groups fed back to the whole group.  Group 1  defined the age group as 11 to 18 years  considered that recommendations should be for: schools; FE colleges; extended schools; youth services  importance of the "4 A's" – Appealing, Appropriate, Accessible and Affordable  considered those who are currently inactive  very important that people working with adolescent girls understand them  need to consult girls about what they would like to do (as an ongoing process) - recommendation  options should be aimed at the interests of adolescent girls  leaders must be good role models  "gradual engagement" – will take some adolescent girls time to get used to new activity so if possible involve in other ways  importance of environment e.g. changing rooms  single-sex activities should be an option - recommendation  nature of activity and flexibility of approach - recommendation  differentiation in ages / activities / motivation  adolescent girls need educating on the benefits of physical activity Group 2  identified sub-groups (age, different levels of activity)  importance of appropriateness of staff and method of delivery – other agencies must provide quality but also be qualified  'asset-based' delivery  self-efficacy and relationship with physical activity is key  activities must be fun and immediate  staff must be able to relate, empathise, respect and be fully	

	involved.	
	<ul><li>staff should be role models</li></ul>	
	<ul> <li>training of practitioners (including volunteers) is important</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>need to consider single-sex activities but shouldn't exclude boys</li> </ul>	
	from activities (e.g. dance). Guidance is an opportunity to	
	reinforce correct interpretation of equality and diversity	
	legalisation as this is often unclear to practitioners	
	building trust is important     shildren must know the value of physical activity.	
	<ul><li>children must know the value of physical activity</li><li>any apparatus should be affordable and fashionable</li></ul>	
	<ul><li>any apparatus should be affordable and fashionable</li><li>Group 3</li></ul>	
	<ul> <li>current government policies and links to the guidance must be considered</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>self-efficacy and strategies for behaviour change are important</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>different age groups may need to be considered separately</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>focus should be on physical activity in general and not just on</li> </ul>	
	health benefits	
	<ul> <li>girls are the next generation of parents – parental facilitation of physical activity is important</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>appropriate provisions required – need to be realistic and</li> </ul>	
	appropriate to communities	
	<ul> <li>consultation with adolescent girls is important, not only about their</li> </ul>	
	preferences but the reasons behind them	
	<ul> <li>importance of media role models, images of sport, etc</li> </ul>	
	The Chair invited comments from the whole group:	
	<ul> <li>might be useful to look at Women's Sport and Fitness Association</li> </ul>	
	(WSFA) website	
	<ul> <li>it was noted that educational approaches on how to get</li> </ul>	
	adolescent girls to be more active had not yet been discussed	
	The NICE team will draft some recommendations following the meeting and circulate these by email for the PDG to comment.	NICE Team
10	Active Travel: Summary of feedback and next steps	
	A summary of PDG members' comments on the provisional draft	
	Active Travel recommendations and suggested revisions was	
	presented. Comments were invited from the PDG:	
Ì	presented. Comments were invited from the 1 BC.	
	Recommendation 1	
	Recommendation 1  to clarify who is responsible for the implementation of school	
	Recommendation 1	NICE Team
	Recommendation 1  to clarify who is responsible for the implementation of school travel plans. The NICE Team will contact the co-optee with expertise in this area for further advice  the guidance should not specify details set out in current	NICE Team
	<ul> <li>Recommendation 1</li> <li>to clarify who is responsible for the implementation of school travel plans. The NICE Team will contact the co-optee with expertise in this area for further advice</li> <li>the guidance should not specify details set out in current guidance on school travel plans</li> </ul>	NICE Team
	<ul> <li>Recommendation 1</li> <li>to clarify who is responsible for the implementation of school travel plans. The NICE Team will contact the co-optee with expertise in this area for further advice</li> <li>the guidance should not specify details set out in current guidance on school travel plans</li> <li>resource allocation varies with geographical location</li> </ul>	NICE Team
	<ul> <li>Recommendation 1</li> <li>to clarify who is responsible for the implementation of school travel plans. The NICE Team will contact the co-optee with expertise in this area for further advice</li> <li>the guidance should not specify details set out in current guidance on school travel plans</li> <li>resource allocation varies with geographical location</li> <li>to clearly differentiate between Local Authority (LA) and Local</li> </ul>	NICE Team
	<ul> <li>Recommendation 1</li> <li>to clarify who is responsible for the implementation of school travel plans. The NICE Team will contact the co-optee with expertise in this area for further advice</li> <li>the guidance should not specify details set out in current guidance on school travel plans</li> <li>resource allocation varies with geographical location</li> <li>to clearly differentiate between Local Authority (LA) and Local Educational Authority (LEA)</li> </ul>	NICE Team
	<ul> <li>Recommendation 1</li> <li>to clarify who is responsible for the implementation of school travel plans. The NICE Team will contact the co-optee with expertise in this area for further advice</li> <li>the guidance should not specify details set out in current guidance on school travel plans</li> <li>resource allocation varies with geographical location</li> <li>to clearly differentiate between Local Authority (LA) and Local Educational Authority (LEA)</li> <li>role models should be included in a separate recommendation</li> </ul>	NICE Team
	<ul> <li>Recommendation 1</li> <li>to clarify who is responsible for the implementation of school travel plans. The NICE Team will contact the co-optee with expertise in this area for further advice</li> <li>the guidance should not specify details set out in current guidance on school travel plans</li> <li>resource allocation varies with geographical location</li> <li>to clearly differentiate between Local Authority (LA) and Local Educational Authority (LEA)</li> <li>role models should be included in a separate recommendation</li> <li>split recommendation for (i) schools and (ii) local authorities</li> </ul>	NICE Team
	<ul> <li>Recommendation 1</li> <li>to clarify who is responsible for the implementation of school travel plans. The NICE Team will contact the co-optee with expertise in this area for further advice</li> <li>the guidance should not specify details set out in current guidance on school travel plans</li> <li>resource allocation varies with geographical location</li> <li>to clearly differentiate between Local Authority (LA) and Local Educational Authority (LEA)</li> <li>role models should be included in a separate recommendation</li> <li>split recommendation for (i) schools and (ii) local authorities</li> <li>include reference to Local Area Agreements where appropriate</li> </ul>	NICE Team
	<ul> <li>Recommendation 1</li> <li>to clarify who is responsible for the implementation of school travel plans. The NICE Team will contact the co-optee with expertise in this area for further advice</li> <li>the guidance should not specify details set out in current guidance on school travel plans</li> <li>resource allocation varies with geographical location</li> <li>to clearly differentiate between Local Authority (LA) and Local Educational Authority (LEA)</li> <li>role models should be included in a separate recommendation</li> <li>split recommendation for (i) schools and (ii) local authorities</li> <li>include reference to Local Area Agreements where appropriate Recommendation 2</li> </ul>	NICE Team
	<ul> <li>Recommendation 1</li> <li>to clarify who is responsible for the implementation of school travel plans. The NICE Team will contact the co-optee with expertise in this area for further advice</li> <li>the guidance should not specify details set out in current guidance on school travel plans</li> <li>resource allocation varies with geographical location</li> <li>to clearly differentiate between Local Authority (LA) and Local Educational Authority (LEA)</li> <li>role models should be included in a separate recommendation</li> <li>split recommendation for (i) schools and (ii) local authorities</li> <li>include reference to Local Area Agreements where appropriate Recommendation 2</li> </ul>	NICE Team
	<ul> <li>Recommendation 1</li> <li>to clarify who is responsible for the implementation of school travel plans. The NICE Team will contact the co-optee with expertise in this area for further advice</li> <li>the guidance should not specify details set out in current guidance on school travel plans</li> <li>resource allocation varies with geographical location</li> <li>to clearly differentiate between Local Authority (LA) and Local Educational Authority (LEA)</li> <li>role models should be included in a separate recommendation</li> <li>split recommendation for (i) schools and (ii) local authorities</li> <li>include reference to Local Area Agreements where appropriate Recommendation 2</li> <li>consistency needed between recommendation 1 and</li> </ul>	NICE Team
	<ul> <li>Recommendation 1</li> <li>to clarify who is responsible for the implementation of school travel plans. The NICE Team will contact the co-optee with expertise in this area for further advice</li> <li>the guidance should not specify details set out in current guidance on school travel plans</li> <li>resource allocation varies with geographical location</li> <li>to clearly differentiate between Local Authority (LA) and Local Educational Authority (LEA)</li> <li>role models should be included in a separate recommendation</li> <li>split recommendation for (i) schools and (ii) local authorities</li> <li>include reference to Local Area Agreements where appropriate Recommendation 2</li> <li>consistency needed between recommendation 1 and recommendation 2</li> </ul>	NICE Team
	<ul> <li>Recommendation 1</li> <li>to clarify who is responsible for the implementation of school travel plans. The NICE Team will contact the co-optee with expertise in this area for further advice</li> <li>the guidance should not specify details set out in current guidance on school travel plans</li> <li>resource allocation varies with geographical location</li> <li>to clearly differentiate between Local Authority (LA) and Local Educational Authority (LEA)</li> <li>role models should be included in a separate recommendation</li> <li>split recommendation for (i) schools and (ii) local authorities</li> <li>include reference to Local Area Agreements where appropriate Recommendation 2</li> <li>consistency needed between recommendation 1 and recommendation 2</li> <li>include the commercial sector</li> </ul>	NICE Team

to clarify the term "certain distance"

### Recommendation 3

- include awareness of the amount of physical activity people
- avoid use of the term "extreme"
- re-consider the recommendation to parents relating to road safety
   Recommendation 4
- cycling proficiency
- scooters are a more practical example

### **General Comments**

- the draft recommendations are quite long and could lose focus
- all recommendations will be revisited at a future PDG meeting to consider over-arching recommendations
- the relevant links for Local Authorities should be addressed prior to the fieldwork if possible

# The NICE team will amend the draft recommendations relating to Active Travel and circulate to the PDG in due course

**NICE Team** 

### 11 Mystery Review – Group Discussion and Final Decision

The results of the votes were presented and the four most popular topics were discussed:

- Play
- Children's Physical Activity Preferences
- Upstream policies
- Media Campaigns

The following points were discussed:

- the lack of evidence on the Under 8's
- Family and Community review findings are unlikely to have any bearing on these topics
- activity preferences were covered in the qualitative review. If there
  are gaps in this area, expert testimony may be more useful
- the lack of evidence regarding children's preferences was noted, as was the changing nature of preferences over time and by geographical location. It is important to understand the reasons behind children's preferences
- upstream policies was suggested as an area, as many recommendations relate to existing policies – it would be useful to know what these policies are and if they work.
- Importance of the influence of mass media and the link between the media and role models.
- play was suggested as a good area for mystery review as relevant information may have been lost previously due to inclusion criteria. The PDG currently have little evidence about what works in this area
- the importance of play and how it links to later competencies and self-efficacy
- attitudes to physical activity are formed from an early age

A consensus emerged that the "mystery review" should focus on play, a general discussion of potential research questions followed:

- a definition of "active play" is required
- does active engagement in play link to self-efficacy in physical activity later on?
- is outdoor play influential in the long-term engagement in physical activity?

	in these avidence to compact that and compact in a standard	
	<ul> <li>is there evidence to suggest that early years provision should</li> </ul>	
	have access to outdoor space?	
	what is parental understanding of the value of play to health?	
	<ul> <li>does parental involvement in younger children's outdoor play link</li> </ul>	
	to later independent play?	
	<ul> <li>risk aversion – recommendations to Ofsted on how to inspect</li> </ul>	
	early years provision	
	what are parental attitudes to indoor play?	
	are parents a barrier or facilitator to active play?	
	what do professional groups currently need and/or do to promote play?	
	<ul> <li>what are the relative benefits of structured versus unstructured</li> </ul>	
	play?	
	what should providers of play provide?	
	<ul><li>attitudes of play workers / providers?</li></ul>	
	<ul> <li>are new technologies such as the <i>Nintendo Wii</i> considered as</li> </ul>	
	active play?	
	<ul><li>can or should we put an age limit on play on which to focus?</li></ul>	
	San or should we put an age infilt on play on willon to locus!	
	Issy Cole-Hamilton, Peter Cooper and Patricia Maude volunteered to	
	help finalise the research questions for the active play review. The	PDG Members
		/ NICE Team /
	NICE team and Collaborating Centre will liaise with these PDG	
	members to draft and finalise the research questions. To be	Collaborating Centre
12	completed asap to allow time for the review team to do the review.	Centre
13	Summary of the day, agreed action and next steps	
	The Chair summarised the outcomes of the day and noted that a well	
	informed discussion surrounding Adolescent Girls had taken place.	
	The following agreed key actions were noted:	
	NICE Team to draft recommendations on Adolescent Girls	NICE Team
		NICE Tealli
	and circulate for PDG members to comment prior to the next	
	meeting.	DDC Mambara
	PDG Members and NICE Team to work closely with the  Calleberating Control to confirm the final received guestions.	PDG Members / NICE Team
	Collaborating Centre to confirm the final research questions	/ NICE Team
14	to be addressed in the review on play	
14	Next meeting	
	The PDG were reminded that the focus of the next meeting would be:	
	<ul> <li>consider the fourth effectiveness review on family and community</li> </ul>	
	interventions and to draft some recommendations	
	<ul> <li>review the draft recommendations for Adolescent Girls</li> </ul>	
	- review the draft recommendations for Adolescent Gins	
	The change of venue for the next meeting was noted	
	The change of venue for the next meeting was noted.	
15	Any Other Business	
	,	
	<ul> <li>Brian Travis, Project Manager, is leaving NICE in February. The</li> </ul>	
	Chair thanked him for all his hard work and invaluable support to	
	the PDG and wished him all the best for the future.	
	and 1 2 2 and money him an and book for the relation	
Close	The Chair thanked all attendees and closed the meeting at 3.55pm.	