## NICE PUBLIC HEALTH GUIDANCE

## Strategies to prevent unintentional injuries among children

## 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the Programme Development Group

# Thursday 26<sup>th</sup> February 2009

### Hotel Russell Russell Square Bloomsbury

#### London WC1B 5BE

## **Final Minutes**

Attendees:	PDG MembersAmy Aeron-Thomas (AAT), Caroline Bradbury-Jones (CBJ), Andrew Chick (AC), Carolyn Cripps (CC), Davina Hartley (DH), Mike Hayes (MH), Nicky Houghton (NH), Lisa Irving (LI), Shelley Mason (SM), Jenny McWhirter (JMc), Jerry Moore (JMo), Ceri Phillips (CP), Amanda Roberts (AR), Tanja Stocks (TS), Rob Taylor (RT), Liz Towner (LT), Julia Verne (JV), Heather Ward (HW) – ChairNICE Team Hilary Chatterton (HJC), Simon Ellis (SE), James Jagroo (JJ), Mike Kelly (MK), Louise Millward (LM), Kay Nolan (KN), Lesley Owen (LO)Review Team – West Midlands/PENTAG and LSE
Apologies:	Rob Anderson (RA), David McDaid (DD), A La Park (AP) PDG Members
	Julie Mytton (JM), Ralph Saunders (RS) <i>NICE Team</i> Hugo Crombie (HC), Patricia Mountain (PM)
Authors	Patricia Mountain, Louise Millward, Hilary Chatterton, Kay Nolan, Simon Ellis
File Ref	
Version	Final 13.07.09
Audience	PDG members, NICE team, the public (via web publication)

The Chair we staff and coll apologies from The Chair outThe Chair out• To discuss internation policies, let• To consid• To consid• To clarify preventing• To unders injury2DeclarationsThe Chair explicem on every NICE team and declarations of The potentialPDG member• Heather V papers in Non person receive reference• Liz Towned in the revidepartme• Carolyn C• Jenny Mc undertake interest –• Amanda F	troductions and Aims of the Meeting loomed everyone to the first meeting. PDG members, NICE aborators introduced themselves and the Chair conveyed in members who could not attend. lined the objectives of the day: is the findings of Review 1: An overview and synthesis of hal comparative analyses and surveys of injury prevention egislation and other activities (PUIC 1.2)
<ul> <li>staff and coll apologies from The Chair out</li> <li>To discuss internation policies, le</li> <li>To consid</li> <li>To clarify preventing</li> <li>To unders injury</li> <li>2 Declarations</li> <li>The Chair explitem on every NICE team and declarations of The potential</li> <li>PDG member • Heather W papers in Non perso receive re</li> <li>Liz Towne in the revi departme</li> <li>Carolyn C</li> <li>Jenny Mc undertake interest –</li> <li>Amanda F</li> </ul>	aborators introduced themselves and the Chair conveyed n members who could not attend. lined the objectives of the day: s the findings of Review 1: An overview and synthesis of nal comparative analyses and surveys of injury prevention
<ul> <li>To discuss internation policies, let</li> <li>To conside</li> <li>To conside</li> <li>To clarify preventing</li> <li>To underss injury</li> </ul> 2 Declarations The Chair explicem on every NICE team and declarations of The potential <i>PDG member</i> <ul> <li>Heather V papers in Non persor receive reference in the revised partme</li> <li>Carolyn C</li> <li>Jenny Mc undertake interest –</li> <li>Amanda F</li> </ul>	s the findings of Review 1: An overview and synthesis of nal comparative analyses and surveys of injury prevention
internation policies, le To consid To clarify preventing To unders injury 2 Declarations The Chair exp item on every NICE team and declarations of The potential <i>PDG member</i> Heather V papers in Non person receive re Liz Towner in the revi departme Carolyn C Jenny Mc undertake interest – Amanda F	nal comparative analyses and surveys of injury prevention
<ul> <li>To clarify preventing</li> <li>To undersinjury</li> <li>To undersinjury</li> <li>Declarations</li> <li>The Chair explicem on every NICE team and declarations of The potential</li> <li><i>PDG member</i></li> <li>Heather V papers in Non person receive resingent in the revised partme</li> <li>Carolyn C</li> <li>Jenny Mc undertake interest –</li> <li>Amanda F</li> </ul>	
preventing• To undersinjury• To undersinjury2DeclarationsThe Chair explitem on every NICE team and declarations of The potentialPDG member• Heather V papers in Non persor receive redimenter in the revi departme • Carolyn C • Jenny Mc undertake interest – • Amanda F	er any implications of Review 1 for draft recommendations
2 Declarations The Chair exp item on every NICE team and declarations of The potential <i>PDG member</i> • Heather V papers in Non person receive ref • Liz Towner in the revision departme • Carolyn C • Jenny Mc undertake interest – • Amanda F	the links between the different pieces of NICE guidance on gunintentional injuries among children under 15
The Chair exp item on every NICE team and declarations of The potential <i>PDG member</i> • Heather W papers in Non perso receive re • Liz Towne in the revi departme • Carolyn C • Jenny Mc undertake interest – • Amanda F	tand the parameters of Review 2: Quantitative correlates of
item on every NICE team and declarations of The potential <i>PDG member</i> • Heather V papers in Non perso receive re • Liz Towne in the revi departme • Carolyn C • Jenny Mc undertake interest – • Amanda F	of Interests
<ul> <li>Heather V papers in Non perso receive re</li> <li>Liz Towne in the revi departme</li> <li>Carolyn C</li> <li>Jenny Mc undertake interest –</li> <li>Amanda F</li> </ul>	blained that verbal declarations of interest are a standing agenda and a matter of public record. PDG Members, the ad the collaborators verbally summarised their written of interest (if any) and added any specific to the topic today. conflicts of interest declared were:
<ul> <li>prevention</li> <li>Lisa Irving prevention</li> <li>Andrew C service</li> <li>Jerry Moo service, s</li> <li>Davina Ha Children S</li> <li>Mike Haye</li> </ul>	Vard: Non personal pecuniary interest – author of two the review; Pecuniary interest – consultant in injury field; onal pecuniary interest – academic department may in future search grants related to this area er: Non personal pecuniary interest – author of three papers ew; Non personal pecuniary interest – academic nt may in future receive research grants related to this area tripps: Pecuniary interest – consultant trainer Whirter: Non personal pecuniary interest – RoSPA may future work as a result of any recommendations; Pecuniary freelance consultant Roberts: Personal pecuniary interest – paid work in accident n field g: Personal pecuniary interest – paid work in accident n field

	Caroline Bradbury-Jones: Non personal pecuniary interest –	
	academic department may in future receive research grants related to	
	this area	
	Nicky Houghton: Non personal non pecuniary interest –	
	commissioner in a PCT	
	<ul> <li>Ceri Phillips: Non personal pecuniary interest – academic department may in future receive research grants related to this area</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Julia Verne: Non personal pecuniary interest – department may in</li> </ul>	
	future receive research grants related to this area	
	Tanja Stocks: none to declare	
	Rob Taylor: none to declare	
	Amy Aeron Thomas: none to declare	
	Shelley Mason: none to declare	
	Review team	
	<ul> <li>Rob Anderson: Non personal pecuniary interest – academic work in this area may lead to future research contracts</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>David McDaid: Non personal pecuniary interest – academic</li> </ul>	
	department may in future receive research grants related to this area;	
	Personal non-pecuniary interest – involved in APPOLLO project; Non	
	personal non-pecuniary interest – member of PHIAC	
	NICE	
	<ul> <li>Mike Kelly: Non personal non pecuniary interest – published papers</li> </ul>	
	may arise from this work	
	In liaison with the Director of CPHE, the Chair ruled that none of these	
	interests prevented any member from taking full part in the meeting.	
3	Context for the first evidence review	
J		
	Louise Millward from NICE set the context for the review and reiterated	
	that this guidance is part of a suite of NICE guidance on unintentional	
	injuries. She acknowledged that the parameters of the work had changed	
	while the review was underway and thanked the team for remaining	
	responsive and flexible during this period.	
4	Review 1: An overview and synthesis of international comparative	
	analyses and surveys of injury prevention policies, legislation and	
	other activities – Presentation of key findings	
	Devid McDeid reve a presentation on the key findings of the review	
	David McDaid gave a presentation on the key findings of the review.	
5	Review 1: Questions of clarification and whole group discussion	
	The Cheir thenked the review team and ealer d far sweeting of	
	The Chair thanked the review team and asked for questions of	
	clarification. There was a discussion relating to what had/not been covered by the review.	
	<ul> <li>Included cross-country comparisons of legislation, regulation,</li> </ul>	
	enforcement, compliance (LREC), plus large (over 1m population)	
	state/province comparisons in federal countries.	
	<ul> <li>Excluded comparisons between areas of population of</li> </ul>	
	less than one million.	
	<ul> <li>Included modification of road design or environment.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Excluded interventions focused on road users and</li> </ul>	

	<ul> <li>vehicles.</li> <li>Included home safety assessments and safety equipment.</li> <li>Included wider environment (including sports and leisure activities)</li> <li>Included mass media campaigns/initiatives; professional support/workforce development and routine monitoring and surveillance systems where related to LREC.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>The PDG made suggestions about what might be useful to look at:</li> <li>Sub-national areas, ie populations less than 1m (some of these studies may be included in future reviews).</li> <li>Principles of compliance, such as the use of safety equipment (eg cycle helmets)</li> <li>Older studies that pre-date legislative changes</li> <li>European Child Safety Alliance Report Cards may indicate when legislation came into effect</li> </ul>	
Т	Discussion of evidence statements – group-work The committee split into three small groups to discuss the evidence tatements.	
L	<ul> <li>injuries in children will focus on design and modification to highways, roads and streets, the supply and/or installation of home safety equipment, home risk assessments and prevention activities in the external environment. It will cover the following measures:</li> <li>Legislation, Regulation, Enforcement (LRE); Compliance with LRE, and supporting mass media campaigns. In addition, it will cover injury surveillance, data collection and analysis, and workforce training, support and capacity building.</li> <li>The Intervention guidance on preventing unintentional road injuries among under 15s will examine what types of road design or modification to the road environment are effective and cost effective in reducing road injuries among children and young people aged under 15.</li> <li>The Intervention guidance on preventing unintentional injuries among under 15s in the home will examine which interventions involving the supply and/or installation of home safety equipment are effective and cost effective and cost effective in preventing unintentional injuries among under 15s in the home will examine which interventions involving the supply and/or installation of home safety equipment are effective and cost effective in preventing unintentional injuries among under 15 in the home.</li> </ul>	

	It was noted that the PDG had some concerns that education and media campaigns (other than in support of legislation and regulations) was not part of the scope for the Programme guidance.	
8	Plenary from group-work session on evidence statements	
	Feedback from the three groups included:	
	• Mechanisms for enforcing legislation in the road, home and external environment settings, including non–legal means such as insurance, health and safety legislation, codes of practice, penalty points for reckless off-road driving which is covered by old 'furious and wanton' driving legislation.	
	<ul> <li>For different types of injury, legislation is possible:         <ul> <li>Banisters – once brought in environment is safe</li> <li>Seatbelts – repetitive action needs enforcement</li> <li>Drowning in bath – no legislation</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
	Action: May be useful to map types of injury and what kind of	NICE
	<ul> <li>legislation would be useful</li> <li>Up until the UNICEF report there had been no comparison of injury rates and the crude league tables to think about differences – what can you learn from countries with the best rate?</li> <li>Mortality – the only internationally complete dataset <ul> <li>Discussion about whether databases give breakdown of injuries in terms of where the accident occurred etc, difficulties in comparing classification of injuries</li> </ul> </li> <li>How can we collect exposure data and compare across countries, different countries have different cultures</li> <li>Exposure to risk is going to be different internationally</li> <li>The Road environment is more amenable to regulation as is a public space, homes are private/personal space more difficult to enforce, leisure may be something between the two</li> <li>Role of European Road Safety Observatory in monitoring</li> <li>Broad nature of injury prevention overlaps many areas and in many people's remit therefore probably hampers pulling together into specific qualification</li> <li>Capacity building is difficult as so many different professionals</li> </ul>	
	Action: Paper that summarises legislation, standards, code of conduct etc	NICE
	Action: Paper/table showing which government departments fit     in and where on injury prevention	NICE
	• Action: Matrix to include a policy map (including who can do what, at what level and which govt depts. involved), epidemiology, an outline of who is doing what, what are the priorities and what can reasonable be done, and role of mass	NICE
	<ul><li>media</li><li>Action: need a glossary.</li></ul>	NICE
	The Chair thanked the groups and asked NICE to provide this information and to develop a glossary.	
9	Making recommendations – process and methods	
	Simon Ellis reminded members of the process for developing	

		1
	recommendations and considerations and highlighted that these need to meet NICE protocols relating to equality and diversity legislation.	
10	Making recommendations – group work	
	The Chair asked the PDG to break into the same three groups to consider how the evidence might be used to formulate some provisional recommendations.	
11	Feedback and whole group discussion/ consensus	
	The Chair asked the groups to report back on outline areas for recommendations in a plenary session, followed by whole group discussion.	
	The feedback and discussion focused on:	
	<ul> <li>the benefits of child road safety audits, their collation and evaluation</li> <li>data sharing, road safety measures on main roads and standards for training</li> </ul>	
	The PDG raised the following issues:	
	the need more information about legislation, regulation and	
	<ul> <li>enforcement (LRE)</li> <li>which government departments are responsible for injury prevention?</li> <li>how could local authorities assess their own areas to determine risk?</li> <li>that legislation alone might not always be enough</li> <li>what is the current and future role of the Government Offices for Regions (GOR)?</li> <li>what are the priorities outlined in the recent DCSF priority review?</li> <li>National indicator 47 or 48 is relevant, need to consider local authority 'basket of indicators'</li> <li>should link to obesity and sustainability agendas, which are local</li> </ul>	
	<ul><li>priorities</li><li>that risk assessment must include exposure data</li></ul>	NICE
12	Review 2: 'Quantitative correlates' – what to expect	
	Rob Anderson from PenTAG outlined the aim of 'review 2', its parameters and progress to date.	
	It will identify and quantify factors such as cultural, social, economic, environmental and organisational factors that have been shown to be related to the incidence of unintentional childhood injury.	
13	Summary of the day, agreed action and next steps	
	The Chair thanked the members for a successful first PDG meeting.	
	Next steps	
	<ul> <li>NICE team to draft minutes of the meeting.</li> <li>NICE team to collate notes on provisional recommendations and considerations.</li> </ul>	NICE NICE NICE
	NICE team to email PDG with links to documents in item 8.	

	The email addresses for all PDG members will be available in the email.	
14	Any Other Business	
	There was no other business	
Close	The Chair thanked all attendees and closed the meeting at 4.20pm.	