NICE PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMME GUIDANCE

Contraceptive services for socially disadvantaged young people

2nd meeting of the Programme Development Group

Thursday 2nd April 2009 Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health, 5-11Theobalds Road, London WC1X 8SH

Final Minutes

Attendees:	PDG Members	
	Anne Weyman – Chair Amar Abass, Simran Chawla, Ros Delaney, Alaina Dingwall Ruth Hine, Lesley Hoggart ,Rhiannon Holder, Ifigeneia Mavranezouli, Pauline McGough, Terri Ryland, Karen Spooner, Faye Sutton, Kim Tanner, Babs Young .	
	Chris Carmona (CC), Alastair Fischer (AF), Mandy Harling (MH) – pm only, Mike Kelly (MK) – pm only, Kay Nolan (KN), Patricia Mountain (PM), Clare Wohlgemuth (CW).	
	Contractors – ScHARR	
	Lindsay Blank (LB), Nick Payne (NP)	
Apologies:	PDG Members	
	Penny Barber, Pat Farley, Gill Frances, Karen Harrison, Carola Sander.	
	NICE Team	
	Tricia Younger (TY)	
Author	Patricia Mountain	

ltem		Action
1	Welcome, Introductions and Aims of the Meeting	
	Two new members were introduced (Ifigenia Mavranezouli and Terri Ryland)	
	The Chair welcomed the committee and explained this was the first meeting to consider a full review from ScHARR. The review under consideration was the review of contraceptive provision in educational settings.	
2	Minutes of last meeting Deferred.	
3	Declarations of interest	
	Declarations of interest previously declared & declared at this meeting: Amar Abass - personal non pecuniary interest Penny Barber - personal non pecuniary interest* Ros Delaney – personal pecuniary interest – presentation on LARC Lesley Hoggart- personal non pecuniary interest, personal non pecuniary Rhiannon Holder - personal non pecuniary interest Ifigenia Mafranezouli - non personal pecuniary interest Pauline McGough - personal non pecuniary interest Terri Ryland - non personal pecuniary interest Karen Spooner - non personal pecuniary interest Faye Sutton - non personal pecuniary interest (* - not present at this meeting but will receive email correspondence relating to the topic)	
	From ScHARR - All ScHARR staff involved in the review declared a potential non personal pecuniary interest with regard to potential future research in the area.	
	Nick Payne - non personal pecuniary interest Lindsey Blank - non personal pecuniary interest	
4	Contraceptive services in educational settings – Findings of the review	
	Nick Payne and Lindsey Blank presented the main findings of the review and the evidence statements together with an outline of the methods used.	
	The PDG agreed that they found Forest plots a useful way to represent the data and asked that ScHARR continue to use them.	
5	Questions and general discussion of review	

		T
	 The main points of discussion included: There was concern that some research that had been conducted in the UK was not included in the review. ScHARR explained that only evidence published in a peer reviewed journal literature had been used and work needed to be done to access other evidence, not published in scientific journals, sometimes called 'grey' literature, for example evaluation reports and other technical reports Future reviews that will be brought to the PDG should include more UK research. The PDG will use their expertise to assess the applicability of non-UK research. Clarification on outcomes measures used. In the review outcomes are related to sexual behaviour more generally e.g. less partners, abstinence, rather than use of contraception A need for further clarification on relevance to this guidance of abstinence in the USA and Delay programmes in the UK. The main author of 3 potentially interesting studies would be contacted for more information. It was clarified that more information can be requested from study authors if appropriate and relevant. 	NICE Scharr
	 A definition of socially disadvantaged, used in the wording of the referral to NICE from the Department of Health would be useful. 	NICE
	 An understanding of socially disadvantaged young people's access to health services in general, not just contraceptive services would be useful. 	
6	Small group work	
	 The PDG split into three groups, each facilitated by a member of the NICE team to discuss the Effectiveness Review 2- the discussion included: Draft recommendations – areas in the review where feel recommendations could be made Research recommendations – identify gaps in the review Equality 	
	The three groups identified 3 potential areas where the evidence might support a recommendation:-	
	 intensive case management to prevent repeat pregnancy school based dispensing motivational interviewing in college students 	
7	Feedback from the groups	
	The PDG considered that further evidence probably does exist in the	

	 grey literature and that this needs to be identified. Some potential sources were suggested, including the Evaluation of Young People's Health Demonstration Sites. Babs Young offered to send details to NICE for circulation to the PDG. The applicability of interventions from other countries was discussed. MK explained to the PDG that they must consider the intrinsic nature of the intervention and whether it is plausible in the UK context that we live and work in. 	Babs Young
8	Implementation presentation and discussion	
	MH from the Implementation team at NICE gave a brief presentation on the role of that team in ensuring that this guidance will be effectively implemented	
9	Summary of the discussions, agreed action and next steps.	
	 The Chair thanked the PDG for their contributions and summarised the main issues and agreed actions: The information and reports mentioned in the group feedback to be sourced. These include: Teenage Pregnancy Unit National Survey of Sexual Attitudes and Lifestyles Department of Health NAZ Project (sexual health and HIV prevention and support services to targeted black and minority ethnic (BME) communities in London) Health Development Agency archive 	
	 socially disadvantaged effectiveness of services 	
	 The use of forest plots in reviews was useful. The PDG did not feel there was enough information at present to begin drafting recommendations. 	
	 Chair to discuss potential co-optees and experts with NICE i.e. when and whom to invite, also whether all experts should be invited to one meeting. 	
	The PDG members were asked to suggest to NICE any potential co- opted members and those who might be invited to provide expert testimony.	
	The meeting ended at 3pm.	

DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 27th May 2009 NICE offices, 3rd floor, MidCity Place, 71 High Holborn, London WC1V 6NA.

MEETING PAPERS TO BE MAILED: 14th May

PLEASE NOTE CHANGE OF VENUE