

Public Health Interventions Advisory Committee (PHIAC)

PHIAC 22: FINAL Minutes of meeting 15th February, 2008

Workplace Physical Activity

Attendees	<p>Members Catherine Law, David Jones, Jane Putsey, Muriel James, Susan Michie, Dale Robinson, KK Cheng, Mike Owen, Tracey Sach, John Barker, Ann Hoskins, Dagmar Zeuner, Mike Bury, Philip Cutler, Matt Kearney, Mike Rayner (pm only), Alasdair Hogarth</p> <p>NICE Mike Kelly, Jane Huntley, Hugo Crombie, Chris Carmona, Bhash Naidoo, Emma Stewart, Sarah Dunsdon</p> <p>Observers Jenny Griffiths (Non Executive Director, NICE), Alaster Rutherford (Implementation, NICE), Alix Johnson (PPIP)</p> <p>Contractors Michael Wright , Greenstreet Berman Alexandra Rogers, Greenstreet Berman Rachel Evans, Greenstreet Berman Matthew Bending, York Health Economic Consortium (YHEC) (am only) John Hutton, York Health Economic Consortium (YHEC) (am only)</p> <p>Cooptees and Expert witnesses Mark Haig, Nick Colledge, Fiona Bull (British Heart Foundation), Emma Adams (British Heart Foundation), Paula Hooper (British Heart Foundation)</p>
Author	Emma Stewart
File Ref	PHIAC 22 – 150208
Version	1
Audience	Members of PHIAC

Agenda Item	Minutes	Action
<p>1. Welcome and introductions (Chair)</p> <p>2. Apologies (All)</p>	<p>The Chair welcomed members to the twenty second PHIAC meeting. The meeting was declared quorate.</p> <p>Apologies were received from the following: David Sloan, Richard Cookson, Joanne Cooke, Mark Sculpher, Brian Ferguson, Sharon McAteer, Andrew Hopkin, Amanda Hoey, Simon Capewell, Sue Atkinson, Joyce Rothschild, David McDaid, Ruth Hall, Valerie King</p>	
<p>3. Declaration of Interest (All)</p>	<p>Declarations of interest in relation to Workplace Physical Activity were asked for.</p> <p>The following were declared:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nick Colledge is a provider of sports and physical activity services; • Mark Haig is the managing director of Healthworks which is a private company working with workplaces in the northwest of England; • Fiona Bull, Emma Adams and Paula Hooper receive research funding for work in this area, including for the Well@Work project. <p>The following individuals indicated that they may receive a service payment for implementing some of the interventions that the Committee may recommend, or from future research funding relating to Workplace Physical Activity:</p> <p>Service Payment: None Research: <i>PHIAC members:</i> Susan Michie, David Jones, KK Cheng, Tracey Sach <i>Contractors/ co-optees:</i> Michael Wright, Alexandra Rogers and Rachel Evans, John Hutton</p> <p>It was agreed that the above declarations would not prevent participants from taking part in the meeting.</p>	
<p>4. Workplace Physical Activity</p>	<p>Chris Carmona presented a summary of the additional relevant US evidence. It was agreed that the evidence supported and strengthened the original findings and that it should be used to support the current recommendations.</p> <p>The committee felt it would be useful to further reflect on the US evidence during the day and consider whether any additional points should be added to the recommendations.</p> <p>Fiona Bull presented a summary of the Well@Work project and considered how the results of the project fit with the Workplace Physical Activity recommendations. Some of the findings were relevant to the potential recommendations which PHIAC might make.</p>	<p>PHIAC</p>

	<p>The committee briefly discussed the Well@Work report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the methodological limitations of the data were considered. • It was felt to be valuable work in supporting implementation of the guidance. <p>Matthew Bending from the YHEC presented a summary of the additional economics analysis undertaken on the workplace physical activity guidance.</p> <p>The committee made the following observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be helpful to quantify some of the assumptions made in the modelling work, including the effectiveness estimates. • Even at its most conservative estimates the model demonstrates cost effectiveness. • There is a disjunction between the economic and the effectiveness evidence. • Business gains and health gains may need further consideration and modelling. • Quantification of the effectiveness estimates is required. <p>The committee then considered the QRG for Physical Activity and the Environment. The committee were keen that the Mental Wellbeing and Physical Activity intervention guidance made clear links to the programme guidance in the recommendations, elsewhere in the guidance and in implementation.</p>	<p>YHEC</p> <p>YHEC</p> <p>YHEC</p>
<p>5. Workplace Physical Activity – Fieldwork and stakeholder comments</p>	<p>Greenstreet Berman presented an overview of the results of fieldwork. They firstly compared the fieldwork findings with the evidence review. Some of the implications for implementation were also considered. Lastly they considered the implications for the recommendations.</p> <p>Chris Carmona presented the key points from the stakeholder consultation.</p> <p>The following comments were raised by PHIAC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was felt important that more private businesses might be contacted to ensure they are engaged with the guidance and appropriate feedback is received. • The use of incentives may need further consideration. • There is a need to clarify exactly who the recommendations are aimed at. • It was felt it would be useful to define multi-component more explicitly. • Some key issues relating to implementing the guidance were considered. • The guidance must recognise the links with local authority initiatives. • Concern was raised about how this could be implemented in Small and Medium sized Enterprises (SMEs) and some consideration was given to how to support the implementation of the guidance in SMEs. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence relating to SMEs was identified. It was felt that it might be useful to consider further some of this evidence to ensure consistency. • Some of the difficulties of engaging companies outside of the health sector were noted. The following was thought important to encourage engagement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is important to make the business case for implementing the guidance. ○ The guidance must be written in an accessible way for businesses. ○ The need to use examples of good practice. <p>Summary by the Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The US evidence has been considered and this should be synthesised into the original evidence. • The Well@Work report helps contextualise the recommendations within the UK sector. • Further thought is required to consider to what extent further quantification or analysis might inform the economic model. • The Physical Activity and Environment programme guidance was thought to be very relevant and should be cross referenced in this guidance. • Stakeholder comments were discussed and these have enabled the committee to improve the current iteration. Private organisations are under represented as stakeholders and this should be considered further. • There is a need to further consider the business case. • The style of guidance needs careful consideration to help with implementation, particularly to employers and non NHS audiences. • The use and accessibility of the NICE website for these audiences also requires further consideration. 	<p>NICE team</p> <p>YHEC</p> <p>NICE team</p> <p>NICE team</p> <p>NICE team</p> <p>Implementation</p> <p>Implementation</p>
<p>6. Workplace Physical Activity: the recommendations</p>	<p>Chris Carmona presented the changes to the recommendations. PHIAC made the following comments:</p> <p>Recommendation one</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of potential changes relating to equity, management support, evaluation, presentation, SMEs, resources, incentives, were discussed. <p>Recommendation two</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The following issues were considered in rewording this recommendation: the definition of ‘health check’, the relation of health checks to physical activity, equity, dissemination of information and behaviour change, potential harm, litigation, the economic analysis, absenteeism, the context of the obesity epidemic, the business case and the public health provision at local level. <p>Recommendation three</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The following issues were discussed: use of the term 	

	<p>'travel plan', the meaning of 'other active transport', the evidence base for cycling and walking and stairwells.</p> <p>Recommendation four</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rewording relating to LSA boards and other NHS organisations, Local Authorities, the community engagement guidance, evaluation, resources were considered. <p>Some further changes to the overall guidance were considered based on feedback from stakeholders. The following will be added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy relevant documents should be drawn on in line with the NICE template. <p>Draft research recommendations were considered by the committee. These will be redrafted by the NICE team and presented at the next PHIAC meeting.</p> <p>It was agreed that the guidance will be redrafted with the above suggestions and sent to the committee for comment.</p>	<p>NICE team</p> <p>NICE team</p>
<p>7. Equity proofing the guidance (JH)</p>	<p>Jane Huntley presented some of the key points relating to equity proofing draft guidance. She then presented some examples of how equity proofing might work in relation to this particular guidance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was agreed that in future Equity Proofing should be undertaken and drafted initially by the NICE team after drafting the recommendations. A process will need to be developed as to how this will fit into current timelines. • It was suggested that a clear statement relating to the health gradient might be useful to include in documents about equity. 	<p>NICE team</p>
<p>8. Next steps in guidance (JH)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations to be redrafted and then distributed to PHIAC. • Editing to begin on 25th February. • The guidance will be sent to PHIAC on 10th March. • The NICE team will meet with the chair to agree on the final guidance. • The draft guidance will be sent to guidance executive on 27th March. 	
<p>9. Public Meetings (MK and JH)</p>	<p>MK updated the committee regarding holding committee meetings in public.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From June 2008 it is hoped that this will be implemented for all standing advisory committees. • Some of the challenges are being considered by an internal working group at NICE. <p>The committee made the following observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A dress rehearsal and/or media trainer would be helpful • The effect of meeting in public should be evaluated; 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personal liability needed to be clarified; • How to manage the press. • Would there be opportunity for informal discussions, for example having some parts of the meeting not in public? <p>Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training and support is needed for the committee and some implications for processes need further consideration. • There are timing and resource implications. • JH to take these issues back to the working group. 	JH
10. Topic proposals (MK)	<p>A list of topics that have been suggested by PHIAC was presented.</p> <p>MK also let the committee know of the list of topics recently put forward by the topic panel and which are currently with ministers.</p> <p>MK to check the status of the referral on health literacy and report back at the next PHIAC meeting.</p>	MK
11. Minutes of the last meeting (All)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The minutes were approved with some minor changes. • The formatting of minutes is to be reconsidered. 	
12. Social Values Judgement Paper (MK)	<p>The PHIAC response to the Social Values Judgement paper which was discussed at the December meeting was considered by the committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The committee discussed the draft response. It was agreed that individual committee members who had made specific points at the December meeting would enlarge on these and send them to MK. • Comments to be sent to MK by next Friday. This will be re-circulated before sending to the social values paper team. • Richard Cookson to be contacted re his comments at the December meeting. 	PHIAC ES
16. Topic Suggestions (All)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None suggested. 	
17. AOB (Chair)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Away Day is now being held in September. ES to send details to committee members. Topic suggestions to be sent to ES or raised in committee. • PHIAC rep volunteers were requested. ES to send an email to PHIAC members detailing outstanding topics. • 2 research projects are being commissioned by the NIHR HTA programme based on research recommendations from public health intervention guidance No's 1 and 2 • Draft guidance of mental wellbeing and older people has been put out for consultation. The guidance is now aimed at disadvantaged older people. There was some concern 	ES ES

	<p>amongst the committee about this change and the process that has led to it. This will be considered further by CL and MK.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The committee were informed about the resignation of David Jones who was warmly thanked for his contribution to the committee.	
18. Close	The meeting closed at 4.30pm	