

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

**Public Health Advisory Committee C
Community Engagement**

11th Meeting of the Public Health Advisory Committee

11th December 2014

Broadway House, Tothill St, London SW1H 9NQ

Final Minutes

Attendees:	<p><i>PHAC Members</i> David Sloan, Elizabeth Bayliss, Michal Chantkowski , Ross Cowan Alison Giles, Gail Findlay, Chris Nield , Eileen Kaner (from 10:10am to 3:40pm), Stephen Morris (out of the room 11:30am – 12:30pm), Kamran Siddiqi, Jane South Geraldine Stone, Karen Wint.</p> <p><i>NICE Team</i> Antony Morgan, James Jagroo, Alix Johnson, Gill Leng (until 11:30am) Lesley Owen, Patricia Mountain, Peter Shearn, Tracey Shield</p> <p><i>Review Teams:</i> <i>Optimetry Matrix</i> Clive Pritchard <i>Leeds Beckett University</i> Anne-Marie Bagnall (until 11:30pm) <i>EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London (EPPI).</i> Ginny Brunton , Dylan Kneale (from 11:30am to 1:00pm)</p>
Apologies:	<p><i>PHAC Members</i></p> <p>Gina Radford, Jasmine Murphy</p>

Author	PM
File Ref	
Version	Final
Audience	PHAC members, NICE team, members of the public

Item		Action
<p>1. Welcome and objectives for the meeting</p>	<p>The Chair (David Sloan in the absence of Gina Radford) welcomed the Public Health Advisory Committee (PHAC) to the second meeting on the update of NICE Community Engagement guideline. This was the 11th meeting of PHAC C.</p> <p>The Chair welcomed the members of the committee, review teams, and members of the public. The Chair informed the PHAC that apologies had been received. These are noted above.</p> <p>The members of the public were also welcomed to the meeting. The members of the public had been briefed already, both verbally and in writing by the NICE team, and the Chair reminded them of the protocol for members of the public, i.e. their role is to observe and they may not speak or ask questions. Also, no filming or recording of the meeting is permitted.</p> <p>The Chair reminded all present that the PHAC is independent and advisory, and that its decisions and recommendations to NICE do not represent final NICE guidance; and they may be changed as a result of public consultation.</p> <p>The Chair outlined the objectives of the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To hear an update on Stream 2 qualitative evidence from Leeds Beckett University/University of East London • To hear expert testimony on the family of community-centred approaches • To discuss the findings from the effectiveness review on ‘Coalitions, Collaborations and Partnerships’ prepared by Institute of Education (IOE) • To start the process of drafting recommendations • To discuss the findings from the cost effectiveness review prepared by Matrix • To discuss the economic modelling presented by Matrix • To discuss further opportunities for expert testimony 	

<p>2. Declarations of Interests</p>	<p>The Chair explained that verbal declarations of interest are a standing item on every agenda and are published as part of the final guidance and documented in the minutes as a matter of public record.</p> <p>The NICE policy on Declarations of Interests has recently been updated and the categories revised. The declarations of interest will be published as part of the final guideline. The new policy was tabled and the Chair asked the PHAC to familiarise themselves with it before the next meeting. The Chair asked everyone to verbally declare any additional interests that may have arisen since the last meeting, or any changes to previously declared interests, under the categories below.</p> <p>The interests declared by members were as follows: financial or non-financial (specific or non-specific*)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • financial interests can be personal [family] or non-personal.(specific or non specific*) <p>*Specific and non-specific interests</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An interest is 'specific' if it refers directly to the matter under discussion. • An interest is 'non-specific' if it does not refer directly to the matter under discussion <p>Personal non-financial interest Chris Neild: As Consultant in Public Health for Sheffield City Council she sometimes applies for research grants in connection with community engagement;. honorary lecturer at Sheffield University Chris Nield:specific interest: authored a document submitted as evidence Elizabeth Bayliss:runs a community development charity-Social Action for health</p> <p>The interests declared by contractors were as follows; Personal non-financial interest Anne- Marie Bagnall;has research interests in the topic area, and hopes to write papers and generate new research in the topic area. Non-personal financial interest Anne- Marie Bagnall; employed by Leeds Beckett University and contracted by NICE to deliver the evidence for stream 2 of the Community Engagement guidance update. The Chair and the Associate Director noted that the interests declared did not prevent the attendees at committee from fully participating in the meeting</p>	
<p>3, 4 Orientation presentation</p>	<p>Antony Morgan (AM), associate director for this guideline, gave a presentation to outline the</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process for guideline development • Approach to the evidence <p>The Contractors that have been commissioned are;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPPI Centre (Institute of Education) lead by Dr Ginny Brunton - responsible for Stream 1 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> University of Leeds (in collaboration with the University of East London) – led by Dr Anne-Marie Bagnall and Professor Angela Harden - responsible for Stream 2 Optimity Matrix led by Clive Pritchard – responsible for Stream 3 <p>AM explained that the PHAC would be developing and agreeing an appropriate conceptual framework</p> <p>From January 2015 the Centre for Public Health would become part of the Health and Social Care Directorate, and AM introduced the Director, Deputy Chief Executive of NICE, Gill Leng.</p> <p>Also from January 2015, a unified methods and process manual will be implemented across NICE to unify the methods taken. This can be found here: http://www.nice.org.uk/article/PMG20/chapter/1%20Introduction%20and%20overview</p> <p>Gill Leng explained that the new methods will ensure that there are clear action orientated recommendations within the guideline. The recommendations will clearly be linked to the evidence statement as part of the NICE Pathway on the NICE website.</p> <p>There was time for questions and discussion</p>	<p>NICE</p>
<p>5, 6 Family of interventions conceptual framework</p>	<p>At the last meeting there was a discussion on the options for the best framework to help organise the recommendations and to help understand what additional evidence may be useful that is not being covered by the review level work.</p> <p>As a starting point Jane South, PHAC member, provided an overview of the work of a Public Health England and NHS England project to draw together and disseminate existing evidence and learning on working with communities and supporting community-centred health and wellbeing interventions.</p> <p>There was time for questions and discussion.</p>	
<p>7,8. Update on Steam 2 qualitative evidence</p>	<p>Anne-Marie Bagnall introduced an update of the work that is being undertaken by Leeds Beckett University. This will be presented in full at the third and fourth PHAC meetings on this topic in February and March 2015.</p>	
<p>9,10.Report 4: In-depth analysis - Coalitions, Collaborations and Partnerships (Component 2; Stream 1)</p>	<p>Ginny Brunton (GB) and Dylan Kneale (DK) from EPPI presented Report 4: In-depth analysis - Coalitions, Collaborations and Partnerships. (This is the second component of Stream 1).</p> <p>GB explained that the aims of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To update and extend the evidence base identified for the previous systematic review on community engagement undertaken by EPPI To focus on both effective approaches (through synthesis of outcome evaluations) and appropriateness (through a synthesis of process evaluations). 	

	There was time for questions and discussion.	
11. Introduction to drafting recommendations and considerations	Peter Shearn (PS), joint lead analyst at NICE for this topic, gave a short presentation, which included a reminder of the process of drafting recommendations. PS reminded the PHAC that the process for drafting recommendations is an iterative one, and the role of the PHAC is to interpret the evidence, following the NICE core principles of transparency and stakeholder consultation.	
12. Drafting recommendations and considerations	<p>The NICE team had drafted potential draft recommendations based on the first review presented at PHAC 11.1. The purpose of these draft recommendations was as a starting point for discussion, and PS explained that the PHAC may wish to amend or delete these recommendations. There was time for questions and discussion</p> <p>Action: NICE team to revise draft recommendations according to PHAC direction and bring back to the next meeting.</p> <p>Action: NICE team to bring to the next meeting the logic model used for the published Community engagement guidance (PH9)</p> <p>Action: PHAC members to forward any relevant logic models or diagrams to the NICE team (antony.morgan@nice.org.uk)</p> <p>Action: Professor Jennie Popay from University of Lancaster to be invited to give expert testimony relating to the work relating to the evaluation of New Deal for Communities</p>	<p>NICE</p> <p>NICE</p> <p>PHAC</p> <p>NICE</p>
13. Brief overview of economic evidence	Clive Pritchard (CP), Principal Economist at Optimity Matrix, gave a presentation which outlined the options for the economic analysis is to explore the cost-effectiveness of different approaches to community engagement, and asked the PHAC to make a judgment on the way forward.	
14. Cost-consequence analysis	CP explained that cost consequence analysis considers all the health and non-health benefits of an intervention across different sectors, but not directly comparable across a range of interventions due to benefits being measured using different units	
15. Social Return on Investment (SROI)	<p>CP explained that SROI places a monetary value on outcomes, so that they can be added up and compared with the investment made. This results in a ratio of total benefits (a sum of all the outcomes) to total investments.</p> <p>There are two types of SROI:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluative SROIs are conducted retrospectively and 	

	<p>are based on outcomes that have already taken place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forecast SROIs predict how much social value will be created if the activities meet their intended outcomes. <p>SROI tends to be based on observational, rather than experimental, data; therefore, assumptions need to be transparent</p>	
16. Discussion on economics	<p>The evidence statements prompted a discussion about comparators and whether benefits arising can be attributed to CE per se or to the public health ‘interventions’ embedded within a community engagement approach. Committee members had differing views on the potential added value of SROI. Given the newness of the approach, one member was concerned that using SROI might be detrimental to making the case for community whereas others considered it more appropriate for capturing the diversity of CE. Lesley Owen, health economist for this guideline, reminded the PHAC that the purpose of the economic analysis is to help inform the PHACs deliberations on recommendations.</p> <p>The Chair suggested an economics sub-group. This group will have meetings by telephone and feedback in plenary at future PHAC meetings, where the decisions will be taken. All members were invited to participate. Three members volunteered (SM, AG, GS) Any other members who would like to join this group to contact lesley.owen@nice.org.uk</p> <p>Action: NICE to set up an economic subgroup to further discuss SROI and what it might entail and bring back to the next PHAC meeting.</p>	NICE
17. Discussion of gaps in the evidence and potential areas for expert testimony & research recommendations	<p>Expert testimony is used by NICE to address potential gaps in the evidence.</p> <p>The expert witnesses suggested by the PHAC at the last meeting have been contacted but AM asked the PHAC to continue to suggest other experts who could provide expert testimony at a future PHAC meeting</p> <p>Action: PHAC to consider the expert witnesses to be invited to a future PHAC meeting and to contact the NICE team</p>	PHAC
18. Minutes of the last meeting	<p>The minutes of the last meeting were agreed to be an accurate record, with an amendment to the declarations of interest All the actions had been completed or are in hand.</p>	
18. Summary of the day and any Other Business/Next steps	<p>The Chair summarised the items that had been discussed throughout the day.</p> <p>Antony Morgan informed the PHAC of the next steps in the guideline development process</p>	

PHAC C Final minutes of PHAC C meeting 11th December 2014

	PHAC members were reminded that NICE will only process expenses that are submitted within 3 months of the date incurred	
19. Close	The meeting closed at 4:00pm.	

DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 3rd February 2015

VENUE FOR NEXT MEETING: Broadway House, Tothill St, London SW1H 9NQ