

Public Health Interventions Advisory Committee (PHIAC)

PHIAC 16: Minutes of meeting 13th July, 2007

Mental Wellbeing and Children in Primary Education

Attendees	<p>Members Catherine Law, David McDaid, David Jones, KK Cheng, Muriel James, Mike Bury, Dagmar Zeuner, Mike Owen, Sue Atkinson, Matt Kearney, Mike Rayner, John Barker, Joyce Rothschild, Ann Hoskins, Alasdair Hogarth, Jane Putsey, David Sloan, Valerie King</p> <p>NICE Mike Kelly (MK), Antony Morgan (AM), Amanda Killoran (AK), Sarah Dunsdon (SD), Dylan Jones (DJ), Bhash Naidoo (BN), Jane Cowl (JC), Kirsty Maclean Steel (KM), James Jagroo (JJ), Laura Norburn (LN), Emma Stewart (ES)</p> <p>Observers Bruno Crosier (work experience student), Midori Sato (PhD student), Miranda Mindlin (public health work placement, UCL.)</p> <p>Contractors <i>Chris McCabe, Sarah Stewart Brown), Carolyn Summerbell, Janet Shucksmith, Yaser Adi</i></p> <p>Cooptees and Expert witnesses <i>Deborah Michel, Karen Bateson, Anne Deverill, Sue Mackay, Peter Blackman, Marilyn Phipps</i></p>
Author	Emma Stewart
File Ref	PHIAC 16 – 200707
Version	Final
Audience	Members of PHIAC

Agenda Item	Minutes	Action
1. Welcome and introductions (Chair)	The Chair welcomed Members to the sixteenth PHIAC meeting, particularly the two new health economist members – David McDaid and Tracey Sach.	
2. Apologies (All)	Apologies were received from the following: Tracey Sach, Simon Capewell, Brian Ferguson, Richard Cookson, Dale Robinson, Andrew Hopkin, Howard Gilfillan, Sharon McAteer, Ruth Hall, Mark Sculpher, Amanda Hoey, Philip Cutler, Klim McPherson, Susan Michie	
3. Declaration of Interest (All)	<p>Declarations of conflicts of interest in relation to the Promotion of Mental Wellbeing in Primary Schools were asked for.</p> <p>No conflicts of interest were declared.</p> <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 matters under discussion at the meeting:</p> <p>Service Payment: <i>Co-optees/ Experts:</i> Karen Bateson <i>PHIAC members:</i> Muriel James</p> <p>Future research funding: <i>Co-optees/ Experts:</i> Janet Shucksmith; Sarah Stewart Brown <i>PHIAC members:</i> KK Cheng, David Jones, Catherine Law</p>	
4. Mental Wellbeing and Children: Whole School and Targeted Approaches – consideration of evidence	<p>The chair introduced contractors from the collaborating centres, who gave brief presentations on the key findings from the effectiveness and cost effectiveness reviews for both whole school and targeted approaches. The presentations were given by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sarah Stewart Brown (Warwick University) – Whole School Approaches – a review of effectiveness. • Janet Shucksmith (University of Teeside) – Targeted approaches – a review of effectiveness. • Chris McCabe (University of Leeds) – key findings from the economics appraisal. 	
5 Comment from the PHIAC technical reps	The Chair then asked the PHIAC technical representative, David Jones, to comment on what he saw as being the key issues. He was asked in particular to highlight any	

	<p>gaps in the evidence, the limitations of the data, and issues for clarification.</p> <p>The key issues were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significance and reporting bias. • How to separate out the different components of an intervention to understand what made it effective. • To establish who the targets actually were in targeted interventions. • To agree where there is an overlap with other guidance. • To consider further how to proceed with the economic analyses. 	
6 Discussion by the committee	<p>The committee discussed the following main points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues about effect size. • Consideration of what didn't work. • The applicability of the studies. • The possibility of gathering further qualitative evidence to help clarify more fully the detail of 'what works'. • The limitations of the data. • The potential need to consider different evidence sources – such as practical experience in this area and other sources such as Ofsted reports. • Whether the literature on bullying should be included as an additional piece of work. 	
7 Comment from the PHIAC lay and practitioner reps and co-optees.	<p>The chair asked the PHIAC lay representative, Jane Putsey, to suggest outline areas for making recommendations.</p> <p>The chair then asked the 3 nominated practitioner representatives, Alasdair Hogarth, Joyce Rothschild and Dagmar Zeuner to give their perspective on the potential areas for making recommendations.</p> <p>The 4 co-optees were invited to respond and comment upon any of the issues raised or discussed during the morning, or other issues they considered important. The co-optees were: Karen Batesman (Solihull, CAMHS), Peter Blackman (AFIYA), Sue Mackay (Kent Health Promotion Service,) Marilyn Phipps (Damson Wood School)</p>	
8 Summary from the chair	<p>The chair concluded the morning by summarising the key discussions and areas for further deliberation. These were:</p> <p>Some overall observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is intervention, not programme guidance • The need for future consideration of the impact of the wider determinants of health on specific interventions. • The general problems associated with the 	

	<p>limitations of evidence.</p> <p>Specific issues/ ways of taking the guidance forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was overall support for adopting a health promoting approach rather than making treatment recommendations. • There is a need to note the context and framework in which interventions work – noting issues of equalities and in particular Black and Ethnic Minority groups. • There is a need to further interrogate ‘what works’ – trying to draw out the effective components in an intervention and whether multi-component interventions are the most effective approach. • Language used and definitions are very important – this includes the need to build upon current school frameworks rather than creating something new. • A school’s ethos and leadership are important. • Bullying needs to be included as an outcome in the guidance– however it is currently not included in the evidence reviews. • There is a need to develop further the economics evidence. • Existing practice needs to be better evaluated. • The transition between primary and secondary school is important for mental wellbeing and may need to be referred as a topic for consideration by the topic selection panel at NICE. 	
7 Discussion by PHIAC	<p>The committee were asked to consider further some of the summary points, and to begin to form some draft recommendations.</p> <p>The following was proposed, given the discussions and issues raised during the day, as considerations and areas to formulate recommendations for the guidance:</p> <p>General considerations:</p> <p>The considerations section should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • emphasise the importance of the topic and highlight the potential costs of not doing anything; • highlight that opportunities to act are in place and should be built on. • note the need to fully explore the cost effectiveness in the long term of these interventions, and this should be measured in terms of QALYs. • note that the primary interest is mental wellbeing in all children, but that it may be beneficial to also address at risk groups. <p>It was agreed that the guidance should be in a language that is useful to the education sector – and within the current framework. The link between PCTs and education</p>	

	<p>needs to be made clear.</p> <p>All the recommendations will need to be culturally sensitive.</p> <p>All the recommendations will have to take into account additional bullying evidence and any additional qualitative data. The practicalities of how this will be achieved will need to be considered further.</p> <p>Potential areas for making recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated programmes which include parents. • Multi faceted approaches. • Whole school approaches • Targeted approaches at wave 2 level. • The potential negative effects/ ethical problems of some of the interventions and issues of the problems of stigmatisation/ labelling of children. • Training recommendations • Mechanisms for involving parents in interventions. 	NICE team
8. An overview of the SEAL programme	A representative from the Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning Programme (SEAL), Deborah Michel was introduced, and gave a short overview of the programme.	
12. Key gaps in the evidence and provisional research recommendations	<p>The committee were asked to consider the limitations and gaps in the evidence and suggest areas for research recommendations, particularly those which might be helpful when the guidance is revised.</p> <p>It was noted that key gaps but not research recommendations will appear in the draft guidance.</p> <p>The following were suggested by the committee as topics for research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of the SEAL project. What aspects are having an effect? • The importance of school ethos – with particular consideration of the Ofsted reports. • Qualitative research, particularly on implementation, to help develop a more detailed understanding of 'what works'. • Stress management programmes for schools. • Health outcome measures and the need to benchmark these against QALY measures and health economic measures. • Further exploration of brief interventions in anxiety disorders, and who should deliver such interventions. • Consideration of the life course and when particular interventions are most appropriate. • How to identify high risk groups and what is effective for them. • Black and minority ethnic group children as a 	

	<p>particularly vulnerable group, distinct from 'high risk'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differences in effectiveness between communities and settings • Attachment disorders. • Child protection issues. • How do schools engage parents, particularly difficult to reach parents. • The effect of interventions (including SEAL) on inequalities. • The evidence between emotional wellbeing and educational outcomes. 	
13. Next Steps	<p>Antony Morgan gave a brief overview of the next stages in guidance production:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft recommendations to be drawn up by the NICE team. • A number of additional tasks will need to be completed: revisions by the review teams; review teams to collate additional material on violence; additional economic modelling work. • Working with colleagues from Department for Children, Schools and Families to access some of the "grey" literature. • Stakeholders will also be asked to submit additional evidence. <p>The following timeline was agreed by the committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 31st July (team will have produced draft recommendations.) • 21st August (comments back from PHIAC.) • Consultation on draft guidance 14th September. • Additional work will feed into next meeting – 16th December. 	
14. Minutes of the meeting of PHIAC 14 (All)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The minutes were approved by the committee with some minor changes. 	
15. Topic Suggestions (All)	<p>The following potential topics were suggested by the committee to be referred on to the topic selection committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoting wellbeing and the transition between primary and secondary school. • Promotion of wellbeing in pre-school years. • Patient engagement/ promotion of health literature. <p>The team were encouraged to refer any other topics.</p>	
11 AOB (Chair)	<p>Dagmar Zeuner gave a brief overview to the committee of the social values judgement (SVJ) workshop earlier in the month, at which she and others had represented PHIAC. Particular reference was made to the public health issues that were raised during the workshop. Some of the key issues were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How the inequalities agenda should be incorporated into the SVJ paper, and also how this 	

	<p>fits with new equalities legislation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether there should be two sets of value judgements – clinical and public health or whether they should be integrated. • The nature of evidence: how to deal with the broader framework needed for public health. • How to address the issue of public health economics (including equity) and to move beyond the QALY. <p>The committee asked for clarification on when a copy of the SVJ paper would be made available to the committee for review.</p> <p>The committee agreed that the interesting debate around equity vs efficiency should be considered further at the September meeting. However, it was noted that public health is not only about equity.</p> <p>The Chair reminded members to return declaration of interest forms to ES if they had not already done so.</p>	<p>ES to investigate</p> <p>Add to September agenda</p> <p>MK</p> <p>PHIAC</p>
12 Close	The meeting closed at 16.25	