

Public Health Interventions Advisory Committee (PHIAC)

PHIAC 18: Minutes of meeting 19th October, 2007

Mental Wellbeing of Children in Primary Education and Workplace Physical Activity

Attendees	<p>Members Catherine Law, David Jones, Jane Putsey, Muriel James, Richard Cookson, Dale Robinson, KK Cheng, Mike Owen, Tracey Sach, John Barker, Ann Hoskins, David McDaid, Mike Bury, David Sloan, Valerie King, Matt Kearney, Klim McPherson, Mike Rayner, Mark Sculpher</p> <p>NICE Mike Kelly (MK), Simon Ellis (SE) (AM only), Tricia Younger (TY) (PM only), Hilary Chatterton (HC) (AM only), Caroline Mulvihill (CM) (AM only), Linda Sheppard (LS), (PM only), Clare Wohlgemuth (CW), (PM only), Sarah Dunsdon (SD), Bhash Naidoo (BN), Emma Stewart (ES) (Minute taker)</p> <p>Observers Michael Wright and Alexandra Rogers (Greenstreet Berman), Reetan Patel (NICE)</p> <p>Contractors <i>Workplace Physical Activity</i> Sophie Beale, John Hutton, Lindsey Dugdill, Alison Brettle</p> <p><i>Mental Wellbeing and Children in Primary Education</i> Sarah Stewart Brown, Yaser Adi, Carolyn Summerbell, Janet Shucksmith, Susan Jones</p> <p>Cooptees and Expert witnesses <i>Workplace Physical Activity</i> Fiona Bull (British Heart Foundation National Centre for Physical Activity and Health), Nick Colledge (Wigan Leisure and Culture Trust)</p> <p><i>Mental Wellbeing and Children in Primary Education</i> Sue Mackay</p>
Author	Emma Stewart
File Ref	PHIAC 18 – 191007
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 eighteenth PHAC meeting.</p> <p>The meeting was declared quorate.</p> <p>Apologies were received from the following: Philip Cutler, Sharon McAteer, Howard Gilfillan, Sue Atkinson, Andrew Hopkin, Susan Michie, Joanna Cooke, Joyce Rothschild, Amanda Hoey, Brian Ferguson, Alasdair Hogarth, Dagmar Zeuner, Ruth Hall, Simon Capewell</p>	
<p>3. Declaration of Interest (All)</p>	<p>Declarations of interest in relation Workplace Physical Activity were asked for.</p> <p>The following were declared: Fiona Bull (research lead investigator for Workplace Physical Activity), Nick Colledge (manager of a Workplace Physical Activity programme in Wigan, which has received funding), Lindsey Dugdill.</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 Workplace Physical Activity:</p> <p>Service Payment: None</p> <p>Research: <i>PHAC members:</i> David Jones, KK Cheng, Tracey Sach, Mark Sculpher <i>Contractors/ co-optees:</i> John Hutton, Lindsey Dugdill, Sophie Beale</p> <p>Declarations of interest in relation to Mental Wellbeing of Children in Primary Education were asked for.</p> <p>The following conflicts of interest were declared: David McDaid (European study is currently being carried out with Sarah Stewart Brown)</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 Mental Wellbeing of Children in Primary Education:</p> <p>Service Payment: None</p> <p>Research: <i>PHAC members:</i> Catherine Law <i>Contractors/ Co-optees:</i> Sarah Stewart Brown</p>	

4. Workplace Physical Activity: Evidence reviews	<p>The chair introduced contractors who gave brief presentations on the key findings from the effectiveness and cost effectiveness reviews for Workplace Physical Activity. The presentations were given by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lindsey Dugdill, University of Salford • Sophie Beale, York Health Economic Consortium <p>Chris Carmona, NICE, presented the key points from the stakeholder consultation on the evidence.</p>	
5. Workplace Physical Activity: Comment from the technical reps	<p>PHIAAC technical representatives, KK Cheng and Richard Cookson commented on the evidence of effectiveness and the economic appraisal:</p> <p>The key points raised were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the evidence on effectiveness showed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ that single interventions show unclear effects. ○ that multi-component interventions show some clear effects. ○ that the interventions seem to have very few potential negative effects. • It was felt that it would be useful to do some further economic modelling on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some of the short term health benefits (ie mental wellbeing). ○ NHS cost savings. ○ The exact effectiveness percentage required for the intervention to be cost effective. It was felt current estimates in the studies might be too high. • That some further sensitivity analysis was required as the model currently assumes that people are moving from being completely sedentary to being active for life. 	
6. Workplace Physical Activity: discussion	<p>The committee discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the limitations of both the effectiveness and economic evidence. • The mis-match between the effectiveness review and the cost effectiveness review. • Whether any further current or grey literature could be drawn upon. • The exclusion of US studies. • Effect sizes. • Some of the assumptions in the economic modelling. • The need for further sensitivity analysis. This should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ cost per employee over time, ○ additional counselling sessions over time ○ lost work hours. • The diversity of measures for physical activity in the studies. • The need to consider further whether the interventions have the potential for harm. • The impact on health equity. • The audience for the recommendations. 	

	<p>It was agreed that the following would need further consideration by the NICE team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effect sizes. • Relative rather than absolute levels of activity. • The potential long and short term effects of the interventions. • Presentation of the data • The evidence from the US. 	NICE team
7. Workplace Physical Activity: Forming recommendations	<p>The practitioner representatives, Ann Hoskins and Dale Robinson, and the lay representative, Muriel James, described the potential areas for making recommendations.</p> <p>The following issues were considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The wording of the recommendations in relation to the intended audience. • The corporate responsibilities of businesses and other employers. • Potentially differential advice for Small and Medium sized Enterprises and larger corporations. • The importance of resonance with employees and employers. • The importance of businesses 'signing up' to the recommendations. <p>The 2 co-optees were then invited to respond and comment upon any of the issues raised or discussed, or other issues they considered important. The co-optees were: Nick College (Wigan Leisure and Culture Trust) and Fiona Bull (School's British Heart Foundation National Centre for Physical Activity and Health)</p> <p>The following comments were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The type of work-place and the environment for working are both likely to effect the implementability of the recommendations. • The potential tension between physical activity interventions and workplace health in general. • The impact on health equity. • Links to the Physical Activity and the Environment programme guidance. It was agreed that the PHIAAC committee should be sent a draft version of this guidance for consideration. • Links with the 'Well at Work' study, due to be published in February 2008. This study includes individual, environment and policy interventions and considers whether they are effective. NICE team to follow up this work with the Department of Health. 	<p>NICE</p> <p>NICE</p>
8. Further comment from PHIAAC	<p>The committee discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The importance of linking this guidance to other related NICE guidance. • The inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review of evidence. • The importance of the scope. • The need to consider further who incurs the costs of 	

	implementing the recommendations in this guidance.	
9. Summary from the chair	<p>The chair summarised the discussions and areas for further deliberation. These were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The importance of the scope. • The limitations of the evidence, including uncertainties on effect sizes and duration of interventions and the links to cost effectiveness. • The need to consider both NHS and employer costs. • Recommendations might cover the following types of interventions (with some caveats): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ multi-component interventions ○ stair climbing ○ walking ○ counselling interventions • The importance of context/ environment. • The challenges of trying to get a population perspective when the evidence is individually focussed. • The importance of integrating recommendations with previous guidance. <p>The committee agreed that recommendations could be made from the current effectiveness evidence but more economic analysis may be needed, in particular with reference to duration of effects of physical activity interventions.</p> <p>The committee agreed the following actions to proceed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NICE team will liaise with contractors in order to reconsider the US evidence. • The NICE team will liaise with the economic contractors to consider the issues raised, especially about effect size. • The NICE team will draft recommendations based on the available evidence and reconsider these when the US evidence is available. • The 'Well at Work' study should be considered. • Recommendations will need to integrate with other NICE guidance. • As recommendations are formed, they will need to take account of issues of equity. This will be considered in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ overall health improvement; ○ differential effects; ○ relative and absolute measures of inequality. • Cost effectiveness analysis should be on impacts on the business sector. A briefing paper will be put together for the R&D committee by MK in collaboration with the health economists. <p>Possible research recommendations will make reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective measures of physical activity • Further economic analysis. 	NICE
10. Next Steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The timelines need to be considered further by the NICE team and details will be sent to the committee 	NICE

	once finalised.	
11. Mental Wellbeing and Children in Primary Education	<p>Amanda Killoran presented an overview of the draft recommendations and responses from the stakeholders on the evidence.</p> <p>The chair introduced contractors from the collaborating centres. Brief presentations were made on the key findings from the further effectiveness review on violence and bullying, and analysis of the cost effectiveness of targeted approaches. The presentations were given by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sarah Stewart Brown, University of Warwick • Bhash Naidoo on behalf of Chris McCabe, University of Leeds (via teleconference) 	
12. Mental Wellbeing and Children in Primary Education: PHIAAC technical rep and PHIAAC members	<p>The PHIAAC technical representative, David Jones, commented on the effectiveness and economic evidence. The PHIAAC committee also commented, and the following observations were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That there was a need for further clarification on some of the evidence statements. • Effect sizes need to be considered more fully. • The need to be cautious with some of the outcome measures. • The need to be cautious with the economic analysis. • That additional economic analysis would be helpful to show the change over time of the costs. • Whether the potential long term impacts of the interventions can be modelled. • How to include criminal justice costs and the potential costs to parents. • That there is a need for some further sensitivity analysis. 	
13. Forming recommendations	<p>The lay representative, Jane Putsey gave her perspective on the potential areas for making recommendations.</p> <p>The co-optee was then invited to respond and comment upon any of the issues raised or discussed, or other issues they considered important. The co-optee was: Sue Mackay</p> <p>The committee discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need to acknowledge the current activities of schools in this area. • Staged procedures should be emphasised. • The importance of drafting the recommendations in the context and language of schools. • The need for some context to be included in the introductory paragraph • The importance of the guidance in emphasising that whole school approaches are the most effective approach. • Assumptions relating to economic modelling; particularly the relevance of cost data. • Modelling should look at targeted vs whole school interventions. Chris Mc Cabe to make this 	Chris McCabe

	<p>comparison.</p> <p>Chair's summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An introductory section with contextual information would be extremely helpful. NICE team to draft this for the next draft of guidance. That there are items to be added into the considerations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognition of context and current school practice The importance of a staged approach. That it is important to distinguish between difficult behaviour or children who are withdrawn and clinical mental health illness. That the limitations of the economic data need to be acknowledged. That the universal approach is preferred to targeted. That the economic analysis needs to consider targeted vs whole school approach economic analysis. NICE team to redraft and then go out to consultation. <p>Research recommendations will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interventions to prevent or reduce physical bullying. <p>Antony Morgan Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revisions to be drafted. PHIAC members from the education sector to look over the guidance, particularly in terms of language. Revisions to be signed off by Catherine Law. Any members who would like to see the guidance on a one to one basis should email Catherine directly. Guidance should be sent to the committee when it goes to consultation. 	<p>NICE</p> <p>NICE</p> <p>PHIAC</p> <p>PHIAC</p>
14. Minutes of the meeting of PHIAC 17 (All)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The minutes were approved by the committee with some minor changes. 	
15. Matters Arising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was noted that Mentor UK, whose representative Susi Farnworth had attended the October PHIAC meeting, had not made it clear that they received funding from the drinks industry. MK to write to Mentor UK. Older People and Mental Wellbeing – revised recommendations to be sent to the committee with a revised timeline. Additional topics arising from this guidance will be referred to the topic consideration panel. 	<p>MK</p> <p>NICE</p>
16. 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"> Obesity related interventions for the Government (taxes and subsidies on foods, advertising of foods.) 	
17. AOB (Chair)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NICE social values judgement paper – this has been considered by the board, and is being considered by 	

	<p>editors. Committee to reconsider at a future meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• NICE conference – committee members were reminded to book their place at the NICE conference by Wednesday.	
18. Close	The meeting closed at 16.30	