

NICE PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMME GUIDANCE PROMOTION OF PHYSICAL ACTIVITY IN CHILDREN

2nd Meeting of the Programme Development Group

Wednesday 3rd October 2007

Floor 24, City Tower, Piccadilly Plaza, Manchester, M1 4BD

Minutes

Attendees:	<p><i>PDG Members</i> Gareth Stratton (Chair), Esther van Sluijs, Patricia Maude, Sarah Vaughan Roberts, Peter Cooper, Vicki Birchwood, Barry Causer, Malcolm Tungatt, John Hutton, Issy Cole-Hamilton, Gordon Andrews, Ashley Cooper, John Stevens, Suzanne Priest, Martin Hagger, Paul Trueman, Kim Twine.</p> <p><i>NICE</i> Simon Ellis, Mike Kelly, Hilary Chatterton, Anthony Threlfall, Hugo Crombie, Bhash Naidoo, Adrienne Cullum (Teleconference), Jane Cowl, Melinda Kay.</p> <p><i>Contractors</i> Charlie Foster and Gill Cowburn (Collaborating Centre)</p> <p><i>Cooptees and Expert witnesses</i></p> <p><i>Observers</i> Jenniffer Alty (NICE)</p>	
Apologies:	<p><i>PDG Members</i> Chris Laws, Jonathan Williams, Lindsey Dugdill, Catherine Rawas</p> <p><i>NICE</i> Brian Travis</p> <p><i>Contractors</i> Nick Cavill, Fiona Bull, Stuart Biddle (Collaborating Centre)</p>	
Authors	Melinda Kay, Simon Ellis	
File Ref	Physical Activity and Children - Minutes of PDG Meeting 2	
Version	Final	
Audience	PDG members, NICE team, the public (via web publication)	

	<p>definitions in areas of expertise).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members to return expense claims by 26th October. • Members to send any outstanding biographies to Melinda Kay as soon as possible. • Hard copies of papers – to date, no-one has said they do not want hard copies. <p>The Chair highlighted the following matters arising as agenda items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NICE paper on options to incorporate children’s views into guidance development • Working definition of physical literacy 	<p>PDG members</p> <p>PDG members</p>
3	<p>Qualitative Review – Presentation of Key Findings</p> <p>Charlie Foster and Gill Cowburn presented the findings of the Qualitative Correlates Review (PAC2-3a)</p>	
4	<p>Qualitative Review – Questions and Discussion</p> <p>There was a general discussion about the review methods and findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it is difficult to assess this kind of the evidence and to determine which critical appraisal questions are most important • it is likely that all relevant studies are included, although there may be more from the grey literature • most of the studies focused on children’s views about physical education and not the broader definition of physical activity • some studies were published some years ago and may not represent current practice and views • members were informed that they can highlight any problems with the evidence in the considerations section of the guidance • members suggested that it would be helpful for the group to see a summary of the PE guidance for schools 	<p>NICE team</p>
5	<p>Qualitative Review – Small group work and feedback on key findings and implications for the guidance/ recommendations</p> <p>The PDG split into 4 groups to discuss the main findings for each core area and consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are all relevant areas covered? • Is supporting evidence sufficient? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – quality and quantity – known evidence omitted • Limitations of the evidence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – identify gaps – common methodological problems • Messages to be drawn from the review and implications for recommendations <p>The sub-groups fed back as follows:</p> <p><i>Family and Community</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all included studies are relevant, but some evidence missing (eg 	

	<p>family cohesion; ethnic community and cultural factors; access for disabled; parents as facilitators [only discussed as barriers]).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there are overlaps and interactions between core areas (eg family & community and under 8s) • overall, the evidence was credible and agreed with quality rating (ie some weaknesses). • key messages: physical activity has to be fun; independence important; parental support is important • development stages – family is more influential on different age groups such as children and adolescents <p><i>Under 8s</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • children’s dislike of team sport arose from just one (older) study, so may not be generalisable to all age groups. • the findings suggest decline in interest as activity becomes more structured – fun is important. • PDG may wish to look at long term athlete development model (LTADM). • how to facilitate fun (or ‘active engagement’) – need to consider for recommendations. Different children have fun in different ways. • role of parents and practitioners/teachers as facilitators/ barriers including safety concerns. • lack of evidence in very young children <p><i>Active travel</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • very little evidence other than active travel to/from school. • findings are credible and concur with quantitative correlates review • parental fear / stereotyping barriers may also be relevant • there is an absence of data for rural areas • acceptable risk and perceptions of risk • the literature lacks data about intensity/frequency, physiological/health benefits • definition of active travel needed • possible overlap with NICE guidance on environment and physical activity <p><i>Adolescent girls</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11-18 year old girls. Included studies relevant but most of it is about education/sport. Areas not covered include: yoga, dance, aerobics. • some additional international studies might help where there are gaps (eg community and culture, dance). • whether evidence exists on the influence of magazines/ media and informal activities such as clubbing and ‘springy chicken’ • social pressures can act as both a positive and negative influence – need to clarify terminology and definition of social pressures (eg body image). • members mentioned review published by Youth Dance England and Laban report 	<p>NICE/CC teams</p>
--	--	-----------------------------

9	<p>Upcoming reviews – progress to date</p> <p>The group were given a verbal report on the progress to date with the reviews.</p> <p>PDG to send evaluations to NICE to forward to collaborating centre review team.</p> <p>The terms ‘Family’ and ‘Community’ need to be defined.</p>	<p>PDG members</p> <p>NICE/ CC teams</p>
10	<p>Physical literacy definition and glossary</p> <p>As reviews are not covering the full definition of ‘physical literacy’, it was suggested that term ‘core physical skills’ be used</p> <p>Any terms in the scope should be in the glossary.</p>	<p>CC team</p> <p>NICE team</p>
11	<p>Summary of the day, agreed action and next steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • any grey literature to be sent to NICE team • Co-optees & experts to be a standing agenda item • consider how to develop a matrix to outline how the core areas inter-relate • gaps in the reviews: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ age & developmental categories ○ health & safety ○ intensity of activity ○ parents as barriers or facilitators ○ very young children ○ ethnicity ○ degrees of (dis)ability • glossary – PDG to let NICE team know if there are any amendments or additions. NICE team to ensure all terms from scope in glossary. 	<p>PDG Members</p> <p>NICE Team</p> <p>PDG members</p> <p>NICE team</p>
12	<p>Next meeting</p> <p>The PDG were informed that the focus of the next meeting on Wednesday 7th November will be the first effectiveness review – on interventions with under 8s. This will be sent out with the paperwork on Friday 26th October.</p> <p>The change in venue of the next PDG was noted (City Inn, Manchester).</p>	<p>NICE team</p>
13	<p>Any Other Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members were asked to opt out if they do not want their email address revealed 	<p>PDG Members</p>
Close	<p>The Chair thanked attendees and closed the meeting at 3.50pm</p>	