

NICE PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMME GUIDANCE PROMOTION OF PHYSICAL ACTIVITY IN CHILDREN

4th Meeting of the Programme Development Group

Wednesday 12th December 2007

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

Minutes

Attendees:	<p><i>PDG Members</i> Vicki Birchwood, Barry Causer, Issy Cole-Hamilton, Ashley Cooper, Peter Cooper, Lindsey Dugdill, Martin Haggard, John Hutton, Chris Laws, Patricia Maude, Gareth Stratton (Chair), Paul Trueman, Malcolm Tungatt, Kim Twine, Esther van Sluijs, Sarah Vaughan-Roberts, Jonathan Williams</p> <p><i>NICE</i> Hilary Chatterton, Hugo Crombie, Adrienne Cullum (via Teleconference), Simon Ellis, Anthony Threlfall, Brian Travis</p> <p><i>Contractors</i> Stuart Biddle, James Buchanan (p.m. only), Nick Cavill, Adrian Davis, Charlie Foster, Jane Wolstenholme (via teleconference, p.m. only)</p> <p><i>Co-optees and Expert witnesses</i> Catherine Rawas</p> <p><i>Observers</i> Laura Boughen (a.m. only)</p>	
Apologies:	<p><i>PDG Members</i> Gordon Andrews, Suzanne Priest, John Stevens</p> <p><i>NICE</i> Mike Kelly, Bhash Naidoo</p> <p><i>Contractors</i></p>	
Authors	Brian Travis, Simon Ellis	
File Ref		
Version	Final	
Audience	PDG members, NICE team, the public (via web publication)	

Item		Action
1	<p>Welcome, Introductions and Aims of the Meeting</p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the fourth meeting. The new attendees to the meeting were introduced to the group and apologies were received.</p> <p>The Chair outlined the objectives of the day:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • discuss the findings of the Active Travel effectiveness review • develop draft recommendations and ‘considerations’ on Active Travel • discuss and revise the draft recommendations on Under 8s • understand the process for economic appraisal and comment on draft review • identify some topics for the ‘mystery review’ 	
2	<p>Declarations of Interests</p> <p>The PDG, NICE and reviewers were asked to give verbal declarations of interests that were additional to their written declarations or specific to the topics for discussion today.</p> <p>Adrian Davis declared his position as Health Policy Advisor at Sustrans and membership of the Health and Safety Advisory Study Group.</p> <p>No further verbal declarations of interest were received.</p>	
3	<p>Minutes of previous meeting (7th Nov 2007)</p> <p>The Chair asked the PDG Members for any accuracy amendments to the minutes of the previous meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It was noted that there is a need to clearly differentiate between Key Stage 1 and the Early Years Foundation Stage, as this is important when considering play against Physical Activity in the National CurriculumThe Foundation Stage focuses on physical development, Key Stage 1 focuses on PE in the National Curriculum. ▪ It was also noted that a typographical error had occurred on page 7 – ‘Rob’ Thorpe should read ‘Rod’ Thorpe. <p>The Chair highlighted the following matters arising / action points that were not on the agenda:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Chair thanked PDG Members for their short biographies which have now all been received and noted that the document of updated biographies was a tabled paper. Members were asked to forward any amendments to the NICE Team, as well as identify any gaps in knowledge within the group ▪ The Chair thanked members for returning their completed 	<p>PDG Members</p> <p>PDG Members</p>

	<p>confidentiality forms which have now all been received.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Members were thanked for their contributions to the glossary to date and reminded to send any additional glossary terms and/or definitions to the NICE Team ▪ NICE Team have been in touch with Chris Holmes and his former team at COI. The Chair gave a brief overview of his paper. The Exec Summary to be circulated to the PDG in confidence. ▪ NICE Team have compiled selected extracts from the Foresight work in a tabled paper. ▪ Members were reminded that expense forms should always be returned within 3 months; for the November meeting, forms must be submitted to NICE by 7th February at the latest. ▪ NICE and Collaborating Centre teams are working on developing a clear definition of ‘curriculum-based’ to clarify what is included in the reviews ▪ NICE Team have added ‘compensation’ to the potential topics for the ‘mystery review’. ▪ NICE Team have collated relevant recommendations from the NICE Physical activity & environment guidance in a tabled paper. ▪ NICE Team have collated relevant recommendations from the NICE Obesity guideline in a tabled paper. ▪ NICE Team have checked with Information Services colleagues re the NCB library and provided a verbal summary to the PDG. ▪ NICE Team will provide document of collated evidence statements to date for the next meeting 	<p>NICE Team</p> <p>NICE Team / Collaborating Centre</p> <p>NICE Team</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>Active Travel Review – Presentation of Key Findings</p> <p>The findings of the active travel effectiveness review (PAC4-3a) were presented to the PDG by the Collaborating Centre.</p>	
<p>5</p>	<p>Active Travel Review – Questions and Discussion</p> <p>The Chair invited questions of clarification and there was a general discussion about the review methods and findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pedometer studies had not been included in the evidence review. The collaborating centre reported they will be captured in the family and community review. ▪ The most successful interventions appeared to be linked to volunteer involvement. The <i>Walking the Way to Health</i> programme might inform how to overcome “volunteering barrier” ▪ Just 16 hours input from a School Travel Co-ordinator may not be realistic. Schools need a “champion” to keep schemes going ▪ The context for studies might be important, as factors such as geography and landscape may have impacted on the findings ▪ School travel plans are compulsory for Healthy School Status ▪ There is a lot of “local” practice which may be missed in reviews ▪ A “one size fits all” approach to travel plans is likely to fail and each school needs a tailored approach ▪ Although Head teacher or governors may not have time to “champion” any intervention, necessary to have high level commitment ▪ The evidence review suggests children who use active travel live closer to school. It is uncertain what health gain there is from travelling such short distances. There is potential for a broader 	

	<p>approach to active travel, in terms of travel to other destinations and mode of travel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The majority of included papers are from urban areas. ▪ There is little detail about the interventions included in the review ▪ Traffic controlling / calming was not included as it was covered in environment review ▪ Children who attend special schools are likely to have to travel further than most. Children with special educational needs should have plans in place to aid independence ▪ There are possible compensatory changes in other physical activity behaviours resulting from active travel. Cross sectional literature shows that children who walk/cycle to school are more active to a degree that can not be explained by active travel itself. However, not possible to determine the direction of effect ▪ The importance of parental involvement was noted ▪ There is no clear evidence on seasonality ▪ There is no evidence that socio-economic status resulted in any differences in children's physical activity. Other factors such as distance from school may have an impact ▪ Members were informed that they will be able to refer to NICE physical activity and environment guidance (and specific recommendations). 	
6	<p>Active Travel – Outline of areas to be considered</p> <p>The PDG were provided with a framework to help facilitate the development of the recommendations.</p>	
7	<p>Active Travel – Group Work</p> <p>The PDG split into 3 smaller groups to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ identify issues with the evidence relating to Active Travel ▪ draft some recommendations, being specific as possible about actions, populations, audiences, impact on inequalities, and implementation issues ▪ identify some key considerations 	
8	<p>Active Travel – Feedback from groups and whole group discussion to agree areas for draft recommendations, considerations and gaps</p> <p>Each of the three groups fed back to the whole group.</p> <p><u>Group 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An over-arching recommendation about parents being aware of how much activity children need each day and the importance of providing opportunities for active travel wherever possible. ▪ A specific recommendation on the school travel plan, encouraging schools to create a sustainable infrastructure where children can be more active. Noted that primary and secondary schools are likely to have different needs. Head teacher should play a key role, to include teachers, governors and children themselves. The Local Authority should have a monitoring role. 	

	<p><u>Group 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Issues around ethnicity, socio-economic status and the importance any intervention being culturally appropriate. ▪ There are wider benefits of active travel, such as social well being and engaging with the environment. ▪ There may be different issues re travelling to and travelling from school (particularly for older children). ▪ An over-arching recommendation that all children use active travel for most of their local journeys. The recommendation should be incorporated into the children and young people’s plan and aimed at the Director of Children’s Services. ▪ All school children to use active travel for all journeys to and from school, also school trips. Every school should have a plan according to existing guidance. Note that children may become more independent with age and may influence details of the plan. ▪ Children should be involved in the development of the implementation plan and help identify local barriers (for example, unsafe routes). ▪ Involve head teacher in the implementation of a travel plan and provide training and resources to school travel adviser. School champion needs a lot of support. ▪ Parents to be encouraged to allow their children to active travel. <p><u>Group 3</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Problems of ‘hard to reach’ groups. ▪ It was noted that evidence skewed towards urban populations. ▪ Encourage the development of community travel plan to promote change in the travel behaviour of children and their parents. A diverse range of stakeholders in the community should be involved in the development and implementation of the plan, including parents. ▪ A mapping exercise should be undertaken to identify current gaps. A health / environment impact assessment to be undertaken and used to involve the Local Authority. ▪ Address active travel among pre-school children, particularly children less than 2 years of age. Physical activity co-ordinator, health visitors and health trainers all have a role. Settings include pre-school care, toddler groups. <p>The Chair invited any questions / comments from the whole group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Chair noted that there was consensus that there should be a generic recommendation followed by more specific guidance. There are many potential target audiences. Recommendations to consider sustainability, training needs and evaluation. ▪ The NICE team will prepare some draft recommendations based on the group feedback and discussion. These will be circulated by email and the PDG to comment prior to the next meeting. 	<p>NICE Team</p> <p>PDG Members</p>
9	<p>Under 8’s: Summary of feedback and next steps</p> <p>The PDG were presented with a summary of the comments from PDG members on the provisional draft Under 8s recommendations and some revisions were suggested.</p>	

	<p>Comments were invited from the group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Main considerations - active play is something that young children do naturally, because they enjoy it. It was suggested that a PDG member should draft wording to be added to consideration ▪ Physical literacy had not been left out intentionally and a definition will be included in the glossary <p><u>Recommendation 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Whether the volume of activity recommended should reflect what is in existing guidance or stress that 1 hour a day is a minimum. ▪ Need to consider the wider health benefits of physical activity. ▪ Need to stress active play rather than just play ▪ Who should take action? People who provide children’s services should be aware of their role, especially those who advise parents. The media are a key influence <p><u>Recommendation 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This should include “active play” and include everyone who has contact with children. ▪ All children should be included, not just under eights <p><u>Recommendation 3</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Early years providers have a role in ensuring a positive and physically challenging environment that encourages children to be active ▪ A starting age was considered too prescriptive. ▪ The term ‘sedentary’ to be used to encompass children with severe physical disabilities in situations where moving out of sitting is not an option. ▪ This recommendation is important for habituation of physical activity, particularly as sedentary behaviour tracks most strongly <p><u>Recommendations 4 and 5</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It was noted the first bullet point should include active play. ▪ Fundamental movement skills requires definition. ▪ It was suggested PTA/School Councils could be a possible “halfway house” for getting the message across ▪ Local Authorities need adding as a target audience ▪ Risks stigmatising those with low activity. There should be an aspiration to achieve a minimum of 60mins/day <p><u>Recommendation 6</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Very important to address non-school settings. ▪ Community safety personnel to be included ▪ To address places to play and tendency to stop children playing 	PDG Member
10	<p>Economics Presentation</p> <p>John Hutton presented an overview of the necessity, process and method for incorporating economic considerations into the guidance/ recommendations.</p>	
11	<p>Cost Effectiveness Review – Presentation / Introduction</p> <p>The preliminary draft effectiveness review was presented to the PDG by the Collaborating Centre. The PDG were asked to note this review is still a work in progress.</p> <p>Questions of clarification were invited:</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It was noted that while it is possible to estimate the cost of an intervention after it has been done, it is difficult to do this ▪ It was noted that the lack of evidence on costs is one of the reasons NICE focus on modelling work ▪ Questions relating to assumptions will be addressed at the next PDG meeting on health economics ▪ A commentary on the 36 papers to inform the modelling will be circulated to the PDG 	NICE Team / Collaborating Centre
12	<p>Mystery Review / Matrix – Group Discussion</p> <p>The PDG were presented with a matrix of what the current reviews cover, gaps and potential areas for the ‘Mystery review’.</p> <p>The topic for the Mystery review to be decided by the end of PDG 5.</p> <p>The Chair invited the PDG to offer some suggestions then to continue the discussion via email.</p>	PDG Members
13	<p>Summary of the day, agreed action and next steps</p> <p>The Chair summarised the outcomes of the day and noted that a good discussion surrounding Active travel had taken place</p> <p>The following agreed key actions were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NICE team to circulate some draft recommendations on Active travel for PDG members to comment before next meeting ▪ NICE team to circulate revised Under 8 recommendations • NICE team to circulate Mystery review topics for Members to comment 	<p>NICE Team</p> <p>NICE Team</p> <p>NICE Team</p>
14	<p>Next meeting</p> <p>The PDG were reminded that the focus of the next meeting would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ consider the third effectiveness review on adolescent girls and to draft some recommendations ▪ review the draft recommendations for Active travel ▪ to decide on the Mystery review 	
15	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>No other business was raised.</p>	
Close	The Chair thanked all attendees and closed the meeting at 4.00pm.	