

# National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence

## Centre for Public Health Excellence

### *Review Decision*

#### **Consideration of an update of the public health guidance on Promoting young people's social and emotional wellbeing in secondary education (PH20)**

#### **1 Background information**

Guidance issue date: September 2009

Public health intervention guidance

3 year review: 2012

The current guidance can be found at: <http://guidance.nice.org.uk/PH20>

#### **2 Review decision**

The guidance will not be updated.

It will be reviewed for update in a further 3 years (in 2015).

#### **3 Process for updating guidance**

Public health guidance is reviewed 3 years after publication to determine whether all or part of it should be updated (see process manual for further details: <http://publications.nice.org.uk/the-nice-public-health-guidance-development-process-third-edition-pmg5/updating-public-health-guidance>).

The process for updating NICE public health guidance is as follows:

- NICE convenes an expert panel to consider whether any new evidence or significant changes in policy and practice would be likely to lead to

substantively different recommendations. The expert panel consists of selected members (including co-optees) of the original committee that developed the guidance, the review team that produced the original evidence reviews and representatives of relevant government departments.

- NICE consults with stakeholders on its proposal for updating the guidance.
- NICE may amend its proposal, in light of feedback from stakeholder consultation.

NICE determines where any guidance update fits within its work programme, alongside other priorities.

## **4 Consideration of the evidence and practice**

The expert panel considered information from the NICE implementation team and discussed current and ongoing research of relevance to the current recommendations.

The panel discussed policy and system reforms as well as evidence, including the implementation of Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL) and developing evidence base on 'Mindfulness' (the intentional cultivation of moment-by-moment, non-judgmental focused attention and awareness).It considered each recommendation from PH20 and whether changes in context of secondary education or evidence may significantly alter or invalidate recommendations.

- Changes in the policy context; education and health systems and practice were highlighted as having important implications for the promotion of social and emotional wellbeing of children and young people.

- The panel noted evidence on limited impact of SEAL on key outcomes and the importance of intervention fidelity in delivering desired outcomes.
- The panel noted that Mindfulness is one of a group of interventions aimed at developing social and emotional wellbeing and, potentially, supporting other schooling outcomes. It agreed that no changes to the guidance were necessary in respect to this particular intervention.

The panel agreed continued implementation of existing recommendations would benefit from:

- Revisions to the policy and 'who should take action' sections given the substantive changes to the public health system.
- Redrafting of recommendations on partnership working, including bringing the recommendation on working in partnership with young people forward in the guidance.
- Assessment of evidence related to other outcomes (for example academic achievement)
- Development of tools to support audit by teaching staff

The panel supported the possibility of updating the policy and organisational sections of the guidance through other NICE products (for example NICE Pathways and Local Government briefings) should the guidance not be updated at this time.

### ***Implementation and post publication feedback***

The NICE Implementation report highlighted an evaluation of implementation of SEAL in a sample of UK schools, but that no routine data or specific feedback had been recorded from the NICE field team or post-publication enquiries.

## 5 Stakeholder consultation

Registered stakeholders were invited to comment on the provisional review decision during a 2 week consultation in late 2012. Twelve stakeholder organisations responded; six agreed with the proposal. One organisation had no substantive comments. Overall, stakeholder comments did not identify new evidence which would invalidate recommendations and necessitate an update of PH20. Stakeholders did, however, raise broader issues that might be considered in the development of subsequent guidance.

Stakeholders suggested that the guidance is extended to include multiagency service design and delivery; access and referral to specialist services (such as CAMHS) and better consideration of the requirements of people with a health condition (citing sickle cell disorders and myalgic encephalomyelitis [or encephalopathy] (ME)/chronic fatigue syndrome), disability, special educational need or combination of complex needs.

- The guidance acknowledges that people with socially disadvantaged circumstances, a disability or a health condition may be vulnerable to experiencing difficulties with their social and emotional wellbeing, but that whole-organisation approaches can benefit all, including those who are vulnerable.
- Activities that are tailored or describe the operation of specialist services would be outside the scope of the current guidance. Consideration of additional areas may require an additional referral to NICE, rather than update of the existing scope.

Stakeholders identified other interventions that could be considered in an update, as they had evidence of use in the context of secondary education. These included Targeted Mental Health in Schools (TaMHS), resilience programs and interventions that include parents, carers and families (such as using the Marlborough Multi-Family Model and services provided by Family education centres). The Information provided by stakeholders, however, did not indicate that the recommendations in guidance require revision.

Interventions involving families, in settings outside secondary school, would fall outside the scope of the guidance.

Some stakeholders suggested an update should produce more detailed recommendations to guide practice. It was also suggested that systematic monitoring of secondary students' social and emotional wellbeing should be considered; the guidance should make better linkage of social and emotional wellbeing to other outcomes (such as academic achievement, psychological outcomes and mental health) and that the implementation of social and emotional wellbeing programs should be researched and reported.

- The guidance acknowledges that social and emotional wellbeing interventions are one element of a broader multi-agency strategy; that secondary education establishments have access to the specialist skills, advice and support they require and that promoting social and emotional wellbeing can support learning and good health. These points, along with other recommendations, are supportive of approaches to consideration of social emotional wellbeing and support to all those involved in secondary education. Accordingly, this stakeholder feedback does not indicate that an update to the guidance is necessary.
- Collection of data on students' social emotional wellbeing and monitoring how interventions are deployed in schools are implementation issues and do not suggest that an update is necessary.

Stakeholders agreed with the review proposal that nomenclature used in the guidance should be updated to reflect policy and organisational changes.

One stakeholder considered that as compulsory education or training up to the age of 18 years is expected to be introduced 2013, this could impact on the need for social and emotional wellbeing provision.

## **6 Equality and diversity considerations**

No equality issues were identified which were considered relevant to this update review.

## **7 Conclusion**

PH20 refers to a group of universal interventions used as part of an organisation-wide approach aimed at developing social and emotional wellbeing and, potentially, supporting other schooling and health outcomes. NICE Guidance Executive agreed that no changes to the guidance were necessary in respect to the interventions and practice recommended.

NICE Guidance Executive noted that implementation of this guidance could be improved if new policy and organisational structures were made explicit in the digital version of guidance (for example, through NICE Pathways). CPHE will explore, within NICE, how this might be achieved.

NICE Guidance Executive agreed that the guidance did not require updating at this time, but that the amendment work should be initiated. The guidance should be reviewed for update in a further 3 years.

Mike Kelly, CPHE Director

Antony Morgan, Associate Director – CPHE

Ruaraidh Hill, Analyst – CPHE