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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Welcome, Introductions and focus of the Meeting** | The Chair welcomed the group to the first meeting and outlined the objectives of the day:  
- discuss the findings of the Quantitative correlates review  
- discuss the findings of the Rapid appraisal of practice  
- discuss the findings of the Brief review of inspection data  
- consider any implications of the above for draft recommendations  
- discuss and agree the focus for the remaining evidence reviews  
- identify potential cooptees and experts to attend future meetings |
| **2. Declarations of Interests** | It was reported that Mike Kelly and the Chair have reviewed all of the declarations of interests made in writing and their view was that there are no conflicts of interest.  
The following interests were declared:  

**Personal pecuniary interest**  
Susan Lane  
Kim Golding  
Paula Conway  

**Personal family interest**  
None  

**Non-personal pecuniary interest**  
Harriet Ward  
Paula Conway  

**Personal non-pecuniary interest**  
Sarah Byford  
Kim Golding  
Paula Conway  
Janet Rich  

**Non-personal pecuniary interest**  
Roy Jones (contractor)  
The PDG confirmed that none of these declarations were an impediment to people taking part in the meeting.  

PDG members were asked to inform the Chair and Mike Kelly if any new declarations of interest arise in the future.  

**Action:** Members to inform NICE of any new declaration of interests. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Quantitative correlates review</th>
<th>Roy Jones from the ScHARR Collaborating Centre presented the key findings from the quantitative correlates review.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4. Quantitative correlates review – Questions and group discussion | The Collaborating Centre and NICE team clarified the purpose and context of the review. The PDG discussed the review and raised the following issues:  
  - Robustness of placement stability evidence  
  - Residential care for children with complex needs  
  - Concern about black and minority ethnic children, especially boys  
  - Concern about disabled children  
  - Specialist ‘treatment foster care’ versus ‘ordinary’ foster care  
  - What counts as outcomes and how to measure them  
  - Interventions – broader look at what works / applicability of interventions in US to UK setting  
  - Changing climate for outcomes – reduced numbers of children in care, but with more complex needs |
| 5. Rapid appraisal of practice | Ben Coombs from Cragg Ross Dawson presented the key findings from the rapid appraisal of practice. |
| 6. Rapid appraisal of practice – Questions and group discussion | The group considered the following as key issues:  
  - Placement stability  
  - Role of good quality child and adolescent mental health services (CAMHS)  
  - Relationship between services  
  - The importance of education (and an holistic approach)  
  - Effective care planning  
  - Physical health / health assessments  
  The PDG also considered the limitations of the report and the relationship to other evidence. |
| 7. Brief review of inspection and review data | Mary Ryan presented the brief review of inspection and review data. |
| 8. Brief review of inspection and review data - Questions and discussion | The PDG made comments about the following:  
  - Health assessments – purpose, timings, uptake, quality standards, involving children, and impact on outcomes for looked after children  
  - Monitoring the health plan  
  - Speedy access to CAMHS  
  - Continuity of care – turnover of social workers.  
  - Placements out of borough  
  - Leadership and responsibility (performance management) |
### 9. Small group work – issues from reports & priorities for further reviews

The PDG split into groups to consider the issues arising from the three reports and discuss what the focus should be for the remaining evidence reviews.

### 10. Feedback from small group work

The groups feedback the following key issues.

**Group 1**
- Different models of training / European context – improvement of services in UK
- Service delivery / leadership / planning / joining up services
- Understanding what a stable placement means, what a good placement looks like
- Corporate parenting
- Ethnicity issues
- Social pedagogy
- Quality of placement
- Reasons for entering residential care
- Attachment

**Group 2**
- Outcomes
- Resources
- CAMHS
- Early intervention / prevention and impact
- Minority groups
- Healthcare assessments for young people

**Review 1**
- Wider context

**Review 2**
- Broader agenda – should include different provision / all carers / all settings
- Consideration of other models used in non-UK settings

**Group 3**

**Review 1**
- Attachment
- Resilience
- Relationships
- Broader definition of mental health
- Supporting / training carers – all carers

**Review 2**
- Evaluation of specialist services
- Populations – infants / very young children
- Access to services

**Review 3**
- Support services
• Transition to adulthood
• How and when do we measure outcomes

It was agreed that the NICE team and ScHARR will re-draft the review questions and circulate to the PDG.

**Action:** NICE to send revised review questions to PDG for further comment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11. Next meeting</th>
<th>It was agreed that the next meeting will focus on placement stability. It was suggested that presentations are given by Ian Sinclair and Harriet Ward.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Action:</strong> NICE to invite Ian Sinclair to the next PDG meeting. <strong>Action:</strong> NICE to ask Harriet Ward to present at next meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. Co-optees / experts</th>
<th>The NICE team explained the role of co-optees and experts at PDG meetings.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Action:</strong> PDG to email their suggestions for co-optees / experts to Simon Ellis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Action:</strong> PDG members to volunteer to give presentations on their areas of expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was suggested that a foster carer trainer attends as a co-optee or an expert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Action:</strong> NICE / PDG Chair to consider the involvement of a foster carer trainer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. Summary of the day</th>
<th>The Chair summarised the day.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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