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1. Welcome, Introductions and focus of the Meeting

The Chair welcomed the group to the 5th meeting and outlined the objectives of the day:

- To consider the evidence from effectiveness review 2 on ‘Training and support for carers’
- To draft recommendations based on effectiveness review 2
- To revise the draft recommendations on ‘Transition Support Services’
- To receive an update on progress with the health economic analyses

The Chair also welcomed the co-optees Jane Asquith and Claudia Philips and the expert witness Gillian Schofield.

2. Declarations of interests

The following interests were declared:

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

**Personal family interest**
None

**Non-personal pecuniary interest**
Harriet Ward
Paula Conway
Roy Jones (review team)
Gillian Schofield (expert witness)

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

The Chair judged that none of these represented a conflict of interest and so everyone could take full part in the meeting.

3. Minutes of previous meeting and matters arising

The minutes were agreed with no amendments.

Matters arising:
- All other action points were completed except for the points listed below.

Actions outstanding:
- Centre for Excellence Outcomes (C4EO) scoping reviews to be circulated to PDG.
### References to be provided for the Scandinavian studies.

#### 4. Introduction to the review and clarification of content / purpose of the effectiveness reviews

Catherine Swann clarified the types of studies included and excluded from NICE effectiveness reviews and explained the purpose of effectiveness reviews.

The group had a discussion and made the following points:
- Uncontrolled before-and-after studies should be included in the reviews.
  **Action point:** NICE and ScHARR to consider these studies for inclusion.
- Sharing experience – it was suggested that PDG members could give presentations and prepare papers.
  **Action point:** NICE / SCIE to consider.
- Term ‘support’ – it was noted that the term ‘support’ is not used in social work and the preferred term is ‘supervision’.

#### 5. Effectiveness review 2: The effectiveness of training and support for carers

The ScHARR team presented the key findings from their second effectiveness review.

- Only found studies on training and support for foster carers that met the inclusion criteria
- Training programmes investigated for foster carers have limited impact on the behaviour of looked after children and young people

#### 6. Effectiveness review 2: Questions of clarification

The PDG did not raise any questions of clarification.

#### 7. Support for foster carers: expert witness

Gillian Schofield, University of East Anglia, gave a presentation on support for foster carers.

The presentation covered:
- The need for ‘therapeutic foster care’
- Permanence in foster care
- The ‘Growing up in Foster Care’ study, 1997 – 2006
- Parenting dimensions from attachment theory and foster care research that promote security and resilience
- The five dimensions of the ‘secure base’ model
- Research on training for the care of children growing up in foster homes
- Structural challenges: which social workers are promoting secure base parenting model?
- Importance of active work with carers to become active parents – supporting emotional development and wellbeing

#### 8. Support for foster carers: expert witness -

The PDG discussed the following:
- Parenting styles
### Discussion
- Sensitivity of parenting
- Foster care of babies
- Education of young children impact on language / social interaction skills
- Relationship between foster carer and social worker
- Role boundaries between social workers
- Loving a child
- Support for foster carers

### 9. Effectiveness review 2: developing recommendations
The PDG made preliminary recommendations in small groups.

### 10. Effectiveness review 2: Plenary report back from groups
Feedback from groups
Each group presented their recommendations. Key areas were:
- Training and support for foster carers
- Co-working across social work and foster care
- Identifying poor foster carers
- Support for family members of foster carers
- National standard for training
- Recruitment and assessment by foster carers by multi-disciplinary teams
- Universal principles
- Relationship based approach
- Prioritising mental health of children coming into care

It was suggested that a family court judge might attend a future PDG meeting.  
**Action point:** NICE / SCIE to consider.

**Discussion**
- Use of word ‘therapeutic’  
  **Action point:** Small group (Kim, Sophie, Paula) to work together to define the term. PDG members to then send suggestions to the group.
- Principles apply to all forms of care

### 10. Draft recommendations on Transition of Support Services
Linda Sheppard gave an overview of the comments and concerns received from the PDG on the draft recommendations from PDG meeting 4. Issues that required further discussion were highlighted.

NICE / SCIE  
Kim Bown, Sophie Boswell, Paula Conway
| 11. Draft recommendation: Further refinement | The PDG discussed the key issues:  
- It was agreed that the term ‘Transitional Support Services’ will be used and tested at consultation. The definition was also amended.  
- Overarching recommendation is needed on the developmental stage and needs of a child – it was suggested this is linked up to an Audit / Pathway plans. **Action point:** Geoffrey, Colin and Janet to draft a recommendation and then circulate to the PDG.  
- Research recommendations are required about the quality of research and funding. In addition, the methodological issue should be stressed. **Action point:** Sarah and Douglas to draw up a recommendation clarifying appropriate research methodologies for use with LACYP. **Action point:** NICE to develop universal phrase for all who should take action. | Geoffrey Skinner, Colin Thompson, Janet Rich  
Sarah Byford, Douglas Simkiss  
NICE |
| 12. Health economics | Alejandra Duenas presented the further work and findings on the economics relating to Transition Support Services.  
**Action point:** Slide 7 to be circulated with some explanation to the PDG.  
**Action point:** PDG to send any relevant evidence to Alastair.  
**Action point:** NICE to look for additional data on mental health and gender | Alastair Fischer / Alejandra Duenas  
PDG  
NICE |
| 13. PDG lead roles | It was noted that there will be PDG leads for the following roles:  
- economics  
- equality assessment  
- policy  
- implementation  
- commissioning  
**Action point:** PDG members to email Simon if they are interested in any of the roles. | PDG members |
| 14. Forward schedule | The group were advised that there are up to six slots for members or experts to give presentations at future meetings.  
**Action point:** PDG to email Simon with suggestions. | PDG |
| 15. Summary of the day | The next meeting will take place on 9th – 10th July 2009, NICE Offices, London. |