

NICE PUBLIC HEALTH GUIDANCE

Strategies to prevent unintentional injuries among children

1st Meeting of the Programme Development Group

Thursday 26th February 2009

Hotel Russell
Russell Square
Bloomsbury
London WC1B 5BE

Final Minutes

Attendees:	<p><i>PDG Members</i> Amy Aeron-Thomas (AAT), Caroline Bradbury-Jones (CBJ), Andrew Chick (AC), Carolyn Cripps (CC), Davina Hartley (DH), Mike Hayes (MH), Nicky Houghton (NH), Lisa Irving (LI), Shelley Mason (SM), Jenny McWhirter (JMc), Jerry Moore (JMo), Ceri Phillips (CP), Amanda Roberts (AR), Tanja Stocks (TS), Rob Taylor (RT), Liz Towner (LT), Julia Verne (JV), Heather Ward (HW) – Chair</p> <p><i>NICE Team</i> Hilary Chatterton (HJC), Simon Ellis (SE), James Jagroo (JJ), Mike Kelly (MK), Louise Millward (LM), Kay Nolan (KN), Lesley Owen (LO)</p> <p><i>Review Team – West Midlands/PENTAG and LSE</i> Rob Anderson (RA), David McDaid (DD), A La Park (AP)</p>	
Apologies:	<p><i>PDG Members</i> Julie Mytton (JM), Ralph Saunders (RS)</p> <p><i>NICE Team</i> Hugo Crombie (HC), Patricia Mountain (PM)</p>	
Authors	Patricia Mountain, Louise Millward, Hilary Chatterton, Kay Nolan, Simon Ellis	
File Ref		
Version	Final 13.07.09	
Audience	PDG members, NICE team, the public (via web publication)	

<p>1</p>	<p>Welcome, Introductions and Aims of the Meeting</p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the first meeting. PDG members, NICE staff and collaborators introduced themselves and the Chair conveyed apologies from members who could not attend.</p> <p>The Chair outlined the objectives of the day:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To discuss the findings of Review 1: An overview and synthesis of international comparative analyses and surveys of injury prevention policies, legislation and other activities (PUIC 1.2) • To consider any implications of Review 1 for draft recommendations • To clarify the links between the different pieces of NICE guidance on preventing unintentional injuries among children under 15 • To understand the parameters of Review 2: Quantitative correlates of injury 	
<p>2</p>	<p>Declarations of Interests</p> <p>The Chair explained that verbal declarations of interest are a standing item on every agenda and a matter of public record. PDG Members, the NICE team and the collaborators verbally summarised their written declarations of interest (if any) and added any specific to the topic today. The potential conflicts of interest declared were:</p> <p><i>PDG members</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heather Ward: Non personal pecuniary interest – author of two papers in the review; Pecuniary interest – consultant in injury field; Non personal pecuniary interest – academic department may in future receive research grants related to this area • Liz Towner: Non personal pecuniary interest – author of three papers in the review; Non personal pecuniary interest – academic department may in future receive research grants related to this area • Carolyn Cripps: Pecuniary interest – consultant trainer • Jenny McWhirter: Non personal pecuniary interest – RoSPA may undertake future work as a result of any recommendations; Pecuniary interest – freelance consultant • Amanda Roberts: Personal pecuniary interest – paid work in accident prevention field • Lisa Irving: Personal pecuniary interest – paid work in accident prevention field • Andrew Chick: Non personal pecuniary interest – works for the fire service • Jerry Moore: Non personal pecuniary interest – works for police service, seconded to Department for Transport • Davina Hartley: Non personal pecuniary interest – member of Children Safeguard Board in Bradford • Mike Hayes: Non personal pecuniary interest – CAPT may undertake future work as a result of any recommendations 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caroline Bradbury-Jones: Non personal pecuniary interest – academic department may in future receive research grants related to this area • Nicky Houghton: Non personal non pecuniary interest – commissioner in a PCT • Ceri Phillips: Non personal pecuniary interest – academic department may in future receive research grants related to this area • Julia Verne: Non personal pecuniary interest – department may in future receive research grants related to this area • Tanja Stocks: none to declare • Rob Taylor: none to declare • Amy Aeron Thomas: none to declare • Shelley Mason: none to declare <p><i>Review team</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rob Anderson: Non personal pecuniary interest – academic work in this area may lead to future research contracts • David McDaid: Non personal pecuniary interest – academic department may in future receive research grants related to this area; Personal non-pecuniary interest – involved in APPOLLO project; Non personal non-pecuniary interest – member of PHIAC <p><i>NICE</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mike Kelly: Non personal non pecuniary interest – published papers may arise from this work <p>In liaison with the Director of CPHE, the Chair ruled that none of these interests prevented any member from taking full part in the meeting.</p>	
<p>3</p>	<p>Context for the first evidence review</p> <p>Louise Millward from NICE set the context for the review and reiterated that this guidance is part of a suite of NICE guidance on unintentional injuries. She acknowledged that the parameters of the work had changed while the review was underway and thanked the team for remaining responsive and flexible during this period.</p>	
<p>4</p>	<p>Review 1: An overview and synthesis of international comparative analyses and surveys of injury prevention policies, legislation and other activities – Presentation of key findings</p> <p>David McDaid gave a presentation on the key findings of the review.</p>	
<p>5</p>	<p>Review 1: Questions of clarification and whole group discussion</p> <p>The Chair thanked the review team and asked for questions of clarification. There was a discussion relating to what had/not been covered by the review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Included cross-country comparisons of legislation, regulation, enforcement, compliance (LREC), plus large (over 1m population) state/province comparisons in federal countries. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Excluded comparisons between areas of population of less than one million. • Included modification of road design or environment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Excluded interventions focused on road users and 	

	<p>vehicles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Included home safety assessments and safety equipment. • Included wider environment (including sports and leisure activities) • Included mass media campaigns/initiatives; professional support/workforce development and routine monitoring and surveillance systems where related to LREC. <p>The PDG made suggestions about what might be useful to look at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub-national areas, ie populations less than 1m (some of these studies may be included in future reviews). • Principles of compliance, such as the use of safety equipment (eg cycle helmets) • Older studies that pre-date legislative changes • European Child Safety Alliance Report Cards may indicate when legislation came into effect 	
<p>6</p>	<p>Discussion of evidence statements – group-work</p> <p>The committee split into three small groups to discuss the evidence statements.</p>	
<p>7</p>	<p>Links between programme guidance and the intervention guidance</p> <p>Louise Millward gave a brief presentation to show how the programme and intervention scopes relate to each other. This included some example areas that will be covered in each piece of guidance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This Programme guidance on Strategies to prevent unintentional injuries in children will focus on design and modification to highways, roads and streets, the supply and/or installation of home safety equipment, home risk assessments and prevention activities in the external environment. It will cover the following measures: Legislation, Regulation, Enforcement (LRE); Compliance with LRE, and supporting mass media campaigns. In addition, it will cover injury surveillance, data collection and analysis, and workforce training, support and capacity building. • The Intervention guidance on preventing unintentional road injuries among under 15s will examine what types of road design or modification to the road environment are effective and cost effective in reducing road injuries among children and young people aged under 15. • The Intervention guidance on preventing unintentional injuries among under 15s in the home will examine which interventions involving the supply and/or installation of home safety equipment are effective and cost effective in preventing unintentional injuries among children and young people aged under 15 in the home. • The Intervention guidance on preventing unintentional injuries outside the home among children under 15 will examine which interventions in the external environment are effective and cost effective in preventing unintentional injuries among children and young people aged under 15 (this scope is currently being developed). 	

	recommendations and considerations and highlighted that these need to meet NICE protocols relating to equality and diversity legislation.	
10	<p>Making recommendations – group work</p> <p>The Chair asked the PDG to break into the same three groups to consider how the evidence might be used to formulate some provisional recommendations.</p>	
11	<p>Feedback and whole group discussion/ consensus</p> <p>The Chair asked the groups to report back on outline areas for recommendations in a plenary session, followed by whole group discussion.</p> <p>The feedback and discussion focused on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the benefits of child road safety audits, their collation and evaluation • data sharing, road safety measures on main roads and standards for training <p>The PDG raised the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the need more information about legislation, regulation and enforcement (LRE) • which government departments are responsible for injury prevention? • how could local authorities assess their own areas to determine risk? • that legislation alone might not always be enough • what is the current and future role of the Government Offices for Regions (GOR)? • what are the priorities outlined in the recent DCSF priority review? • National indicator 47 or 48 is relevant, need to consider local authority 'basket of indicators' • should link to obesity and sustainability agendas, which are local priorities • that risk assessment must include exposure data 	NICE
12	<p>Review 2: 'Quantitative correlates' – what to expect</p> <p>Rob Anderson from PenTAG outlined the aim of 'review 2', its parameters and progress to date.</p> <p>It will identify and quantify factors such as cultural, social, economic, environmental and organisational factors that have been shown to be related to the incidence of unintentional childhood injury.</p>	
13	<p>Summary of the day, agreed action and next steps</p> <p>The Chair thanked the members for a successful first PDG meeting.</p> <p>Next steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NICE team to draft minutes of the meeting. • NICE team to collate notes on provisional recommendations and considerations. • NICE team to email PDG with links to documents in item 8. 	<p>NICE</p> <p>NICE</p> <p>NICE</p>

	The email addresses for all PDG members will be available in the email.	
14	Any Other Business There was no other business	
Close	The Chair thanked all attendees and closed the meeting at 4.20pm.	