

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE**

**Public Health Advisory Committee C  
Community Engagement**

**10<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Public Health Advisory Committee  
28th October 2014**

**NICE London Office  
10 Spring Gardens, London SW1A 2BU**

**Final Minutes**

<b>Attendees:</b>	<p><b><i>PHAC Members</i></b> David Sloan, Elizabeth Bayliss, Michal Chantkowski , Ross Cowan Alison Giles, Gail Findlay, Jasmine Murphy (until 3pm), Chris Nield , Geraldine Stone, Jane South, Karen Wint.</p> <p><b><i>NICE Team</i></b> Antony Morgan, James Jagroo, Lesley Owen, Patricia Mountain, Peter Shearn, Tracey Shield</p> <p><b><i>Review Teams</i></b> <b><i>Optimetry Matrix</i></b> Jacque Mallender (from 2pm) Mariana Dates(from 11.00am) Ketevan Rtseladze (from 11am) <b><i>EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London</i></b></p> <p>Ginny Brunton(from 10.30am)                      James Thomas (from 10.30am)</p>
<b>Apologies:</b>	<p><b><i>PHAC Members</i></b> Eileen Kaner, Stephen Morris, Gina Radford,Kamran Siddiqi,</p>

<b>Author</b>	PM
<b>File Ref</b>	
<b>Version</b>	Final
<b>Audience</b>	<b>PHAC members, NICE team, members of the public</b>

Item		Action
<p><b>1. Welcome and objectives for the meeting</b></p>	<p>The Chair (David Sloan in the absence of Gina Radford) welcomed the Public Health Advisory Committee (PHAC) to the first meeting on the update of NICE Community Engagement guideline. This was the 10<sup>th</sup> meeting of PHAC C.</p> <p>The Chair welcomed the members of the committee, review teams, and members of the public. The Chair informed the PHAC that apologies had been received. These are noted above.</p> <p>The members of the public were also welcomed to the meeting. The members of the public had been briefed already, both verbally and in writing by the NICE team, and the Chair reminded them of the protocol for members of the public, i.e. their role is to observe and they may not speak or ask questions. Also, no filming or recording of the meeting is permitted.</p> <p>The Chair reminded all present that the PHAC is independent and advisory, and that its decisions and recommendations to NICE do not represent final NICE guidance; and they may be changed as a result of public consultation.</p> <p>The Chair outlined the objectives of the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To provide an overview of the guideline development process and discuss the existing NICE Community Engagement guideline (PH9)</li> <li>• To discuss the scope of the guidance including any potential equality issues</li> <li>• To discuss the findings from the overview of the EPPI systematic review</li> <li>• To discuss the findings from the effectiveness review <i>Community engagement for health via Coalitions, Collaborations and Partnerships</i></li> <li>• To discuss the findings from the cost-effectiveness reviews</li> <li>• To discuss the outline of the draft health economic model</li> <li>• To start the process of drafting recommendations</li> <li>• To discuss the opportunities for expert testimony</li> </ul>	

<p><b>2. Declarations of Interests</b></p>	<p>The Chair explained that verbal declarations of interest are a standing item on every agenda and are published as part of the final guidance and documented in the minutes as a matter of public record.</p> <p>The Chair asked everyone to verbally declare the interests they had made in writing at the time of their application to join the PHAC and also to declare any additional interests that may have arisen since then.</p> <p>The interests declared by members were as follows:</p> <p><b>Personal pecuniary interest:</b></p> <p><b>Gail Findlay:</b> Employee of University of East London as Director of Health Improvement at the Institute of Health and Human Development; Freelance Consultant with recent contracts (now completed) with Regional Voices, Institute of Health Equity at University College London (UCL) and Barts NHS Trust for UCL Partners.</p> <p><b>Non-personal pecuniary interest</b></p> <p><b>Alison Giles;</b> runs a social enterprise called Our Life that provides strategic advice on community engagement to public health teams, the social housing sector and the NHS, which also provide community engagement services such as citizens juries and participatory research, for which we receive payment from the commissioning organisations. Alison's post is salaried and there are no shareholders and all profits are reinvested in community engagement in the North West. Her organisation stands to benefit from the NICE guidance because they are commissioned to deliver community engagement projects and will strive to comply to the guidelines as they emerge</p> <p><b>Kamran Siddiqi:</b> works at the Institute of Health Sciences at University of York that has an interest in a number of public health areas of research and have secured research grants from NIHR, MRC and several other organisations for a variety of public health topics</p> <p><b>Jane South;</b> currently seconded to Public Health England as a public health academic (on an honorary contract 2 days/week) from until March 2015 to further dissemination of evidence and learning on community centred wellbeing and participatory approaches. As part of the work is writing a concept paper on community approaches; has also acted on the advisory group for component 1 conducted by EPPI centre – A systematic review on 'Community engagement for health via coalitions, collaborations and partnerships'</p> <p><b>Karen Wint;</b> Contracts/Tenders for health programmes/delivery for women's health and family</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>services within east London boroughs via public health and CCG and department of Health</p> <p><b>Personal non-pecuniary interest</b>  <b>Ross Cowan:</b> Trustee of the Health Race and Equality Forum, a charity which receives funding from two Clinical Commissioning Groups and (to date) one Public Health team to carry out community engagement activities; Part-time employee (Health and Wellbeing Policy Officer) of Voluntary Organisations Network North East which receives funding from, and is a part of, Regional Voices, one of 22 voluntary sector networks and organisations in the Department of Health, NHS England and Public Health England Strategic Partners Programme.  <b>Gail Findlay:</b> As Director of Health Improvement at IHHD/UEL responsible for grants from Big Lottery via Greater London Authority (for the Well London programme) and directly or indirectly responsible for grants from other Well London commissioning organisations and other funders of Well London/Well Communities programmes  <b>Alison Giles;</b> has spoken on national platforms and written publicly on the topic, presenting the case as it exists for community engagement  <b>Jane South:</b> part of the research team (Led by DR Anne-Marie Bagnall, Leeds Beckett University) that is undertaking NICE Community Engagement stream 2, component 1a - map of the literature on current and emerging community engagement policy and practices and component 1b – map of current practice (case studies)  <b>Kamran Siddiqi:</b> has a personal academic interest in a number of public health research topics including tobacco cessation, second-hand smoking, preventing tobacco uptake and ethnicity and health and has written and presented on these topics and have secured research grants from various public bodies and charities including NIHR  <b>Karen Wint:</b> Chair of women’s Health &amp; Family Services; Management Committee Member –for Greenwich Healthwatch  <b>The interests declared by NICE team were as follows;</b></p> <p><b>Personal non-pecuniary interest:</b>  <b>Tracey Shield</b> – member of Poynton Town Council neighbourhood planning committee. Part of the process includes community engagement with the local community. Has recommended NICE PH 9 and NICE Local Government Briefing on community engagement as resources for this process</p> <p>The Chair and the Associate Director noted that the interests declared did not prevent the attendees at</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>committee from fully participating in the meeting</p> <p>There were no interests declared by the contractors attending the meeting.</p> <p>The Chair and the Director/Associate Director noted that the following members would not participate in all or part of the meeting.</p>	
<p><b>3. Overview presentation</b></p>	<p>Antony Morgan, associate director for this guideline, gave a presentation to outline the</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Process for guideline development</li> <li>• Existing guideline PH9</li> <li>• Approach to the evidence</li> </ul> <p>PH9 was published in 2008. NICE Centre for Public Health process requires that all guidelines are reviewed to assess if an update is required. In 2011, an expert panel was convened. It agreed that an update was necessary and NICE guidance Executive agreed the review decision published here: <a href="http://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ph9/documents/community-engagement-review-decision2">http://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ph9/documents/community-engagement-review-decision2</a></p> <p>This topic will be following a revised process after January 2015 as NICE has agreed, after public consultation, an updated methods and process manual published here: <a href="http://www.nice.org.uk/Media/Default/About/what-we-do/our-programmes/developing-NICE-guidelines-the-manual.pdf">http://www.nice.org.uk/Media/Default/About/what-we-do/our-programmes/developing-NICE-guidelines-the-manual.pdf</a></p> <p>Antony clarified the differing roles and responsibilities of the members, the Chair and the NICE team.</p> <p><b>Action: NICE to send notes of expert panel meeting held to inform the development of the scope</b></p> <p><b>Action: NICE to send to the PHAC the slides from the presentations at this meeting</b></p>	<p>NICE</p> <p>NICE</p>
<p><b>4, 5. Scope of the guideline and equality impact assessment</b></p>	<p>Tracey Shield, analyst at NICE, gave an overview of the final scope of the guideline explaining what will be covered by the scope and what will fall outside of the scope; which populations are covered and which are</p>	

	<p>not and the key questions that the guideline will be addressing.</p> <p>James Jagroo, analyst at NICE, gave an explanation of the equality impact assessment process. NICE has a duty to have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations.</p> <p>The purpose of this equality impact assessment (EIA) is to document the consideration of equality issues in each stage of the guideline production process: Scope; Guidance consultation and Pre guidance publication. The EIA is designed to support compliance with NICE's obligations under the Equality Act 2010 and Human Rights Act 1998.</p> <p>The relevant protected characteristics are:.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• age;</li> <li>• disability;</li> <li>• gender reassignment;</li> <li>• pregnancy and maternity;</li> <li>• race;</li> <li>• religion or belief;</li> <li>• sex;</li> <li>• sexual orientation</li> <li>• marriage and civil partnerships</li> </ul> <p>There was time for questions and discussion.</p>	
<p><b>6. Developing recommendations and considerations</b></p>	<p>Peter Shearn, analyst at NICE, gave the PHAC an overview of the commissioned evidence that they will be receiving during the guideline development process.</p> <p>There are three review teams that have been commissioned to provide the following evidence:</p> <p><b>EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London (EPPI)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report 1: Community Engagement for Coalitions, Collaborations and Partnerships (Review of effectiveness)</li> <li>• Report 4: In-depth analysis - Coalitions, Collaborations and Partnerships</li> <li>• Report 5: In-depth analysis – Social networks &amp; social media</li> </ul> <p><b>Leeds Beckett University/University of East London (UEL)</b></p> <p>Report 6: Map of UK literature (policy &amp; practice) Report 7: Barriers &amp; facilitators (Review of UK qualitative) Report 8: Case study evidence (England)</p> <p><b>Optimetry Matrix</b></p> <p>Report 2: Précis of economic chapter in EPPI Review Report 3: Rapid Review of Economic Evidence Report 9: Economic model</p>	

	<p><b>Action: NICE to consider overlaps with another guideline in development - Older people - independence and mental wellbeing</b></p>	<b>NICE</b>
<p><b>7. Overview of NIHR (EPPI) systematic review</b>  <b>•Effectiveness and process studies</b></p>	<p>James Thomas from the EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London presented Expert Paper 1: Community engagement strategies to reduce health inequalities: a multi-method systematic review of complex interventions.</p> <p>There was time for questions and discussion</p>	
<p><b>8,9 Review 1: community engagement for health via coalitions, collaborations and partnerships.</b></p>	<p>Ginny Brunton from EPPI presented the first effectiveness review: Community engagement for health via coalitions, collaborations and partnerships: a systematic review and meta-analysis. This component provides a context for the research project and describes the method, findings and the resulting evidence statements.</p> <p>There was an opportunity for discussion and questions. The PHAC considered the potential gaps in the evidence that could be filled by the contribution of expert witnesses.</p> <p><b>Action: NICE to consider the expert witnesses to be invited to a future PHAC meeting</b></p>	<b>NICE</b>
<p><b>10. Cost effectiveness review:</b>  <b>•Precis of NIHR (EPPI) Review</b>  <b>•Update of CE evidence</b></p>	<p>Mariana Dates from Optimity Matrix, explained that work will be divided into three components;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Component 1:</b> A précis of the economic chapter of the EPPI review;</li> <li>• <b>Component 2:</b> A rapid review of economic evidence from 2011 onwards;</li> <li>• <b>Component 3:</b> An economic model (or models) exploring the cost-effectiveness of different approaches to community engagement</li> </ul> <p>Mariana gave a presentation on the first component. There was time for discussion and questions</p>	
<p><b>11,12 Introduction to modelling</b></p>	<p>Jacque Mallender gave a presentation to introduce the health economics modelling that Optimity Matrix is undertaking. The questions that the model will seek to answer are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How effective and cost-effective are community engagement approaches at improving health and wellbeing and reducing health inequalities</li> <li>• How effective and cost-effective are community engagement approaches at encouraging people to participate in activities to improve their health and wellbeing and realise their capabilities – particularly people from disadvantaged groups</li> </ul>	

	There was time for questions and discussion	
<b>13. Drafting recommendations</b>	<p>Peter Shearn explained that the process for drafting recommendations is an iterative one, and the role of the PHAC is to interpret the evidence, following the NICE core principles of transparency and stakeholder consultation.</p> <p><b>Action –NICE to add to a future agenda PH9 conceptual framework for this update</b></p> <p><b>Action – NICE team to look at published NICE guidance to see if there are overlaps in recommendations.</b></p> <p><b>Action: NICE to check if there are other NICE guidelines in development that overlap with this topic</b></p>	<p>NICE</p> <p>NICE</p> <p>NICE</p>
<b>14. Discussion of gaps in the evidence and potential areas for expert testimony</b>	<p>There was a discussion on the potential gaps in evidence and how they may be filled by the PHAC receiving expert testimony.</p> <p><b>Action: suggestions to be emailed by the PHAc to the NICE team</b></p> <p><b>Action: NICE to draft a list of potential experts</b></p> <p><b>Action: NICE to look at the feedback from the NICE implementation team drafted during the Published guidance review for PH9</b></p>	<p>PHAC</p> <p>NICE</p> <p>NICE</p>
<b>12. Summary of the day and any Other Business/Next steps</b>	<p>The Chair summarised the items that had been discussed throughout the day.</p> <p>Antony Morgan informed the PHAC of the next steps in the guideline development process</p> <p>PHAC members were reminded that NICE will only process expenses that are submitted within 3 months of the date incurred</p>	
<b>12. Close</b>	The meeting closed at 4:00pm.	

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 11th December 2014 at: Broadway House, Tothill St, London SW1H 9NQ**