

NICE PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMME GUIDANCE

Personal, Social, Health and Economic Education

**13th and 14th meeting of the Programme Development Group
Thursday 16th and Friday 17th September 2010**

Royal College of Anaesthetists, Red Lion Square, London

Attendees:	<p><i>Programme Development Group (PDG) Members:</i> Anne Weyman (Chair), Terri Ryland, Anne Ludbrook, Tracey Phillips, Kate Birch, Kathryn Cross, Laura Cottey, Simon Blake (day 2 only), Anna Martinez, Mark Bellis (day 2 only), Jonathan Cross, Jasmin Mitchell, Chris Gibbons, Clare Smith</p> <p><i>Co-opted member:</i> Richard Ives</p> <p><i>NICE:</i> Tricia Younger (TY), Hilary Chatterton (HJC), Peter Shearn (PS), Una Canning (UC), Louise Millward (LM), Alastair Fischer (AJF), Emma Doohan (ED)</p> <p><i>Contractors (day 1 only):</i> Ross Neilson and Rakhee Patel (GHK fieldwork), Paul Rhodes and Anne Heaven (QA Research)</p> <p><i>Experts:</i> Brian Gates (Religious Education Council and University of Cumbria) (day 1 only), Wesley Perkins (Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Geneva) (day 2 only)</p> <p><i>Observers:</i> Ben Gardner, James Cane</p>
Apologies:	<p><i>Programme Development Group (PDG) Members:</i> Colleen McLaughlin, Simon Blake (day 2), Mark Bellis (day 2)</p>

Day one

Agenda Item		Action
1. Welcome and introductions	<p><u><i>Introductions and apologies</i></u></p> <p>The Chair welcomed the Group to the 13th and 14th meeting.</p> <p>Aylssa Cowell has resigned from the PDG.</p> <p>The aims of the meeting were outlined as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To consider expert testimony on faith, ethnic and cultural issues relevant to the guidance. • To consider stakeholder comments, the fieldwork report and the consultation with young people. • To revise the draft guidance, particularly the recommendations and the considerations 	

	<p>underpinning the recommendations.</p> <p><u><i>Declarations of interest</i></u> The following interests had been declared previously, and are listed in full in the minutes of PDG 1:</p> <p><i>Personal Pecuniary</i> Richard Ives</p> <p><i>Personal Family</i> None declared.</p> <p><i>Non Personal</i> Anna Martinez Anne Ludbrook Mark Bellis Kathryn Cross Clare Smith Tracey Philips</p> <p><i>Personal non-pecuniary</i> Anne Weyman Kate Birch Jasmin Mitchell Laura Cottey Anna Martinez Clare Smith</p> <p>The Chair ruled that none of these interests prevented any member from taking full part in the meeting.</p> <p><u><i>Minutes of last meeting</i></u> The minutes were agreed as an accurate record. All matters arising were completed.</p>	
<p>2. Overview of the programme for the 2 days and next steps</p>	<p>TY outlined the programme for the 2 day meeting, the arrangement for the meal in the evening and the next steps after the 2 day meeting.</p> <p>The key dates following the meeting were outlined as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25th October to 8th November – PDG to comment on draft guidance • 10th November – Meeting with chair to review PDG comments. • 17th – 22nd November – Chair reviews the revised and edited guidance • 30th November – NICE guidance executive signs off the final guidance. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 26th January 2011 – Final guidance published <p>Action point:</p> <p>Members to approve the listing of PDG members that will appear in the final guidance.</p>	PDG members
3. Key issues around sex and relationships and alcohol education and working with faith, cultural and ethnicity issues	TY presented a presentation written by Hansa Patel-Kanwal on key considerations around sex, relationships and alcohol education and working with faith, cultural and ethnicity issues.	
4. A perspective from the RE Council of England and Wales	<p>Brian Gates, Chair of the Religious Education Council of England and Wales, gave a presentation on the perspective of the RE council of England and Wales on this topic. This was supported by a short paper.</p> <p>The PDG asked questions of clarity and explored some of the themes outlined.</p>	
5. Revising the draft guidance: stakeholder comments	HJC presented an overview of stakeholder comments on the draft guidance. She highlighted the suggested changes to each recommendation made by stakeholders.	
6. Revising the draft guidance: fieldwork and consultation with young people	<p>Ross Neilson and Rakhee Patel from GHK Fieldwork presented an outline of the main findings from the fieldwork with practitioners in different parts of the country. This included an overview of their views on the guidance content and feasibility in practice.</p> <p>Paul Rhodes and Anne Heaven of Qa research presented an outline of their consultation with young people. They outlined how the research was undertaken and the main findings from work.</p> <p>The PDG were given an opportunity to ask any questions or give any feedback on the fieldwork report and the consultation on young people.</p> <p>The PDG suggested some revisions to the recommendations based on these reports.</p> <p>The PDG were asked to identify any additional issues that should be raised when revising the recommendations.</p>	
7. Redrafting the recommendations	HJC presented the suggested changes to each recommendation based on the stakeholder comments, the fieldwork, and the consultation with young people.	

	<p>The PDG discussed each recommendation in turn and agreed on the revisions.</p> <p>Action point It was agreed that some of the PDG members would assist with helping to nuance and reword the recommendations following the discussions during the day.</p>	PDG members
Close	The meeting ended at 5.30pm	

Day 2

Agenda Item		Action
1. Welcome and introductions	<p>The Chair welcomed attendees to the second day of the PDG Meeting.</p> <p>No additional declarations of interest were made.</p>	
2. The social norms model and how it relates to this work	<p>Wes Perkins from Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Geneva, New York, outlined the 'social norms' approach, which identifies young people's misperceptions about their peer norms. He outlined relevant research in assessing effective strategies for reducing teen risk behaviour in the US, and suggested how it could apply to the PSHE guidance.</p> <p>The PDG agreed that they would incorporate some of the ideas presented when revising the recommendations.</p>	
3. Gaps and research recommendations	<p>Louise Millward from NICE outlined the gaps in the evidence identified in the draft guidance.</p> <p>The PDG discussed the research recommendations and it was agreed that some of the PDG members would work in a sub-group to prioritise 5 research recommendations for the guidance. These would be agreed with the PDG later in the day.</p>	
4. Potential update of the NICE 2007 guidance on alcohol and schools	<p>TY advised the group that the guidance on 'interventions in schools to prevent and reduce alcohol use among children and young people' published in 2007, is due to be considered for update.</p> <p>TY asked the PDG to consider whether they felt that the recommendations from the intervention guidance were already incorporated into the PSHE guidance. It was felt that all recommendations from the intervention guidance, except recommendation 2, had been included in the PSHE guidance.</p> <p>Action point:</p>	

	<p>Recommendation 2 in the intervention guidance should be considered for update by a different committee as it is outside the scope of this guidance. TY to report back to NICE.</p>	TY
5. Revising the recommendations	<p>The PDG continued to consider each of the recommendations in turn and to agree on the revisions to each.</p> <p>It was agreed that it was important for this guidance to cross reference other relevant NICE guidance.</p> <p>Action point: The NICE team will cross refer from the PSHE guidance to the following NICE guidance where appropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alcohol use disorders – preventing harmful drinking; • Looked After Children; • School based interventions on alcohol; • Contraceptive Services for socially disadvantaged young people. 	NICE
6. Equality impact assessment	<p>UC outlined the purpose of an equality impact assessment and suggested some revisions to the guidance based on the assessment.</p> <p>The PDG discussed the suggested revisions and agreed appropriate revisions to the guidance.</p>	
7. Communications	<p>Shalu Kanal from the communications team at NICE discussed the arrangements for the publication of the guidance and advised the PDG about interaction with the media following publication.</p> <p>The PDG were asked to refer any press enquiries to the communications team.</p> <p>Action point: PDG to send through any appropriate case studies to help with the press launch. Any PDG members who would like to be involved in the press launch should let the NICE know.</p> <p>Action point: The PDG was asked to look through the briefing on the development of the implementation support teams. The PDG were asked to let the NICE team know if they were interested in helping to develop the implementation support tools.</p>	<p>PDG</p> <p>Communications team, NICE</p> <p>PDG</p>
8. AOB	<p>Thanks were given to the NICE team and the PDG for all of their hard work on the guidance.</p>	
Close	<p>The meeting ended at 3.05pm</p>	