

NICE PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMME GUIDANCE

PSHE

**5th Meeting of the Programme Development Group
Thursday 11th September 2008**

Royal College of Anaesthetists, London

Attendees:	<p><i>Programme Development Group (PDG) Members:</i> Anne Weyman, Anne Ludbrook, Simon Beard, Jonathan Cooper, Aylssa Cowell, Joseph Quigley, Clare Smith, Jasmin Mitchell, Tracey Phillips, Kate Birch, Richard Ives, Simon Blake, Chris Gibbons, Ruth Joyce, Kathryn Cross, Colleen McLaughlin, Jane Tuckerman, Julie Lang</p> <p><i>NICE:</i> Tricia Younger (TY), Hilary Chatterton (HJC), Louise Millward (LM), Clare Wohlgermuth (CW), Bhash Naidoo (BN), Sarah Dunsdon (SD).</p> <p><i>National Collaborating Centre for Women's and Children's Health (NCC-WCH)</i> Jay Banerjee, Nina Balachander, Leo Nherera, Sharangini Rajesh, Hannah Rose Douglas.</p> <p><i>Expert Advisor:</i> Harry Sumnall</p> <p>Observers: Rosemary Davidson, Kay Nolan, Peter Shearn.</p>
Apologies:	<p>Sarah Smart, Laura Cottey, Mark Bellis, Terri Ryland, Anna Martinez, Tariq Ahmed.</p> <p><i>NICE:</i> Mike Kelly, Una Canning.</p> <p><i>NCC-WCH:</i> Paul Jacklin, Roz Ullman</p>

Agenda Item		Action
1. Welcome and introductions	<p><u><i>Introductions and apologies</i></u></p> <p>The Chair introduced Hannah Rose-Douglas from the NCC WCH and Kay Nolan and Peter Shearn from the NICE CPHE team as observers.</p> <p><u><i>Declaration of interest</i></u></p> <p><i>Personal Pecuniary</i> Ruth Joyce Richard Ives</p> <p><i>Personal Family</i> None declared.</p> <p><i>Non Personal</i> Anne Ludbrook Aylssa Cowell</p>	

	<p>Simon Blake Simon Beard Mark Bellis Kathryn Cross Clare Smith</p> <p><i>Personal non-pecuniary</i> Joseph Quigley Simon Blake Aylssa Cowell Anne Weyman</p> <p><u>Minutes of last meeting</u> The following corrections to be made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harry Sumnall to be removed from the contractor section. • Ruth Joyce to be removed from the Declaration of Interest section. <p><u>Matters arising</u></p> <p><i>Update on actions from last meeting:</i></p> <p>The glossary has been updated since the last meeting.</p> <p>Action point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PDG members to consider the glossary and send any further comments to TY or HJC. <p>Action point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HJC to contact small team re logic model. <p>Information about the updating of the reviews was included in the tabled papers.</p> <p>The Collaborating Centre confirmed that they will produce effect size calculations in parallel to the review work.</p> <p>Action point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeline for NCC to produce effect size calculations to be agreed between NCC and NICE. <p>NICE informed the group that no further studies have been sent in by the PDG other than the papers on parenting sent in by Anne Weyman. In terms of the C-card scheme, it will be for the review team to decide whether it is included or excluded.</p> <p>Tracey Philips informed the group that the National Community forum report is now due for publication in October.</p> <p>Action point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tracey Philips to send the report to NICE when available. <p>The SRE review is due to be published in September/October.</p> <p>Action point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anna Martinez to report on the SRE review, if available, at the next meeting. 	<p>NICE</p> <p>NICE</p> <p>PDG</p> <p>HJC</p> <p>NICE / NCC</p> <p>Tracey Philips</p> <p>Anna Martinez</p>
--	---	--

<p>2. Timeline changes</p>	<p>The group considered the revised timeline. The proposed changes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence consultation 21st January – 18th February 2009. • Cancellation of February 2009 meeting • 2 day meeting 10 – 11th March 2009. • Guidance consultation and fieldwork 13th May – 10th June 2009, 2 day meeting 23rd June and 24th June 2009. 	
<p>3. Economics review</p>	<p>The NCC WCH presented the main economic findings from the Secondary review, part 1. Three papers from the literature search met the inclusion criteria and four evidence statements were subsequently developed.</p> <p>The group discussed the review and made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The context of the interventions is important and this is absent from the studies. • Concern over the lack of evidence, age of the studies and the applicability of the evidence to the UK setting. • Concern was raised in relation to the connection between the cost effectiveness review and effectiveness review, as the latter is currently missing US data. • Queries were raised around the assumptions in the studies. • The group added that it is not always clear what the control group is exposed to – nothing or usual practice? • The group also raised specific queries on the three studies. • It was acknowledged that the review needs to be clear - what constitutes Drug Education in each country. <p>There is not enough UK cost effectiveness evidence, but the economic modelling report will be based on UK costs.</p> <p>It was agreed that the NCC WCH need include US studies so the PDG can consider applicability.</p>	<p>NCC</p> <p>NCC</p>
<p>4. Secondary review (part 1)</p>	<p>The NCC WCH presented the main findings from the Secondary school review. 15 UK papers, 7 EU papers and 7 Commonwealth papers met the inclusion criteria.</p> <p>The group discussed the review and included the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skill related outcomes should be a separate category in the evidence table. <p>Action: A skills category to be included in the evidence table.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further critiquing and questioning of papers should be done, for example exploring relationships and also clarifying when details are not provided in studies. <p>Action: Information to be collated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 13 study, the reduction to be re-considered. 	<p>NCC</p> <p>NCC</p> <p>NCC</p>

	<p>Action: NCC to reconsider paper.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the biases in the studies were discussed. • The exploration of the relationship between the findings in the review and the contribution to the broader agenda needs to be considered. • The PDG to consider the Audit Commission paper on wellbeing. <p>Action: Ruth Joyce to send TY and HJC the link to the Audit Commission report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Curriculum Key stage 3 review – expert to attend a future meeting. <p>Action: NICE to identify an expert to give evidence at a future meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behaviour change was discussed and it was acknowledged that an international comparison might be useful. UNICEF and HBSC data might be useful for providing context. • Further detail on the length of interventions (i.e. number of sessions / duration of programmes) is required. • The review needs to bring out the usefulness of different methodological approaches. • Culture and character of school and the impact on the curriculum to be considered. <p>Action: PDG members to encourage organisations to register as stakeholders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness and consistency of training to be considered. <p>Action: NICE to find out the timescale for the National PSHE CPD Programme evaluation report.</p>	<p>Ruth Joyce</p> <p>NICE</p> <p>PDG</p> <p>NICE</p>
<p>5. Consideration of secondary review (part 1)</p>	<p>The PDG considered the secondary review in groups and made the following points:</p> <p><i>General comments</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor evidence base (quantity and quality) <p><i>Gaps in research</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed descriptions of experimental and control interventions, and delivery and assessment procedures • Roles of parents / carers • Minority and vulnerable groups • Pupil voice (but was evident in qualitative evidence base) • Link between alcohol education and SRE and interaction (including research in this area) • Long term follow up • Dose/ response relationships • Programme fidelity • Lack of emphasis on relationship education <p><i>Key areas for recommendations</i></p> <p>Practice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication skills • Entitlement to education about SRE and alcohol. • Access to services / socio-economic status • Integration of SRE and alcohol education where appropriate • Need for teacher training <p>Additional considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of different developmental stages of children in one class • Gender (delivery / type of interventions) • Effect of pedagogical approach and characteristics of the deliverer • Length of intervention in relation to crowded curriculum and opportunity costs • Differences between schools and role of needs led education • Parental beliefs about what is age appropriate 	
<p>6. Community review draft recommendations</p>	<p>NICE presented an overview of the community review and the draft recommendations.</p> <p>The PDG split into groups to consider the draft recommendations in more detail.</p> <p><i>Points arising from group sessions</i></p> <p>Recommendation 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take account of learning from primary review • Define wording and terms such as ‘wellbeing’. • Consideration of community interventions for primary school age children. • Public health recommendations are not mandatory. • Other issues: delivery, encouraging parental support, different levels of engagement and training (setting and provider). <p>Recommendation 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take account of evidence from qualitative review. • Approach to be spread across the tiers. • Based on needs, not curriculum. • Community services based in schools • School- related health and support services, for example, Connexions, mobile buses, commissioners, police, school support officers <p>Action point: NCC needs to check references to ‘counselling’ in the review and see specifically what the study is referring to.</p>	<p>NCC</p>
<p>7. Next steps</p>	<p>Next meeting: <i>October meeting</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secondary review part 2. • Update on implementation • Visit from Douglas Kirby and workshop session. <p>Action point: PDG to email NICE with suggestions for the</p>	

PSHE 5 Final minutes

	workshops. <i>December meeting</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Full version of secondary review, economic modelling report and a fieldwork update.	Simon Blake PDG
8. AOB	No items.	

Next meeting: Wednesday 22nd October 2008.