

**NICE PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMME GUIDANCE**

**Personal, Social and Health Education**

**7<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Programme Development Group  
Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> December 2008**

**The Novotel. St Pancras  
100 - 110 Euston Road, LONDON. NW1 2AJ**

Attendees:	<p><i>Programme Development Group (PDG) Members:</i> Anne Weyman, Anne Ludbrook, Simon Beard, Jonathan Cooper, Jasmin Mitchell, Tracey Phillips, Kate Birch, Richard Ives, Kathryn Cross, Laura Cottey (am), Mark Bellis, Anna Martinez, Tariq Ahmed, Joseph Quigley, Terri Ryland, Clare Smith.</p> <p><i>NICE:</i> Tricia Younger (TY), Hilary Chatterton (HJC), Clare Wohlgemuth (CW), Bhash Naidoo (BN), Sarah Dunsdon (SD) Peter Shearn (PS), Jane Cowl (JC), Una Canning (UC).</p> <p><i>Contractors:</i> Nina Balachander, Leo Nherera, Julie Lang, Sharangini Rajesh, Irene Kwan, Moira Mugglestone, Paul Jacklin, Leo Nherera.</p> <p>Expert Advisor: Harry Sumnall</p> <p>Observers: Rosemary Davidson, Alix Johnson.</p>
Apologies:	<p>Sarah Smart, Simon Blake, Ruth Joyce, Aylssa Cowell, Colleen McLaughlin, Chris Gibbons.</p> <p>NICE: Louise Millward (LM),</p> <p><i>Contractors:</i> Jay Banerjee.</p>

<b>Agenda Item</b>		<b>Action</b>
1. Welcome and introductions	<p><u><i>Introductions and apologies</i></u></p> <p>The Chair welcomed the group to the 7th meeting.</p> <p><u><i>Declaration of interest</i></u></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 Simon Beard</p>	

	<p>Mark Bellis Kathryn Cross Clare Smith</p> <p><i>Personal non-pecuniary</i> Joseph Quigley Anne Weyman Kate Birch Jasmine Mitchell Laura Cottey Anna Martinez Simon Beard Clare Smith</p> <p><u>Minutes of last meeting</u> The minutes were agreed as an accurate record.</p> <p><u>Matters arising</u></p> <p><i>Update on actions from last meeting:</i></p> <p>Douglas Kirby (Senior Research Scientist, ETR Associates) has sent copies of his slides from the previous meeting. He will be writing a report of his contribution to the meeting which will then be issued for consultation with the evidence reviews as 'evidence from expert testimony'.</p> <p><i>Community Forum Report:</i> The National Community forum report has not yet been released.</p> <p><b>Action :</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tracey Philips to send the report to NICE when available.</li> </ul> <p><i>SRE review:</i> Anna Martinez briefed the PDG on the content of the SRE review.</p> <p>The SRE review considered evidence and expert opinion over a 3 – 5 month period and the steering group met 3 times. A summary paper was circulated to the PDG which covered the core components of the review.</p> <p>The SRE review recommends that PSHE becomes statutory programme of study but this requires an amendment to legislation. The McDonald report will address the implications of the SRE review recommendations</p> <p>The Rose report on Primary education has been issued for consultation until 26<sup>th</sup> February 2009.</p> <p><b>Action :</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anna Martinez to email SRE review to TY for circulation.</li> </ul>	<p>Tracey Philips</p> <p>Anna Martinez</p>
--	---	--



	<p>Group 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group 2 focused on quality studies which identified positive behaviour change outcomes.</li> <li>• Consistent features included:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ classroom based</li> <li>○ peer and teacher combined facilitation</li> <li>○ training</li> <li>○ changing interventions</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Gaps in the evidence included baseline data, at risk groups and the importance of relevant outcomes.</li> <li>• Issues to inform research recommendations:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ outcomes not reporting on health</li> <li>○ more research required with similar objectives</li> <li>○ more information required around context</li> </ul> </li> <li>• No clear patterns regarding intensity/duration of interventions.</li> </ul> <p>Group 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group 3 focused on SRE and looked at studies reporting behavioural outcomes.</li> <li>• There was no evidence that any of the programmes caused harm.</li> <li>• Programmes studied showed positive behavioural outcomes. Longer programmes appeared to have better outcomes than shorter ones.</li> <li>• Other issues requiring further investigation include:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ effect of training</li> <li>○ minimum/optimum programme time</li> <li>○ optimum age or repetition over optimum time period for specific programme</li> <li>○ content</li> <li>○ role of school /community to provide SRE</li> <li>○ whether the interventions linked to services and if so whether this affected effectiveness</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Action :</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NICE to consider how emerging evidence / considerations maps onto the logic model.</li> </ul>	<p>NICE</p>
<p>4. FE Progress Report</p>	<p>It was reported that the FE review is currently being amended and will be sent t to the PDG after Christmas.</p>	
<p>5. Secondary review PDG Group work feedback</p>	<p>The issues discussed were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For alcohol education a link exists between home, community and school working together.</li> <li>• For SRE a class based approach seems important as does the link between teacher and peer facilitation.</li> <li>• Initial teacher training and CPD are critical.</li> <li>• Optimal age and I timing of interventions is an important consideration.</li> </ul>	

	<p><b>Action :</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NICE and the Collaborating Centre to consider synthesis of the evidence for this review.</li> </ul>	NICE / CC
6. Economics modelling presentation	<p>The presentation outlined the modelling process and the types of outcomes that could be used.</p> <p>The PDG was asked to consider the types of programmes that should go into the model, and the difference between generic programmes and current practice and any opportunity costs.</p> <p>The discussion covered the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• costs of training</li> <li>• cross sector nature of PSHE</li> <li>• impact of new curriculum at key stage 3</li> <li>• impact on change of effect size</li> <li>• the change in allocation of post 16 funding to an individual programme of study</li> <li>• new diploma system and uncertainty around post 14 funding</li> <li>• Ofsted reports – useful for information on current PSHE provision</li> <li>• impact and resource implications of a change in statutory school leaving age</li> <li>• currently no funding for PSHE work in FE or schools sector</li> <li>• funding is currently linked to National Qualifications framework</li> <li>• alcohol and drinking – impact on academic performance / number of alcohol related deaths amongst young males.</li> <li>• SRE and impact on outcomes including qualifications, employability in later life, social costs and poverty.</li> <li>• Under 18 conceptions as an outcome</li> </ul> <p>A working group was formed to assist in developing the economic model. Richard Ives, Mark Bellis and Anne Ludbrook offered to join the working group.</p>	
7. Fieldwork and consultation with young people	<p>The fieldwork process was outlined to the Group. Jane Cowl described the way that views of children and young people might be sought during the fieldwork phase.</p> <p>The timetable was uncertain due to the delayed evidence reviews.</p>	
8. Next steps	<p>NICE will be considering how to take the review work forward. In the meantime, PDG members should keep the agreed future dates in their diaries.</p>	

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING: Wednesday 24<sup>th</sup> June 2009, Royal College of Paediatrics & Child Health, Theobalds Road, London WC1X 8SH**