

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE
Public Health Advisory Committee E – Meeting 1**

**Workplace policy and management practices to improve the health and
wellbeing of employees
Thursday 6th February 2014**

**St James's House, 61 – 95 Oxford Street, Manchester, M1 6PQ
Final Minutes**

Attendees:	<p><i>PHAC Members</i> Paul Lincoln(Chair), Ralph Bagge, Mark Gabbay, Ruth Hall, Elaine Harris, Diana Kloss, D'Arcy Myers, Ivan Robertson, Jane Royle, Mandy Wardle (left at 3.50pm), Jeremy Wight (left at 12 noon)</p> <p><i>NICE Team</i> Hilary Chatterton, Ruaraidh Hill, Jane Huntley, Patricia Mountain, Caroline Mulvihill</p> <p><i>Review Team (from the Work Foundation, Institute for Employment Studies, Lancaster University)</i> Jim Hillage, Tyna Taskila</p>
Apologies:	<p><i>PHAC Members</i> Jayne Parry, Dennis Simpson, Matt Taylor</p>

Author	PM
File Ref	
Version	Final
Audience	PHAC members, NICE team, members of the public

Item		Action
-------------	--	---------------

<p>1. Welcome and objectives for the meeting</p>	<p>The Chair welcomed the Public Health Advisory Committee (PHAC E) to the first meeting on Workplace policy and management practices to improve the health and wellbeing of employees. Professor Clare Bambra from Durham University has resigned from the committee. NICE is currently seeking to recruit a replacement topic expert member.</p> <p>The Chair welcomed the members of the review team from ,The Work Foundation, The Institute for Employment Studies, .</p> <p>No members of the public had requested to attend this meeting. The PHAC members introduced themselves and the Chair gave a short explanation of the process for NICE public health guidance development.</p> <p>The Chair outlined the objectives of the meeting which was to begin the process of developing guidance on ‘Workplace policy and management practices to improve the health and wellbeing of employees’. The aims of the day were to look at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background information on the guidance scope • Presentation and discussion on the evidence review • Introduction to health economics • Developing recommendations • Considering potential expert testimony <p>The Chair informed the PHAC that apologies had been received. These are noted above.</p>	
<p>2. Declarations of Interests</p>	<p>The Chair explained that verbal declarations of interest are a standing item on every agenda and are recorded in the minutes as a matter of public record. 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 potential conflicts of interest declared were as follows:</p> <p><u>Personal pecuniary interest</u></p> <p>Paul Lincoln: employed by UK Health Forum (UKHF)</p> <p>Ivan Robertson: a Director of Robertson Cooper Ltd which is a University of Manchester spin-off company that offers advice and products relating to psychological well-being at work.</p> <p>Diane Kloss: Non-Executive Director of Syngentis, a not for profit organisation working with NHS occupational health providers.</p> <p>Mandy Wardle: employed by one of the Department of Work and Pensions Fit for Work pilots. This pilot is</p>	

	<p>funded by the local county council and enables us to employ a member of staff to do this work and evaluate it. The interventions do not recommend products but broker in or support local service or approaches that are best practice.</p> <p>Jeremy Wight: employed by, and Executive Director of Public Health for NHS Sheffield (Sheffield PCT), and anticipates his employment transferring to Sheffield City Council in April 2013</p> <p><u>Personal family interest</u> Paul Lincoln: his partner is a public health consultant Mark Gabbay: his wife is a clinical psychologist employed by NHS</p> <p><u>Non-personal pecuniary interest</u> Paul Lincoln: member of the Advisory Board of Public Health England with all remuneration going to his main employer UKHF; Chair of the NICE Behaviour Change Programme Development Group until October 2013 with all remuneration going to his main employer UKHF); UKHF has undertaken economic modelling work for a previous piece of NICE guidance (PH47); deputy Chair of Public Health advisory group on National Institute for Health Research. Mark Gabbay: departmental head of LRiG which undertakes NICE evidence reviews for NICE technology appraisals; active researcher in health services research including mental health, health inequalities and fitness for work research; a salaried practicing GP. Diana Kloss: Chair of the Council for Work and Health; Jeremy Wight: an honorary Professor of Public Health at the University of Sheffield</p> <p><u>Personal non-pecuniary interest</u> Diane Kloss: Chair of Council for Work and Health organisation</p> <p><u>Contractors</u> <u>Non-personal pecuniary interest</u> Jim Hillage - Director of Research at an independent research institute which funded mainly through competitively tendered research contracts. Clients include, inter alia the Department for Work and Pensions, the Department of Health, NICE, Welsh Government, Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development, European Agency for Safety and Health at Work, Health and Safety Executive, National Institute for Health Research, NHS Employers, AstraZeneca and Macmillan. I have conducted previous research into subjects related to workplace policy and management practices to improve the health and wellbeing of employees which may or may not be relevant to this review</p>	
--	---	--

	<p><u>Personal non-pecuniary interest:</u> Jim has conducted previous research into subjects related to workplace policy and management practices to improve the health and wellbeing of employees which may or may not be relevant to the review under discussion at this meeting.</p> <p><u>Tyna Taskila</u> <u>Non-personal pecuniary interest:</u> Tyna is a Senior Researcher at The Work Foundation at the Centre for Workforce Effectiveness. Our work is funded mainly through competitively tendered research contracts; work that Jim is involved in receives an educational grant from F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd for the conduction of research investigating the impact of schizophrenia on labour markets in the UK, Germany, Spain and Canada.</p> <p><u>Personal non-pecuniary interest:</u> Tyna has conducted academic research in Holland and Finland related to return to work and employment of people with cancer and received funding from governmental and non-profit organisations; co-chair of the European CanWon (Cancer and Work) network which has received four years of funding (2012-2015) from the COST (European Cooperation in Science and Technology).</p> <p>The Chair and the Associate Director agreed that the interests declared did not prevent the attendees at committee from fully participating in the meeting.</p>	
<p>3. Overview of the final scope</p>	<p>Caroline Mulvihill, lead analyst for this topic, gave a presentation outlining an overview of the final scope of this topic. The final scope had been agreed following stakeholder consultation.</p> <p>The guidance will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employers in micro, small, medium and large organisations. This includes all employees, including volunteers or those undertaking unpaid work. <p>The guidance will not include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-employed people and those of working age not in employment <p>The PHAC discussed the final scope and were given the opportunity to ask questions of clarification which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expected outcomes from the guidance, which will inform both the public and the private sector • This guidance is part of suite of work that NICE is currently working on workplace health (Workplace health - employees with chronic diseases and long-term conditions and 	

	<p>Workplace health - older employees).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It also relates to published NICE guidance on the workplace. How the different pieces of work relate to each other will be clearly linked on the NICE website using NICE Pathways. • Clarification will be needed on the definition of line manager and employee within this guidance • The relative control of line managers at different levels within an organisational structure will vary <p>Action: NICE to circulate links to relevant published NICE guidance Action: PHAC to familiarise themselves with relevant published NICE guidance</p>	<p>NICE PHAC</p>
<p>4. Equity impact assessment</p>	<p>Caroline Mulvihill outlined the NICE Equity Impact Assessment process (EIA) and the EIA findings which have been completed for this guidance so far. A NICE EIA the following protected characteristics are considered: Age; Disability; Gender reassignment; Pregnancy and maternity; Race; Religion or belief; and Sex/ sexual orientation. Details can be found here: NICE Equality scheme http://www.nice.org.uk/aboutnice/howwework/niceequalityscheme.jsp There was time for questions and discussion which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders from minority groups would be beneficial. The NICE process means that stakeholders self-register, so ensuring that minority groups are contacted as potential stakeholders is important <p>Caroline explained that the EIA will come back to future PHAC meetings so that the committee can use it as a check list, to ensure that the guidance addresses potential inequalities.</p>	
<p>5. Overview of the evidence to be considered at future meetings</p>	<p>Caroline Mulvihill gave an overview of the evidence reviews that will be discussed at future meetings and introduced Jim Hillage from the review team. The reviews will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three evidence reviews (include cost effectiveness). • Two quantitative reviews and one qualitative review • Cost effectiveness modelling 	
<p>6, 7. Evidence review and questions and discussion</p>	<p>Jim Hillage presented the findings of the first evidence review for Workplace policy and management practices to improve the health of employees' Jim gave an overview of his teams work so far. There was time for questions and discussion.</p>	

	<p>Action: PHAC members who identify relevant studies to forward to NICE caroline.mulvihill@nice.org.uk</p>	<p>PHAC</p>
<p>8. Introduction to health economics</p>	<p>Alastair Fischer, health economist at NICE, provided a brief overview of the NICE health economics process. explaining why NICE considers cost effectiveness; what health economics is about and introducing some essential concepts used in health economics</p> <p>Action: volunteers for a sub-group to discuss the health economics by teleconference. Any decisions would be brought back to PHAC for agreement in the committee Action: NICE to circulate Alastair’s presentation</p>	<p>PHAC NICE</p>
<p>9. Health economics – key issues for this topic area</p>	<p>The health economist for the IES consortium is Professor Bruce Hollingsworth, Lancaster University. He was unable to attend this meeting. However he prepared an overview on the health economics for this particular topic which Jim Hillage presented.</p>	
<p>10. Overview of how NICE drafts recommendations</p>	<p>Hilary Chatterton, analyst at NICE, gave a short presentation to the PHAC on the NICE Public Health process for developing recommendations. Action: NICE team to circulate this presentation to the PHAC</p>	<p>NICE</p>
<p>11. Drafting recommendations, considerations or research recommendations</p>	<p>The PHAC began to draft recommendations using the five evidence statements from Review 1; also identifying draft considerations and research recommendations.</p> <p>Action: NICE team to capture the discussions and develop a first draft of recommendations to be brought back to the next PHAC meeting</p>	<p>NICE</p>
<p>12. Proposals for expert testimony</p>	<p>Explained that part of the NICE Public Health guidance development process expert witnesses may be invited to give testimony if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviews have uncovered significant gaps in the evidence • The available evidence conflicts significantly • The PHAC wishes to seek the views and experiences of specific groups of researchers, practitioners, clients or service users. <p>Expert testimony can be used to provide a range of information including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Context – for example, the policy or commissioning context • Effectiveness – for example, preliminary results from ongoing interventions or services • Service design and delivery • Experience – for example, views and 	

	<p>experiences of groups of clients or practitioners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Experts' can be drawn from both professional and lay communities. <p>The Chair asked the committee to consider whether this guidance needs expert testimony and if so, from whom. The PHAC made suggestions for organisations and individuals for NICE to consider.</p> <p>Action: PHAC to forward suggestions to NICE (caroline.mulvihill@nice.org.uk) Action: NICE will follow up any expert testimony suggestions to bring back to the PHAC for consideration</p>	<p>PHAC</p> <p>NICE</p>
<p>13,14 Summary of the day and next steps/AOB</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next meeting Thursday 20th March 2014, NICE offices Manchester. • PHAC members are reminded that NICE will only process expenses that are submitted within 3 months of the date incurred. 	
<p>The meeting closed at 4.00pm</p>		