

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

Older people and mental wellbeing

1st Meeting of the Public Health Advisory Committee

Wednesday 16 July 2014

Renaissance Hotel, Manchester

Final Minutes

Attendees:	<p><i>PHAC Members</i> Alan Maryon-Davis (Chair) Anna Goodman Brendan Collins Carolyn Arscott Christina Victor Gail Mountain Jakki Cowley Lynne Wealleans Mima Cattan Rachel Johns (left at 14:45) Richard Watt</p> <p><i>NICE Team</i> Kay Nolan Ruairaidh Hill Karen Peploe Lesley Owen Nicola Ainsworth (arrived 10:45) Rupert Franklin</p> <p><i>Review Team</i> A-La Park (LSE) Anna Forsman (LSE) (left 15:30) Clive Pritchard (Matrix) (arrived 11:30) David McDaid (LSE) Jacque Mallender (Matrix) (arrived at 15:00) Mitesh Nakum (Matrix) (arrived 11:30) Tihana Matosevic (LSE) Trace Jhita (Matrix) (arrived 11:30)</p> <p><i>Observers</i> Written alphabetically with the organisation in brackets after their name Nuzhat Ali (Public Health England)</p>
Apologies:	<p><i>PHAC Members</i> Daniela DeAngelis Jo Cooke</p>

Author	Rupert Franklin
File Ref	Draft minutes of PHAC B meeting 16 July 14
Version	Draft 1
Audience	PHAC members, NICE team, members of the public

Item		Action
1. Welcome and objectives for the meeting	<p>The Chair welcomed the Public Health Advisory Committee (PHAC) to the first meeting on Older people: independence and mental wellbeing.</p> <p>The Chair welcomed the members of the review team/the observers/the experts.</p> <p>The Chair welcomed the members of public 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 general housekeeping for the venue which included noting all fire exits.</p> <p>The Chair outlined the objectives of the meeting which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receiving a background to the topic and scope • Receiving an overview of the approach taken to reviewing the evidence base • Discussing the initial findings of the first review on interventions to promote and protect the mental wellbeing and independence of older people. • Discussing a framework to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of interventions • Considering drafting recommendations, considerations and research recommendations • Considering gaps in the evidence and the potential need for 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 interests declared were as follows:</p> <p><u>Personal pecuniary interest</u> Alan Maryon-Davis: Writes articles on a range of health matters in an independent freelance capacity, occasionally on older people and mental health matters. No commercial links. Has recently co-written guidance for primary care staff on identifying and supporting people at risk of fuel poverty and cold homes, funded by the UK Health Forum.</p> <p><u>Personal family interest</u> Rachel Johns: Husband works for Hewlett Packard and sister works for Proctor and Gamble. Sister is a GP.</p> <p>Gail Mountain: Husband is an old-age psychiatrist</p> <p>Anna Goodman: Mother is a professor at the University of Hertfordshire with research interests in, and grants received for, research relating to health and mental wellbeing in old age.</p> <p><u>Non-personal pecuniary interest</u> Alan Maryon-Davis: His academic institution, Kings College London, bids for and receives grants from a variety of sources for undertaking research into older people's health and wellbeing. Trustee of the UK Health Forum, an umbrella organisation that brings together NGOs and experts in non-communicable disease prevention and undertakes policy analyses and modelling under contract with government and various national agencies. This includes dementia and chronic mental illness in older people. Chair of Alcohol Research UK, an independent charity offering research grants to researchers in the field of alcohol harm reduction. Some of this research concerns older people and may be co-funded through government or other non-commercial agencies. Unpaid advisor to Macmillan Cancer Care on the role of exercise in improving the health and wellbeing of people living with, and beyond, cancer. Macmillan</p>	

	<p>derives income from a wide range of sources.</p> <p>David McDaid: Has held academic research grants related to mental wellbeing and mental health promotion and is likely to seek research grants on these topics in the future. Based at an organisation that has a strong focus on mental health and social care – the LSE hosts the National School for Social Care Research.</p> <p>Jakki Cowley: Works for an organisation that may apply for research and implementation funding</p> <p>Mima Cattan: Is the principal investigator on a 2 ½ year feasibility study funded by NIHR: “Adapting a falls prevention exercise programme with and for older people with visual impairment: a feasibility study”.</p> <p>Gail Mountain: Member of the College of Occupational Therapists which has long standing research interests in this area. Employer, University of Sheffield, has long standing research interests in this area.</p> <p>Anna Goodman: Employer, Campaign to End Loneliness, awarded £4200 by SSCR to investigate pathways into loneliness in older age</p> <p><u>Personal non-pecuniary interest</u></p> <p>Brendan Collins: Works for a university department which may bid for research funding but have nothing specifically around older people, independence and mental wellbeing. Some of his research is around mental wellbeing. Has previously done some MSc level teaching of occupational therapists.</p> <p>David McDaid: Has given advice and presentations to the European Commission, World Health Organization, government bodies and non-governmental bodies, including mental health service user organisations on different aspects of the economics of mental health promotion and disease prevention.</p> <p>Anna Forsman: Has previously undertaken research on published papers on mental health promotion and mental disorder prevention among older people</p> <p>Anna Goodman: Employed by Campaign to End Loneliness which has a direct interest in the topic.</p> <p>The Chair and the Director/Associate Director noted that the interests declared did not prevent the attendees at committee from fully participating in the meeting.</p>	
--	---	--

<p>3. Introduction to the topic</p>	<p>Kay Nolan, Associate Director for this guidance, gave a presentation on the process of guideline development. She explained the key stages that are involved and the schedule for development of this guideline</p> <p>Ruaraidh Hill, Lead Analyst for this topic, gave an overview of the scope and the approach that NICE took to commissioning the evidence reviews. He explained the changes that were made to the scope following consultation with stakeholder organisations, the areas that the scope focuses on, and the key questions that the guideline will look to address.</p> <p>Ruaraidh then gave an overview of the equalities considerations the team have identified through scoping. He explained that equalities considerations will need to be taken into account throughout the development of the guideline.</p> <p>Action: NICE to circulate their presentations to the PHAC</p>	<p>NICE</p>
<p>4. Questions and discussion</p>	<p>The PHAC discussed the presentations and were given the opportunity to ask questions for clarification which focused on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Populations • Scope exclusions • Clarifications about terminology 	
<p>5. Presentation of evidence review: Part 1</p>	<p>David McDaid gave a presentation on the approach that his team have taken to the reviews and the methods used in the first review. The PHAC were asked to provide details of any relevant organisations that the review team might be able to contact for the review looking at current UK practice.</p> <p>Action: NICE to circulate the presentations to the PHAC members Action: PHAC members to send details to the NICE technical team of any relevant organisations that could be contacted to evaluate current UK services.</p>	<p>NICE PHAC</p>
<p>6. Presentation of evidence review: Part 2</p>	<p>David McDaid gave a presentation on the results of the evidence that has been identified on technological interventions that promote or protect the mental wellbeing and independence of older people.</p>	
<p>7. Questions and</p>	<p>The PHAC discussed the presentation and were given</p>	

<p>discussion</p>	<p>the opportunity to ask questions. The group discussed the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the studies. Some PHAC members highlighted additional sources of evidence which might be relevant and they agreed to send the details of these to the NICE team.</p> <p>Action: PHAC members to send details of relevant studies to the NICE team</p>	<p>PHAC</p>
<p>8. Presentations of evidence review: Part 3</p>	<p>Anna Forsman gave a summary of the results of the evidence that they identified on social support interventions that promote or protect the mental wellbeing and independence of older people.</p>	
<p>9. Questions and discussion</p>	<p>The PHAC discussed the presentation and were given the opportunity to ask questions. Some PHAC members highlighted additional sources of evidence which might be relevant and they agreed to send the details of these to the NICE team.</p> <p>Action: PHAC members to send details of relevant studies to the NICE team</p>	<p>PHAC</p>
<p>10. Presentation of evidence review: Part 4</p>	<p>David McDaid gave a summary of the results of the evidence that was identified on caregiver interventions that promote or protect the mental wellbeing and independence of older people. He highlighted in addition to those papers presented at the meeting, there are further papers on this topic which will be presented at a further meeting.</p>	
<p>11. Questions and discussion</p>	<p>The PHAC discussed the presentation and were given the opportunity to ask questions. The group discussed the potential scope of recommendations and whether it would be possible to make recommendations for health and social care professionals.</p>	
<p>12. Drafting recommendations</p>	<p>Kay Nolan gave a presentation about what is involved with writing recommendations. She explained the format that they should take and gave some general principles of good practice.</p> <p>The group discussed the presentation and gave some thought to areas where they might like to make recommendations in the guideline. The group agreed that it would be helpful to have a framework to work</p>	

	<p>within when developing recommendations. It was highlighted that there are related guidelines including PH16 (Occupational therapy and physical activity interventions to promote the mental wellbeing of older people in primary care and residential care) which may be helpful. The NICE team will bring this to the next meeting It was agreed that the topic experts on the group would give a presentation at the next meeting to highlight key issues in this topic.</p> <p>Action: NICE team to bring pathways for related guidelines to next meeting Action: PHAC topic experts to prepare a presentation on the key issues for the next meeting</p>	<p>NICE PHAC topic experts</p>
<p>13. Discussion of gaps in the evidence and potential areas for expert testimony and research recommendations</p>	<p>David McDaid explained the review team’s plan for the review of current UK practice in this area. He explained that they will look at a range of geographical areas and asked for suggestions from the PHAC about which areas would be best to consider.</p> <p>The group discussed the plans and noted that whilst a broad reaching mapping exercise could be useful, it would be valuable if the review could provide some in-depth analysis of what occurs in particular regions with some detailed questionnaires.</p> <p>The group highlighted a number of initiatives that they were aware of, and groups and organisations that it might be helpful to contact. It was agreed that they would send the relevant details to the NICE team.</p> <p>Action: PHAC members to provide suggestions for geographical areas to consider in the review. Action: PHAC members to provide details of organisations or groups that might be able to inform the third review.</p>	<p>PHAC PHAC</p>
<p>14. Cost effectiveness</p>	<p>Jacque Mallender gave a general introduction to health economics and the different types of health economic analysis that can be performed.</p> <p>Tracey Jhita gave a presentation on Matrix’s planned approach to the health economic modelling. She gave an overview of the framework and sought the PHAC’s opinion on elements of the framework</p>	

<p>15. Q&A session</p>	<p>The PHAC discussed the presentation and were given the opportunity to ask questions. They discussed potential challenges to developing a health economic model for this topic and identified the most appropriate approach to take for the health economic modelling.</p>	
<p>16. Summary of the day and next steps</p>	<p>The Chair summarised the items that had been discussed and agreed throughout the day. He noted in particular that there is the scope in the process to have testimony from experts and that it would be helpful for the group members to think about external expertise which can be brought in.</p> <p>KN outlined the next steps including the objectives of the next meeting on Tuesday 7th October She reiterated the agreed action that all topic members would feed into a presentation about the key issues for this topic.</p>	
<p>17. Any other business</p>	<p>None</p>	
<p>18. Close</p>	<p>The meeting closed at 15:50</p>	