

NICE PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMME GUIDANCE PROMOTION OF PHYSICAL ACTIVITY IN CHILDREN

3rd Meeting of the Programme Development Group

Wednesday 7th November 2007

City Inn, One Piccadilly Place, Auburn Street, Manchester, M1 3DG

Minutes

Attendees:	<p><i>PDG Members</i> Gordon Andrews, Vicki Birchwood, Issy Cole-Hamilton, Peter Cooper, Lindsey Dugdill, Martin Haggard, John Hutton, Chris Laws, Patricia Maude, Suzanne Priest, John Stevens, Gareth Stratton (Chair), Paul Trueman, Malcolm Tungatt, Kim Twine, Esther van Sluijs, Sarah Vaughan-Roberts</p> <p><i>NICE</i> Hilary Chatterton, Hugo Crombie, Adrienne Cullum (via Teleconference), Simon Ellis, Mike Kelly, Anthony Threlfall, Brian Travis</p> <p><i>Contractors</i> Andy Atkin, Nick Cavill, Trish Gorely</p> <p><i>Co-optees and Expert witnesses</i> None</p> <p><i>Observers</i> Patricia Mountain (NICE)</p>	
Apologies:	<p><i>PDG Members</i> Barry Causer, Ashley Cooper, Jonathan Williams</p> <p><i>NICE</i> Bhash Naidoo</p> <p><i>Contractors</i> Charlie Foster</p>	
Authors	Brian Travis, Simon Ellis	
File Ref	Physical Activity and Children - Minutes of PDG 3	
Version	Final	
Audience	PDG members, NICE team, the public (via web publication)	

Item		Action
1	<p>Welcome, Introductions and Aims of the Meeting</p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the third meeting. The new attendees to the meeting were introduced to the group and apologies were received.</p> <p>The Chair outlined the objectives of the day:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ discuss the findings of the Effectiveness Review – Under 8s (PAC3-3a) ▪ re-visit findings pertaining to Under 8s from previous reviews ▪ agree some draft recommendations and any considerations ▪ agree any gaps and provisional research recommendations ▪ consider the need for co-optees or experts at future meetings 	
2	<p>Declarations of Interests</p> <p>The PDG, NICE and reviewers were asked to give verbal declarations of interests that were additional to their written declarations or specific to the topics for discussion today.</p> <p>No additional verbal declarations of interest were received.</p> <p>The Chair reminded members that any outstanding written declarations of interest must be returned to NICE as soon as possible.</p>	<p>PDG Members</p>
3	<p>Minutes of previous meeting (3rd Oct 2007)</p> <p>The Chair asked the PDG Members for any accuracy amendments to the minutes of the previous meeting. No amendments were required to the previous meeting minutes.</p> <p>The Chair highlighted the following matters arising/action points that were not on the agenda:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Any outstanding PDG Member biographies should be returned to NICE as soon as possible. ▪ Any outstanding confidentiality agreement forms should be returned to NICE as soon as possible. ▪ Any outstanding written declarations of interest should be returned to NICE as soon as possible. ▪ It was noted that the glossary is evolving. Members were asked to email any comments or suggested terms to the NICE team. The Chair clarified that it is a working document for the PDG. The glossary in the final guidance will be much shorter. ▪ Several members had suggested a co-optee, however his expertise did not appear to be physical activity. Members highlighted his work at DH relating to social marketing and obesity, which included family attitudes to exercise and how they affect children. NICE team to re-investigate whether any 	<p>PDG Members</p> <p>PDG Members</p> <p>PDG Members</p> <p>PDG Members</p> <p>NICE Team</p>

	<p>reports are available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NICE also to consider recent Foresight work. ▪ The Chair thanked members who had submitted grey literature, which has been forwarded to the review team. Members were reminded that literature needed to be publicly available and should meet the agreed inclusion criteria for reviews. ▪ Expense claims for October meeting must be submitted to NICE by 3rd January at the very latest. Any queries relating to payment of expenses should be directed to Melinda Kay. ▪ Members were updated on NICE’s work on ensuring that equity considerations are incorporated into guidance development. 	<p>NICE Team</p> <p>NICE Team</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>Patricia Maude – Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) and Key Stage 1 presentation</p> <p>Patricia Maude presented an overview on the new Early Years Foundation Stage and the statutory Key Stage 1 curriculum for PE.</p> <p>Patricia Maude also tabled the new KS3 and KS4 Curricula for Physical Education.</p> <p>The PDG raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Children’s centres and schools constitute two of the delivery mechanisms for the EYFS are the delivery mechanism for Key Stage 1. ▪ Concerns about the amount of training for early years and KS1 teachers ▪ Ofsted considers the contribution to Every Child Matters (with reference to the whole health agenda). ▪ PSA targets are increasing to 5 hours high quality physical education and school sport per week. ▪ Early years foundation stage - anyone providing childcare to children under 5 will be inspected and must be registered by law. It is the responsibility of every childcare provider to consider children’s needs/development. Children should be able to play outside at some point every day. ▪ Concerns about the deskilling of teachers and their ability to deliver PE curriculum, as outside agencies are often brought in to cover PPA (planning, preparation and assessment) time. Teachers may therefore also not be able to monitor the children’s PE learning. ▪ The effectiveness of the curriculum is unclear and it is difficult to know how active children are in their two hours of Physical Education. There are numerous references to play in EYFS. The curriculum is a minor part of overall activity of children. ▪ Physical Education and Physical Activity are not synonymous (definitions are in the Glossary). ▪ There is no research to indicate the extent of the carry-over from curriculum into ‘co-curricular’ and ‘extra-curricula’ activity. <p>It was noted that the curriculum is not within the scope of this guidance, however it is important as context. There are two key issues regarding implementation and inspection:</p>	

	(1) amount of time in teacher training curriculum (2) Ofsted inspection regime.	
5	<p>Under 8's Review – Presentation of Key Findings</p> <p>The findings of the under 8's effectiveness review (PAC3-3a) were presented to the PDG by the Collaborating Centre.</p>	
6	<p>Under 8's Review – Questions and Discussion</p> <p>The Chair invited questions of clarification and there was a general discussion about the review methods and findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The importance of parental involvement was highlighted ▪ There is not a lot of evidence of effectiveness ▪ In studies where there is no change, it is not clear how active the children were at the start ▪ Where no significant changes in outcomes, there did not appear to be any trends in either direction ▪ Physical activity 'opportunities' are important but a distinction needs to be made between 'programmed' interventions that are structured and those that are <i>ad hoc</i> ▪ Some members suggested that for under 5s, there should not be 'break times' as such, since all time should be 'play time' (teaching and learning occurs through play) ▪ Some interventions may be introduced in the curriculum, but the opportunity to be active might be at lunchtime. It was noted that curriculum had been defined as 'taught time'. Interventions which added PE to the school day were considered. A clear definition of the term "curriculum-based" is required ▪ The issues of a 'compensatory reduction' in informal physical activity or exploratory play when a formal physical activity intervention is introduced was not well addressed in the literature. This is a concern, since it might be the case that increasing structured physical activity leads to a decrease in informal activity. To consider a paper on the evidence for 'compensation' and/or for the additional review. ▪ Interventions may be valuable in both the short and long term. Early exploration might have an impact on confidence and core physical skills in later years. ▪ if children enjoy an activity, they are more likely to do it. ▪ Members noted concerns about the validity of parental self-reports of increases in play with children. ▪ Members suggested it would be useful to have a 'matrix' of the reviews, which shows gaps and overlaps in the areas covered. ▪ the review omits important evidence on the whole family approach and studies on obesity might be helpful. However, while some studies of obese children take a family approach, these tended to be in a clinical setting and so fall outside the scope. Studies about obesity prevention that included measures of physical activity had been included in this review. ▪ NICE Team to collate relevant recommendations and evidence from the NICE guidance on Physical activity and the environment (due January 2008). 	<p>NICE/CC review team</p> <p>NICE Team</p> <p>NICE Team</p> <p>NICE Team</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NICE Team to collate relevant recommendations and evidence from the NICE Obesity guideline (published December 2006). ▪ Members were reminded that the development of recommendations was an iterative process and those drafted after the meeting would be re-considered at future meetings. ▪ NICE to check that National Children’s Bureau libraries databases are included in future searches. ▪ the need to consider risk, harm prevention and parental concerns was highlighted and would be captured in the Considerations section. These may also be an option for the final review. 	<p>NICE Team</p> <p>NICE Team</p> <p>NICE Team</p>
7	<p>Making recommendations</p> <p>A short presentation was given by NICE.</p> <p>The Collaborating Centre provided a brief reminder of the main findings related to Under 8s from the qualitative review.</p>	
8	<p>Under 8’s Review – Group sessions: to identify areas for recommendations, gaps and considerations</p> <p>The PDG split into two groups to identify potential recommendations, gaps and considerations.</p>	
9	<p>Under 8’s Review – Feedback from groups and whole group discussion: to agree outline areas/ begin drafting recommendations</p> <p><u>Group 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Different age groups and target populations within the under 8’s ▪ Different communities and environments need targeting ▪ Value of parents – need whole family approach ▪ Positive value of learning skills ▪ Quality of provision, need for training ▪ How many children attend pre-school? Potential inequality of experiences? <p><u>Group 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sufficient opportunity for children to be active. Encouraging adults to provide opportunities. Opportunity to play actively. ▪ A range of recommendations needed – for parents, for pre school, for in school and for out of school. ▪ Importance of core skills and intensity of activity. ▪ What should be recommended to parents? . ▪ Physical activity provides important health outcomes, core physical skills and co-ordination. ▪ To consider spontaneity versus structure, to ensure enjoyment and variety. ▪ All adults to engage with children - parents at home, practitioners, teachers. ▪ Recommendations to recognise the importance of choice for children 	

	<p>The Chair thanked both groups and invited further discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The consistent messages from both groups were noted: the need for development of skills; the need to highlight 60 minutes per day; the importance of adults and involving the whole family. ▪ It was noted that this age group is important in terms of influencing physical activity when children get older ▪ It was suggested that it would be useful to have all the evidence statements in one document for ease of reference ▪ Concerns were raised that sedentary behaviour might be more likely to 'track' than physical activity ▪ Concerns were raised that few of the barriers identified in the epidemiological review had been addressed by the interventions in the Under 8s review. ▪ Members advised that where evidence is lacking, recommendations can be based on best practice and expert opinion. Also, "stating what might seem to be obvious" can be useful as it can affirm good current practice 	NICE Team
10	<p>Co-optees & experts for future meetings</p> <p>Members suggested the following areas where cooptees/experts could fill any gaps in the PDG expertise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the leisure industry / community-based initiatives re how to engage families ▪ the evidence base on SureStart ▪ working with children with disabilities ▪ equity issues (? Sport England) ▪ Rod Thorpe's work regarding 'progression' <p>PDG Members to email the NICE Team with suggestions.</p> <p>The NICE Team are looking into the suggestions already made.</p>	PDG Members
11	<p>Upcoming reviews – progress to date</p> <p>The Collaborating Centre briefly summarised the progress of the upcoming reviews.</p>	
12	<p>Summary of the day, agreed action and next steps</p> <p>The Chair summarised the outcomes of the day and noted that the group had not had chance to determine key considerations or research gaps.</p>	
13	<p>Next meeting</p> <p>The PDG were reminded that the focus of the next meeting would be the second effectiveness review on Active Travel.</p>	
14	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>The Chair reminded PDG members to return their expense forms to NICE as soon as possible.</p> <p>It was noted that the sharing of members email addresses had not</p>	PDG Members

	yet been agreed. The NICE Team will send an 'opt-out' email before circulating email addresses. Members were encouraged to discuss issues between meetings but reminded they should copy the whole group and the NICE Team, as it is important that all discussions are captured.	NICE Team
Close	The Chair thanked all attendees and closed the meeting at 3.50pm	