

NICE PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMME GUIDANCE PROMOTION OF PHYSICAL ACTIVITY IN CHILDREN

7th Meeting of the Programme Development Group

Thursday 17th April 2008

NICE Offices, Level One, City Tower, Piccadilly Plaza,
Manchester M1 4BD

Final Minutes

Attendees:	<p>PDG Members Gordon Andrews, Vicki Birchwood, Barry Causer, Issy Cole-Hamilton, Ashley Cooper, Peter Cooper, Lindsey Dugdill, John Hutton, Chris Laws, Patricia Maude, Gareth Stratton (Chair), Paul Trueman, Malcolm Tungatt, Kim Twine, Jonathan Williams</p> <p>NICE Hilary Chatterton, Hugo Crombie, Adrienne Cullum (via Teleconference), Mike Kelly, Patricia Mountain, Bhash Naidoo, Anthony Threlfall,</p> <p>Contractors Garry Barton ,Stuart Biddle, Nick Cavill, Ric Fordham, Charlie Foster</p>	
Apologies:	<p>PDG Members Martin Hagger , Suzanne Priest , Esther van Sluijs, John Stevens, Sarah Vaughan-Roberts,</p> <p>NICE Simon Ellis</p>	
Authors	Patricia Mountain, Simon Ellis	
File Ref		
Version	Final	
Audience	PDG members, NICE team, the public (via web publication)	

Item		Action
1	<p>Welcome, Introductions and Aims of the Meeting The Chair welcomed Members to the seventh meeting.</p> <p>Apologies were received from Martin Hagger, Suzanne Priest, Esther van Sluijs, John Stevens, Sarah Vaughan-Roberts, and Simon Ellis. The Chair outlined the objectives of the day;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss the findings of the Cost effectiveness analyses (PAC7-3) • Agree the process for producing draft recommendations for consultation • Revisit all the recommendations (PAC7-6) and begin finalising them 	
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>Charlie Foster declared that he was supervising in an academic capacity the son of a member of NICE staff. Mike Kelly thanked him and assured the group that there was no conflict of interest.</p>	
3	<p>Minutes of previous meeting (5th March 2008) and matters arising</p> <p>The Chair asked the PDG Members for any accuracy amendments to the minutes of the previous meeting.</p> <p>The minutes were approved by the PDG, after minor amendments.</p> <p>The Chair highlighted the following matters arising / action points that were not on the agenda:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • p. 6 VERB papers – Nick Cavill has contacted the journal editors and the papers will be made available to the PDG at the proof stage. The date of this is as yet unknown • A point of correction was raised – Barry Causer wanted a correction to alter the Southwark Olympics to the Southwark Community Games • p. 6 Draft Family and Community - recommendations – these were circulated and comments received from PDG. Item on agenda today. • p. 7 Adolescent girls - recommendations – NICE team revised these. All recommendations on agenda today. • p.7 Behaviour change guidance – circulated with meeting papers • p. 7 Economics – John Hutton and Paul Trueman fed into further discussions, as did several PDG members. Item on agenda this morning. • p. 8 Draft Family and Community recommendations – drafted by NICE team and circulated. Agenda item today. • p. 8 Adolescent girls - recommendations – revised all recommendations on agenda. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • p. 8 All recommendations, evidence statements – collated and consolidated by NICE team. Agenda item today. 	
4	<p>Cost effectiveness analyses – Presentation of Key Findings Physical Activity Collaborating Centre Garry Barton and Ric Fordham gave a short presentation of their report, plus some additional analyses. It was noted that there have been some corrections to the results since the draft report was circulated.</p>	
5	<p>Cost effectiveness analyses – Questions and discussion The Chair invited questions of clarification and there was a general discussion about the cost effectiveness analysis, and the following points were raised;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The known difficulty of using the QALY which was derived for adults in an evaluation of interventions for children • The assumption of a simple linear relationship between activity done and health gain • The difficulty of using data derived from one case study from each area • The potential for inaccuracy because the model used a QALY gain that was small and calculations were done to several decimal places • The suitability of the QALY approach (the standard NICE method) for evaluating the full costs and benefits of the interventions being considered. The main difficulty was that the interventions were not designed solely to improve health. Other benefits such as educational benefits and social cohesion might accrue from the interventions • The evaluation of the community games scheme provided an example of the potential weakness of the analysis because many of the potential benefits for other public sectors were not included • Other economic approaches might be used, for example the human capital approach • Whether it was appropriate to take the assumptions and economic analysis at face value • It was noted that the model did not capture the long term benefits of physical activity • Professor Kelly noted that there was no preference weighted matrix from a sample of children. The Chair agreed and noted that this should be a research recommendation from the group. 	
6.	<p>Cost effectiveness analyses – Implications for recommendations Bhash Naidoo summarised what the findings mean for recommendations in this area, and what further analyses may be required/ possible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The most important factor driving the analysis is the QALY value used. • As there is no QALY data for children, adult data has to be used as proxy. • Long term effectiveness is difficult to show from an intervention in childhood • As children are generally healthy, their quality of life score is close to 1 without an intervention • Physical activity interventions in children are implemented for reasons other than for just their health benefits • Due to difficulties around the underlying assumptions, it is difficult to 	

	<p>prove which intervention is more cost effective than another. Sustained activity which children undertake on a regular basis, such as walking buses, is more cost effective because it is sustained, not because the actual activity is more beneficial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apportionment of costs of infrastructure, for example swimming pools, can have a dramatic impact on cost effectiveness within this methodology 	
7	<p>Cost effectiveness analyses – Group discussion The following points were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data from named organizations could be anonymised • Professor Kelly suggested that the redrafted report discusses the possibility of using the human capital approach as an alternative economic approach to using QALY estimates for children, possibly with regard to the life course approach. 	
8	<p>Family and Community – Summary of feedback Hilary Chatterton gave a short presentation summarising the main comments and suggested changes from the email correspondence about the family and community recommendations.</p> <p>It was noted that these changes will be reviewed in detail along with all other recommendations. Hilary reminded the PDG of the importance of actively corresponding so that everyone's views are considered.</p>	
9	<p>Producing draft guidance for consultation – process and key dates Mike Kelly summarised the key dates for the Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation on synopsis of evidence - May 12th – 19th June • PDG 8: May 22nd – continue to finalise recommendations • PDG 9 and 10: Meeting in June is two days (11th and 12th) • NICE team to continue to re-order and revise recommendations • Consultation on draft guidance: 18th August – 15th September • PDG 11 and 12: Meeting in October is two days • Project team to amend and finalise the guidance: mid October, with publication anticipated 28th Jan 2009 	
10	<p>Finalising recommendations – Experience from the Physical activity and environment PDG</p> <p>Hugo Crombie gave a short presentation with an example from NICE guidance on Physical Activity and the Environment: from evidence to initial recommendation, editing and changes post consultation and fieldwork, to the final recommendation</p>	

<p>11</p>	<p>All recommendations to date – Overview</p> <p>Anthony Threlfall gave a presentation to suggest a framework that the PDG might consider using when re-drafting the recommendations. This framework highlighted the importance of recognising the public health problem that was to be addressed by a recommendation, then the PDG should consider if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The public health problem is best addressed by an intervention that is targeted at a particular population or universal approach. • What interventions may help address the problem? • What evidence might support the approach? • Who is the best person or persons to deliver the recommendation? <p>Anthony then introduced paper PAC7.11 which had brought together all the PDG's recommendations made so far into one document.</p>	
<p>11</p>	<p>All recommendations – The big picture: over-arching recommendations, duplicates and gaps</p> <p>All recommendations – session 1</p> <p>Members were invited to read PAC7.11 and think about the “big picture” – the over-arching recommendations, duplicates and gaps. Members agreed to initially focus on the first two recommendations about consultation and acting upon consultation. The PDG broke up into small groups to use the framework to discuss and amend these two recommendations.</p> <p>Feedback from the groups included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need for local authorities to have a strategic plan for children's physical activity • A debate about consultation with children – should it be targeted on children most in need or should consultation be wider? It was agreed that a targeted approach was more realistic. • Agreement that those children and their families who are not achieving an hour a day physical activity should be targeted. • A recognition of the need for targeting led to a discussion about identifying children for consultation. • It was agreed that it was essential to ensure that the correct people were identified as responsible for implementing the recommendation 	
<p>12</p>	<p>All recommendations – session 2</p> <p>The detail: specifying each recommendation</p> <p>The Chair invited members to comment on recommendations. It was decided that the group would focus on discussing and drafting new versions of recommendations 1, 2 and 11. These three recommendations were discussed in detail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation 1 – Universal rather than targeted? The need to consult, for example young peoples' focus groups. This recommendation was for senior people in relevant organisations, for example directors of children's services, local authority chief executives. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation 2 – There was a discussion around combining 1 and 2, however it was decided that recommendation 2 was for a different audience (providers), for example early years practitioners. • Recommendation 11 – There was discussion about the structuring of the recommendations. It was noted that the NICE guidance on Behaviour Change sets out a useful structure and it was agreed to follow this structure. Recommendation 11 to be re-worded to become the first recommendation and would be an over arching recommendation. <p>It was recognised that these three recommendations would need to join up and there was a need for communication and coherent action</p> <p>It was agreed that NICE would look at recommendations 1, 2 and 11 and produce new drafts based on the discussions.</p> <p>It was also agreed that NICE would re-structure the remaining recommendations according to the categories from the behaviour change guidance.</p>	<p>NICE team</p> <p>NICE team</p>
<p>13</p>	<p>All recommendations – The detail: specifying each recommendation (continued) Producing draft guidance for consultation – process and key dates</p> <p>Members were referred to paper PAC7.5, focusing on the timeline and process between now and the consultation on draft guidance in late August. It was noted that the drafting has to be done by end of June, at the May and June PDG meetings, and by email in between. The editors will attend the May meeting to talk about their role.</p>	
<p>14</p>	<p>Summary of the day, agreed action and next steps</p> <p>The Chair thanked members and presenters and summarised the outcome of the day.</p> <p>Agreed key actions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some rewriting is needed on the economic analysis paper. The work should mainly focus on explaining the difficulties of undertaking the analysis, the limitations of the analysis and the appropriateness of this type of analysis with children. • NICE to re-draft first three recommendations (currently 1, 2 and 11) and circulate to the PDG for comments before the next meeting • NICE to re-structure the remaining recommendations and circulate to the PDG before the next meeting 	<p>NICE team</p> <p>NICE team</p> <p>NICE team</p>
<p>15</p>	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>There was no other business</p>	
<p>Close</p>	<p>The Chair thanked all attendees and closed the meeting at 4.15pm.</p>	