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The referral and scope

- Each topic for clinical guideline development is referred to NICE by the Department of Health, based on recommendations from topic selection consideration panels.
- The referral is then translated into the Scope which provides a framework within which to develop the guideline. The scope describes:
  - the epidemiology of the disease/condition,
  - the key clinical issues;
  - the population and aspects of care that the guideline will and won’t cover.
Stakeholders and scoping the CG

- Stakeholder organisations can be:
  - Commercial
  - Health care provider
  - Patient/Carer
  - Professional
  - Research
  - Social Care
  - Statutory

- The scope is developed after consultation with stakeholders at two key stages:
  - A pre-consultation stakeholder workshop;
  - A 4 week consultation period.
Aims

1. To review stakeholder involvement during the scoping phase of clinical guidelines that commenced since January 2009;

2. To identify opportunities for further facilitating active stakeholder engagement during guideline development.
Approach:

1. To undertake an audit of stakeholder involvement in all clinical guidelines that commenced the scoping process during 2009.

2. To seek the views of stakeholders who attended the pre-consultation scoping workshops; and

3. To examine stakeholder comments submitted during consultation through a thematic analysis.
1. Audit of stakeholder involvement

- Dataset comprises:
  - 18 Clinical Guidelines
    - 5 Short Clinical Guidelines (SCG’s)
    - 2 NCC-Cancer
    - 4 NCC-Mental Health
    - 5 NCGC-Acute and Chronic Conditions
    - 2 NCC-Women and Children’s Health
Number of Stakeholders

- Across 18 guidelines there were an average of 110 (range 55 to 186) registered stakeholders/guideline topic;
- Number of SH’s appears topic (breadth) dependent
  - Topics with most SH’s:
    - “Recognition, referral and diagnosis of ASD” (n=187);
    - “Assessment and management of psychosis with substance misuse” (n=178)
  - Topics with fewest SH’s:
    - “Ablative therapy for treatment of Barrett's oesophagus” (n=56);
    - “NIV in the management of motor neurone disease” (n=61)
- There were an average of 24 stakeholders/guideline (range: 6 [Barrett’s Oesophagus] - 47 [stroke rehabilitation]) attending each scoping workshop.
### Who are our stakeholders?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SH ‘type’</th>
<th>Registered (%)</th>
<th>Workshop (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Provider</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient/Carer</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Care</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Views of workshop attendees

Data set:

- Between January and February 2010, attendees at 6 scoping workshops were asked to complete questionnaires that sought to assess views on the workshop and the broader scoping process.
- Average response rate: 38.2% (range 25.0-62.5%)
Views of workshop attendees-(1)

• Communications:
  – There was general agreement that the existing methods of communicating information on the date/timing of the scoping workshops was adequate;
  – Around half (49%) of attendees were contacted directly by NICE and invited as registered stakeholders;
  – A further 43% had the invitation forwarded to them by registered stakeholders;
  – Around 4% of respondents initiated contact with NICE.
Views of workshop attendees-(2)

- Attendees:
  - Respondents were split over whether the ‘right people’ were in attendance at the workshop.
  - Around 41% felt the makeup of the attendees was correct, however, 14% replied that the make-up was ‘wrong’ and a further 22% had expected certain groups to be better represented.
  - Responses suggest that attendees at two workshops (UGI bleeding and Spasticity in Children) were particularly concerned about whether the ‘right people’ were in attendance.
3. Scope consultation

• Audit data:
  – On average, 17% of registered stakeholders and 36% of workshop attendees submit written comments during consultation;
  – On average, 32.4% (range: 12.4-51.1%) of registered stakeholders either attend the workshop OR submit written comments.

• Thematic analysis:
  – Consultation comments from 5 guidelines (February 2009-April 2010) were assessed;
  – A total of 453 comments were received and 12 themes emerged from the collected comments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terminology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusions</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparators</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clinical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cost</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive of approach</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DH remit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections &amp; Clarifications</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The challenges:

- How to identify all ‘relevant’ stakeholder organisations for each clinical guideline?

- How to engage/encourage stakeholder organisations to register an interest in the guideline?

- How to ensure all stakeholders are given an equal opportunity to engage in the consultation process (i.e. attend the workshop and/or respond to the consultation process)?

- How to assess/monitor?
The ‘solutions’?

• To be more proactive in identifying and recruiting stakeholder organisations at the scoping stage?
  – Resourcing implications.

• To identify facilitators/barriers to active engagement in the consultation process.

• Others?