

Work Groups 2 and 5- Training and Citizen Involvement Meeting

Date: 20 August 2019, Lisbon

MC Chair: Naomi Fineberg

MC Vice chair: Joseph Zohar

WG2 Lead: Ornella Corazza

WG5 Lead: Celia Sales (Lead) and Julia Jones (Deputy lead)

Also attending - Members of WGs 2 and 5:

Philip Bonanno, Samuel Chamberlain, Andres Fontalba Navas, Liljana Ignjatova, Daniel Moreno Sanjuan, Astrid Muller

Objectives: Collaboration between WG2 and WG5

WG2 update: Ornella Corazza

- 1) ERASMUS application unsuccessful, awaiting feedback. Very disappointing. From UK perspective, BREXIT might limit the opportunities for resubmission.
- 2) Next step – pilot a post graduate-certificate, which could lead a future joint MSc Programme.
- 3) Discussion followed, including: the development of a MSc course requires up to two years to develop and requires validation by a University. Experience from Maastricht discussed, with problems with regulations to run a MSc course, eventually stopped and now just doing a PG Cert at one or more Universities. Ornella will meet George J. Georgiou at UH as their joint courses in addictions could lead to a PG Cert.
- 4) Another option could be to provide training and certificates for the educators? E.g. Train the trainers. Malta example discussed, to offer modules that can build up from PG Cert, Diploma and MSc.
- 5) Views of the group invited. Do such courses exist already in different countries? Not known. Liljana has materials from seminars she delivers to teachers, young people and NGOs in N. Macedonia. Andres and Daniel reported that in Spain they disseminate educational material to the public, but using different methods of dissemination e.g. using social media – TV, Twitter, Instagram, newspapers. Use methods from health promotion and short strategic messages e.g. used in Spain with diabetes and melanoma. Important to engage public and

make positive messages about how to manage the behaviour, not just about problems. Support people to develop resilience, positive actions to take. Rather than telling people what they should do, a behaviour change approach may be more appropriate? Discussion about what type of courses to develop - Masterclasses, online courses? To run at conferences e.g. ICBA meeting? Make courses available to the public?

Action Ornella to explore at UH putting together modules for a PG Certificate Level and liaise with COST members with existing resources to incorporate

- 6) STSM – recent mission was by Mauro Pettorusso who went to Chicago to work with Jon Grant. It was successful and led to a publication (under submission).
 - a. Update from Natalie - now a cap on travel expenses to be claimed – 300 euros. From now on, trips outside Europe will require additional funding. But subsistence amount not changed.
 - b. Call is still open. Budget is for three STSMs a year.
 - c. Applicants needs to apply on website, with agreement from host University and host visiting. Approved via WG4.
- 7) ITC grants – for early career researchers from ITC countries to attend a conference if presenting or giving a poster. ICOCS meeting in Copenhagen. EPA conference? ICBA in Nottingham June 2020. Europa Association of drug addiction meeting – **Action Liljana to confirm venue and dates.**

WG5 update: Celia Sales, Julia Jones and members of WG5.

- 1) Presentation given to update on WG5 objectives, plans and consultation activities to date, led by Celia and Julia. There was a discussion about whether this work constituted research or consultation. WG5 members were clear that this has been consultation and not research, following the definition provided by the Health Research Authority (HRA) and NIHR INVOLVE from the UK, that public involvement in research means ‘being involved in the research process so that the work [or elements of it] is done **with** or **by** the public and not to, about or for them. This is not the same as taking part in research as a research participant, or subject of the research’ (<http://www.invo.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/INVOLVENRESfinalStatement310309.pdf>). However, we need to ensure that all consultation activities have been conducted within an ethical framework, respecting the rights, safety, dignity and well-being of those members of the public involved in the consultation discussions.
 - a. In Macedonia (Liljana Ignjatova) - different responses, priorities and training needs identified from consultation with different groups (young people, teachers, health and

social care professionals). E.g. teachers have great need for guidance and help regarding PUI.

- b. In Spain (Andres Fontalba Navas) - family isolation biggest problem for parents about PUI. PUI is about mobile phones/smart phones – mothers talked about this much more than the internet. Parents concerned about harm – development, attention and concentration of children/young people. Low social awareness about PUI and perceptions of risk.
 - c. In Malta (Philip Bonanno) – teachers expressed view that important to go to schools where children are and deliver training about PUI. Teachers need guidance and feel helpless.
 - d. In Greece (Katerina Flora, presented by Julia) - parents concerned about additive nature of excessive internet use. View that parents’ role essential in controlling (or not) children’s use of internet
 - e. Other consultations ongoing/to be written up. Agreed to compile and review results and decide in Copenhagen whether to pause, or continue with a few missing citizen key groups e.g. fathers. **Action Celia, Julia, Anna Maria and members of WG5**
- 2) Potential new COST project - In Spain, Daniel Moreno has funding for a blended learning/training programme to develop training for 300 nurses in primary care to deliver community-based interventions for patients with chronic health conditions (diabetes, COPD, heart disease). There is evidence that people with long term conditions, who are sedentary, risk a greater (potentially problematic) use of mobiles/internet. The training will be face to face, then online over 3 months. There is an opportunity before the training starts (October 2019) to incorporate a session(s) about PUI and Daniel and Andres would like to collaborate with COST members to develop this training resource.
- a. It was discussed how this training package could be evaluated or developed into a research study. How best to design a study / evaluate whether the training is effective? It will be important to measure health status and internet use before patients receive intervention from nurses, then afterwards to see if intervention has been effective. Or another design could be to provide PUI training to half of nurses OR nurses just give PUI intervention half of patients. Suggestion to adapt methods from other topics e.g. smoking cessation. Or a more exploratory approach in the first instance to ask nurses their experience of the training and then implementing with this target group. A qualitative interview study (focus groups or one to one) could identify the strengths and limitations of the training and then putting into practice in the primary care setting. What are the barriers to implementation, from patient and nurses’ perspectives?
 - b. Ornella suggested we could take video clips of patients, short clips, for training. See material already on the COST website – from training schools that could be used.

- c. Recent article in British Journal of Psychiatry (mentioned by Astrid)– might be useful research to use.
- 3) Publications from WG5 consultation – it was agreed that the consultation and processes employed could be written up for publication, if possible. Perhaps to target different audiences – to publish in a clinical journal (to ask COST colleagues for suggestions) and/ or a public involvement journal e.g. Research Involvement and Engagement
<https://researchinvolvement.biomedcentral.com/>.

It will be important to ensure that all the consultation activities have followed a clear ethical framework, as recommended by HRA/INVOLVE guidance and other literature in the field of PPI ((<http://www.invo.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/INVOLVENRESfinalStatement310309.pdf> and <https://researchinvolvement.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s40900-017-0058-y>

Action: Celia and Julia to discuss with WG5 members and WG1 colleagues.

Actions from meeting:

- WG2 and WG5 to collaborate together moving forward. Ornella and Celia to discuss different areas for collaboration.
- Ornella to develop plans for developing and piloting a PG Certificate in PUI.
- Spanish study of nurses could be a pilot to develop together the training materials and evaluation. Suggest a qualitative exploratory study of nurses' experiences. Findings to lead to larger intervention study. Julia offered to support the development of a proposal, with her qualitative research expertise.
- Teachers could have similar needs to the nurses and a follow-up study could be conducted with teachers - Philip
- To consider proceeding towards publishing the findings of consultation exercise – Celia, Julia & members of WG5 to explore feasible and ethically acceptable options
- Video clips of different groups of citizens – from website? From different countries and languages? – Ornella, Celia and members of WGs 2 and 5.

Next joint WG Meeting

11-12 September, Copenhagen.