Program in Policy Decision-Making

McMaster University

26 October 2012



Harnessing Research Evidence to Make Change Happen

First Biennial Australian Implementation Conference Melbourne, VIC, Australia

John N. Lavis, MD, PhD Professor and Director, McMaster Health Forum McMaster University





State of research and state of policymaking

Many types of research evidence are needed

Addressing challenges in using research evidence

Wrap up and resources



Supporting the use of research evidence (what this conference is calling 'implementation') looks very different depending on <u>who</u> you're supporting

- Citizens (patients, parents, etc.)
- Practitioners (doctors, social workers, etc.)
- Managers (in hospitals, NGOs, etc.)
- Policymakers (in government)*

It also looks very different depending on <u>what</u> you're supporting them to do

- Select which programs and services to provide / fund
- Strengthen systems (to get cost-effective programs and services to those who need them)*



Three (soon four) systematic reviews have examined the factors that increase the prospects for evidence use

- Interactions between researchers and policymakers
 - Engage policymakers in priority-setting, research (including reviews), and deliberative dialogues
- <u>Timing</u> / timeliness
 - Facilitate retrieval of research evidence through onestop shops, SUPPORT tools, training workshops, and rapid-response units

One systematic review has examined the effectiveness of interventions to support review use by policymakers



Many factors influence the policymaking process

- Institutional constraints (e.g., constitutional rules)
- Interest group pressure
- Ideas (e.g., citizens' values and many types of information, including tacit knowledge and real-world views and experiences)
- External events (e.g., global recession)

Research evidence is just one of these factors (and it can be used in instrumental, conceptual and political / symbolic ways)



Does the policymaking process in Australia provide the same 'ways in' for research evidence as the process in other countries?

- Direct routes to politicians, policy advisors and civil servants in central and line agencies
 - Election (and leadership) platforms
 - Budget setting
 - Policy development
- Indirect routes
 - Stakeholder advocacy
 - Media coverage
 - International agreements / global guidance

State of Policymaking (3)



What does evidence-informed policymaking mean?

Many Types of Research Evidence Are Needed



Defining the problem

- (Lots of institutional/state data)
- Making <u>comparisons</u> (over time, across settings or against plans)
 - (Reviews of) Observational studies, such as administrative database studies and community surveys
- Highlighting alternative <u>framings</u> of the problem to assist with mobilizing support among different groups
 - (Reviews of) Qualitative studies that examine stakeholders' views about and experiences with the problem

Many Types of Research Evidence Are Needed (2)



Assessing potential policy & program options

- Identifying several feasible policy and program options that could affect the problem
 - Frameworks (alone or embedded in reviews and overviews of reviews)
- Describing the positive effects (benefits) of the options
 - (Reviews of) Effectiveness studies (e.g., randomized controlled trials, interrupted time series, CBAs)
- Describing the negative effects (harms) of the options
 - (Reviews of) Effectiveness or observational studies

Many Types of Research Evidence Are Needed (3)



Assessing potential policy and program options (2)

- Describing the <u>cost-effectiveness</u> of options
 - (Reviews of) Economic evaluations
- Describing the <u>key elements</u> of complex options (to facilitate local adaptation if necessary)
 - (Reviews of) Qualitative studies that examine how or why interventions work (i.e., process evaluations)
- Describing <u>stakeholders' views</u> about and experiences with the options
 - (Reviews of) Qualitative studies that examine stakeholders' views about and experiences with particular options

Many Types of Research Evidence Are Needed (4)



Identifying implementation considerations

- Identifying potential <u>barriers</u> (and facilitators) to implementation at the level of citizens, practitioner, organizations and systems
 - (Reviews of) Observational studies and/or qualitative studies
- Describing the effects of appropriately targeted
 <u>implementation strategies</u>
 - (Reviews of) Effectiveness studies

Monitoring implementation and evaluating impact

Many Types of Research Evidence Are Needed (5)



Evidence briefs

 Documents that incorporate all of these types of research evidence in a given country/state

Evidence-informed policymaking

 A process by which those involved in or likely to be significantly affected by a policy have the opportunity to deliberate about the problem, options and implementation considerations, informed by all of these types of research evidence and by insights about all of the other factors that influence policymaking

Addressing Challenges in Using Research Evidence



- 1. Research evidence competes with many other factors in the policymaking process
- 2. Research evidence isn't valued as an information input
- 3. Research evidence isn't relevant
- 4. Research evidence isn't easy to use

Addressing Challenge 1



Challenge 1

- Research evidence <u>competes</u> with many other factors in the policymaking process
 - Institutional constraints (e.g., constitutional rules)
 - Interest group pressure
 - Other ideas such as citizens' values, tacit knowledge, real-world views and experiences)
 - External events (e.g., global recession)

One option (among many) for addressing challenge 1

 Improve democratic processes (but this is beyond the scope of most of us) or create 'routine' mechanisms (as many countries have done for technology assessments and environmental assessments)

Addressing Challenge 2



Challenge 2

Research evidence isn't <u>valued</u> as an information input

One option (among many) for addressing challenge 2

 Encourage policymakers (and stakeholders) to place value on the use of research evidence by highlighting examples from the past or from other jurisdictions where research made the difference between policy/program success and failure (or communication success and failure [WHO and World Bank, REACH Uganda, Science-ish]



Challenge 3

Research evidence isn't <u>relevant</u>

One option (among many) for addressing challenge 3

- Engage policymakers (and stakeholders) periodically in priority-setting processes and communicate the priorities to researchers [EVIPNet Cameroon, EMRO]
 - Long-term requirements for data-collection systems and for new primary research
 - Medium-term term requirements for systematic reviews
 - Short-term requirements for 'evidence briefs'

Addressing Challenge 4a



Challenge 4

• Research evidence isn't easy to use

Challenge 4a

 Research evidence isn't <u>communicated</u> effectively (i.e., policymakers (& stakeholders) hear noise, not music)

Two options (among many) for addressing challenge 4a

- Prepare and disseminate an evidence brief for policy (as an input to a deliberative dialogue) [EVIPNet, McMaster Health Forum]
- Develop and execute a knowledge-translation plan for a study or review (asking what's the message, to whom should it be directed, by whom should it be delivered, how should it be delivered, and with what effect)



Evidence briefs

Systematic reviews of research

Applied research studies, articles, and reports*

Basic, theoretical and methodological innovations

Addressing Challenge 4b



Challenge 4

• Research evidence isn't easy to use

Challenge 4b

 Research evidence isn't <u>available</u> when policymakers need it and in a form that they can use

Four options (among many) for addressing challenge 4b

- Promote the use of the right 'one-stop shop' for research evidence about policy-related questions
 - Cochrane Library / Evidence Updates for clinical
 - Health-evidence.ca for public health
 - Health Systems Evidence for health systems (which includes a free monthly evidence service) 19



Four options (among many) for addressing challenge 4b (cont'd)

- Create a clearinghouse of national policy-relevant documents [ZAMFOHR, EIHR Portal]
- Provide policymaker- and stakeholder-targeted training workshops and related tools that provide the knowledge and skills needed to find and use research evidence efficiently [EXTRA, EVIPNet, MHF, SUPPORT Tools]
- Maintain a rapid-response capacity among key partners who can collectively deliver the many types of research evidence that will be needed (assessed, synthesized and packaged in ways that make it easy to use) [REACH Uganda, EVIPNet Burkina Faso & Cameroon, ZAMFOHR and soon – we hope -- MHF]

Addressing Challenge 4c



Challenge 4

Research evidence isn't <u>easy to use</u>

Challenge 4c

 Policymakers (and stakeholders) lack mechanisms to prompt them to use research in policymaking

One option (among many) for addressing challenge 4c

 Propose changes to cabinet submission and program planning processes to prompt analysts to summarize whether and how research evidence informed the definition of the problem, the framing of options to address the problem, and the proposed approach to implementation [Ontario's Research Evidence Tool]



Challenge 4

• Research evidence isn't easy to use

Challenge 4d

 Policymakers lack <u>forums</u> where system challenges can be discussed with stakeholders and researchers

One option (among many) for addressing challenge 4d

 Convene deliberative dialogues (sometimes called policy dialogues or stakeholder dialogues) at which a pre-circulated evidence brief serves as the starting point for off-the-record deliberations involving policymakers, stakeholders and researchers A Healthy Ecosystem Requires All of These Challenges to Be Addressed



- 1. Research isn't valued as an information input [General <u>climate</u> for research use]
- 2. Research isn't relevant [Production]
- 3. Research isn't easy to use [Translation]
 - a. Research isn't communicated effectively [Push]
 - b. Research isn't available when policymakers need it and in a form that they can use [Facilitating pull]
 - c. Policymakers lack mechanisms to prompt them to use research in decision-making [Pull]
 - d. Policymakers lack forums where policy challenges can be discussed with key stakeholders [Exchange]

A Healthy Ecosystem Also Requires Rigorous Evaluation of Parts / Whole



Activities and outputs

• Evidence briefs and stakeholder dialogues (both formative and summative evaluations)

Outcomes and impacts

- Greater availability of research evidence on priority issues, stronger relationships between researchers & policymakers, and greater policymaker capacity to find and use research evidence
- Impacts on the policymaking process

Context and its influence on which activities and outputs are prioritized and whether and how they achieve outcomes and impacts

What Made the Big Difference in the Canadian Province of Ontario?



- Research isn't valued as an information input [General climate for research use] – <u>Clear signals from</u> the top, new performance criterion for civil servants
- 2. Research isn't relevant [Production]
- 3. Research isn't easy to use [Translation]
 - a. Research isn't communicated effectively [Push]
 - b. Research isn't available when policymakers need it and in a form that they can use [Facilitating pull]
 - c. Policymakers lack mechanisms to prompt them to use research in decision-making [Pull] <u>Research</u>
 <u>Evidence Tool</u>, <u>training of the 'bosses' and the doers</u>
 - d. Policymakers lack forums where policy challenges can be discussed with key stakeholders [Exchange] ²⁵

Which Challenges is Australia Addressing Well or Poorly?



- 1. Research isn't valued as an information input [General climate for research use]
- 2. Research isn't relevant [Production]
- 3. Research isn't easy to use [Translation]
 - a. Research isn't communicated effectively [Push]
 - b. Research isn't available when policymakers need it and in a form that they can use [Facilitating pull]
 - c. Policymakers lack mechanisms to prompt them to use research in decision-making [Pull]
 - d. Policymakers lack forums where policy challenges can be discussed with key stakeholders [Exchange]





Do you want to change the programs and services on offer, or the system that determines whether the 'right' mix of programs and services get to the right people?

Evidence-informed policymaking about systems is an achievable goal (not an oxymoron) provided that

- We recognize that research evidence is just one input into policymaking (and it can be used in many ways and in each stage of the policymaking process)
- We work hard to develop (and test) innovative strategies to support the use of research evidence in policymaking as part of multi-faceted initiatives that are adapted to the local context





Does the policymaking process in Australia provide the same 'ways in' for research evidence as the process in other countries?

What does evidence-informed policymaking mean?

What challenges in using research evidence in policymaking is Australia addressing well or poorly?





Lavis JN, Oxman AD, Lewin S, Fretheim A: SUPPORT Tools for evidence-informed health Policymaking (STP). Introduction. **Health Research Policy and Systems** 2009, 7(Suppl 1):I1 doi:10.1186/1478-4505-7-S1-I1.

Lavis JN. How can we support the use of systematic reviews in policymaking? **PLoS Medicine** 2009; 6(11): e1000141.

Evidence briefs and dialogue summaries on 20+ topics on the **McMaster Health Forum** website (www.mcmasterhealthforum.org)





Tools and resources available on **Health Systems Evidence** (www.healthsystemsevidence.org)

- Searchable database and monthly evidence service
- Downloadable PDFs
 - Finding & using research evidence ('cheat sheet')
 - Hyperlinked list of SUPPORT tools
 - Backgrounder on Health Systems Evidence
 - Backgrounder on the EIHR Portal
 - Top ten resources to support EIP
- Videos
 - Finding & using research evidence (3 * 20 minutes)
 - HSE (5 minutes) / EIHR Portal (5 minutes)