HIA - what difference does it make?
Effectiveness of HIA in New Zealand, Australia and beyond
Evaluating the effectiveness of HIA in New Zealand and Australia 2005-2009

- Context
- What we did
- What we found
- So what
### CHETRE: Involved in conducting or supporting 44 HIAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2004 | Non-Emergency Health Related Transport Policy HIA  
     | Slow Stream Rehabilitation HIA  
     | Shellharbour Foreshore Development HIA  
     | Health Promotion Future Directions HIA  
     | Integrated Chronic Disease Prevention Social Marketing Campaign HIA  
     | Healthpact EFHIA |
|      | an indirectly…  
     | Healthy Eating Healthy Action Strategic Framework EFHIA  
     | Eat Well For Life EFHIA  
     | Videoconference Support Scheme for Rural Specialists EFHIA  
     | Breastfeeding Action Plan EFHIA  
     | Cardiac Rehabilitation Program EFHIA |
| 2005 | HIA of the NCAHS Indigenous Environmental Health Workers Proposal  
     | Lower Hunter Regional Strategy HSIA  
     | Population Plan for Bungendore HIA  
     | Growth in Western Sydney HIA  
     | Health Home Visiting in NSCCAHS HIA  
     | Greater Granville Regeneration Scheme HIA  
     | Wollongong Foreshore Precinct Plan HIA |
| 2006 | Health Service Planning in GSAHS HIA  
     | Liverpool Hospital Capital Works HIA  
     | Good for Kids, Good for Life Aboriginal Childhood Obesity Prevention Strategy EFHIA  
     | Rapid EFHIA of the Australian Better Health Initiative (NSW) |
| 2007 | Coffs Harbour *Our Living City* Settlement Strategy HIA  
     | EFHIA of the Australian Better Health Initiative (SA)  
     | Oran Park and Turner Road Land Release HIA  
     | Lithgow 25 Year Strategic Plan HIA  
     | Desk Based EFHIA of the Every Brushes Twice a Day Project  
     | HIA of the Emergency Intervention in the Northern Territory (NT) |
| 2008/9 | Opening Doors and Breaking Down Barriers to Ongoing Indigenous Education in Broken Hill SHWIA  
     | HIA on Sustainable farming through managing native grasslands in Southern NSW  
     | Rapid EFHIA on NSW STI strategy  
     | Goodooga emergency health service |
| 2010 | Rapid Efhia Liverpool hospital design phase  
      | Townsville Centre Redevelopment  
      | Mackay Regional Development Plan  
      | Early childhood home visiting  
      | Social sustainability and Health IA for Airds Bradbury  
      | Rapid Efhia Obesity Management Plan SSWAHS |
| 2011 | Chronic disease management strategy SSWAHS  
      | HIA of small site rural health service reconfiguration  
      | Mackay Housing Density Strategy HIA |
| 2012 | Dental Health Strategy Housing Masterplan Health St |
HIA in Australia
Internationally

- Use of HIA has expanded rapidly
- Growing number of case studies demonstrating utility
- But the conditions and prerequisites for HIA’s effectiveness remain unclear
- Need to demonstrate effectiveness in influencing planning and implementation
Wismar Framework

Four types of HIA effectiveness (Wismar, Blau, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health adequately acknowledged</th>
<th>Modification of pending decisions</th>
<th>Direct Effectiveness</th>
<th>General Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Reasons provided for not following HIA recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HIA-related changes in the decision</td>
<td>Health consequences are negligible or positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Due to the HIA the project was dropped</td>
<td>HIA has raised awareness among policy-makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision was postponed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No effectiveness</td>
<td>No effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The decision would have been made anyway</td>
<td>The HIA was ignored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The HIA was dismissed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conceptual Framework for Evaluating the Impact and Effectiveness of Health Impact Assessment (Harris-Roxas, Harris, 2012)

**Context**
- Decision Making Context
  - Purpose, Goals and Values
- Parameters
  - Decision-making processes
  - Decision-makers
  - Type of HIA

**Process**
- Inputs
  - Proposal
  - Capacity and experience
  - Resources
  - Time
  - Organisational arrangements
- Procedure
  - Fidelity
  - Involvement of decision-makers and stakeholders
  - Transparency
  - Trade-offs
  - Review

**Impacts**
- Proximal Impacts
  - Informing decisions
  - Changing decisions and implementation
  - Changes in health determinants
  - Predictive efficacy
- Distal Impacts
  - Understanding
  - Learning
  - Influencing other activities
  - Engagement
  - Perception of HIA
The Project

2 year project funded by Australian Research Council with an international team of investigators.

**Investigators**: E Harris, F Baum, B Harris-Roxas, L Kemp, J Spickett, H Keleher, M Harris, R Morgan, A Dannenberg, D Sukkumnoed, A Wendel

**Researchers**: H Ng Chok, F Haigh

**Aim**
To describe and explain changes to decision-making and implementation associated with the use of health impact assessments (HIAs) completed in Australia and New Zealand between 2005 and 2009.

**Research Questions**
1. Is there **evidence** that HIAs have changed decision-making and the implementation of policies, program or projects to strengthen positive and mitigate negative health impacts?
2. What **factors** are associated with increased or reduced effectiveness of the HIAs in changing these decisions and the implementation of policies, programs or projects?
3. What **impacts** do participants/stakeholders report following involvement in these health impact assessments
4. **How can we assess effectiveness**
**Project diagram**

**Phase 1 (55)**

- **Stage 1:** HIAs conducted between 2005-2009 in NZ and Australia identified and assessed against inclusion criteria
  - Purpose: Identify HIA activity.

- **Stage 2:** Quality of HIAs assessed using Review Package
  - Purpose: Assess quality and test usefulness of review package.

- **Stage 3:** Characteristics of HIAs identified
  - Purpose: Understand the scope and range of HIAs carried out.

**Phase 2 (47)**

- **Stage 1:** Questionnaire developed and sent to HIA contacts
  - Purpose: Identify impact on decision making, contextual factors.

- **Stage 2:** Follow up interviews
  - Purpose: Clarify answers, gather additional information and identify potential case studies.

- **Stage 3:** Effectiveness assessed using Wismar Framework
  - Purpose: Assess effectiveness and test usefulness of Wismar Framework.

- **Stage 4:** Effectiveness categorisation adapted
  - Purpose: Development of solution to identified weaknesses in Wismar Framework.

- **Stage 5:** Hypotheses relating to factors that can enhance HIA effectiveness developed
  - Purpose: Identification of factors that enhance effectiveness.

**Phase 3 (11)**

- **Stage 1:** Develop and apply criteria for case study selection – feasibility, hypotheses, effectiveness, geographic spread
  - Purpose: Case study selection.

- **Stage 2:** Interviews with ≥ 3 stakeholders in each HIA
  - Purpose: Gather evidence

- **Stage 3:** Analyse transcripts coding for conceptual framework, hypotheses, equity, HIA stages, effectiveness categories, plus emerging themes
  - Purpose: Analysis

- **Stage 4:** Assessment
  - Purpose: Evaluation and testing of conceptual framework, effectiveness categorisation, hypothesis, impact of HIA

- **Stage 5:** Forum
  - Purpose: Dissemination, testing face validity and identifying implications for research, policy and practice.

**Dissemination**

- Forum, Final technical report, Papers, Booklet
The HIAs

113 identified

55 included

11 case studies

Plans = 30
Projects = 12
Programs = 6
Policies = 6

Plans = 7
Projects = 2
Programs = 0
Policies = 2
Mandated = 4

Decision Support = 48

Advocacy = 2

Community Empowerment = 1
What we found

1. **Evidence** that HIAs have changed decision-making and the implementation of policies, program or projects.

Wismar framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Effectiveness</th>
<th>General Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 (64%)</td>
<td>11 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunistic Effectiveness</td>
<td>No effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Case Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Count (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>7 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. What factors are associated with increased or reduced effectiveness of the HIAs?

- More important
  - Direct involvement
  - Intersectoral
  - Learning
- Less important
  - Timing
  - Depth/type
3. What **impacts** do participants/stakeholders report following involvement in these health impact assessments

- Direct
- General
- Opportunistic
- No effectiveness
4. How can we assess effectiveness

- Quality review problematic
- Wismar doesn’t work
- Amended categorisation more useful
- Conceptual framework also useful
- More work to do…
What’s interesting
HIAs make a difference

“So this study very much provided, I guess, a fairly strong frame work in which to then develop contractual obligations under the project.”

“Was there evidence of heightened HIA awareness in decision makers? Definitely, definitely, definitely, definitely and it certainly consolidated our relationships with both Departments”

“this is not an exaggeration, for me HIA is as vital as the air we breathe, you know, that’s how I see it.”
Direct involvement of DM important

“we saw drafts on the way through as well to be able to comment on too so the HIA helped inform those as well. But like I say they – I have sighted the, the actual – I want to say the guts of the report – content of the report being recycled.

Interviewer:

How did that make you feel?

Respondent:

Yeah I was gleeful when I saw that.”

“If in doubt, pull the HIA out. So often I find myself in council, as a councillor, we’re talking about re-development and saying well, wouldn’t it be prudent to get an HIA prior, you know,“
Right person at right level is not necessarily the top level

“if we had of said – had have gone to a, you know, general manager and said “Look we want to set up a partnership” maybe then they would say “No don’t worry, that’s not core business” so we didn’t do it that way. We went through almost the back door and got it.”... “so all of that just flowed really easily in engineering. Now, had we had to put a policy to Council that – that dealt with any of that, we would have been stuck in mud for years just trying to get it through the community services part of the division before it got to Council. So, we didn’t. So, we didn’t. But the engineers were really happy”
• Different perspectives on effectiveness
• Effectiveness can change over time
• Effectiveness takes time
• Evaluating HIA reports doesn’t tell you much about effectiveness
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