

Shaun C. Hendy

Science for Policy

the need for a Commission for Science

Introduction

There is growing interest in the use of scientific research for informing public policy (Gluckman, 2011). Science has shown itself increasingly able to make predictions of catastrophic harms many decades in advance, as well as suggesting ways in which these harms may be avoided. Scientific methodologies are now also being drawn on in many other areas of policy. Randomised controlled trials (RCT) and related statistical and experimental techniques are starting to be used to evaluate the effectiveness of existing policy and to experiment with the development of new policies, for instance (Pearce and Raman, 2014).

More recently, government itself has become an important source of scientific knowledge, and it is likely to become even more important in the coming decades. In New Zealand the Integrated Data Infrastructure (IDI) has become a unique and powerful source of socio-economic data that captures many aspects of the lives of residents and citizens (Statistics New Zealand, 2016). The IDI is used by independent researchers, as well as by researchers within government agencies such as the Ministry of Social Development, to inform operational practice and public policy, as well as to study the effectiveness of these policies. Indeed, the Ministry of Social Development has built a substantial data science team which carries out research commissioned by its policy branch (Ministry of Social Development, 2016).

Scientific research, however, requires more than just data and skilled researchers who can apply appropriate statistical techniques to this data. Modern science needs to be practised under the open scrutiny of other researchers to function effectively (Miguel et al., 2014). Peer review, for instance, while still necessary, is no longer regarded as sufficient to correct scientific fraud (Stroebe et al., 2012). Furthermore, the public increasingly has expectations that the conduct of scientific research be open to their scrutiny as well (Yarborough, 2014). As a result, a need has been identified for new institutions for the governance of evidence-based

Shaun C. Hendy is Professor of Physics at the University of Auckland and founding director of Te Pūnaha Matatini, a New Zealand Centre of Research Excellence focused on the study of complex systems and networks.

polymaking (Pearce and Raman, 2014). In this article I propose a Parliamentary Commission for Science, an organisation that would be responsible for ensuring the scientific use of evidence by government and fostering corresponding levels of trust in the public.

Transparency in science

Transparency and openness are believed to be a crucial component of the scientific approach to producing objective knowledge. A recent review of studies of the relationship between the consumption of sugary drinks and obesity found that those funded by drinks companies or the sugar industry were five times more likely to find no link than those that were not (Bes-Rastrollo et al., 2013). An important source of such biases is the tendency for studies that produce results unfavourable to the funder to go unpublished. Parties with an interest in the results may wittingly or unwittingly seek out researchers whose methodologies are more likely to produce favourable results, as these researchers will have a track record that tends to favour the funder. Even in the absence of end-user funding, researchers can face incentives that do not favour the publication of null results (Miguel et al., 2014). Bias then arises from an incomplete scientific literature which contains too few null results and an excess of false positives. Without a record of the unpublished work of scientists, science may not be objective.

Transparency also influences the public's assessment of scientific integrity. A 2014 UK survey of public attitudes to science revealed that 83% of those surveyed agreed that it was important to have some scientists who are not linked to business, while 77% believe that the independence of scientists can be compromised by the interests of their funders (Castell et al., 2014). Openness is required not only to ensure that science continues to function properly, but also for maintaining public trust in science (Yarborough, 2014).

These factors have led to calls for increasing openness in science (Miguel et al., 2014). The open science movement encourages researchers to make all stages of the scientific process accessible to the public and other researchers. In some

fields of research it is becoming common to openly register studies and an intention to publish before the research commences. The American Economic Association, for instance, has established a public register for RCT studies in economics and social science (www.socialscienceregistry.org). However, open science practices are not yet standard in the science community: they have not been codified in the Royal Society of New Zealand's (2012) professional standards, for instance. This has important implications for the utility of science advice for policy.

Government use of scientific research

The prime minister's chief science advisor, Sir Peter Gluckman, took stock of the New Zealand public sector's use of scientific

accommodate political concerns. While acknowledging that there could at times be legitimate reasons for delay (to allow time for government to develop a policy response, for instance), he found that delay was also being used to minimise the political impact of findings that were inconvenient or embarrassing for the government. Such delays are detrimental to the value of the research, and can reduce the ability of the public and independent experts to scrutinise evidence that underpins policies, potentially harming the public (Sedley, 2016).

Such delays can occur in the New Zealand context. A recent Treasury-commissioned study of the 90-day employment trial legislation¹ by researchers from Motu Economic and

Parties with an interest in the results may wittingly or unwittingly seek out researchers whose methodologies are more likely to produce favourable results,...

evidence as recently as 2013. Gluckman concluded that there was 'significant unevenness across government regarding departmental use of and respect for research-derived evidence'. He made two key recommendations: 1) 'The establishment of government-wide formal protocols to guide policy makers in sourcing quality research-based advice'; and 2) 'The appointment of Departmental Science Advisors to major ministries' (Gluckman, 2013, pp.31, 24). Since this stocktake, a network of eight science advisors has been established across government (Office of the Prime Minister's Chief Science Advisor, 2015).

A more recent inquiry – the Sedley inquiry – into the use of research by policymakers identified similar problems in the UK. Sedley had a particular focus on the necessity for transparency in the use of research commissioned by government. In particular, Sedley found that the publication of research findings was sometimes subject to delay, to

Public Policy Research was subject to months of delay before its release (Office of the Minister of Finance, 2016). Motu is an independent research organisation which only undertakes externally funded projects that it can publish openly.² Making use of the IDI, Motu researchers found that 90-day employment trials had not met several of the stated policy objectives that supported their introduction. Release of the study's results was delayed several times by the Treasury, with researchers being told that the government needed time to inform Cabinet and to formulate a policy response.³ Upon release, however, government ministers resorted to the use of anecdotal evidence in an effort to undermine the report's findings (Radio New Zealand, 2016).

It also appears that the eventual release of the study by Treasury was sparked by a media request for the results under the Official Information Act (Office of the Minister of Finance, 2016). A journalist had learnt about the study after a

joint Treasury/Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment briefing on the research project was mistakenly advertised as a public seminar.⁴ It is impossible to know how much longer the release of this research would have been delayed without this inadvertent public disclosure. Delays in the release of government-commissioned research reduce the quality of public discourse, undermine public trust in research and compromise the scientific literature (Selby, 2016).

Similar concerns must apply to delays in publishing research that is carried out within government agencies. There is currently no systematic way of identifying delays or missing studies conducted internally by government. Yet if government is to use research effectively, whether internally or externally conducted, it must ensure

register of all externally commissioned government research'; b) undertake 'routine publication of research government has considered in policy formulation with, if appropriate, reasons for rejecting it'; and c) provide 'a clear statement of the current requirements for prompt publication and adherence to them' (Sedley, 2016, p.7).

The role of a Parliamentary Commission for Science

I have argued elsewhere for the creation of a Parliamentary Commission for Science (Hendy, 2016). This organisation would be modelled on the role of the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, and would carry out several of the functions envisioned by the Sedley inquiry. The commissioner for the environment is accountable to Parliament rather than to a minister or ministry, and

instances where staff turnover had left departments and ministries unable to access their own commissioned research.

Another important role of the Parliamentary Commission for Science would be reporting on and monitoring the integrity of the public research system, both inside and outside government. Yarborough argues for the need to 'routinely conduct confidential surveys in individual laboratories, institutions and professional societies to assess the openness of communication and the extent to which people feel safe identifying problems in a research setting' (Yarborough, 2014). In New Zealand a government researcher could seek to notify research misconduct or incorrect use of research under the Public Disclosures Act 2000, but none of the current authorities specifically named in the act have scientific expertise. The Parliamentary Commission for Science should be added to the list of authorities named in the Public Disclosures Act, occupying a similar place in the legislation to the parliamentary commissioner for the environment.

Summary

I have argued that new institutions are needed to govern the way scientific research is used and conducted by government. In New Zealand, a Parliamentary Commission for Science would fulfil such a role, being responsible for: reviewing the government's processes for generating and utilising scientific evidence, and reporting on this to Parliament; maintaining a register of internally and externally commissioned research by government, together with a pre-analysis plan with timelines (where appropriate); requesting, and then publishing, policy outcomes of each research project; investigating any matter where scientific misconduct may have occurred; and reporting, on a request from the House or any select committee, on any petition, bill or any other matter which may need scientific input.

I have argued that new institutions are needed to govern the way scientific research is used and conducted by government.

a high degree of transparency as the science community is learning to do. Sedley considers concerns that increased transparency might dampen policy-makers' willingness to commission research, but notes that UK departments that have operated public research registers do not appear to have reduced their use of research in policy.

While Gluckman considers transparency in his stocktake, his corresponding recommendation is limited to public access to the data and does not extend to the advice or research itself: 'Provide greater transparency regarding the use of research-informed data' (Gluckman, 2013, p.6). The Sedley inquiry's recommendations go significantly beyond this, requiring that scientific *advice and the research* it is based on be made public. Specifically, Sedley recommends that government: a) establish 'a standardised central

is appointed by the governor-general at the recommendation of Parliament for a five-year term. A similar arrangement for a Parliamentary Commission for Science would offer the necessary independence from the government of the day needed for such functions.

In particular, the commission would maintain a register of internally and externally commissioned government research which provided publication and review timelines, the stated goals of the research and a description of the methods to be used. It would have powers to track how this research was used once published, including requesting (and then publishing) policy reasons for the rejection of any evidence. It is worth noting that public registration of commissioned research would also enhance that research's value by making it available to policymakers across government: Sedley noted several

1 Employment Relations Amendment, section 67A.

2 A. Grimes, personal communication, 2016.

3 I. Sin, personal communication, 2016.

4 Ibid.

References

- Bes-Rastrollo, M. et al. (2013) 'Financial conflicts of interest and reporting bias regarding the association between sugar-sweetened beverages and weight gain: a systematic review of systematic reviews', *PLOS Medicine*, 10 (12), e1001578
- Castell, S. et al. (2014) *Public Attitudes to Science 2014*, London: Ipsos MORI
- Gluckman, P. (2011) *Towards Better Use of Evidence in Policy Formation: a discussion paper*, Auckland: Office of the Prime Minister's Science Advisory Committee
- Gluckman, P. (2013) *The Role of Evidence in Policy Formation and Implementation*, Auckland: Office of the Prime Minister's Science Advisory Committee
- Hendy, S.C. (2016) *Silencing Science*, Wellington: Bridget Williams Books
- Miguel, E. et al. (2014) 'Promoting transparency in social science research', *Science*, 343 (6166), pp.30-1
- Ministry of Social Development (2016) 'Corporate group', <https://www.msd.govt.nz/about-msd-and-our-work/about-msd/our-structure/corporate-governance-and-risk-cluster.html>, retrieved 1 July 2016
- Office of the Minister of Finance (2016) 'Research findings on the effects of 90-day trial periods in employment', Cabinet paper, June
- Office of the Prime Minister's Chief Science Advisor (2015) 'Briefing note: the New Zealand science advisory system'
- Pearce, W. and S. Raman (2014) 'The new randomised controlled trials (RCT) movement in public policy: challenges of epistemic governance', *Policy Sciences*, 47 (4), pp.387-402
- Radio New Zealand (2016) 'Govt changes tune on 90-day trial policy', 17 June 2016
- Royal Society of New Zealand (2012) 'Code of professional standards and ethics in science, technology, and the humanities', issued by the Council of the Royal Society of New Zealand, 18 October
- Sedley, S. (2016) *Missing Evidence: an inquiry into the delayed publication of government-commissioned research*, London: Sense about Science
- Statistics New Zealand (2016) 'How researchers are using the Integrated Data Infrastructure', http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/snapshots-of-nz/integrated-data-infrastructure/researchers-using-idi.aspx, retrieved 1 July 2016
- Stroebe, W. et al. (2012) 'Scientific misconduct and the myth of self-correction in science', *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7 (6), pp.670-88
- Yarborough, M. (2014) 'Openness in science is key to keeping public trust', *Nature*, 515 (7527), p.313

Fast-track your career in the public sector with a top-level professional qualification with a:

Master of Public Policy *or a* Master of Public Management



School of
Government

- Try the graduate pathway professional programme for a Master's in Public Policy or Public Management with the School of Government.
- This is a one-year course after the completion of a Bachelor qualification.
- Public policy and public management are examined at the postgraduate level.

for more details visit victoria.ac.nz/sog/study

