



Introduction to Annexes 1-5

Introduction

OST's review has examined DCMS's performance in relation to the ten success criteria that underpin good practice in the use of science by Government departments, which were identified in the Government's Cross-Cutting Review of Science and Research. These are to:

1. Develop a clear, overall science and/or research strategy;
2. Horizon scan – to identify future science-related issues;
3. Review and harness existing research and identify gaps and opportunities for future research;
4. Commission and manage new research;
5. Ensure the quality and relevance of the work they carry out and sponsor;
6. Use research and scientific advice, e.g. in formulating policy;
7. Publish results and debate their findings and implications openly;
8. Share, transfer and manage knowledge;
9. Implement Guidelines 2000 and the Code of Practice for Scientific Advisory Committees; and
10. Use, maintain and develop scientific expertise (including both capacity- and capability-building).

Organisation of the Science Review of DCMS

The aim of the DCMS Science Review was to assess the quality and use of science in DCMS. To formulate a view on this, OST concentrated its attention on three areas as follows:

1. The Analytical Services Division (ASD) – Annex 1

In October 2001, DCMS social, economic and statistical expertise was centralised within an Analytical Services Division (ASD). Since April 2003, day-to-day responsibility for the DCMS research budget (~£400k per year) has also been transferred to ASD (although some activities, mostly gathering of data, are still paid for from DCMS policy divisions' own programme budgets). In view of this, it was deemed essential that ASD's role and practices within the Department underwent a detailed review to assess its impact on DCMS's science.¹

¹ Since completion of the OST review, ASD has been subsumed within Strategy Policy and Delivery (SPD).

2. DCMS policy divisions for detailed examination – Annexes 2-4

To obtain information on how DCMS's science operates in practice, it was decided to examine three policy divisions in detail. Following a scoping study, the Steering Panel agreed with OST's conclusion that DCMS's policy divisions were all equally good candidates for study, and the Panel was content for OST to make the selection. After further consideration, OST selected Sport, Architecture and the Historic Environment, and Tourism.

3. DCMS's 'arm's length' relationship with its NDPBs – Annex 5

DCMS has arm's length sponsorship responsibilities for some 60 Non-Departmental Public Bodies (NDPBs) – around 20 of which deliver the majority of the Department's science. For the Science Review to examine the nature and impact of this relationship across all of the NDPBs, a survey questionnaire was compiled and sent to all the Department's NDPBs. This allowed OST to test the effects of the arm's length relationship in relation to science in all DCMS's NDPBs – be they strategic, advisory, major or minor science spenders, etc. – and the implications this has for the quality and use of science in DCMS.

The evidence on each of these areas of focus has been compiled as a set of five stand-alone annexes. This has allowed OST to infer whether areas of good practice or weakness are a feature of an individual sector or DCMS division alone, or are a department-wide phenomenon.

Methodology for the Science Review of DCMS

The Science Review used a number of approaches to collect the data required to assess the quality and use of science within DCMS. These comprised:

- A Survey, which was sent to all the Department's NDPBs;
- Interviews with key personnel in DCMS and its NDPBs;
- Interviews with DCMS's stakeholders (including other Government departments, academia, industry, consultants used by DCMS, etc.);
- Examination of documentary evidence provided by DCMS and its NDPBs;
- Follow-up information provided by interviewees; and
- Consultation with the Steering Panel members with expertise in the areas that the Science Review focused on.

Detailed information on these is provided in Annex 6: Review Methodology.

Collection and analysis of information

How the consultations informed the Science Review

Interviews with staff in DCMS provided information relevant to all ten areas of focus for the Science Reviews and on the arm's length relationship with the NDPBs.

Interviews with NDPB staff provided information primarily on DCMS's arm's length relationship and the implications this has for the quality and use of science by DCMS. N.B. The Science Review focused on DCMS's science and the Department's relationship with its NDPBs; its purpose was not to look at the management and governance of science within the NDPBs themselves.

Interviews with stakeholders in other Government departments, industry and academia built up a broader picture of DCMS and its science, particularly with regard to use of external expertise, cross-Government working on areas of overlapping interest, and knowledge transfer and management issues.

How the picture was built up

The Science Review sought to test what DCMS said it did in relation to science, against its performance. OST looked for evidence of how DCMS and, where appropriate its NDPBs, performed in each of the ten key areas identified by the Government's Cross-Cutting Review of Science and Research² as being necessary to ensure high quality science and evidence-based policy within Government. The resulting evidence is set out in Annexes 1-5.

² Cross Cutting Review of Science and Research: Final Report, March 2002, section C. (http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/media//3A7B0/science_crosscutter.pdf).