

# Response to proposed changes to DCMS Statistical Publications



28 July 2017

The Heritage Alliance is England's largest coalition of independent heritage interests. We unite 112 organisations which together have over 7 million members, volunteers, trustees and staff. The vast majority of England's historic environment is owned, managed and cared for by Heritage Alliance members.

We have only responded to relevant questions

**13. The latest Taking Part Quarter 2 release was published on 31st January 2017. Were you aware that this had been published?**

Yes.

**14. Have you used this publication at all? By 'used' we mean engaged with the contents of the release to inform your work or interest areas.**

Yes. I summarised the high level findings in heritage Update which goes to around 14,000 inboxes.

**15. If yes, which elements of the release did you make use of? a) Report b) Dashboard c) Infographics d) Spreadsheets/Tables**

The report mostly and looked at some infographics.

**16. Which topics did you use the release to gain data/information on? a) Arts b) Heritage c) Museums and galleries d) Libraries e) Archives f) Digital participation g) Volunteering and charitable giving h) First World War 17.**

All apart from Art.

**If the Taking Part Quarter 2 release was no longer published, what impact would this have on you as an individual and/or on your organisation (if applicable)?**

We would have to wait longer to share these figures with the sector. Reducing the stats to being published annually may create nearly as much work in their collection, but mean that

The Heritage Alliance is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales, Registered No: 4577804 Registered Charity No. 1094793 Registered Office: Clutha House 10 Storey's Gate, Westminster, London SW1P 3AY

stats are less used as there is half the opportunity to come across them. The stats are useful background information but could be more useful for our policy work than currently if reformed to capture information across more of the sector than they do currently.

**18. Are there any data items or information within the existing publication which would be essential for you to continue to have access to in a quarter 2 publication?**

No.

**19. The Exports of Objects of Cultural Interest was last published on 15th December 2016. Were you aware this had been published?**

Yes.

**20. Have you used this publication at all? By 'used' we mean engaged with the contents of the release to inform your work or areas of interest.**

Yes. I summarised the high level findings in Heritage Update which goes to around 14,000 inboxes.

**21. If this publication ceased, what impact would that have on you as an individual or on your organisation (if applicable)?**

We would not be able to share this information with the heritage sector. I hope that there would still be press releases on items but we would not be able to know what happens to them i.e are they saved or not. Perhaps the report could be simplified rather than scrapped?

**25. Which of these other DCMS statistical releases have you used?**

DCMS Sectors Economic Estimates, Taking Part survey releases, Charitable Giving Indicators Museum and Galleries Monthly Visits, Sponsored Museums Annual Performance Indicators, Reported Treasure Finds.

**26. Do you have any comments on the content of any of our releases? For example, do they provide a sufficient level of detail to meet your needs?**

The DCMS sectors economic estimates underestimates the economic output of the heritage sector. This is an extremely important figure for advocacy work and ensuring that Government understands the value and impact of the sector and is willing to address its needs. The sector does much work trying to better establish this data. Given the fact that the heritage sector has stretched resources it would be useful if DCMS statistics fully captured this information.

Key issues include the number of heritage employees captured in the figures. We understand that this reflects only those involved in the 'operation of historical sites and buildings and similar visitor attractions'. This excludes huge numbers of staff working in the sector. These are a core part of the sector such as archaeologists, conservation officers, conservators, organisations such as the AHF, amenity societies etc.

If the method for assessing this is standardised across all DCMS sectors, then it may be that this is not accurately capturing information for other sectors. We are happy to discuss further how this can be improved.

It is far more useful to have fewer releases which give a complete understanding of the sector rather than more regular impartial figures.

Another concern is that The DCMS Sectors Economic Estimates imply that heritage is not part of the creative industries or tourism.

Heritage should be given more prominence in the main statistic release and, if not addressed, the limitations of the statistics in terms of capturing information in relation to the sector should be at the very least acknowledged and the limits of the stats in terms of assessing the size of the heritage sector clearly stated.

**28. Which elements of our statistical releases do you find most useful? a) Main release in pdf format b) Main release in html format c) Infographics d) Spreadsheets/Tables e) Other (please state)**

The main release in either format is equally useful. Though being able to link to particular sections in a html version may be useful.

**29. How do you usually hear about DCMS statistics? (eg Gov.uk website, @DCMSInsight twitter account, Newsletter, Word of mouth, Media / Press)**

Government website changes alert subscription.

**30. Do you have any other comments on how we could improve the content, format or dissemination of our statistical releases and associated outputs?**

As well as improving the DCMS Sectors Economic Estimates methodology to provide a better reflection of DCMS sectors as set out above there is something of a gap between DCMS and DCLG statistics on heritage buildings. A joint publication which identified things relating to heritage in planning would be useful.

This could capture things like the number of times the Secretary of State turns down a listing recommendation, the number of local authorities with local lists, the number of conservation

officers, the number of demolitions of listed buildings, and locally listed buildings. The number of works carried out under permitted demolition rights etc.

The level of heritage volunteering is not captured in the releases as well as it might be. The heritage sector's volunteers have huge benefits in the terms of the work they do. However, conversely the volunteering has benefits for the health of elderly volunteers for example. Could these impacts be better captured?

For further information, please contact The Heritage Alliance.

**Contact**

Lizzie Glithero-West  
Chief Executive

The Heritage Alliance  
10 Storeys Gate  
London SW1P 3AY  
020 7233 0800  
[lizzie.glithero-west@theheritagealliance.org](mailto:lizzie.glithero-west@theheritagealliance.org)