



**University College Dublin**

**Periodic Quality Review**

**UCD Buildings and Services**

**April 2009**

## Table of Contents

1.	Introduction and Context	3
2.	UCD Buildings and Services	6
3.	Planning, Organisation and Management	7
4.	Functions and Activities	12
5.	Management of Resources	14
6.	User Perspectives	17
7.	Summary of Commendations and Recommendations	18

Appendix 1: UCD Buildings and Services Response to the Review Group Report

Appendix 2: UCD Buildings and Services Site Visit Schedule

Appendix 3: UCD Buildings and Services Schedule for Tour of Facilities

# 1. Introduction and Overview of UCD Buildings and Services

## *Introduction*

- 1.1 This Report presents the findings of a quality review of the UCD Buildings and Services, at University College Dublin. The review was undertaken in April 2009.

## *The Review Process*

- 1.2 Irish Universities have collectively agreed a framework for their quality review and quality improvement systems, which is consistent with both the legislative requirements of the Universities Act 1997, and international good practice. Quality reviews are carried out in academic, administrative and support service units.

- 1.3 The purpose of periodic review is to assist the University to assure itself of the quality of each of its constituent units, and to utilise learning from this essentially developmental process in order to effect improvement, including :

- To monitor the quality of the student experience, and of teaching and learning opportunities
- To monitor research activity, including: management of research activity; assessing the research performance with regard to: research productivity, research income, and recruiting and supporting doctoral students.
- To provide an opportunity for units to test the effectiveness of their systems and procedures for monitoring and enhancing quality and standards
- To provide a framework within which the unit can continue to work in the future towards quality improvement
- To identify shortfalls in resources and provide an externally validated case for change and/or increased resources
- Identify, encourage and disseminate good practice – to identify challenges and address these
- To provide public information on the University's capacity to assure the quality and standards of its awards. The University's implementation of its quality review procedures also enables it to demonstrate how it discharges its responsibilities for assuring the quality and standards of its awards, as required by the Universities Act 1997.

- 1.4 Typically, the review model comprises four major elements:

- Preparation of a Self-assessment Report (SAR)
- A visit by a Review Group (RG) that includes UCD staff and external experts, both national and international. The site visit normally will take place over a two or three day period.

- Preparation of a Review Group Report that is made public
- Agreement of an Action Plan for Improvement (Quality Improvement Plan) based on the RG Report's recommendations; the University will also monitor progress against the Improvement Plan

Full details of the review process can be found on the UCD Quality Office website: [www.ucd.ie/quality](http://www.ucd.ie/quality).

1.5 The composition of the Review Group for UCD Buildings and Services was as follows:

- Ms Carmel O'Sullivan, UCD Library (Chair)
- Mr Eamonn O'Neill, UCD Bursar's Office (Deputy Chair)
- Professor Patrick Gibbons, UCD School of Business
- Mr Mark Poland, University College Cork
- Mr Derry Caleb, University of Surrey

1.6 The Review Group visited the Unit from 27<sup>th</sup> to 30<sup>th</sup> April 2009 and had meetings with Unit staff, University students and staff, including: the Head of Buildings and Services; Vice-President for Capital and Commercial Development; Unit Management Team; SAR Coordinating Committee; staff from Unit departments; stakeholders from the student body and the academic and central support services community; representatives from user operated buildings. UCD Buildings and Services' response to the Review Group Report is attached at Appendix 1. The site visit schedule and the schedule for the tour of facilities are attached at Appendices 2 and 3 respectively.

1.7 In addition to the Self-assessment Report, the Review Group considered the extensive documentation provided by the Unit and the University, e.g. Campus Development Plan; Value for Money reports; Space Audit Reports; Estate Performance Review; Belfield Campus Commuting Strategy 2002-2008 etc.

### ***Preparation of the Self-assessment Report***

1.8 In preparation of the Self-assessment Report (SAR) a Quality Working Group (QWG) was formed in August 2008. Initially envisaged as a support group to plan and prepare work for the review, the members of the QWG were also members of the Self-assessment Report Coordinating Committee (SARCC). The QWG met weekly.

1.9 The Self-assessment Report Coordinating Committee (SARCC) was formed on 31<sup>st</sup> October 2008. This group was responsible for sign-off on the approach taken and the development of the resulting Self-assessment Report. The Committee members were selected after an open invitation to participate in this process was sent to all members of the Unit by the Director of Buildings and Estates. The SARCC members were chosen in order to represent as many areas and staff grades of the Unit as possible. The Committee members were encouraged to seek input from managers, colleagues, and any reports in their area of activity, through their daily

interactions and on specific individual matters. The members of the SARCC are listed below:

- Aidan Grannell (Chair), Director of Buildings and Estates (QWG member)
- Cormac Reynolds, Electrical Services Manager (QWG member)
- Cxema Pico, Systems and IT Manager (QWG member)
- Enda Bennett, HR Partner (QWG member)
- Gary Smith, Services - Facilities Manager (QWG member)
- Geoff Gray, Services - Duty Manager
- John Free, Transport and Commuting Manager
- Maria Kinsella, Services Supervisor
- Mary Brides, Telephone Services Supervisor
- Michael Rafter, Operations Manager (Services) (QWG member)
- Paddy McCarthy, Maintenance Plumber
- PJ Barron, Project Engineer
- Sean Clancy, Energy Unit / Project Engineer
- Sean Leonard, Maintenance General Operative

The SARCC met every 1 to 2 weeks, depending on the workload.

1.10 Communication of the Quality Review was addressed in the following manner:

- Town Hall meeting for all staff of Buildings and Services in October 2008 (Introduction of Quality Review process to the Unit)
- SARCC minutes published on Buildings and Services Portal website
- User Perspective Questionnaire distributed to University
- Focus interviews with key groups selected for their significant levels of interaction with the operation of the Unit
- Internal SWOT analysis sessions (volunteers sought to participate)
- Quality Review information session for all staff of Buildings and Services on February 13<sup>th</sup> 2009
- Updates as a standing item on the Buildings Management Team meeting agenda
- Updates provided locally by members of the SARCC

- Internal distribution of the SAR for comment and feedback

### ***The University***

1.11 University College Dublin (UCD) is a large and diverse university whose origin dates back to 1854. The University is situated on a large, modern campus, about 4km to the south of the centre of Dublin.

1.12 The current University Strategic Plan (2005-2008) states that the University's Mission is:

“To advance knowledge, pursue truth and foster learning, in an atmosphere of discovery, creativity, innovation and excellence, drawing out the best in each individual, and contributing to the social, cultural and economic life of Ireland in the wider world”.

The University is organised into 35 Schools in five Colleges;

- UCD College of Arts and Celtic Studies
- UCD College of Human Sciences
- UCD College of Life Sciences
- UCD College of Engineering, Mathematical and Physical Sciences
- UCD College of Business and Law

1.13 As one of the largest universities on the island of Ireland, UCD supports a broad, deep and rich academic community in Science, Engineering, Medicine, Arts, Celtic Studies and Human Sciences. There are currently over 22,000 students registered on University programmes, including over 3,000 international students from more than 110 countries.

## **2. UCD Buildings and Services**

2.1 The UCD Buildings and Services Unit is responsible for the planning, development, functional operation and efficient management and maintenance of the physical infrastructure and grounds of the University to achieve the 'Healthy, Living and Sustainable Campus' advocated in the Campus Development Plan. The long-term vision is to foster an adaptive user-friendly culture in its staff and to develop in a logical incremental way that best serves the objectives of the University.

2.2 The UCD Buildings and Services Unit has its principal base at Belfield House where many of its central systems and staff are located. The Unit has responsibility for the physical operation and management of teaching, research and support facilities sited across 60 buildings, several campus and hospital locations. Front line and maintenance staff are located at a number of Services Centres to support specific academic buildings.

2.3 The functional activities of Buildings and Services are:

- Building Operations (Services)

- Building Planning Unit
  - Capital Building Projects
  - Energy Unit
  - Landscape and Grounds
  - Minor Works Projects
  - Office of the Director
  - Technical Services
  - Voice Services, Building IT and Systems (BITS)
- 2.4 The Unit deals with a very broad array of activities ranging from routine maintenance, to campus security to the planning and execution of major capital projects. These activities are managed and executed with a staff of 106 full-time and 23 part-time employees.
- 2.5 The Unit manages three estates - Belfield (133.5 ha), Blackrock (7.7 ha) and Lyons Farm (234.8 ha). The Capital Construction Programme 2005-2010-2015 is in the order of 150m to 250m euro. There is a significant burden on this Unit in terms of University service delivery and risk management.

### **Commendations**

- 2.6 The Review Group commends the obvious sense of loyalty to the University and commitment to doing a “good job” that was manifest in our experience with the Unit and in the testimonials provided by users of the Unit’s services. The Review Group developed a clear sense of the commitment to customer service as a core value within the Unit, which was exhibited regularly.
- 2.7 The Review Group also commends the engagement which the Unit committed to in this Quality Review, again with a clear sense of wanting to improve its current operations and service level.

### **Recommendations**

- 2.8 The Review Group recommends that the roles and reporting relationships within the Unit are clarified further and that a revised organisation chart be developed to enhance clarity around roles and reporting relationships. Some of the stakeholders stated that they found the organisation structure confusing. Descriptions of roles and reporting relationships need to be transparent and clearly communicated for staff and users.

## **3. Planning, Organisation and Management**

- 3.1 The Buildings and Services Unit is a complex unit with a diverse range of activities which, managed holistically, will provide the added value these services can bring to an organisation. The Unit is going through a period of change which will influence the comments on how this Unit fits into the overall structure of the University. The Unit, through its work on capital and strategic

planning, is at the hub of major change within UCD and can provide the catalyst for further change. The Review Group has identified a number of issues it believes need to be addressed and these will be contained within the recommendations section, however, there is much for the unit to be commended on.

### Planning

- 3.2 Overall the general planning of works is carried out professionally and delivered in line with the requirements of the stakeholders. There is clear responsibility and structure for individual projects. However, it would have been useful to see a more formal representation of the project management procedures and guidelines within the support documentation. The functional and organisational charts within the SAR were unclear. The line of responsibility for services, delivery of breakdown repairs, PPM and minor works and where the management roles reported, were not apparent from these charts. The lack of clarity in organisational structure can affect planning and execution of complex projects. All stakeholders interviewed, however, had positive comments to make about the planning and execution of the works within the Unit, and all spoke very highly of the professional attitude of the staff and their willingness to help.
- 3.3 The Estate master planning information was detailed and contained excellent information about the estate. It is clear that a substantial amount of work has been carried out to produce the Master Plan. There was evidence of excellent performance in capital, transport and commuting, and energy management and major strides had been taken in each.

### Organisation

- 3.4 As mentioned in the planning section, the reporting lines were not clear in the organisational structure. The information in the SAR could be reproduced to provide more clarity. The Review Group were unsure about relationships between different sections and activities. The organisation charts 2.4.2 and appendix 3.1 needed explanation and additional information and did not show clearly the staff structure and their responsibilities. It would also have been helpful if there was a coordinated function and activities chart to assess how the Unit functioned and who was responsible for which activity. The relationship between capital, operational and facility managers in user-operated buildings was unclear and is discussed within the various sections below.
- 3.5 What was clear and important is that the staff knew how to make the processes and systems work. However, in discussions with stakeholders there did appear to be an over-reliance on personal relationships rather than strong organisational lines.

### Management

- 3.6 The Unit had a very strong 'can do' attitude where staff supported each other and projects got delivered to the satisfaction of the clients. There were some comments relating to different methods being applied by different project managers. Having a consistent well understood approach helps reporting and enables units to provide common guidelines. The Director has clear control of the nine sections reporting to him and he coordinates the overall operation well. There is a strong culture of support and of working on behalf

of the University which is important and commendable - the staff presented as being very loyal.

- 3.7 The Review Group was advised of impending changes at University Senior Officer level. As these changes have not yet been implemented, it has not been possible to comment on them or how they would affect the structure. There are very strong external drivers such as the Office of the President, the development of research and the University emphasis on excellent student facilities (as part of the overall strategy for improving the student experience). These need to be harnessed and used to drive improvements while at the same time not diverting resources from ongoing operational needs in important areas. The overall management culture is sound.

### **Commendations**

- 3.8 As already mentioned in Section 2 'UCD Buildings and Services' (commendation 2.6), the strong identity and reputation of the Unit and the loyalty of staff to the Unit and the University came across very emphatically. It is clear that the Unit has been very successful in maintaining its identity while at the same time delivering a challenging development programme.
- 3.9 There is evidence of an inclusive style of management by the head of the Unit and his introduction of staff talks has proven successful in bringing the Unit through complex changes.
- 3.10 There is significant evidence that the Unit does provide a very sound and strong Building Planning Unit that appears to deliver on time and within budget. Some thought has gone into the master planning and a clear programme of development has emerged. The Master Plan for the site is impressive and in isolation will deliver what is required of it. The holistic approach and understanding of transport needs and environmental issues come through fairly strongly. The Master Plan is very similar to an Estate Strategy, however, clear objectives from the University's strategic plans needed to be more prominent to set the direction of the document. Alternatively, a separate estate strategy document could be created, that refers to the Master Plan, as a working document on estate design and development but that would also include operation, performance and a funded implementation strategy. The review of the older laboratories and work on life cycle analysis is a good example of sustainable and holistic decision making and estate management.
- 3.11 The management team's attitude is about success and team work which enables them to drive forward capital projects with the support of all of their colleagues.
- 3.12 The Review Group were impressed with the volume and quality of data on the estate. It was comprehensive and included condition and functionality assessment, space records and details on activities carried out across the Unit. As mentioned earlier, the Master Plan was a comprehensive piece of work.
- 3.13 The campus facilities were of high quality and, in particular, the first impression provided by the landscaping was excellent. The Director of Sport was a good advocate for the Unit and commended the work carried out by the team.

- 3.14 All of those who were interviewed were supportive of Buildings and Services and reported good execution of work of a high quality.
- 3.15 Personal development is encouraged and a number of staff were undertaking higher degrees or had achieved higher degrees whilst at the University. There was a general level of support and self improvement across the group. "Home Grown" staff appeared to be a speciality – this can be both a strength and a weakness as there is also value in bringing in fresh ideas from outside.
- 3.16 The Director and his staff realised that there was a need to develop KPIs that were meaningful which would help them improve and demonstrate performance.

### **Recommendations**

The following recommendations represent a snap shot view and suggest further reviews in some areas, as well as recommendations, which could be considered.

- 3.17 The Unit uses a mix of staff and contractor resources to deliver services. The Review Group recommends that the Unit keeps this 'mix' under review to ensure both value for money and the retention of institutional knowledge.
- 3.18 It is important for Estate operations to reflect the needs of the strategic plans of the University and although the Master Plan was an excellent document it would have benefitted from an interpretation - from an estate perspective - of the University objectives i.e. a statement of issues that need to be addressed with options for addressing these, and a section on affordability and programming. It is possible that these were available within various documents.
- 3.19 The SAR document had many recommendations throughout it; however, it would have been useful had key objectives been set out for the Building and Services Unit and methods identified on how the Unit would meet these objectives - through organisational, structural, processes and systems changes, developments or improvements. The Review Group recommends that the Unit develop its vision into a clear set of objectives that all staff can buy into. Buildings and Services should produce an annual report in which these objectives could be clearly laid out - showing progress made.
- 3.20 It was clear that a significant amount of work had been done to prepare for this review and that a remarkable amount of work was being undertaken by Buildings and Services. The Review Group felt that there were individual packages of excellent material within the SAR and in all of the supporting documents. There was a common agenda on improving systems and processes. What became apparent, however, was that better coordination of these activities was necessary. The Unit would have benefitted from professional administrative support in managing its documents and in coordinating its activities.

The Review Group was surprised that the Director had no dedicated PA/secretarial /administrative support to help manage, organise, and coordinate the activities to fulfil the functions of the Buildings & Services Unit and, in particular, to provide support to enable him to:

- Manage any programme changes

- Review organisation, roles and responsibilities to ensure Compliance
- Develop systems and processes that would provide evidence of performance in all areas
- Provide support and advice to other professional members
- Provide professional advice to Officers of the University
- Develop high level KPIs

The University would benefit by freeing up the Director from some administrative activities in order to provide him with time to manage the 1.3 billion euro estate. The Review Group recommends that the “Office of Director” be reviewed to ensure that there is an adequate level of resources available to the Director to facilitate the accomplishment of his role as efficiently as possible.

- 3.21 Some managers are responsible for both capital projects and day-to-day operations. This is a common in small management teams and is a high risk scenario where both capital and operational duties could fail due to shifting priorities. The value of capital, minor works and operational activity should warrant organisational structure changes to avoid this (this does not mean the excellent support provided across the disciplines should be lost).
- 3.22 The Review Group feels there is a need to review or test the organisational responsibility for high risk Project Portfolio Management (PPM) and / or failures where they occur within the user-operated buildings. The Facilities Managers within these buildings have significant responsibilities yet there appeared to be no direct line management to the Building and Services Unit. Unfortunately these organisational issues are often only tested after major incidents have taken place or key plant has failed.
- 3.23 Processes and systems are an essential part of any organisation where performance needs to be measured and action taken. This is more important where there are many thousands of jobs per year and where the record keeping is part of legal compliance. This is both a management and operational issue. The systems are there to help manage the complex activities being undertaken, provide feedback to the users of Buildings and to the Unit’s own staff and to enable the coordination of activities. If there is a drive to meet KPIs and deliver against Service Level Agreements (SLAs) then collection of information and reporting must be efficient and cost effective. In relation to systems development, it is noted that progress has been made (e.g. web portal, shared folders etc.) but that much work remains to be executed. The Review Group recommends a review of the Unit’s computing and information systems to provide a framework for the suite of processes being delivered. A coordinated approach to systems development is essential to manage this complex and diverse group of activities and the Review Group recommends that appropriate resources are provided to develop this University activity. A high level group should be established, drawn from various areas of the Unit and led by the Director. This group should consider the appropriateness of the existing systems and put in place a plan to develop a full suite of systems covering planned preventative maintenance, asset management, helpdesks, document management etc. to be rolled out in the medium term.

- 3.24 The Building and Services Unit has a key role in incident management and has procedures to deal with incidents. It is important that these are dovetailed with the University's Business Continuity Planning. It was not clear where this activity sits in the organisation and who was responsible for developing business impact assessments and individual unit plans in this regard – the University needs to review this. Responsibility for Health & Safety was also unclear in some areas where non Buildings and Services staff had control of maintenance and repairs and where the work was done by contractors (i.e. in user-controlled buildings). The Review Group recommends that an analysis be carried out to ensure that there is clarity and ownership of activities undertaken. This should include technical responsibility and quality control on high risk areas, plant or machinery - including the management of contractors and their compliance with regulations.
- 3.25 The Unit has the single highest level of influence on environmental and sustainable activities within the University. A coordinated approach to energy management and sustainability would help the University to improve its overall awareness of the sustainability agenda. A network of champions across the University would assist the Unit to drive through new measures of improved performance in these areas.

## **4. Functions and Activities**

### **Commendations**

- 4.1 UCD's energy unit has played a key role in the creation and adoption of best practice in energy management in recent time. The drive forwards of overall 'green' policies at international and national level provide UCD with a unique opportunity to develop its campus into a unique 'green campus' across a broader sustainability agenda. This would incorporate energy, commuting, waste, etc.
- 4.2 The professional and courteous manner in which the Buildings and Services helpdesks were managed was noted by the Review Group.
- 4.3 The Review Group noted and welcomed the Buildings and Services approach to 'Building Care'. It commended the completion of condition surveys and the targeting of resources to address key problem areas.
- 4.4 The Review Group commended the approach taken to put in place a comprehensive suite of computerised systems to support the work of the office.

### **Recommendations**

- 4.5 The Review Group recommends that Buildings and Services develop a robust set of procedures to help ensure consistency of approach in the delivery of services. There appears to be an over-reliance on personal relationships and methods of working. Standard operating procedures and systems need to be introduced for key activities where they are spread across different people and or locations.
- 4.6 The two distinct areas of responsibility within the Unit are capital and operations; capital works (which may or may not include minor work); and an

operational section with responsibility for staff performance, maintenance contractor performance, PPM, breakdown, coordination of energy reduction and systems efficiencies with the energy team. The procedures governing the management of capital projects are outlined in the Capital Works Management Framework. This covers the appointment of consultants, contractors etc. Significant capital programmes present significant risk to the University. Large sums are involved and in addition to the financial risk, it is imperative that projects are meticulously planned and implemented. The Review Group also recommends strengthening the management of capital projects – from initiation to completion. It is suggested that a single unit within Buildings and Services takes responsibility for the capital programme as it is extremely difficult for managers with significant day-to-day operational responsibilities to focus on the significant challenges of managing capital projects. This unit would develop a consistent process for the delivery of projects ensuring the project briefs are well developed, all procedures are applied to achieve compliance with government procedures and that the necessary consultation process with end users, building operations, health & safety are completed.

- 4.7 The Review Group recommends that Buildings and Services review their current approach to the implementation of minor works projects. A simple procedure for the identification, costing approval and implementation would assist in the management of minor works projects. The procedure should allow end users to clearly understand the process that applies and provide regular feedback and update of the status of individual minor works projects.
- 4.8 The process by which newer buildings are managed is commendable for user-operated buildings. The operation of these buildings is mostly controlled and funded by the local college or institute. This provides local service and cost transparency. The Facilities Managers do not report to the Director of Buildings and Services but to the local head of college/institute. The Review Group believes it is extremely important that the staff of Buildings and Services have full knowledge of the operation of the user-operated buildings and that, as a minimum, a formal communication network is established between the Buildings and Services management and staff and the Facilities Managers to ensure full compliance with all statutory obligations (health & safety, procurement etc.) and that a consistent and professional approach to the management of the overall University estate is guaranteed. The communication network should help ensure that 'best practice' is shared by all building professionals, that lessons are learned, and that best value for money is achieved in procuring services.
- 4.9 There was some criticism of the absence of an automated feedback loop from the helpdesk. The Review Group recommends that the feedback loop to end users for maintenance issues should be improved so that the person originating a maintenance issue is always apprised of its resolution. It is also recommended that an updated computerised helpdesk system is established to allow all requests to be logged, automatic emails generated, work requests generated, feedback provided on completion of tasks etc. A new system should allow trends to be analysed, KPIs established and to provide key management information to inform resource allocation etc.
- 4.10 The Review Group encourages Buildings and Services to continue its Building Care Programme and to develop a prioritised list of backlog maintenance, health & safety requirements, access improvements needed etc and to put in place, where possible, a multi-annual programme to improve the conditions of

the estate in the short to medium term. The programme should prioritise relevant statutory requirements (e.g. Disability Act, Health & Safety Act etc).

## **5. Management of Resources**

### **Commendations**

- 5.1 The resources managed by the Building and Services Unit are diverse and each section requires a different style of management and time devoted to it. It is clear from our discussions that the staff feel that they have confidence in the management of the Unit and see it as high quality and at no time did we hear any negative comments about the management from staff within the Unit or the external stakeholders. The Unit has instigated many new initiatives and is part of programmes to improve energy management, space management and recognises that sustainability and capital management must be considered holistically.
- 5.2 There are good indicators that point to strong and competent management of resources:
- a. The capital programme appears to have no capital overruns and delivers on time and within budget
  - b. The Unit consistently meets its budget
  - c. The quality of the work carried out is of an acceptable quality and the Review Group was advised that staff were pleased with the results
  - d. Staff appear hardworking, dedicated and responsive
  - e. The grounds and landscaping are in excellent condition and provide an excellent first impression of the University
  - f. There is a clear understanding that there is a need to improve management of space and, in particular, space utilisation information had been prepared to drive this forward
  - g. There are good signs of a clear understanding by the Unit's senior management of the things that need to be done to manage a complex estate and where they want to improve

### **Recommendations**

- 5.3 The recommendations focus on the operation of the Unit and overall management of the University resources. It is difficult to disassociate the management of resources from discussion about value for money (VFM) and performance. The Review Group cannot make a judgment on VFM issues and performance – rather, the Review Group will identify process and system improvements that could help in the overall management of the estate. These in turn will support VFM initiatives. In order to demonstrate VFM and overall performance there is a need to record and analyse activities. Because the Unit appears to be under-supported by administrative and systems specialities it has not progressed sufficiently to provide information on KPIs and SLAs, both of which it is planning to develop and introduce. The introduction of new computing programmes and information systems will not

necessarily increase VFM or performance. If the Unit wishes to introduce systems to deliver the changes recommended it is essential that value judgments reflecting on suitability and VFM are undertaken.

- 5.4 The following recommendations are based on the discussions with Unit staff and the reports they receive. They reflect on what the typical needs would be for a complex University with highly engineered facilities and a high volume of work tasks. Although the number of work tasks were less than 10,000 (the figure 7,240 was referred to in the Self-assessment Report), it was not clear from the figures that they included the user-operated buildings or work that was given directly to contractors or if they included the schedule of PPM works that was undertaken. The Review Group recommends:

#### Internal resources

- 5.5 The Unit should develop more management reports on performance and provide feedback to the managers, operators and stakeholders from the systems they currently operate, for example, to provide timely management data on outstanding works/tasks, repeat failures and record of actions taken, by whom and when.
- 5.6 The Review Group recommends that the Unit should develop meaningful KPIs for each section of the Unit based on what would help them to identify how well they are doing and provide appropriate management reports. Some areas may not warrant any appropriate KPIs and unless useful they should not be developed.
- 5.7 Task management should be linked with risk assessments and provide alerts to relevant staff or contractors on health & safety issues by room and location. This would ensure that there is a robust system that minimises risk and health & safety issues.

#### Contract Management

- 5.8 It was evident that a significant amount of tasks were outsourced and a number of similar contractors were on site at any one time. Some work had been undertaken to rationalise the lifts contract which has been successful (however not fully inclusive as the Students Centre had a different lift contractor). It is felt that a review of the procurement process to rationalise the number of contracts could be beneficial, in particular on tendering maintenance contracts, small new works and minor works. The review should consider the advantages and disadvantages of facilitating opt-outs by units such as the Student Centre. The Review Group recommends that the Unit develop a procurement plan to ensure best value for money from all contracted services. KPIs relating to the management of contractors and value for money would help demonstrate performance. If the volume of new works and minor repairs was high then the introduction of Frameworks may help to improve delivery.
- 5.9 It was felt that some contractors did not see the students as customers and communication between the contractors, University staff and students was strained on occasions. The Review Group strongly recommends that robust disciplinary procedures are in place to deal with all transgressions of contractors, staff and students. Front line staff can be at risk if they are not protected by robust governance.

- 5.10 The Review Group recommends that it would be beneficial to introduce post occupancy evaluations of contracts to identify successful, good and bad elements in the delivery of major capital projects and be part of the continuous, improvement, commissioning and learning initiative.

#### Project Management

- 5.11 The different styles of project management need to be replaced with one common method of delivery. A simple process and project management guide for all those involved with a capital project which clearly sets out roles and expectations would be beneficial, for example for the role of the Energy Manager, Health & Safety Officer, operations and maintenance personnel etc. This would help manage the internal resources of both the Buildings and Services Unit and its client departments.
- 5.12 From discussions with clients and staff, the Review Group were under the impression that there was no common format to the record management of projects. If this is correct, it would be beneficial to introduce a common process and a structured organised record management system for all capital works and minor projects.

#### Space management

- 5.13 The Review Group recommends that UCD should coordinate its room booking and space utilisation policies. The system should be user friendly (student interface) and, if possible, all rooms should be in a central booking system. Poor management of space leads to inefficient developments and severe negative opportunity costs. It was not clear to the Review Group and to staff and students who was responsible for room bookings. Students felt that advance block booking prevented them using space which was, in fact, free. Room utilisation figures should be reviewed to ensure maximum usage. The Review Group recommends that a standard policy should be implemented regarding booking of rooms by students/student clubs. This should aim to enable bookings to be confirmed at the time they are made. If this is not possible, then Services should provide subsequent confirmation rather than requesting the student to return at a later date to verify whether the booking has been made. If possible, the policy should allow bookings to be made by phone, email or web rather than requiring the student to attend the desk in person.
- 5.14 The Review Group recommends that space utilisation and auditing policies need to be put in place across all colleges and units (including support units) and simple KPIs produced to demonstrate performance. Although there were initiatives underway to develop and implement space management processes within the colleges, it is important that the University has a coordinated approach and each unit is treated appropriately. Failure to have a University approach may have a divisive impact. The Unit should continue to identify international best practice in asset management and to communicate clear policies to users.

## **6. User Perspectives**

- 6.1 The User Perspective was represented at meetings of groups of users with the SARCC, with the Review Group and via the online survey which was completed in parallel with the Self-assessment.
- 6.2 15 Focus Groups met with individuals from the SARCC.
- 6.3 The primary user groups that met with the Review Group were:
- Academic users with experience of involvement on capital developments, academics with general experience as users of the Buildings and Services service
  - Students including representatives of Student Clubs
  - Support Unit users
  - Staff from user-controlled buildings.
- 6.4 The online survey was conducted in February 2009 and completed by over 2,300 staff and students. Approximately 2/3 of the responses were by students and 1/3 by staff.

### **Commendations**

- 6.5 Many users made a point of stressing the commitment and responsiveness of Buildings and Services staff.
- 6.6 In general, a large majority of survey respondents rated the various aspects of Buildings and Services as 'Adequate' or 'Good'.

### **Recommendations**

- 6.7 There appears to be an inconsistency between the services provided by different service desks. This may partly be due to the fact that some of them are operated by Services staff, some by user-operated buildings staff and some by a combination. But this is not the only factor. While local circumstances may require variations in the level of service, the Review Group recommends that a common minimum set of services be provided at each desk and that the services available at each desk be clearly communicated at that desk.
- 6.8 A variety of service 'brands' are used by the Buildings and Services Unit (Buildings and Services, Buildings Office, Services, First Response, Unicare, E3, The Energy Bureau). The Review Group recommends that the number and purpose of brands be reviewed and consolidated. Efforts should then be undertaken to clearly communicate to users what services are provided.
- 6.9 There is an 'untapped market' for energy saving initiatives. The awareness of the existing energy saving initiatives is lower than would be expected and can be improved with clear, focussed communication. The student body could be very active energy saving champions and would benefit from deeper and broader engagement (See also recommendation 3.25 regarding placing Energy Saving in a broader Sustainability context).

- 6.10 Designated liaison staff ('go to' people) within the user community in each building would help communication and provide improvements both for the user community and for Buildings and Services. Such staff would deal with operational affairs rather than (or in addition to) policy issues or more strategic issues.
- 6.11 In discussions with representatives from user-operated buildings and students, it emerged that there appears to be a need for a more coordinated and interactive approach to event management. The Review Group recommends that the Unit set up an event co-ordination system to oversee annual planning of events and to ensure that event organisers have access to this information on a regular basis (not just an event listing).
- 6.12 Energy charging via the RAM has helped to incentivise energy saving and has also provided more transparent information to users. Closer integration of IT Services information and Buildings and Services information could facilitate accurate charging for IT infrastructure in a building by charging those occupying the space and, thereby, providing similar benefits for IT Charging via the University Resource Allocation Model.

## **7. Summary of Commendations and Recommendations**

### **a. UCD Buildings and Services**

#### Commendations

- 2.6 The Review Group commends the obvious sense of loyalty to the University and commitment to doing a "good job" that was manifest in our experience with the Unit and in the testimonials provided by users of the Unit's services. The Review Group developed a clear sense of the commitment to customer service as a core value within the Unit, which was exhibited regularly.
- 2.7 The Review Group also commends the engagement which the Unit committed to in this Quality Review, again with a clear sense of wanting to improve its current operations and service level.

#### Recommendations

- 2.8 The Review Group recommends that the roles and reporting relationships within the Unit are clarified further and that a revised organisation chart be developed to enhance clarity around roles and reporting relationships. Some of the stakeholders stated that they found the organisation structure confusing. Descriptions of roles and reporting relationships need to be transparent and clearly communicated for staff and users.

### **b. Planning, Organisation and Management**

#### Commendations

- 3.8 As already mentioned in Section 2 'UCD Buildings and Services' (commendation 2.6), the strong identity and reputation of the Unit and the loyalty of staff to the Unit and the University came across very emphatically. It is clear that the Unit has been very successful in maintaining its identity while at the same time delivering a challenging development programme.

- 3.9 There is evidence of an inclusive style of management by the head of the Unit and his introduction of staff talks has proven successful in bringing the Unit through complex changes.
- 3.10 There is significant evidence that the Unit does provide a very sound and strong Building Planning Unit that appears to deliver on time and within budget. Some thought has gone into the master planning and a clear programme of development has emerged. The Master Plan for the site is impressive and in isolation will deliver what is required of it. The holistic approach and understanding of transport needs and environmental issues come through fairly strongly. The Master Plan is very similar to an Estate Strategy, however, clear objectives from the University's strategic plans needed to be more prominent to set the direction of the document. Alternatively, a separate estate strategy document could be created, that refers to the Master Plan, as a working document on estate design and development but that would also include operation, performance and a funded implementation strategy. The review of the older laboratories and work on life cycle analysis is a good example of sustainable and holistic decision making and estate management.
- 3.11 The management team's attitude is about success and team work which enables them to drive forward capital projects with the support of all of their colleagues.
- 3.12 The Review Group were impressed with the volume and quality of data on the estate. It was comprehensive and included condition and functionality assessment, space records and details on activities carried out across the Unit. As mentioned earlier, the Master Plan was a comprehensive piece of work.
- 3.13 The campus facilities were of high quality and, in particular, the first impression provided by the landscaping was excellent. The Director of Sport was a good advocate for the Unit and commended the work carried out by the team.
- 3.14 All of those who were interviewed were supportive of Buildings and Services and reported good execution of work of a high quality.
- 3.15 Personal development is encouraged and a number of staff were undertaking higher degrees or had achieved higher degrees whilst at the University. There was a general level of support and self improvement across the group. "Home Grown" staff appeared to be a speciality – this can be both a strength and a weakness as there is also value in bringing in fresh ideas from outside.
- 3.16 The Director and his staff realised that there was a need to develop KPIs that were meaningful which would help them improve and demonstrate performance.

### Recommendations

The following recommendations represent a snap shot view and suggest further reviews in some areas, as well as recommendations, which could be considered.

- 3.17 The Unit uses a mix of staff and contractor resources to deliver services. The Review Group recommends that the Unit keeps this 'mix' under review to ensure both value for money and the retention of institutional knowledge.

- 3.18 It is important for Estate operations to reflect the needs of the strategic plans of the University and although the Master Plan was an excellent document it would have benefitted from an interpretation - from an estate perspective - of the University objectives i.e. a statement of issues that need to be addressed with options for addressing these, and a section on affordability and programming. It is possible that these were available within various documents.
- 3.19 The SAR document had many recommendations throughout it; however, it would have been useful had key objectives been set out for the Building and Services Unit and methods identified on how the Unit would meet these objectives - through organisational, structural, processes and systems changes, developments or improvements. The Review Group recommends that the Unit develop its vision into a clear set of objectives that all staff can buy into. Buildings and Services should produce an annual report in which these objectives could be clearly laid out - showing progress made.
- 3.20 It was clear that a significant amount of work had been done to prepare for this review and that a remarkable amount of work was being undertaken by Buildings and Services. The Review Group felt that there were individual packages of excellent material within the SAR and in all of the supporting documents. There was a common agenda on improving systems and processes. What became apparent, however, was that better coordination of these activities was necessary. The Unit would have benefitted from professional administrative support in managing its documents and in coordinating its activities.

The Review Group was surprised that the Director had no dedicated PA/secretarial /administrative support to help manage, organise, and coordinate the activities to fulfil the functions of the Buildings & Services Unit and, in particular, to provide support to enable him to:

- Manage any programme changes
- Review organisation, roles and responsibilities to ensure Compliance
- Develop systems and processes that would provide evidence of performance in all areas
- Provide support and advice to other professional members
- Provide professional advice to Officers of the University
- Develop high level KPIs

The University would benefit by freeing up the Director from some administrative activities in order to provide him with time to manage the 1.3billion euro estate. The Review Group recommends that the "Office of Director" be reviewed to ensure that there is an adequate level of resources available to the Director to facilitate the accomplishment of his role as efficiently as possible.

- 3.21 Some managers are responsible for both capital projects and day-to-day operations. This is a common in small management teams and is a high risk scenario where both capital and operational duties could fail due to shifting

priorities. The value of capital, minor works and operational activity should warrant organisational structure changes to avoid this (this does not mean the excellent support provided across the disciplines should be lost).

- 3.22 The Review Group feels there is a need to review or test the organisational responsibility for high risk Project Portfolio Management (PPM) and / or failures where they occur within the user-operated buildings. The Facilities Managers within these buildings have significant responsibilities yet there appeared to be no direct line management to the Building and Services Unit. Unfortunately these organisational issues are often only tested after major incidents have taken place or key plant has failed.
- 3.23 Processes and systems are an essential part of any organisation where performance needs to be measured and action taken. This is more important where there are many thousands of jobs per year and where the record keeping is part of legal compliance. This is both a management and operational issue. The systems are there to help manage the complex activities being undertaken, provide feedback to the users of Buildings and to the Unit's own staff and to enable the coordination of activities. If there is a drive to meet KPIs and deliver against Service Level Agreements (SLAs) then collection of information and reporting must be efficient and cost effective. In relation to systems development, it is noted that progress has been made (e.g. web portal, shared folders etc.) but that much work remains to be executed. The Review Group recommends a review of the Unit's computing and information systems to provide a framework for the suite of processes being delivered. A coordinated approach to systems development is essential to manage this complex and diverse group of activities and the Review Group recommends that appropriate resources are provided to develop this University activity. A high level group should be established, drawn from various areas of the Unit and led by the Director. This group should consider the appropriateness of the existing systems and put in place a plan to develop a full suite of systems covering planned preventative maintenance, asset management, helpdesks, document management etc. to be rolled out in the medium term.
- 3.24 The Building and Services Unit has a key role in incident management and has procedures to deal with incidents. It is important that these are dovetailed with the University's Business Continuity Planning. It was not clear where this activity sits in the organisation and who was responsible for developing business impact assessments and individual unit plans in this regard – the University needs to review this. Responsibility for Health & Safety was also unclear in some areas where non Buildings and Services staff had control of maintenance and repairs and where the work was done by contractors (i.e. in user-controlled buildings). The Review Group recommends that an analysis be carried out to ensure that there is clarity and ownership of activities undertaken. This should include technical responsibility and quality control on high risk areas, plant or machinery - including the management of contractors and their compliance with regulations.
- 3.25 The Unit has the single highest level of influence on environmental and sustainable activities within the University. A coordinated approach to energy management and sustainability would help the University to improve its overall awareness of the sustainability agenda. A network of champions across the University would assist the Unit to drive through new measures of improved performance in these areas.

## **c. Functions and Activities**

### Commendations

- 4.1 UCD's energy unit has played a key role in the creation and adoption of best practice in energy management in recent time. The drive forwards of overall 'green' policies at international and national level provide UCD with a unique opportunity to develop its campus into a unique 'green campus' across a broader sustainability agenda. This would incorporate energy, commuting, waste, etc.
- 4.2 The professional and courteous manner in which the Buildings and Services helpdesks were managed was noted by the Review Group.
- 4.3 The Review Group noted and welcomed the Buildings and Services approach to 'Building Care'. It commended the completion of condition surveys and the targeting of resources to address key problem areas.
- 4.4 The Review Group commended the approach taken to put in place a comprehensive suite of computerised systems to support the work of the office.

### Recommendations

- 4.5 The Review Group recommends that Buildings and Services develop a robust set of procedures to help ensure consistency of approach in the delivery of services. There appears to be an over-reliance on personal relationships and methods of working. Standard operating procedures and systems need to be introduced for key activities where they are spread across different people and or locations.
- 4.6 The two distinct areas of responsibility within the Unit are capital and operations; capital works (which may or may not include minor work); and an operational section with responsibility for staff performance, maintenance contractor performance, PPM, breakdown, coordination of energy reduction and systems efficiencies with the energy team. The procedures governing the management of capital projects are outlined in the Capital Works Management Framework. This covers the appointment of consultants, contractors etc. Significant capital programmes present significant risk to the University. Large sums are involved and in addition to the financial risk, it is imperative that projects are meticulously planned and implemented. The Review Group also recommends strengthening the management of capital projects – from initiation to completion. It is suggested that a single unit within Buildings and Services takes responsibility for the capital programme as it is extremely difficult for managers with significant day-to-day operational responsibilities to focus on the significant challenges of managing capital projects. This unit would develop a consistent process for the delivery of projects ensuring the project briefs are well developed, all procedures are applied to achieve compliance with government procedures and that the necessary consultation process with end users, building operations, health & safety are completed.
- 4.7 The Review Group recommends that Buildings and Services review their current approach to the implementation of minor works projects. A simple procedure for the identification, costing approval and implementation would assist in the management of minor works projects. The procedure should

allow end users to clearly understand the process that applies and provide regular feedback and update of the status of individual minor works projects.

- 4.8 The process by which newer buildings are managed is commendable for user-operated buildings. The operation of these buildings is mostly controlled and funded by the local college or institute. This provides local service and cost transparency. The Facilities Managers do not report to the Director of Buildings and Services but to the local head of college/institute. The Review Group believes it is extremely important that the staff of Buildings and Services have full knowledge of the operation of the user-operated buildings and that, as a minimum, a formal communication network is established between the Buildings and Services management and staff and the Facilities Managers to ensure full compliance with all statutory obligations (health & safety, procurement etc.) and that a consistent and professional approach to the management of the overall University estate is guaranteed. The communication network should help ensure that 'best practice' is shared by all building professionals, that lessons are learned, and that best value for money is achieved in procuring services.
- 4.9 There was some criticism of the absence of an automated feedback loop from the helpdesk. The Review Group recommends that the feedback loop to end users for maintenance issues should be improved so that the person originating a maintenance issue is always apprised of its resolution. It is also recommended that an updated computerised helpdesk system is established to allow all requests to be logged, automatic emails generated, work requests generated, feedback provided on completion of tasks etc. A new system should allow trends to be analysed, KPIs established and to provide key management information to inform resource allocation etc.
- 4.10 The Review Group encourages Buildings and Services to continue its Building Care Programme and to develop a prioritised list of backlog maintenance, health & safety requirements, access improvements needed etc and to put in place, where possible, a multi-annual programme to improve the conditions of the estate in the short to medium term. The programme should prioritise relevant statutory requirements (e.g. Disability Act, Health & Safety Act etc).

#### **d. Management of Resources**

##### Commendations

- 5.1 The resources managed by the Building and Services Unit are diverse and each section requires a different style of management and time devoted to it. It is clear from our discussions that the staff feel that they have confidence in the management of the Unit and see it as high quality and at no time did we hear any negative comments about the management from staff within the Unit or the external stakeholders. The Unit has instigated many new initiatives and is part of programmes to improve energy management, space management and recognises that sustainability and capital management must be considered holistically.
- 5.2 There are good indicators that point to strong and competent management of resources these are:
- h. The capital programme appears to have no capital overruns and delivers on time and within budget

- i. The Unit consistently meets its budget
- j. The quality of the work carried out is of an acceptable quality and we were advised that staff were pleased with the results
- k. Staff appear hardworking, dedicated and responsive
- l. The grounds and landscaping are in excellent condition and provide an excellent first impression of the University
- m. There is a clear understanding that there is a need to improve management of space and, in particular, space utilisation information had been prepared to drive this forward
- n. There are good signs of a clear understanding by the Unit's senior management of the things that need to be done to manage a complex estate and where they want to improve

### Recommendations

- 5.3 The recommendations focus on the operation of the Unit and overall management of the University resources. It is difficult to disassociate the management of resources from discussion about value for money (VFM) and performance. The Review Group cannot make a judgment on VFM issues and performance – rather, the Review Group will identify process and system improvements that could help in the overall management of the estate. These in turn will support VFM initiatives. In order to demonstrate VFM and overall performance there is a need to record and analyse activities. Because the Unit appears to be under-supported by administrative and systems specialities it has not progressed sufficiently to provide information on KPIs and SLAs, both of which it is planning to develop and introduce. The introduction of new computing programmes and information systems will not necessarily increase VFM or performance. If the Unit wishes to introduce systems to deliver the changes recommended it is essential that value judgments reflecting on suitability and VFM are undertaken.
- 5.4 The following recommendations are based on the discussions with Unit staff and the reports they receive. They reflect on what the typical needs would be for a complex University with highly engineered facilities and a high volume of work tasks. Although the number of work tasks were less than 10,000 (the figure 7,240 was referred to in the Self-assessment Report), it was not clear from the figures that they included the user-operated buildings or work that was given directly to contractors or if they included the schedule of PPM works that was undertaken. The Review Group recommends:

#### *Internal resources*

- 5.5 The Unit should develop more management reports on performance and provide feedback to the managers, operators and stakeholders from the systems they currently operate, for example, to provide timely management data on outstanding works/tasks, repeat failures and record of actions taken, by whom and when.
- 5.6 The Review Group recommends that the Unit should develop meaningful KPIs for each section of the Unit based on what would help them to identify how well they are doing and provide appropriate management reports. Some

areas may not warrant any appropriate KPIs and unless useful they should not be developed.

- 5.7 Task management should be linked with risk assessments and provide alerts to relevant staff or contractors on health & safety issues by room and location. This would ensure that there is a robust system that minimises risk and health & safety issues.

### *Contract Management*

- 5.8 It was evident that a significant amount of tasks were outsourced and a number of similar contractors were on site at any one time. Some work had been undertaken to rationalise the lifts contract which has been successful (however not fully inclusive as the Students Centre had a different lift contractor). It is felt that a review of the procurement process to rationalise the number of contracts could be beneficial, in particular on tendering maintenance contracts, small new works and minor works. The review should consider the advantages and disadvantages of facilitating opt-outs by units such as the Student Centre. The Review Group recommends that the Unit develop a procurement plan to ensure best value for money from all contracted services. KPIs relating to the management of contractors and value for money would help demonstrate performance. If the volume of new works and minor repairs was high then the introduction of Frameworks may help to improve delivery.
- 5.9 It was felt that some contractors did not see the students as customers and communication between the contractors, University staff and students was strained on occasions. The Review Group strongly recommends that robust disciplinary procedures are in place to deal with all transgressions of contractors, staff and students. Front line staff can be at risk if they are not protected by robust governance.
- 5.10 The Review Group recommends that it would be beneficial to introduce post occupancy evaluations of contracts to identify successful, good and bad elements in the delivery of major capital projects and be part of the continuous, improvement, commissioning and learning initiative.

### *Project Management*

- 5.11 The different styles of project management need to be replaced with one common method of delivery. A simple process and project management guide for all those involved with a capital project which clearly sets out roles and expectations would be beneficial, for example for the role of the Energy Manager, Health & Safety Officer, operations and maintenance personnel etc. This would help manage the internal resources of both the Buildings and Services Unit and its client departments.
- 5.12 From discussions with clients and staff, the Review Group were under the impression that there was no common format to the record management of projects. If this is correct, it would be beneficial to introduce a common process and a structured organised record management system for all capital works and minor projects.

## *Space management*

- 5.13 The Review Group recommends that UCD should coordinate its room booking and space utilisation policies. The system should be user friendly (student interface) and, if possible, all rooms should be in a central booking system. Poor management of space leads to inefficient developments and severe negative opportunity costs. It was not clear to the Review Group and to staff and students who was responsible for room bookings. Students felt that advance block booking prevented them using space which was, in fact, free. Room utilisation figures should be reviewed to ensure maximum usage. The Review Group recommends that a standard policy should be implemented regarding booking of rooms by students/student clubs. This should aim to enable bookings to be confirmed at the time they are made. If this is not possible, then Services should provide subsequent confirmation rather than requesting the student to return at a later date to verify whether the booking has been made. If possible, the policy should allow bookings to be made by phone, email or web rather than requiring the student to attend the desk in person.
- 5.14 The Review Group recommends that space utilisation and auditing policies need to be put in place across all colleges and units (including support units) and simple KPIs produced to demonstrate performance. Although there were initiatives underway to develop and implement space management processes within the colleges, it is important that the University has a coordinated approach and each unit is treated appropriately. Failure to have a University approach may have a divisive impact. The Unit should continue to identify international best practice in asset management and to communicate clear policies to users.

## **e. User Perspectives**

### Commendations

- 6.5 Many users made a point of stressing the commitment and responsiveness of Buildings and Services staff.
- 6.6 In general, a large majority of survey respondents rated the various aspects of Buildings and Services as 'Adequate' or 'Good'.

### Recommendations

- 6.7 There appears to be an inconsistency between the services provided by different service desks. This may partly be due to the fact that some of them are operated by Services staff, some by user-operated buildings staff and some by a combination. But this is not the only factor. While local circumstances may require variations in the level of service, the Review Group recommends that a common minimum set of services be provided at each desk and that the services available at each desk be clearly communicated at that desk.
- 6.8 A variety of service 'brands' are used by the Buildings and Services Unit (Buildings and Services, Buildings Office, Services, First Response, Unicare, E3, The Energy Bureau). The Review Group recommends that the number and purpose of brands be reviewed and consolidated. Efforts should then be undertaken to clearly communicate to users what services are provided.

- 6.9 There is an 'untapped market' for energy saving initiatives. The awareness of the existing energy saving initiatives is lower than would be expected and can be improved with clear, focussed communication. The student body could be very active energy saving champions and would benefit from deeper and broader engagement (See also recommendation 3.25 regarding placing Energy Saving in a broader Sustainability context).
- 6.10 Designated liaison staff ('go to' people) within the user community in each building would help communication and provide improvements both for the user community and for Buildings and Services. Such staff would deal with operational affairs rather than (or in addition to) policy issues or more strategic issues.
- 6.11 In discussions with representatives from user-operated buildings and students, it emerged that there appears to be a need for a more coordinated and interactive approach to event management. The Review Group recommends that the Unit set up an event co-ordination system to oversee annual planning of events and to ensure that event organisers have access to this information on a regular basis (not just an event listing).
- 6.12 Energy charging via the RAM has helped to incentivise energy saving and has also provided more transparent information to users. Closer integration of IT Services information and Buildings and Services information could facilitate accurate charging for IT infrastructure in a building by charging those occupying the space and, thereby, providing similar benefits for IT Charging via the University Resource Allocation Model.

**UCD Buildings and Services Response to the Review Group Report**

We welcome the report as the culmination of a very useful and constructive process. The self assessment prompted us to consider our activities and to identify areas of good practice as well as aspects which were considered to need attention.

The resulting recommendations are in line with our internal review and provide us with very good content for our Quality Improvement Programme.



## Site Visit Schedule

### UCD Buildings and Services

Monday, 27 April – Thursday, 30 April 2009

#### Monday, 27 April 2009

##### Pre-Visit Briefing Prior to Site Visit

- 17.30-19.00 Review Group and Director of Quality ***only*** meet to review preliminary issues and to confirm work schedule and assignment of tasks for the following two days.
- 19.30 Review Group and Director of Quality ***only*** - Dinner hosted by UCD Registrar and Deputy President

#### Tuesday, 28 April 2009

##### Oval Room, Belfield House

- 08.45-09.30 Private meeting of Review Group
- 09.30-10.15 Review Group meet with **Vice-President for Capital and Commercial Development**
- 10.15-10.30 Coffee Break
- 10.30-11.20 Review Group meet with **Head of Buildings and Services**
- 11.20-11.30 Break
- 11.30-12.30 **Meeting with Buildings and Services Management Team**
- 12.30-12.40 Break
- 12.40-13.00 **Meeting with Energy Unit**
- 13.00-14.00 **Working lunch for Review Group** (including brief discussion with Director of Quality, if required)
- 14.00-17.30 Meetings with **representative selection of stakeholder groups**
- 14.00-14.40 **Academic Staff**
- 14.40-14.50 Break
- 14.50-15.35 **Student Interface**

15.35-15.50	Coffee
15.50-16.35	<b>Central Support Unit Staff</b>
16.35-16.45	Break
16.45-17.30	<b>User Operated Buildings</b>
17.30-18.00	Private meeting of Review Group
18.00	Review Group departs

**Wednesday, 29 April 2009**  
**Oval Room, UCD Belfield House**

08.30-09.00	Private meeting of Review Group
09.00-9.30	Meeting with <b>Self-assessment Review Co-ordinating Committee</b>
09.30- 09.35	Break
09.35-13.00	Meetings with <b>functional groups from Buildings and Services</b>
09.35-10.10	<b>Building Operations</b>
10.10-10.15	Break
10.15-10.30	<b>Commuting</b>
10.30-10.50	Coffee
10.50-11.25	<b>Planning, Capital, Projects</b>
11.25-11.30	Break
11.30-12.05	<b>Technical Services</b>
12.05-12.10	Break
12.10-12.25	<b>Voice Services</b>
12.25-12.30	Break
12.30-13.00	<b>Help desk / MIS</b>
13.00-1400	Working lunch for Review Group (including brief discussion with Director of Quality, if required)
14.00-15.15	Meeting with <b>individual staff</b> – by request to the Quality Office (10 minute sessions)
15.15-15.30	Coffee Break

- 15.30-15.50 Meeting with **HR Partner**
- 15.50-16.15 Meeting with **Head of Buildings and Services**, (and other staff, as appropriate) to clarify any outstanding issues
- 16.15-17.30 **Tour of facilities** with Head of Buildings and Services and transfer to Hotel (Schedule at Appendix 3)
- 17.30 Review Group departs

**Thursday, 30 April 2009**  
**Oval Room, UCD Belfield House**

- 08.45-10.15 Review Group prepare first draft of Review Group Report and extract key provisional points of commendation and recommendations for improvement for exit presentation
- 10.15-10.30 Coffee Break
- 10.30-13.00 Review Group continue to prepare first draft of Review Group Report and extract key provisional points of commendation and recommendations for improvement for exit presentation
- 13.00-13.45 Lunch
- 13.45-15.00 Review Group finalise first draft of RG Report and exit presentation. Exit presentation made by extern(s) members (or other member of RG, as agreed) – and confirm arrangements for Report completion and deadline
- 15.00-15.15 Break
- 15.15-15.35 Review Group appraise **Head of Buildings and Services** of Exit Presentation
- 15.35-15.45 Transfer to venue for Exit Presentation all available staff of the unit

**Venue: Q015, UCD Quinn School**

- 16.00-16.30 **Exit presentation** to all available staff of the Unit
- 16.45 Review Group Departs

**Schedule for Tour of Facilities**

**Buildings and Services**

**Wednesday, 29 April 2009**

*Indicative Start Time*

- 16.15 Tour of Buildings and Services, Belfield House  
Reception – Energy Unit - Offices West Wing - Offices East Wing
- 16.30 Transport Pick-up – Main Entrance, Belfield House by John Free, Traffic and  
Commuting Manager
- Drive towards N11 entrance –Tree Relocation Programme  
Drive by O'Reilly Hall and Veterinary Hospital and onto Campus Bank  
Disembark and walk to Newman Building
- 16.40 Theatre L – Teaching Technology Programme and Air Handling Upgrade  
Programme
- Walk to Research Administration
- 16.50 Research Administration
- Walk to CSCB
- 17.00 CSCB – Science A1 Laboratory – Science Hub – Science West – Health  
Sciences
- 17.15 Health Sciences Library
- 17.20 Transport Pick-up to Energy Centre
- 17.30 Energy Centre
- 17.40 Depart Energy Centre to Hotel via N11