UNIVERSITY COLLEGE CORK
NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND, CORK

QUALITY IMPROVEMENT/QUALITY ASSURANCE

PEER REVIEW GROUP REPORT

OFFICE OF BUILDINGS & ESTATES

ACADEMIC YEAR 2010/2011

Date 30th May 2011

Name	Position/Discipline	Institution
Mr Angus Currie (Chair)	Director, of Estates & Buildings	University of Edinburgh, Scotland
Mr. Paul Mangan	Director of Buildings	Trinity College Dublin
Mr John O'Callaghan	Member of Governing Body	University College Cork
Mr Éamonn Sweeney (Rapporteur)	Advisor to the President	University College Cork

TIMETABLE OF THE SITE VISIT

A detailed timetable is presented as Appendix A of this report. During the review period the Peer Review Group (PRG) met the following groups:

- Staff of Office of Buildings and Estates
- UCC students
- UCC staff
- Representatives of external stakeholders
- Senior University Officers
- The President of UCC
- At the request of the PRG a meeting with senior representatives of the Department of Human Resources was included at very short notice and the PRG expressed its gratitude at the accommodations made.

Overall, the PRG deemed the timetable to be suitable and appropriate for the purpose of the site visit. It was however regrettable that two Senior Officers who were timetabled to see the PRG failed to attend the scheduled appointment.

PEER REVIEW

Methodology

The members of the PRG acted as a team throughout the site visit. The PRG appointed Mr. Angus Currie as Chair of the Group and Mr Eamonn Sweeney as Rapporteur. The PRG received the Self Assessment Report (SAR) well in advance of the site visit and additional documentation was provided during the site visit immediately upon request.

Where necessary in order to meet with staff from the Office of Buildings and Estates the group divided into two. Each sub group ensured that a full exchange of experience was

shared in the subsequent discussions. An initial draft of the report was prepared during the afternoon and evening of the second day of the site visit and was finalised via email communications following the site visit. All members of the PRG agreed to the final report which was submitted to the Quality Promotion Unit.

Site Visit

The PRG was very satisfied with the site visit which included a visit to key facilities of the Office of Buildings and Estates and a tour of the Campus.

OVERALL ANALYSIS

Self-Assessment Report

The PRG considered the SAR to be a comprehensive, well prepared, well-structured and objective document. The appropriate supporting appendices gave a comprehensive overview of the Office. The PRG generally agreed with and accepted that the analysis and the majority of recommendations contained in the report were appropriate and timely.

Without exception, all of the representatives from the wider University community that the PRG met acknowledged the commitment and contribution of the Buildings and Estates Office staff to the work of the University, frequently working under considerable pressure and resource constraint to deliver essential services and quality developments.

SWOT Analysis

It was the view of the PRG that the SWOT analysis was balanced, realistic and candid. The tiered approach to the development of the SWOT analysis by each of the units within the Office of Buildings and Estates was commended as was the high level of engagement of all staff in the preparation for the review and the actual review process.

The SWOT analysis involved all staff of Office of Buildings and Estates and each unit within Office of Buildings and Estates were very serious in their approach to the process of undertaking the analysis. The culmination of this was in the combined analysis carried out by the senior managers from the Office of Buildings and Estates. The PRG was pleased that all sections of the Office of Buildings and Estates contributed in a very meaningful manner to the preparation of the SWOT.

The PRG was cognisant of the issues identified in the SWOT analysis and noted that these are reflected in the recommendations proposed in the SAR.

Benchmarking

The PRG was of the view that the work on benchmarking and analysis was comprehensive, succinct, professionally presented and gave a good overview of the estate, finance and resources. The PRG noted the engagement with Estate Management Statistics service and the work carried out by the independent advisor. The PRG noted that the benchmarking exercise related to the period 2007/2008 and was of the view that given the dramatic change to the financial environment in the intervening period that it would have been beneficial to update elements of the benchmarking exercise. In addition, the PRG recommended that the benchmarking exercise could have benefited from benchmarking against peer review amongst Irish institutions, especially between comparable buildings types given the extensive building programme in recent years, although it noted that such data is not readily available.

FINDINGS OF THE PEER REVIEW GROUP

Unit Details

The PRG were satisfied with the details provided on the unit structure and given the prevailing financial climate noted that there will be a need to ensure a careful approach to sustainability of staff levels and skill mix. The PRG noted the large number of managerial staff who have been in 'acting' roles for several years and this should continue to be monitored. This is addressed in the Recommendations.

Unit Planning and Organisation

The PRG noted that the Office of Buildings and Estates is structured along traditional lines and consistent with best practice within the University sector. The only areas identified for improvement by Office of Buildings and Estates and endorsed by PRG, subject to funding priority, were the issue of co-location of staff in certain units of the Office of Buildings and Estates, and optimising the use of existing systems

The PRG noted the review was conducted in isolation from a number of services within the University upon which the Office of Buildings and Estates relies, e.g. the Computer Centre, Finance Office and the Department of Human Resources. As a consequence a number of recommendations contained in this report will rely on co-operation with these units for successful implementation.

Client/User Groups for the Unit

The Office of Buildings and Estates interacts with all academic and support units within UCC, and also has considerable engagement with local community groups, local authorities, external suppliers, contractors, consultants and visitor groups.

The Office of Buildings and Estates conducted a survey of the different stakeholder groups with whom they interact. The PRG noted that a number of focus meetings were also arranged by the Office of Buildings and Estates with a number of internal and external stakeholder groups to complement the surveys conducted.

Service Standards

Samples of draft 'Service Level Agreements' were included in the SAR. The PRG acknowledged the existence of draft Service Level Agreements for most services, however, the PRG recommended that the Office of Buildings and Estates finalise a clear base service level specification for all services and specifically for cleaning services at UCC. It was noted that the tendering process for cleaning services at UCC has commenced as part of a sectoral tender exercise and it was the view of the PRG that the Office of Buildings and Estates should be closely involved in this process and use the tender specification to inform the base service level. The PRG also noted that formal monitoring of the delivery of the cleaning contract is essential and acknowledged that this could present a resource challenge that could perhaps be priced into the annual cost of the new contract to ensure value for money and that a consistent service is delivered across UCC.

The PRG recommended that a clearly defined base service standard should be defined by the Office of Buildings and Estates for all services and that the Office of Buildings and Estates should give consideration, and engage with senior management, to how departments and units can pay directly for services beyond that base line service provision. The PRG noted the variability of the quality of the current cleaning service provision.

Staff Development

The PRG noted the need to develop a more coordinated and strategic approach to staff development and succession planning within the Office of Buildings and Estates and that the second round of the UCC staff appraisal and development system should be implemented and maintained across all staff within the Office of Buildings and Estates. This would assist in identification and agreement on personal development plans and in turn an overall training plan for Buildings and Estates that is costed and prioritised. HR assistance should be sought with this initiative.

Unit Budget

The PRG observed a clear process for budget allocation and agreement. The PRG noted that the timing of the allocation inhibits strategic planning and short annual cycles of budget allocation makes strategic planning for estates difficult. Targeting of multi-annual budgets would greatly facilitate planning and prioritisation of works to be completed.

The PRG noted that the Office of Buildings and Estates core budget is supplemented by funding from project budgets which are unpredictable and subject to short range opportunity. This requires an ability to respond to such opportunities as they arise.

Unit Co-ordinating Committee & Methodology employed in the preparation of the Self-Assessment Report

The PRG considered the SAR to be a comprehensive, well prepared, well-structured and objective document, and that considerable value was added to the process by the use of an external facilitator in developing the SWOT.

Governance

The PRG suggested re-visiting the membership of Space Sub-Committee, to include a representative of the University's Support Services. It was noted from the UCC management organogram that the Director of the Office of Buildings and Estates reports to the Vice President Operations, however, this post has not yet been filled. Consequently the Director of the Office of Buildings and Estates reports directly to the President and this is clearly beneficial to the Office of Buildings and Estates in determining their role and significance of the physical infrastructure to the University.

Services

The PRG noted the close relationship between the Office of Buildings and Estates and the Finance Office, the Department of Human Resources, the Procurement Office, the Computer Centre and the Office of the Corporate & Legal Affairs.

PRG was encouraged to hear that a dedicated finance resource will be made available to the Office of Buildings and Estates in the very near future. This will facilitate a single point of contact covering both recurrent and capital components. The PRG commended the assignment of a dedicated HR partner to B&E and this will assist in addressing issues arising from implementation of the Croke Park agreement and the training and development needs for staff of Office of Buildings and Estate.

The PRG supports the availability of professional procurement resource to assist Office of Buildings and Estates in managing estate and accommodation. The PRG was encouraged to see evidence of opportunity emerging for increased utilisation of an e-tendering system for commodities, projects and services.

Department of Human Resources

It will be essential that Department of Human Resources provides support and guidance with respect to implementation of a more rigorous performance assessment and management system and development of more structured training plans for all staff.

Computer Centre

Whilst acknowledging the aspiration of the Office of Buildings and Estates to investigate a single IT system for the Office of Buildings and Estates, due to current financial constraints, the PRG recommended a focus on optimising use of the existing systems. The PRG noted the need to work closely with the Computer Department and other key business partners in Finance Office and HR Department in relation to this area. The PRG identified the need to review and align the IT infrastructure requirements with the Office of Buildings and Estates infrastructure, including; IT network infrastructure, smart card technology, access control and telephony services.

Office of Corporate and Legal Affairs:

The PRG noted the recent change in the reporting line for the Health and Safety function at UCC and the need for the Corporate Secretary to continue to monitor compliance with health and safety legislation.

Staffing

PRG noted the impact of the HEA Employment Control Framework, namely, that a number of vacancies have not been filled and are unlikely to be filled in the near future. This matter needs to be monitored closely especially with a view to skill mix and sustainability of service provision by the Office of Buildings and Estates. A large number of posts within the Office of Buildings and Estates are currently filled in an acting capacity. The uncertainty surrounding the permanent filling of these posts represents a significant risk to successful business continuity and service delivery. Notwithstanding these matters the PRG considers there is a need to review the skills set within the Office of Buildings and Estates with a view to consolidation of activities for the medium term.

Accommodation

The PRG recognised the inefficiencies resulting because of split facilities and lack of a dedicated meeting room. The PRG were impressed by the new Trades accommodation and Workshops facility.

Financing

The PRG noted the as yet untapped opportunity for the Office of Buildings and Estates to investigate their relationship with wholly owned UCC companies with a view to recovery of costs for services rendered and a corporate policy view needs to be considered. In reaching a

view on this matter a corporate view should also be taken on whether or not academic and other departments can procure enhanced service levels from the Office of Buildings and Estates.

Communications

Internal and external communications featured significantly in the SAR and the PRG has made recommendations for a more comprehensive communications strategy to be developed and implemented.

In addition it was noted that there was some dissatisfaction at the access to corporate communications for some sectors of staff. This should be remedied.

Implementation of recommendations for improvement made in Peer Review Group Report arising from last quality review

The PRG noted that significant progress has been made in implementing the recommendations of the last Quality Review, as indicated in appendix H and I. The PRG welcomed the commitment to implementation by the Director of the Office of Buildings and Estates and his staff. Appendix H and I presents a comprehensive review of progress against the recommendations of the previous Quality Review. Many are satisfactorily completed and some continue to be worked on.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Recommendations for improvement made by the unit.

SAR Recommendations	PRG Comments/Suggestions
Carried forward recommendations	
Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) - Currently University level KPI's provided to Director of Planning & Institutional Research as required. Further KPI's are being compiled across all services.	Should there be a KPI on income per sq m as a benchmark business metric against best national and international performance?
IT systems- IT systems currently in place include -Shared Folder System -Space database/ warehouse - Helpdesk System (Realtime FM) -Financial Management (Agresso) -Timetabling system (Syllabus +) - HRIS system (Core) The outsourced maintenance contracts include information on planned preventative maintenance. It is proposed to review the cost/benefit of a single IT solution for all Buildings & Estates services.	Is this realistic in present economic situations? Acknowledge it is an aspiration? Requires significant resource in B&E and UCC centre. In the current financial climate why undertake process? Defer review until economic climate improves and focus meantime on maximising existing systems with business partners.

General Recommendations

	Recommendation	PRG Comment/recommendation
1.	Review the existing internal communication and consultation channels and put in place opportunities for all staff to discuss and contribute to the development of the overall estate strategy.	Output from review should be an agreed a communication strategy map. There is a clear need for improvement in the internal communication structure especially in dealing with operational matters. Propose bi-annual meetings for all staff to

		Recommendation	PRG Comment/recommendation
			discuss all issues
			Examine different media for communication - paper, website, meetings.
			Need for 2-way flow of information.
			Recommend that the Office of Buildings and Estates investigate the possibility of increasing access to electronic information for all staff of Office of Buildings and Estates
			Encourage cascade of information from top down with team briefing type network.
			Suggest a monthly 'blog' from senior managers on website on monthly basis also facilitates feedback.
			Recommend that there needs to be a specific regular communication forum for relevant colleagues on small works, maintenance and general services- will assist coordination of operations, maintenance and project activities
2.		Improve external communication through the development of a regular e-newsletter.	Endorsed Include as part of the communications strategy. Recommend that corporate communications are summarised and made more accessible to all staff groups.
3.		Work with Human Resources to address the uncertainty associated with existing non permanent contracts.	Endorsed.
4.		Undertake an annual review *with other services providers* of the breadth of facilities management services provided by the Buildings & Estates Office	Endorsed This activity may be constrained within an era of diminishing resources?
5.		Improve the transparency of information associated with the space allocation process in conjunction with the space subcommittee.	Endorsed Recommends the membership of the Space Sub-committee be reviewed especially with regard to support areas. A representative of Students' Union should be in attendance for appropriate items. Recommends information on space allocated be made available to staff in UCC as required and in line with the resource allocation model. Recommends that the minutes of the Space Sub-Committee are published and available to the University community.

		Recommendation	PRG Comment/recommendation
6.		Improve existing work practices and build stronger co-operation and efficiencies at an operational level in line with the "Croke Park" agreement.	Endorsed. Clarification of this should assist in dealing with operational demarcation issues.
7.		The Buildings & Estates Office uses a mix of in-house/ outsourced services. It is proposed to keep this under review in line with the provisions of the "Croke Park" agreement.	Endorsed. Keep under review – assess regularly the benefits regardless of Croke Park agreement. All opportunities should be taken to optimise services Recommends undertaking a cost benefit analysis with the assistance of the Finance Office partner and also clarify VAT situation.
8.		Consider integration of the existing Buildings & General Services helpdesk and put in place a mechanism to achieve greater feedback on satisfaction levels.	Endorsed. This should be prioritised, with a clear vision as to what is expected of the helpdesk, with staff training included as part of the package.
9.		Work with HR to enhance existing training provision in line with emerging needs.	Endorsed. This needs to be integrated with a more rigorous approach to implementation of the Performance Management and Development System and develop training plans for individuals and an overall B&E Office plan.
10.		In conjunction with HR seek to strengthen the financial analysis, procurement and cost management skills in the Buildings & Estates Office to ensure value for money across all services delivered.	Endorsed Supports the recommendation to improve skills working with expertise available in-house through the creation of tailored courses with Finance and Procurement Offices.
11.		Continue to seek investment levels in the fabric of the Estate in line with International norms	Endorsed. Ensure information on maintenance and compliance need is kept up-to-date and presented for senior corporate consideration at least annually. The reality will be that the funds for maintenance and compliance will be constrained in future years. The PRG notes that it will be necessary to acquire funds for upgrades of buildings to sustain acceptable infrastructure standards. A clear link between estate and finance strategies would be helpful.
12.		Adopt the Draft Service Level Agreement and agree service levels with individual colleges.	Endorsed subject to very clear base service levels being established for all services. Endorsed conclusion of work on SLA to set a

	Recommendation	PRG Comment/recommendation
		baseline for the institution.
		Clarify the procedure for locally enhanced and funded service level agreements.
		Use the opportunity of the new cleaning contract to reset the SLA and introduce formal monitoring, funded as part the contract.
13.	Complete update of the Buildings & Estates Emergency Plan and work with Office of Corporate and Legal Affairs in the development of the overall Business Continuity Plan.	Endorsed.
14.	Continue to develop the University's Green Campus Agenda in conjunction with the academic and student body.	Endorsed. The PRG commended the work of the B&E Office on this agenda

Capital Projects Recommendations

	Recommendation	PRG Comment
1.	Request Computer Centre to undertake a review of procedures and in particular access protocols, tracking etc for data held by CPO on the server (Naspilot).	Endorsed
2.	Review with the Director and Buildings Officer the office configuration and public access	Endorsed. subject to funding availability
3.	Deliver a dedicated secure meeting room for exclusive use of the Director/Capital Projects Office/Buildings Office	Endorsed, subject to funding availability
4.	Consolidate the office by locating all Capital Projects Office staff in single location	Endorsed. subject to funding availability
5.	Continue to pursue the appointment of a Assistant Capital Projects Officer	Noted and should be reviewed in the context of future capital funding programmes and the most recent HEA Employment Control Frameworks. Also consider the level of capital programme moving forward and possible move to more smaller value projects. If this appointment proceeds, avail of the opportunity to expand the skills set in the department.
6.	Develop a managed access website to increase efficiency and manage tracking of tender	Endorsed To be implemented in conjunction with

	Recommendation	PRG Comment
	documentation for Consultant appointments	the Procurement Office. Should apply to all B&E procurement activities and documentation. Development of improved e-tendering processes would facilitate this.
7.	UCC is a leader in Ireland in its commuter plan. The opportunity exists to build on this and further strengthen its position through a process of continued innovation in service delivery. Seek support and additional funding from outside UCC for such innovations (eg. Smarter Travel). UCC's position can be further strengthened though continuous external dissemination in peer groups.	Endorsed. The PRG commended achievements to date.
8.	Develop panel/framework for contractors for various project sizes	Endorsed. Suggest it should be done in partnership with Procurement Office.

Buildings Recommendations

	Recommendation	PRG Comment
9.	Build on our achievement in being the 1st University to be awarded a "Green flag" & achieve formal environmental accreditation.	Endorsed. The PRG commended achievements to date.
10.	Increase promotion of energy efficiency by wider engagement with staff/students. Build on our progress in implementing energy efficiency measures and our success in securing SEAI funding.	Endorsed
11.	Complete a formal tree management plan including detail survey of existing stock, a comprehensive maintenance plan and development of our own stock of replacement trees.	Endorsed
12.	Re design of our waste management facilities on Campus and additional focus on re-cycling, food waste and sustainable usage.	Endorsed Encourage these activities in context of a defined set of targets
13.	Develop electronic way-finding facilities on Campus, to facilitate navigation by persons with sight difficulties and as a method of promoting UCC to prospective students and as a tourist resource.	Assess prioritisation of this recommendation in current financial climate Noted and request focus on compliance related priorities.

	Recommendation	PRG Comment
		Recommendation: direct liaison with Student Disability Support Office.
14.	Build on our strengths of in-house staff and retention of current core staff and high maintenance standards based on the meeting the University's requirement for Infrastructure Services.	Endorsed. Recommends Office works with HR to develop a sustainable staffing plan for Office of B&E and links with individual PMDS reviews.
15.	Clarify work practices with SSO's in order to resolve delivery of collaborative tasks.	Noted Work with HR and cross reference to general recommendation above
16.	Discuss the "communication with Buildings Office staff" requirement & develop improved dissemination of information and reports including general circulation of portions of the Buildings Office monthly report.	Noted Cross reference to earlier recommendation in general section
17.	Consider how to increase role of the Helpdesk, especially relating to customer feedback.	Noted Cross reference to earlier recommendation in general section
18.	Improve training, especially in - Energy - Environment - Leadership at Foreperson/Supervisor level - Re –familiarisation training at Craft level	Endorsed There is a requirement to undertake an analysis of specific craft training requirement as well as general training
19.	Review job titles of Buildings Team Management Staff	Noted. Recommends that this should be undertaken in conjunction with Department of Human Resources
20.	Promote Increased use of new IT technologies to enhance work efficiencies	Endorsed Recommendation that the Office investigate use of handheld devices
21.	Complete revision of SOP for managing small works.	Endorsed. Check for alignment with procedures for major capital projects including commissioning and handover and adjust to be proportionate for small works. Also review definitions of "major" and "small" works

General Services recommendations

	Recommendation	**PRG comment**
22.	Upgrade IT facilities to facilitate automated rostering and payroll procedures.	Endorsed but recognised need to prioritise along with other IT projects identified. Recommend the establishment of a joint working group with IT to review and optimise existing systems
23.	Upgrade CCTV & communication facilities on main campus to address shortcomings in security and traffic management facilities.	Endorsed PRG understands this project is close to conclusion
24.	Improve cross communication to avoid potential conflicts relating to work allocation and to create greater efficiencies.	Link to earlier recommendation on strategy.
25.	Use opportunities arising from cleaning contract tendering process to implement improvements and efficiencies.	Recommend that the Buildings and Estates Office ensures that the new contract accurately reflects need within the University Clarify base service level specification and identify owner of cleaning contract Establish monitoring system across UCC to ensure contract is delivered. In awarding contract ensure the overall cost includes the cost of monitoring the contract
26.	Address issues and challenges brought about by reduced staffing.	Endorsed. Opportunity should be availed of to plan a structure for the future, building from existing structure and skill mix.
27.	Address ongoing training needs in relation to IT updates, Health & Safety, emergency response procedure and customer service.	Endorsed. Suggest the Office of Buildings and Estates liaise with other relevant departments in UCC with respect to emergency response procedures and noting the need to ensure cooperation and liaison with office of Corporate and Legal Affairs in relation to the emergency plan.

Western Campus Facilities Management Recommendations

	Recommendation	PRG Comment
28.	Establish a communication forum with Main Campus Engineering section to share project information and lessons learned.	Endorsed. This should also link with the earlier communication recommendations on a regular forum for operations, maintenance and small works.
29.	Establish a Western Gateway Building web page on the main B&E website.	Endorsed
30.	Improve coverage of First Aid personnel through a training program for SSOs.	Noted. Recommend that any programme should be carried out in conjunction with medical services and in line with approved policies.
31.	The Western Campus FM team is complemented with contract staff, - this needs to be reviewed annually to ensure cost and service efficiencies are maintained.	Recommendation endorsed noting it needs to be analysed in context of additional requirement in Western Gateway Building Concern re sustainability of small team and risk of losing staff from existing cohort, together with additional space coming on line.
32.	Improve communication on energy usage and set targets for building users.	Endorsed Referred to earlier
33.	Pursue the green campus agenda with projects that will enhance our image.	Endorsed
34.	Initiate formal succession planning for key personnel within the boundaries of current economic constraints.	Endorsed
35.	Benchmark the Western Campus operational costs against Main Campus and similar Irish Universities.	Endorsed. Suggested it is benchmarked against comparable new buildings on Campus and with peer institutions.

Heritage Recommendations

	Recommendation	PRG Comment/Recommendation
36.	Develop online data-base of curatorial collections.	Endorsed
37.	Seek opportunities for distributed display of heritage items in existing buildings and new	Endorsed

	Recommendation	PRG Comment/Recommendation
	developments.	
38.	Work with Marketing & Communication etc on promotion of major anniversaries etc.	Endorsed In addition recommend that the B&E Office liaises with the Office of VP External Relations to develop the recognition of UCC as a tourist site.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT MADE BY THE PEER REVIEW GROUP

In addition to the commentary and consideration of the recommendations made by B&E in the SAR the PRG would like to make the following recommendations:

PRG Recommendations

1. That the Office of Buildings and Estates prioritise all recommendations and convert into a three year Quality Improvement plan

2. That a review of the IP telephony infrastructure be carried out with a view to identifying a potential cost-saving replacement to the existing telephony infrastructure at UCC.

3. That the Estate, Environment and Heritage Advisory Committee consider the IT support required to enhance heritage activities at UCC.

4. That room rates and the policy regarding charges, particularly with regards alumni events, be reviewed to ensure maximum utilisation of the resource.

5. That a project to review off-site storage facilities and opportunities for cooperation and development of shared services storage facilities be undertaken incorporating estates, IT, Library, individual academic depts. and possible external partners.

6. That there is a need to review existing provision and, as required, make provision for long-term storage of archival materials.

7. That the long term viability of open access PC labs be reviewed with a view to the potential development of increased and more flexible spaces for postgraduates.

8. That the Office of Buildings and Estates management team explore the potential for greater alignment of small works and capital development works teams as the balance of the development programme changes in coming years

9. That the Office of Buildings and Estates implement a policy for charging and full cost recovery from UCC wholly owned companies for project development and management.

10. That income generating activities be formally identified across the range of services provided by the Office of Buildings and Estates and a corporate policy is agreed on recovering costs from academic and service units where enhanced service levels are agreed.

11. That the Office of Buildings and Estates initiate a formal mechanism through which UMTO/S be informed reliably of plans in relation to estate planning and staffing issues within the Office of Buildings and Estates

12. That closer formal links be developed with the Procurement Office across the full range of B&E purchasing, including Green procurement and liaison with the NPS (national procurement service).

13. That the Office of Buildings and Estates should consider options for increasing opening hours based on identifying a suitable funding model supported by corporate policy.

14. That the Space Subcommittee should be encouraged to identify additional accommodation for graduate students at UCC.

15. That the Office of Buildings and Estates in conjunction with the Computer Centre review the IT infrastructure requirements into the future.

16. Recommend putting in place a forum for overview of an integrated IT and physical estate infrastructure strategy.

17. That the Office of Buildings and Estates establish formal mechanisms for project prioritisation and integration and transparency of decision making.

18. Having regard to the current economic conditions affecting the financial viability of contractors, that the Office of Buildings and Estates address carefully financial criteria and costing prior to shortlisting and appointment of contractors.

19. That the Office of Buildings and Estates conclude work with Cork City Council on the updated development plan and thereafter establish a forum with CCC and other external stakeholders on impact of works on local and regional areas.

20. That the Office of Buildings and Estates work with internal and external stakeholders to maximise the potential tourism opportunities offered by the university campus.

Appendix A

BUILDINGS & ESTATES

PEER REVIEW GROUP SITE VISIT
TIMETABLE

In Summary

Monday 4 April:	The Peer Review Group (PRG) arrives at the River Lee Hotel for a briefing from the Director of the Quality Promotion Unit, followed by an informal meeting with staff from Building & Estates.
Tuesday 5 April:	The PRG considers the Self-Assessment Report and meet with Building & Estates staff and stakeholder representatives. A working private dinner is held that evening for the PRG.
Wednesday 6 April:	The PRG meets with relevant officers of UCC. An exit presentation is given by the PRG to all members of Buildings & Estates. A working private dinner is held that evening for the PRG in order to finalise the report. This is the final evening of the review.
Thursday 7 April:	External PRG members depart.

Monday 4 April 2010	
16.00	Meeting of members of the Peer Review Group Briefing by Director of Quality Promotion Unit, Dr. Norma Ryan. Group agrees final work schedule and assignment of tasks for the following 2 days. Views are exchanged and areas to be clarified or explored are identified.
19.00	Informal dinner for members of the Peer Review Group, Head of Office of Buildings & Estates and members of the B&E Steering Co-ordinating Group. Mr. Eamonn Connaughton, Brookfield Facilities Manager Ms. Evelyn Conway, Administrative Officer – Buildings & Estates Mr. Niall McAuliffe, Capital Projects Officer Ms. Michelle McCarthy, Buildings Office Mr. Michael McCormack, General Services Officer Mr. Mark Poland, Director Buildings & Estates Mr. Paul Prendergast, Buildings Officer
Tuesday 5 April 2010	
08.30	Convening of Peer Review Group
08.45	Mr. Mark Poland, Director, Buildings & Estates
09.30	Group meeting with all Buildings & Estates staff
10.15	Mr. Diarmuid Collins, Bursar

10.45	**Co-ordinating Steering Group** Mr. Eamonn Connaughton, Brookfield Facilities Manager Ms. Evelyn Conway, Administrative Officer – Buildings & Estates Mr. Niall McAuliffe, Capital Projects Officer Ms. Michelle McCarthy, Buildings Office Mr. Michael McCormack, General Services Officer Mr. Mark Poland, Director Buildings & Estates Mr. Paul Prendergast, Buildings Officer

11.30	**Co-ordinating Committee Group – Capital Projects / Directors Office** **Group 1**. *Mr. Paul Mangan* *Mr John O'Callaghan* Ms. Anne Bermingham Ms. Evelyn Conway Ms. Siobhan Hackett Ms. Sheila Kenny Mr. Stephan Koch Mr. Niall McAuliffe Ms. Breda McSweeney Mr. Mark Poland	**Co-ordinating Committee Group – General Services** **Group 2** *Mr Angus Currie* *Mr Éamonn Sweeney* Mr. Stephen Barrett Mr. Tony Browne Mr. Bill Cashman Mr. Brendan Dunne Mr. Ivy Jestin Ms. Sonya Kiely Mr. Padraig Lynch Mr. Michael McCormack Mr. Pat O'Mahony Mr. Denis Spillane
12.15	**Co-ordinating Committee Group – Buildings** Mr. Philip Hogan Ms. Liz Kennedy Mr. Eddie McCarthy Ms. Michelle McCarthy Mr. John Murphy Mr. Kieran Murphy Mr. Gary O'Connell Mr. Kevin O'Regan Mr. Paul Prendergast	**Co-ordinating Committee Group – Western Campus** Mr. Eamonn Connaughton Ms. Carol Cashman Mr. Adrian Downey Mr. Ned O'Connor Ms. Teresa O'Callaghan Mr. Donal O'Riordan **Heritage Office** 12.50: Mr. Michael Holland

13.00	Working lunch
13.30	Visit to core facilities of Building & Estates, escorted by Mr. Mark Poland, Buildings & Estates.
14.30	**Representatives of UCC Students** Mr. Greg Higgins, Student Union - Education Officer Mr. Dave Carey Mr. Padraig Rice Ms. Siobhan Power
15.15	**Representatives of UCC Staff** Professor Paul Callanan, Dept. of Physics

	Mr. Michael Hanna, Cork University Hospital Dr. Tom Moore, Dept. of Biochemistry Ms. Kate O'Brien, Dept. of Applied Psychology
16.00	Dr. Michael Murphy, President, UCC
16.30	Professor Paul Giller, Registrar & Senior VP
17.15	<u>Representatives of stakeholders</u> Mr. Jack Coughlan, Jack Coughlan Architects Mr. David Johnson, Davis Langdon Mr. Howard McDonagh, BAM Construction Mr. John O'Callaghan, Fire Consultant Mr. Pat Ruane, Planning Policy Unit, Cork City Council
19.00	Meeting of Peer Review Group to identify remaining aspects to be clarified and to finalise tasks for the following day followed by a working private dinner for members for the Peer Review Group

Wednesday 6 April 2010

08.30	Convening of Peer Review Group
09.00	Mr. Michael Farrell, Corporate Secretary
09.25	Ms. Karen Coughlan, Administrative Assistant, College of Arts, Celtic Studies & Social Sciences
09.50	Mr. John Fitzgerald, Head, Information Services Dr. Jean van-Sinderen Law, Director of Development
10.20	Professor Anita Maguire, VP for Research & Innovation Professor Grace Neville, VP for Teaching & Learning Mr. Con O'Brien, VP for Student Experience
11.00	Tea/coffee
11.30	Mr. Cormac McSweeney, Finance Office
11.50	Mr. Sean Barry, Procurement
12.15	Heads of Colleges: Professor Geraldine McCarthy, Acting Head, College of Medicine & Health Professor Patrick Fitzpatrick, Head, College of Science, Engineering & Food Science
13.00	Working lunch
14.00	Preparation of first draft of final report
15.00	Ms. Anne Gannon & Mr. Kieran Creedon, Dept of Human Resources
15.30	Preparation of first draft of final report
16.30	Mr. Mark Poland, Head, Buildings & Estates

17.00	Exit presentation to all staff made by the Chair of the Peer Review Group, Mr Angus Currie, and by Mr. Paul Mangan, summarising the principal findings of the Peer Review Group. This presentation is <u>not</u> for discussion at this time.
19.00	Working private dinner for members of the Peer Review Group to complete drafting of report and finalise arrangements for completion and submission of final report.