



Peer Review Group Report for Professional Support Areas

ESTATES OFFICE

Date: 26/05/2022

Contents

1	Introduction and Context	2
1.1	Overview of the Area under Review	2
2	Approach to Self-Assessment	4
2.1	Quality Review Committee	4
2.2	The Self-Assessment Report (SAR).....	5
3	Approach Taken by Peer Review Group	7
3.1	Peer Review Group Members.....	7
3.2	Overview of Approach Taken by Peer Review Group	7
4	Approach to Quality Assurance and Enhancement	8
4.1	Progress Since Last Review	8
4.2	Progress Since Last Review	8
5	Findings of the Peer Review Group.....	10
5.1	Staff Development	10
5.2	Helpdesk.....	11
5.3	Finance Controls.....	14
5.4	Strategic Alignment.....	15
5.5	Maintenance Service Contract.....	17
5.6	Communications & Provision of Information.....	18
5.7	Information Management	19
6	SWOT Analysis and Plans for Improvement	21
6.1	SWOT Analysis for Estates Office.....	21
6.2	Plans for Improvement Identified by Estates Office	22
7	Summary of Commendations and Recommendations	25
	Appendix 1	29

1 Introduction and Context

The broad approach to quality assurance and enhancement DCU aims to promote and develop a culture of quality throughout all aspects of the University. The framework derives from the spirit of Quality Assurance and Quality Improvement enshrined in the Universities Act (1997), which is the legislative basis for quality throughout the Irish University sector, and the Qualifications and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Act 2012.

The DCU processes for quality reviews at DCU are further aligned to the standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) and the published guidelines of Qualifications and Quality Ireland (QQI).

This Report presents the findings of a quality review of the DCU Estates Office, following a visit by the Peer Review Group undertaken on March 23rd -25th 2022.

1.1 *Overview of the Area under Review*

DCU Estates Office is responsible for the day to day development, operation and maintenance of the University's campuses and physical resources across a large multi-campus environment, comprising 6 campuses; Glasnevin Campus (180,000m² on 65 acres), St Patrick's Campus (45,000m² on 28 acres), Innovation Campus (20,000m² on 8 acres), All Hallows Campus (12,000m² on 16 acres), DCU Sport Campus (20 acres), and Morton stadium (12 acres) and 80 buildings, dating from 17th century to present, including a staff complement of 62 in-house staff, 200 external contract staff, and an annual operating budget of €13m/annum.

Key areas of Estates Office responsibility include:

- Capital planning and development including project management and delivery of new buildings, major refurbishments and master planning
- Energy and Utilities Management including monitoring and reporting of overall University energy usage
- Space management, including office moves and planning and participation on the University Space Planning and Management Group
- Management of day-to-day campus Operations, including cleaning, waste, security, maintenance and grounds services across all campuses
- Administration and management of the Estates Office Helpdesk walk in services on each academic campus, as well as the management of all facilities and capital related administration and invoicing, including recharging Energy & Facilities costs associated with DCU Campus Company commercial activity

In addition, the Estates Office regularly participates on a wide range of DCU committees and steering groups as a strategic enabler, providing advice, support and resourcing to assist the University deliver its overall goals and objectives on an ongoing basis.

Estates Participation on DCU Committees and Steering Groups include:

- Health & Safety Steering Committee
- Space Planning & Management Group
- Capital Projects Committee
- DCU Sustainability Council
- Capital Projects Steering Groups
- Quality Promotion Committee
- Heads & Deans Group
- Emergency Management & Planning Group
- DCU Arts Council
- Events planning groups

The Estates Office operates across 3 academic campuses at Glasnevin, All Hallows and St Patrick's with another 3 campus locations at Alpha, DCU Sports and Morton stadium and is responsible for the management and operations of all estates matters for all six campuses.

2 Approach to Self-Assessment

2.1 Quality Review Committee

An Estates Office Quality Review Committee (EOQRC) was convened by the Estates Office with its first meeting on 6th October 2021. The initial membership was reviewed and expanded to ensure a comprehensive membership which encompassed the wide ranging nature of activities of the Estates Office. The working membership along with their roles and responsibilities are compiled in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Estates Office Quality Review Committee (EOQRC)

Name	Role	Primary Campus Responsibility
Alan Mangan	Project Manager	All
Brian O'Toole	Facilities Officer	St Patrick's and All Hallows
Ger McEvoy (chair)	Head of Estates	All
Jane Barker	General Services Manager	All
Linda Martin	Administrator	Glasnevin
Mark Argue	BMS Manager	All
Mary Whelan	Space Planning Coordinator	All
Ray Wheatley	Security Manager	All
Stephen Toomey	Operations Manager	All
Susan Long	Cleaning Coordinator	St Patrick's

The EOQRC adopted a flexible meeting schedule, commencing on 21st October 2021. The Committee met daily across the review period, including evening meetings to conclude round-ups of earlier meetings that were held with a range of stakeholders. Each meeting was themed to include a relevant range of participants including employees within the Area under review,

managers of teams within the Area, customers, colleagues and the University Leadership. The EOQRC met a total of thirteen times prior to the completion of the Self-Assessment Report (SAR) in February 2022.

All members of the Estates Office management team reviewed the data from the self-assessment to arrive at the final SAR. Prior to each meeting the committee reviewed questions that were to be asked and identified who would lead in each relevant area or where they had particular detail they wanted to draw out.

A communications strategy was agreed whereby the Quality Review Committee (QRC) Chair provided all Estates Office staff updates on the self-assessment process, when and how staff members would input and integrate into the activities of the self-assessment process on a fortnightly basis.

2.2 The Self-Assessment Report (SAR)

The EOQRC decided on a two thread, facilitated workshop based approach to their self-assessment. The first thread focussed on external stakeholders which were grouped into four types – Students Reps/ Student Union Members, Academic Staff, Professional Unit Staff, and Campus Company Staff. The second thread focussed on internal stakeholders i.e. Estates Office in-house staff invited to attend. In addition, student staff forums were facilitated by the DCU quality promotion office between Estates Office Staff and members of DCU Students Union and DCU students to gain their insights.

The Peer Review Group (PRG) commends the self-assessment process in relation to the extensive consultation process with Area staff, DCU academic and professional staff, DCU students, and campus companies to produce an authentic SAR.

The approach the Estates Office undertook in their self-reflection activities included employing external consultants to assist in the development of their SAR. The SAR is a well detailed and clearly written report representing deep self-reflection by the Estates Office across all of its areas of activity. Overall, the high quality of the SAR prepared the PRG well for their role in the Quality Review of Estates Office at DCU.

The PRG found the SAR to be largely reflective of the findings throughout the face to face meetings. It was noted that the Estates Office was short in detail with respect to their response to COVID -19 in their SAR. It is understood that it was felt that including their activities surrounding their response to the pandemic may have overshadowed the report. While their approach is appreciated, inclusion of their response to COVID -19 may have contributed to their report by allowing the PRG further understand the additional challenges/requirements their services continue to manage. It is noteworthy to mention that the PRG along with all the stakeholders encountered during their visit agreed that the response, efforts and support of University life by the Estates Office has been extraordinary during the pandemic and is very appreciated by all.

Additionally, the PRG noted that the influence of the Finance management structures in the University were not identified as an issue but did come through in the stakeholder meetings. The PRG concluded that this was a weakness for the Estates Office which was specifically related to the recharge mechanism between the University and campus companies which are run separately to the University.

3 Approach Taken by Peer Review Group

3.1 Peer Review Group Members

Membership of the Peer Review Group for the Quality Review:

- Mr. Michael Burke, Facilities Manager, DCU Faculty of Science and Health
- Mr. John Gibney, Independent Projects and Estates Consultant and former Director of Estates at NUIG
- Mr. Damien Kilgannon, Real Estate Director at Fine Grain Property, former Head of Capital and Investment Programme at HEA
- Ms. Rose Jenkins (Chair), Director of Estates and Campus Services at University of Dundee
- Ms. Nuala Lonergan, (Coordinating reviewer), Postgraduate Programmes Chair, DCU Open Education Unit
- Ms. Aoife Merrins-Gallagher, Postgraduate Research Student, DCU Institute of Education

3.2 Overview of Approach Taken by Peer Review Group

Following an opportunity to engage with the SAR, the PRG met with the Director of Quality Promotion on the morning of March 23rd 2022. This meeting outlined the format of the visit, along with an overview of the aims and objectives of the review process. After this meeting the PRG met privately and Rose Jenkins was nominated to chair the PRG. Following a general discussion of the SAR, the Initial Impressions document (previously completed by PRG members) was discussed with several themes emerging as areas for consideration over the course of the Quality Review. (See Appendix 1 for details of the main meetings, parallel sessions and an overview of attendees.).

Reflecting on the work achieved, the PRG considered that the overall review process undertaken by the EOQRC had been thorough and that the PRG had full access to all appropriate stakeholders – DCU staff (academic and professional), campus companies' personnel, and students, most EO staff across all functions with representation from Glasnevin, St. Patrick's and All Hallows campuses. During the process the PRG noted that student engagement in the face to face meeting had been lower than expected with only undergraduate representation and requested the opportunity to talk to additional students. Unfortunately, this was too short notice and given this was an exam period this request could not be facilitated.

Overall, engagement with the PRG was extremely positive and participants engaged conscientiously with the process, giving honest and valuable comments and feedback on a wide range of issues. Building on the work that had already underpinned the SAR, engagement with QPO staff throughout the review was professional and accommodating.

4 Approach to Quality Assurance and Enhancement

4.1 Progress Since Last Review

The Estates Office, along with its remit, has extensively broadened since the previous Quality Review in 2015. There has been a significant expansion of campus since 2015. The Estates Office is currently responsible for the day to day development, operation and maintenance of 6 campuses, 80 buildings, management of 63 in-house staff, 200 external contract staff, and an annual operating budget of €13m/annum.

There are a range of current quality assurance and enhancement processes documented in SAR including the LEAN (2019) review of the Online Helpdesk, externally-led audits (2019), internal audit of key controls operated by the Estates Office in relation to Facilities Management and quality assurance, an externally-led strategic review (Q4 2020) of the Facilities Management model, the 2020 Estates Office Agile Review, the achievement of ISO 50001 Energy Management at organisational level, the engagement in this quality review and the immediate action with respect to enhancing communications across the Estates Office team. There is strong evidence of a culture of continuous improvement in how the Estates Office positively engages with quality assurance and enhancement processes. Investment opportunities have sometimes held back the Estates Office from being able to fully achieve their ambition.

4.2 Progress Since Last Review

The 2015 Quality Review proposed 15 quality improvement recommendations under the following headings: Strategic Planning and Management of Financial and other Resources, Organisation and Management, Staffing and Accommodation, Customer Perspective, Staff Perspective, and Issues arising from stakeholder meetings. The Estates Office addressed the recommendations under the following domains:

1. Develop the Estates Office Strategy: The Estates Office Strategy acts more as a visioning and positioning document to help guide the principles that oversee the Area. It was developed in 2016 and implemented in 2017 to align with the 2017 -2022 Strategic Plan. It was particularly cognisant of supporting the University's strategic goals of *Ensure a coherent, connected university* (goal 4), *Place sustainability at the core of the university* (goal 8), *Value and develop our staff community* (goal 5).

2. Development of an Estates Office Communications Plan: With the substantial expansion of the DCU Estates Office, the Office engaged in extensive communications through regular meetings across all levels and stakeholders including the Quality Promotion student forums from 2018/2019.

3. Reviewing of Estates Office functions and processes, and researching the potential of different industry approaches: As part of this recommendation, a review exercise led to the appointment of an external provider to undertake maintenance activities across all campuses in 2017.

4. Obtain quotes and commence digitally archiving building drawings (subject to available funding). For cost reasons, digitisation of all archive drawings was not undertaken however, a number of measures have been taken to address the issue including a requirement for drawings in digital format for new projects as well as the use of BIM software for digital archiving building information.

5. Online Helpdesk / Systems manager / Development of the Estates Online helpdesk: The Systems Manager role was filled in 2016. The features of the existing Estates Helpdesk were improved in 2016, 2018 and early 2022.

The detailed assessment by the PRG is provided in Section 5. It identifies that some of the work started as a consequence of the last review requires further development with support from DCU's Senior Management Group. Overall, the PRG observed that the Estates Office has achieved considerable success in seeking external verification of quality and progress through a number of awards.

5 Findings of the Peer Review Group

The PRG has identified seven themed areas and based their recommendations within these. The recommendations address all the relevant key sections as illustrated below. Details on the observations relevant to each point are described in the narrative below, and the specific recommendations have been identified in Section 7.

	Planning and Effective Management of Resources	Effectiveness of Activities and Processes	Communication and Provision of Information	Ongoing Quality Enhancement	External Perspectives
Staff Development	x			x	
Online Helpdesk	x	x			
Finance Controls		x			
Communications			x		x
Maintenance Service Contract				x	x
Information management	x		x		
Strategic Alignment	x	x	x		x

5.1 Staff Development

The SAR compiled by the Estates Office identified Staff Development as a challenge within the SWOC analysis, and Staff Training as an area of both opportunity and challenge.

The PRG noted three key gaps for Staff Development as part of this review, including a need for:

- focus on staff wellbeing,
- greater professional development opportunities,
- and engagement with an appraisal system.

The COVID-19 response of this Estates Office team was deemed highly effective by stakeholders across the University. Though COVID-19 accelerated some helpful strategies for communication among the Estates Office personnel (i.e., Zoom meetings, dissemination of meeting notes etc.), it also fostered reductions in social interaction among staff in physical spaces on campuses. This has had a knock-on effect on staff wellbeing. The PRG recommends engagement with wellbeing opportunities to support staff morale and connection. This may include convening a Social Committee to organise social events or engaging in workshops / seminars on adopting wellbeing

strategies.

Estates personnel across a range of departments expressed a desire for role-specific professional development opportunities (e.g. training for financial record-keeping in the administration office, training for SafePass in operations, training for first response for student mental health difficulties in security etc.). The PRG engaged with the University's Senior Management Group to request that some financial resources be made available for this purpose. Such investment can be used to target identified professional development needs among Estates Office staff.

The PRG understands that DCU is piloting a Performance Review and Development (PRD) initiative as an appraisal system for university employees. The PRG recommends that this PRD is implemented and embedded among all staff in the Estates Office when it is streamlined for DCU staff. This will help everyone to understand their position and role in the organisation and will ensure that everyone understands how they contribute to the bigger picture which could be beyond the area in which they sit themselves. In the meantime, its impending introduction can provide a foundation for Estates personnel to begin to conduct a training needs analysis for all staff members which can identify areas for development in professional practice. The PRG recommends that the Estates team create an implementation action plan that can start now with regard to engaging with professional appraisal in the workplace.

DCU is transitioning from its Talent, Discovery and Transformation Strategic Plan 2017-2022 to its new strategic plan. The Estates Office will develop its new operational plan and objectives in tandem with this new university-wide strategy. The PRG recommends that the Estates Office incorporate a training plan for staff development that considers staff wellbeing, identified training needs and the requirements of the PRD as part of its new operational plan.

In conclusion, the PRG identified a number of recommendations relating to improving staff morale and team building, personal development and career advancement, and adoption of the annual appraisal process.

5.2 Helpdesk

Overall the Estates Office has done an exemplary job of transforming the way it operates in recent years, successfully addressing complex issues such as expansion in student numbers, growth in physical campus assets, creating a unified culture of service delivery, and outsourcing significant services. However, this is one specific area that should be addressed to help further these achievements.

The Estate Office operates a number of Helpdesk services which are split into two formats.

Walk-in Service

The walk-in service is provided from multiple locations across the campuses and include the Estates Central Office and the Security Centre in the basement of the multi-storey car-park. There are other walk-in Helpdesk functions across various campus locations and functions e.g. Information Solutions and Services, Library, and Student Services, although these do not necessarily focus on estate issues.

The PRG met representatives of students, academic staff, professional services staff, commercial companies and university management over the course of its three-day visit. The feedback in respect of Walk-in Helpdesk services, the Security Staff, and Estates Office staff in general was universally positive. This was also reflected in the various pre-visit exercises (e.g. SAR, Focus Groups, and Surveys).

The requests that present at the Walk-in Helpdesks extend from basic directional requests to service requests. Many of these are more effectively addressed through central university communications systems such as websites, direct messaging to the student body through Loop or Instagram, and map-based apps. Whilst communications is dealt with elsewhere in the report it is worth noting that the PRG recognised that better signposting through relevant channels would lead to a better customer experience and help to direct people to the best response first time.

Specific to the Estate Office, the Security Service team, as the only in-person 24/7 service on campus, provides a first-responder service to the university community that sometimes includes an element of pastoral care for students in crisis until such time as professional caregivers respond to a call for assistance. The University needs to decide what is the appropriate level of pastoral care to be provided by the security service, put in place the necessary training for security staff and ensure that reliable links exist with the relevant university units (e.g. Student Development Service, Health Unit). This will ensure the service for students is responsive and effective. The location of the Security Centre needs to reflect the importance of the service provided and the University should consider its relocation at an early opportunity to a location that facilitates ease of access for students, particularly outside of normal university hours.

Online Helpdesk

The Estates Office also operates an Online Helpdesk using a 3rd party software system. This system has been in place since 2009. One of the key recommendations of the 2015 Quality Review related to the Online Helpdesk/Systems Manager / Development of the Estates Online Helpdesk. A joint submission by Estates and ISS to the University to upgrade the Online Helpdesk to a cloud-based proprietary system in 2015 “was deemed cost prohibitive” (*Source: SAR*). In the

interim period various tweaks and enhancements to the system have been implemented but the 2015 recommendation remains largely undelivered and this is noticeable.

A LEAN review of the Estates Office in 2019 by the Strategic Intelligence Unit resulted in a report (*Estates Helpdesk LEAN Review Workshops Output Report – V02*) that effectively concluded that the existing system be replaced. Again, it seems that funding constraints prevented the implementation of the recommendations of the LEAN exercise.

Two significantly complex University initiatives took place between the 2015 Quality Review and this review. The integration of St. Patrick's Campus and the purchase of All Hallows in 2016; and the move to a Multi-Campus Facilities Management delivery model, which saw the outsourcing of all hard facilities management services to a single provider in 2017. These initiatives coincided with significant organisational changes and growth in resources within the Estates Office. The PRG in its engagement with the campus community, in particular with University Management, experienced a great understanding and appreciation of the transformational work required to deliver these initiatives.

Maintenance requests are raised through the Estates Office Helpline system, which is currently integrated in a 3rd party software product, used by the maintenance contractor. The Peer Review Group noted an almost universal dissatisfaction of customers with their experience of the Estates Office Helpdesk service. The Estates Office also acknowledged this as both a weakness and a challenge in the SWOC that was carried out as part of the SAR process. Frontline Estates staff also experienced some situations where the system provides no advance notice of contractors carrying out work in their areas.

The issues mentioned by stakeholders included:

- Lack of feedback and communication around request status within the online helpdesk platform
- Closing of a ticket occurs when the maintenance service contractor has responded to, rather than completed work
- Lack of readily available information on responsibility for implementing task and closing out tickets
- Lack of readily information on delivery time for the resolution of different types of work for completion
- Having to bypass system and leverage relationships
- And poor confidence levels in the system.

If the online Helpdesk is to remain an internal, rather than an outsourced service, then the technical support required to maintain the required service levels should form part of a gap analysis. Refer to Strategy Alignment for more information.

The PRG in its engagement with the Senior Management Group noted the intention to implement a University-wide data / digitalisation project in the life of the next Strategic Plan 2022 - 2027. It also noted, as part of the project, the intention to review the communications and helpdesk functions and that the Estates Office needs will be included in that review.

In conclusion, the PRG felt that there needs to be a review of the Walk-in helpdesks (both Estates and non-estates related) to consider rationalising the existing multiple services and improving the experience for the customers. The other critical action has to be the procurement of a new On-line helpdesk that is fit for purpose and integrated to the University internal software and processes.

5.3 Finance Controls

Interviews with the stakeholder groups highlighted issues with the internal facilities management (FM) operational processes. In relation to finance controls the main concern was around the perceived value for money of works undertaken, the lack of transparency, and the total workload that is created to complete a job.

There is an internal re-charge model between the external maintenance service provider via the Estates Office and back to the stakeholders. The costs from the external maintenance service provider are often perceived by stakeholders as high when compared to other locally sourced options. There is a perception that there is a lack of transparency around quotations and project information which has resulted in dissatisfaction about the perception of value for money. Part of the lack of transparency comes from a lack of readily available detailed information available to stakeholders.

As a consequence, some stakeholders consider using an external company which may possibly not adhere to the University's specification requirements. In some cases, Stakeholders are querying works constantly with Estates and spending their time seeking comparable costs. Some stakeholders are finding 'workarounds' that removes the need to engage with Estates and their providers, and are appointing contractors outside the existing maintenance contract without input from the Estates Office. This is still compliant with the bounds of the contract but is a high risk approach that should end. There are critical steps being missed out of the due diligence process and the Estates Office risks the loss of oversight of works happening on the campuses.

In addition, the groups interviewed also noted that there was a lot of paperwork generated because of the recharge model which is effectively moving a 'wooden dollar' amongst departments and entities. The Finance Office advised this was necessary to ensure that some business units could operate commercially and therefore they had to be separate from the core University activities. However, the process needs to be reviewed to enable a simplification that

suits both parties.

When the PRG explored this issue further they were advised by the Senior Management Group that there has been an ongoing review and that there are potentially changes coming in the future that will help to streamline this process. Coupled with the review of the maintenance service contract and lessons learnt since its introduction, this is a positive step forwards.

In conclusion, the recommendations in this area focus on reducing risk in the 'workarounds' approaches, completing the review of internal recharging structures, and looking at processes to remove bureaucracy and ensure quality, value, and appropriate controls.

5.4 Strategic Alignment

The Estate Office has a Strategy document which covers 2018-2022. The PRG are aware that this is to be revised following the launch of the new overarching University Strategy which is due later this year. The PRG acknowledged the current Estates Strategy document and recommends further development of focus areas with clear objectives and specific SMART actions.

The PRG note that there are many capable, knowledgeable and committed managers within the Estate Office and their senior management team works collegiately and with common goals. Recent changes in the structure of the area have allowed the teams to flourish and focus on many issues and aspects that have been identified for improvement.

Following discussions with the Senior Management team of the Estates Offices, the PRG feel that there are three gaps which are not necessarily mapped to specific roles within the structure as yet. During the interviews with Estates Office Staff, PRG noted that there was a significant pull on senior management time and that this is leading to distractions which prevent them having the space to think strategically or take a 'big picture overview of the situation'. With the opportunity to think about the Strategy of the Estates Office on the horizon and how this may evolve with an alignment to the next University Strategy, the PRG recommends consideration of the following roles being incorporated as listed below. It is noted that these may not sit within the Estates Office, but they would be valuable to help the area develop and achieve more.

Information Manager

(Please also refer to section 5.7 regarding further detail about Information Management issues).

This role relates to aspects of building and systems data. This was an action that was highlighted by the previous PRG in 2015 but it has been challenging for the group to make adequate progress. A dedicated resource responsible for the management of data relating to information systems (e.g. asset inventories, drawing information, O&M manuals) would help improve communications with contractors and the external maintenance service providers, and enable teams to work more

effectively with their stakeholders in a more agile and responsive way. The Estates Office should consider who could be responsible for the oversight of this type of information and whether this is something which can be integrated within a current role, or whether this may require a dedicated position.

IT Systems Manager

The Estates Office is responsible for the operation of a number of highly technical and dynamic IT systems and software platforms that are integral to their working. Some of the processes which are critical to the operational functions to the Estates Office are not properly connected leading to loss of information, duplication, and missed opportunities. There is no one person in the Estates Office who is dedicated or has real technical knowledge across the whole aspect of the IT systems. Information is therefore siloed and challenging to find or share and this causes multiple communications issues and wastes time in projects and jobs. A dedicated resource in this area would improve appropriate management of all the software programmes. The PRG notes that the Director of Estates preference is for a joint resource between ISS and Estates to ensure that there is an oversight of University-wide issues, opportunities, and constraints.

Finance Support Officer

The PRG identified that a significant portion of the Senior Manager's time with the Estates Office Area is spent on reviewing and understanding charges and account management level finance information. These individuals are working to resolve queries and check information when invoices are issued on a monthly basis. Part of this need stems from issues around lack of readily available information and trust in the process/system that that have been highlighted in the Finance Controls and Online Helpdesk sections above. However, even if those aspects can be resolved there would be much merit in the appointment of a person dedicated to understanding and managing financial information, to act as the point of contact for invoice queries and have the relevant autonomy and knowledge to resolve these.

The PRG feels that the organisational structure, with the addition of these and other already-approved posts, be kept under continuing regular review and development to ensure that it is effective and avoids the creation of single-points of failure within the structure.

In conclusion, the PRG felt that a review of the tasks related to the three potential roles highlighted above could bring added value that is missing currently, or is a significant distraction to the Senior Managers. By freeing up their time from pedestrian operational issues, they would be able to focus on the development of strategies for their area, knit together the long term plans that support the emerging University Strategy, and overall provide them with more focus.

5.5 Maintenance Service Contract

The Estates Office implemented a single integrated maintenance service contract following a facilities management review (2016) and a subsequent competitive tendering process assisted by external consultants to oversee the procurement process. The contract was awarded to a maintenance service Contractor in 2017 for 5 years with an option to extend for a further 2 years. Prior to 2017, the Estates Office had a significant number of individual maintenance contracts in place with external contractors. Also, a number of internal stakeholders and campus companies engaged separate contractors which resulted in an inconsistent level of service delivery and a lack of a cohesive long term maintenance programme for all buildings. The local arrangement model also carried an organisational risk due to possible inconsistencies in the approach to statutory building and Health & Safety compliance across the various DCU stakeholders and campus companies.

The awarding of the maintenance service contract coincided with a significant expansion of the University with the incorporation of St. Patrick's College and the purchase of All Hallows College. In a relatively short period of time, DCU grew from a single campus in Glasnevin to a six campus University. The decision to move from a model of annual tendering from a pool of external contractors versus an integrated maintenance service contract is well documented in the SAR document

There is general satisfaction with the service delivery of the maintenance service contract.

As noted under section 5.3, there is a perception that the maintenance services providers do not offer best value for money; this was especially expressed by the external stakeholders'/campus companies group. Most stakeholder groups expressed their concern regarding the lack of detailed information, which is related to problems associated with the Helpdesk (as noted in section 5.2). A broad group of stakeholders involved in meetings during the visit suggested. The PRG considers that improvements are necessary in providing more timely, full, and accurate information on the progress of maintenance issues through the Helpdesk to service requestors. This issue has been corroborated in an external audit carried out in 2018/19. The PRG understands that the appointment of a Technical Services Manager has improved oversight of the maintenance service contract and this has been a welcome improvement. However, stakeholder groups also expressed concern and a degree of frustration when tracking progress with jobs raised on the Estates Helpdesk. The PRG are of the opinion that this is a Helpdesk issue rather than a problem with the maintenance service contractor, although the problem is exacerbated by the maintenance service contractor using a different software system,(refer to Section 5.2 for more details).

A strategic review of the Facilities Management model was commissioned by Estates Office management with an external service maintenance specialist, to review the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats with the current contract. This is a comprehensive report but does not fully capture all perspectives which need further exploration. The report produced a gap analysis between the expectations of the contract and the reality, and set out a number of

recommendations for the next iteration of the tender specification for renewal of the Maintenance Service contract which are a valuable source of information.

The PRG concluded that the recommendations within the report must be noted and considered as the procurement process for a new provider in the future. However, a further expansion of the study to include all other key stakeholders would be beneficial and could provide a much greater level of end user satisfaction.

5.6 Communications & Provision of Information

The SAR compiled by the Estates Office identified both internal and external communications as a challenge within the SWOC analysis. In addition, it acknowledged opportunities for improvements in both areas and the PRG observed this throughout its review.

The PRG noted three key gaps for communications as part of this review, including the need to develop and articulate a written communications strategy for the benefit of:

- Stakeholders - Staff & Students
- Internal Teams
- Campus Companies

The SAR documented a process of internal communication and stakeholder engagement including stakeholder mapping in the establishment of focus groups, meetings including Estates senior management group meetings to gather input from staff and other stakeholders in relation to projects, shutdowns, campus safety works, tree cutting among other projects. Interviews with stakeholder groups highlighted excellent engagement and communication processes on large scale capital projects however, inconsistencies and poor communications across smaller projects and strategic planning initiatives were highlighted. A benchmarking review should be undertaken of all current formal and informal communication processes, tools, channels and actions with a view to documenting existing processes and engaging all stakeholders to provide feedback and input to the development process. Involving staff and all stakeholders at every stage of strategy planning and development will also assist significantly in improving communications within the team.

The recently introduced cascade model of circulating notes from weekly operations meetings to all Estates Office staff should continue so that internal staff communications can be supported. However, the PRG also recommends horizontal communication between the same job roles across campuses and encourages feedback forums so that a more dialogic form of communication exists among all staff. This could be linked to the social activities promoted under Section 5.1.

Student information must be easy to find and at this time it is not. The Estates Office should prioritise the ongoing update the Estates Office web pages and where possible, coordinate with

units who manage university-level social media accounts to include a student-specific section with answers to FAQs. This action would benefit from further interrogation to identify what is interesting or critical to the Student body and retaining a focus on that. Consideration of how to access these pages would be useful as well. For example, using Loop linking with Student Support and Development for more critical messages to ensure that all student stakeholders are up-to-date on important Estates Office matters.

The PRG recommends a feedback loop for campus companies so that clear messaging prevails regarding the roles, processes and actions of the Estates Office. The Estates Office might present at a Faculty Management Board meeting to inform senior staff on what is happening on a macro level, and consideration of appointing a 'Business Partner' as a point of contact to other Areas which could be an effective way to disseminate messages and key information.

Overall, the PRG felt that a written and clearly documented communications strategy would help to identify critical messaging to be directed to specific stakeholder groups and will identify the most appropriate platforms and processes to disseminate relevant information.

Training and ongoing development will be critical to the successful implementation of the communications strategy. Team performance regarding the successful development and implementation of the communications strategy both internally and externally could be linked to performance reviews under the new PRD System ensuring a consistent focus of all team members on continuous improvement of communications through clear stated metrics.

Another consideration discussed was the potential need for a dedicated resource in this area to ensure consistent communications and implementation of the communications strategy across all stakeholders. Again, the PRG recommends that a resource (if deemed required) is linked in some way to the DCU Communications Team to ensure consistency of messages and alignment.

The review and rationalisation of multiple helpdesk services (both Estates and non-estates related) and the delivery of a new fit for purpose online helpdesk service that is integrated to internal university software (aligned to the University wide data/ digitalisation project) will present an excellent opportunity for improved communications and customer experience from the Estates team. It is critical that the Estates Office needs are central to this review. This will form a key element of the communications strategy.

5.7 Information Management

An area for improvement highlighted in section 7.5 of the SAR document is Information Management. Following the review and discussions with stakeholders, the PRG would agree that this is an area that requires action. There is additional evidence in the feedback from the internal estates office away days and the estates office staff survey which supports this view.

A common theme of concern is the need for investment in a Common Data Environment and an improved Information Management system for the Estates Office. PRG have noted the need for a dedicated resource to help oversee the main strategy (refer to section 5.4). The details of the issues are noted below.

The development of a Common Data Environment would enable critical information sharing to be facilitated in a robust, accurate and timely manner, and contribute to addressing the following information limitations issues identified by stakeholders during the review::

- Outdated and irresolute systems - review needed with a need for investment in technology
- Estates Online Helpdesk - out-dated system which is not fit for purpose and adds to the workload of the Admin team and causes frustration with 'customers'
- Digitalisation software upgrade needed for the Projects team
- Digitise/digitalisation of infrastructure and build assets
- Website is difficult to navigate - access to services is hard to find
- No social media for Estates Office
- Achievements not promoted
- Students and staff unaware of Estates Office initiatives
- Permit to Work system is not fit for purpose
- Rely on very basic means of technology / software to deliver all aspects of service
- Poor information = poor decision making

The PRG met with DCU senior management group and they indicated the intention to implement a University-wide data/digitalisation project in the life of the next Strategic Plan 2022- 2027. The Estates Office needs will be included in this project. Their needs are complicated by the sharing of information with the external maintenance provider and also other external consultants like architects and engineers. Likewise, they are required to maintain detailed information upon the conclusion of a project for the lifetime of the building, and this has to be continuously updated. There is an opportunity in advance of the University wide review to examine all aspects of an Information Management project for the estates Office. The following need to be considered:

- Permit to Work system
- Digitisation of archived drawings, Operations & Maintenance manuals
- Space management software to be used by all Faculties and Estates Office
- Document management and control
- Smart technology for buildings - important for the Energy team
- Helpdesk system (discussed in detail in this report in section 5.2)
- Estates Office webpage and social media
- Joint IT role between Estates and ISS.

The above list is not exhaustive and should be defined further through the development of a scope of needs. This theme relates to recommendations made under section 5.4 which advocates a dedicated resource to help unpick and develop an action plan, leading to the long term management of digital information.

In conclusion, the PRG have focussed their recommendations on ensuring that there is a wide ranging, detailed understanding of the Estates Office need that is reflected in the development of the new University-wide data /digitalisation project. To achieve this, a detailed gap analysis is required and a full business case to support a new strategy should be developed.

6 SWOT Analysis and Plans for Improvement

6.1 SWOT Analysis for Estates Office

The SAR for the Area included a proposed summary SWOT analysis of the Area. As a result of the Peer Review Group's analysis of the SAR and findings from the peer review visit, we propose the following to be a true reflection of the Areas capabilities and opportunities, and identified weakness and threats to future success.

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● All stakeholders very impressed with grounds appearance ● EO staff widely recognised as very committed, professional, responsive, agile, transparent, and helpful by all stakeholders ● Walk-in helpdesks excellent service ● Multiple EO staff recognised through DCU President's Awards ● EO excellent case study of successful change management, operations management, organisational change, emergency response/crisis management e.g. COVID 19, continuous improvement (multiple audits and benchmarking exercises), team working, leadership, working with and garnering support of DCU SMG ● Excellent progress in energy saving (59%) and recognition nationally and internationally in energy management and leadership ● Ability to manage a wide range of activities across campus locations ● EO have already sought to address issues identified (e.g. staff communications) during Quality Review process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Out of hours' strategy ● Glasnevin campus security location and accommodation unsuitable ● Critical staff training required ● Staff morale/wellbeing is low as a consequence of the impact of prolonged presence of the Covid-19 and different working cultures emerging ● Resources for Budget management ● Lack of digitalisation of information systems ● Estates online helpdesk not fit for purpose requiring persistent EO personnel intervention ● Lack of details and complexity of recharge systems leads to mistrust of system ● Lack of consultancy available on minor projects from EO office and necessity to involve FM provider ● Horizontal communication across EO staff could be improved ● Lack of feedback mechanism for EO staff to Estates Senior Management team ● Skills gap in structure e.g. information management ● Maintenance contract KPIs unknown to many EO staff

Opportunities	Challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Implementation of Performance Review and Development Scheme. ● Training & development plans for EO Staff ● Implementation of EO communication strategy ● Aligning with government policy on carbon neutral plan ● Engagement with governing authority risk committee through, perhaps, a sub-group ● Implications of pandemic on space management ● Further communication/information sessions to e.g. Faculties on EO's upcoming projects/strategic plan ● Rebuilding staff morale and team building following covid-related workload and working arrangements and recognition of efforts through social events ● Improvements to DCU's group recharge model following Finance's review of model ● A more suitable and visible location and accommodation of GLA campus security ● Review Maintenance service Contract including KPIs before extending or procuring new contract ● Engagement with other DCU Units/ Departments to determine next generation suitable online helpdesk 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Resources for growing DCU estate; on boarding of Morton stadium ● Management of Future Tech and new campus residences building ● Budget - lack of discretionary budget for minor unanticipated works ● Aligning with government policy on climate action ● Implications of pandemic on future of work and thereby space management ● Appropriate visible and central location and accommodation for security staff/first responders for the growing needs of students particularly during out of office of hours in GLA campus ● Effective dissemination of information to students ● Procuring a suitable online helpdesk to meet the complex and varied request submitted to the EO ● Improvement required in digital information management

6.2 *Plans for Improvement Identified by Estates Office*

The PRG would first acknowledge the commitment of the Estates Office to provide a professional service to the University and to do so in an open and helpful manner. It is evident to us that the Estates Office is highly regarded, trusted and appreciated by the highest levels in the University.

The PRG would agree in the main with the emerging themes and identified Areas of Improvement stated in Section 7 of the SAR. The efforts made in response to the last SAR in 2015 have been relatively significant and beneficial for the University. The PRG recognises that the Estates Office has already identified many of the areas that we have commented on and made recommendations on in this report. The Estates Office understands the areas in which improvements and changes would both benefit themselves and the University in the future. The recommendations in the PRG report should be woven into the wider plan and reflected in the Estate Strategy and local policies.

Strategy Planning and Management of Resources: The PRG agrees with the approach to reviewing specifications of the maintenance service contract tender. The PRG recommends that the further stakeholders (campus companies) are included in the discussion to contribute to the specifications and tender document. The criticality of the development of a university Out of Hours strategy is supported by the PRG and it is recommended to be delivered without delay.

Organisation and Staffing: The PRG commends the Estates Office for having actioned communication issues identified as part of the SAR and distributing the notes from their weekly meetings to all Estates Office staff. The PRG recommends that the Estates Office develops a communications strategy document.

The PRG highly commends the Estates Office staff for their deep commitment to the important role in supporting University life and were delighted to see all the awards and commendations that they have received externally and through the DCU's President's Awards. It is fitting that the SAR report focuses on staff well-being after such a prolonged challenging time between the Incorporation Programme followed the Estates Office response to COVID-19. The PRG acknowledges DCU's forthcoming Performance Review and Development (PRD) scheme, however the PRG recommends that well-being supports in addition to the training and professional development needs are immediately discussed with staff and supported by DCU's senior management group to ensure that the Estates Office are supported to enable them to continue to operate so effectively.

Functions, Activities and Processes: The PRG agrees that the amount of time and intervention required by the Estates Office staff to support the Online Helpdesk clearly demonstrates that the system is not fit for purpose. The PRG recommends that discussion of the Online Helpdesk is prioritised at institutional level with a view to replacement.

The PRG agrees with the Estates Office on the need to review and address information management. The PRG recommends that this concern is discussed in tandem with the Online Helpdesk.

Customer/Stakeholder Perspective: PRG agrees that the Estates Office needs to enhance its internal communications. This should also be included in its communications strategy as discussed earlier. The PRG discussed communication with many stakeholders. It was agreed that while social media is helpful the Estates website should be developed as the primary and clearest source of information and updates.

The contribution of the Estates Office to events held at DCU was highly commended by all stakeholders. The PRG commends the intention of the Estates Office to review and maintain oversight of events across all campuses in its supportive role.

Accommodation & Working practices: The PRG commends the Estates Office's plan to review their work plans in light of lessons learned during COVID and explore new working arrangements aligned to forthcoming University policy. The PRG recommends that review of the location and accommodation of the security staff office in the basement of the multi-storey car park be further investigated to provide a more suitable alternative.

7. Summary of Commendations and Recommendations

Planning and Effective Management of Resources				
<p>Commendation: The PRG noted the significant scale and complexity of the Estates Office role and their excellent track record in effectively administering the operational strategy across such a diverse range of services. The culture of continuous improvement is conducive to ongoing advancements in the efficacy of its remit to DCU. The Estates Office is a transformational unit which has expanded its remit significantly in recent years and gained the respect of its stakeholders across each and every level of the institution.</p>				
No	Recommendation	Priority	Level	Details
1	Staff Development: Training needs analysis	P1	A/U	Conduct a training needs analysis for all Estates staff to identify areas for improvement in professional skills and practice
2	Helpdesk Strategy review	P2	A/U	Clarify the University's strategy for both walk-in and online helpdesks, understanding how a one-stop shop approach could help with consideration towards rationalising multiple existing singular services.
3	Finance Budget Structure	P2	A/U	Complete a review of the finance budgetary structure concerning the recharges for operational works completed.
4	Strategic Alignment: New Estate Strategy	P1	A	Develop a robust Estate Strategy that is aligned to the new overarching University Strategy with a clear action plan, objectives, actions, and focus areas.
Effectiveness of Activities and Processes				
<p>Commendation: The Estates Office has done an exemplary job of transforming the way it operates in recent years, successfully addressing complex issues such as expansion in student numbers, growth in physical campus assets, creating a unified culture of service delivery, and outsourcing significant services.</p>				
No	Recommendation	Priority	Level	Details
5	Helpdesk: Procurement of new online Helpdesk Platform.	P1	A	Put in place a fit for purpose online Helpdesk platform that takes account of the needs of all stakeholders now and in the future and will improve customer experience aligned to University software and systems.
6	Finance: Simplify the finance budget and recharging processes	P2	U	Simplify the finance budget and recharging processes, removing bureaucracy, but still ensuring adequate controls to guarantee that works are being completed to appropriate standards (e.g. health & safety, quality, contractual, KPIs, contractual).

7	Strategic Alignment: Creation of an IT Systems Manager	P1	A/U	Recommend the creation of a post for a dedicated resource to oversee and improve the management of all relevant IT systems and software programmes used by the Estates Office. The PRG would suggest that this post is linked to ISS or even sits within that team to ensure that there is an oversight of University-wide issues, opportunities, and constraints.
8	Information Management: Undertake a gap analysis of the Estate Office Information Technology/ Management structures and systems	P1	A/U	Recommend Estates Office, working with the relevant stakeholders across the University, carry out a gap analysis of their Information Technology/ Management structures and systems, encompassing the areas highlighted in Section 5.7. An external facilitator with expertise in Information Management systems is strongly recommended.

Communication and Provision of Information

Commendation: Recently introduced strategies of information dissemination from Estates Office management meetings to all Estates Office staff are a commendable approach to enhancing internal communication. Resounding positive feedback from staff and students and campus companies on the interpersonal relationships with the EO team.

9	Strategic Alignment: Creation of an Information Manager role / post	P1	A/U	Undertake a review as to who could be responsible for the oversight of this critical buildings and system data, and whether this is something which can be integrated within a current role, or whether this could require a dedicated short term or permanent position.
10	Information Management: Develop a business case to enable investment into IT systems and Platforms to improve Information Management.	P1	A	Review the findings of the Estates Office IT structures gap analysis and present a proposal/ business case to DCU senior management group to seek investment into appropriate platforms and systems as required.
11	Communications & Provision of Information	P2	A	Consider the provision of a resource works who with DCU Communications and Student Support and Development to ensure consistency and clarity of information and alignment with the University.

Ongoing Quality Enhancement

Commendation: Very comprehensive and accurate SAR with excellent self-reflection. Significant number of high profile externally benchmarked awards received and validation/ recognition of EO for excellence and quality through periodic audits. EO's openness to external perspectives is a clear strength.

12	Staff Development: Create opportunities for staff socialisation	P3	A	Recommend Estates Office creates opportunities for socialisation for staff through for example a social committee. Engagement with “Our DCU” https://www.dcu.ie/hr/our-dcu could assist with this action. This would enhance opportunities for staff recreational events, share knowledge and experience, and network to build collegiate relationships which has been undermined by the Pandemic, remote working, and siloed teams at the different campus locations.
13	Staff Development: Ensure all staff have a personalised training development plan	P1	A	Incorporate a training plan into the Estates operational plan that includes identified training needs. This should meet the requirements of the PRD but should be actioned in advance of the PRD roll out.
14	Staff Development: Highlight DCU's Learning & Development Department to staff	P1	A	Notify EO staff of well-being workshops offered by DCU's Learning and Development Department as and when they arise
15	Maintenance Service Contract: Review the findings and recommendations of the external reports	P1	A	Review how these can be incorporated into the new procurement process, identifying lessons learnt, and addressing key areas for improvement.
16	Maintenance Service Contract: Expand the review process to include all key stakeholders to help implement a better contract in the future.	P1	A	Prior to writing the new maintenance service Contract tender, expand external reports to include the stakeholder / customer perspective and ensure this is reflected in new contract operational expectations, KPIs, etc.

External Perspectives

Commendation: Multiple stakeholders noted that the general upkeep of campuses was excellent, with well-maintained grounds and new, modern buildings creating a pleasant working environment. The newly enhanced central mall area on the Glasnevin Campus was mentioned as a hugely positive addition for students, staff, and the local community. The Maintenance, Security, Cleaners, and entire Estates Office team were universally praised for their professionalism, helpfulness and their supportive approach.

18	Strategic Alignment: Creation of a Finance Support Officer Post	P1	A/U	Recommend a dedicated post for managing financial information to act as the point of contact and have the relevant autonomy and knowledge to resolve time critical queries.
19	Maintenance Service FM Contract: Review	P1	A	Review the current Maintenance Service FM contract (in-scope assets, KPIs, threshold

	communications with stakeholders			value for breakdowns) so that expectations for both sides are understood and there is a greater level of detail
20	Communications: Write a communications strategy	P2	A	Develop a written communications strategy to identify critical messaging and the appropriate platform for its dissemination to each stakeholder group.

Appendix 1

Timetable Peer Review Group Visit Estates Office

DATE: 23rd – 25th March 2022

Time	Peer Review Group (PRG) Activity/Meeting	Venue	Meeting Attendees
Day 1- Wednesday- in St Patrick's Campus- Belvedere House			
1000-1130	Briefing by Director of Quality Promotion; guidelines provided to assist the PRG during the visit and in developing its report	Belvedere House C204	
1130-1230	PRG Private Meeting Time. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● PRG Selects a Chair ● PRG discusses key themes, areas for exploration based on the SAR ● PRG assigns tasks and responsibilities amongst members 	Belvedere House C204	
1230-1330	Lunch with Director of QPO (Light lunch)	Belvedere House	
1330-1445	Consideration of the SAR: Shall commence with a short presentation by Director of Estates (Gerard McEvoy) followed by discussion (Director, QPO to attend) Consideration of the SAR with the Area Head and members of the Quality Review committee: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Alan Mangan, Project Manager ● Brian O'Toole, Facilities Officer AHC/SPC ● Gerard McEvoy (Chair), Director of Estates ● Jane Barker, General Services Manager ● Linda Martin, Secretary ● Mark Argue, BMS Manager ● Mary Whelan, Space Planning Coordinator ● Ray Wheatley, Security Manager ● Stephen Toomey, Operations Manager ● Susan Long, Cleaning Coordinator 	Belvedere House C204	
1445-1500	PRG private discussion time	Belvedere House	
1500-1555	Meeting with Students; Emma Monahan, BA Communications, Year 2 Josh O Rourke, BA E, P & L, Year 3 Orlaith Onoh, BA E,P & L, Year 2	Belvedere House C204	

1600-1700	<p>Estates Staff- Meeting 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Paul Leahy, Maintenance Supervisor ● Wendy Gurley, Secretary ● Bernadette Reid, Assistant Senior Administrator ● Sylwia Kaminska, Secretary ● Pat Burke, Theatre Technician ● Derek Brennan, Security Supervisor ● Carol Doyle, Security Supervisor ● David Peddie, Grounds person 	Belvedere House C204	
1700-1730	PRG private discussion time	Belvedere House C204	
1800-1930	PRG Private Dinner and discussion	SKYLON Hotel	
Day 2- Thursday- Glasnevin Campus			
0900-0940	<p>Estates Staff- Meeting 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Seamus Traynor, Maintenance Supervisor ● John Farrell, Maintenance Supervisor ● Liam Gaughran, Security Supervisor ● Sarah Hynes, Facilities Officer GLA ● Bernard Keogh, Security Operative ● Gerry McGee, Security Operative ● Evren Unal, Maintenance Supervisor ● Mark Roache, Groundsperson ● Marie Creavy, Cleaner 	NRF Seminar Room Behind the Nursing Building	
0945-1025	<p>Estates Staff- Meeting 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Gavin Hattie, Facilities Engineer ● Coreen Malone, Office Manager ● Edward Hamilton, Security Supervisor ● Peter McDonnell, Project Manager ● Suzanne O'Brien, Senior Administrator ● Richard Jones, Facilities Officer GLA ● Joe Fallon, Energy Manager ● Mark Tate, Technical Services Manager 	NRF Seminar Room	
1030-1100	PRG Coffee/ Private Meeting Time	NRF Seminar Room	
1100-1140	<p>Key staff from university department – Campus Companies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Ken Robinson, General Manager, DCU Sport 	NRF Seminar Room	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Patricia Gaffney, Higher Executive Officer, Educational Research Centre ● Maria Johnston, Operations and Enterprise Development Manager, DCU Invent ● Tim Buckley, The Helix ● Aisling Flood, Operations Manager, DCU Rooms 		
1145-1225	<p>Key staff from other university department Academic Staff where the area under review has significant co-operation from (faculty-based/ prof support) Faculty Managers, SS&D, academic staff consulting on campus development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Maeve Fitzpatrick, Faculty Manager, ● Jonathon Begg, Faculty Manager ● Gavin Osborne, Facilities and Technical Services Manager ● Veronica Dobbyn, Chief Technical Officer/ Chemistry Buyer ● Robbie Sinnott, STEP Research Facilities Unit Manager ● Barry Byrne, Biological and General Safety Officer ● Maurice Burke, Chief Technical Officer 	NRF Seminar Room	
1230-1300	Tour of Facilities- Ger / Alan lead tour		
1300-1400	Lunch/ PRG Private Meeting Time	NRF Seminar Room	
1400-1440	<p>Key staff from other university department – Professional support staff where the area under review has significant co-operation from professional and admin support staff e.g. Sustainability, Health and Safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Orla Nic Aodh, Associate Director of Public Services and Outreach ● Paula Kierans, Health and Safety Manager ● Deirdre Reynolds, HR Business Partner ● Samantha Fahy, Sustainability Manager ● Justin Doyle, Deputy Director ISS ● Gillian Barry, Deputy Director of Registry ● Paul Byrne, DCU Sports and Well Being ● Annabella Stover, Deputy Director Student Support and Development 	NRF Seminar Room	
1445-1510	Staff Open Forum for any member of Area staff	NRF Seminar Room	

1515-1630	PRG Private Meeting Time	NRF Seminar Room	
1630-1715	Meeting with Area senior management Team- max 8 people <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Ger McEvoy, Director of Estates ● Stephen Toomey, Operations Manager ● Richard Kelly, Estate Manager ● Adolfo Rey Garcia, Capital Projects Manager 	NRF Seminar Room	
1715-1800	Meeting with Area Head <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Gerard McEvoy 	NRF Seminar Room	
1830-2000	PRG Private Dinner and Meeting	Skylon Hotel	
Day 3 – Friday Glasnevin Campus			
0845-0930	PRG Meeting with Senior Management Group: Prof. Daire Keogh, President Prof. Anne Sinnott, Deputy President Ms. Marian Burns, HR Director Mr. Ciaran Mcgivern, Finance Director Prof. Lisa Looney, Vice-President Academic Affairs (Registrar) Dr. Declan Raftery, Chief Operations Officer Prof. Derek Hand Executive Dean, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences Prof. Michelle Butler, Executive Dean, Faculty of Science and Health Prof. Anne.Looney, Executive Dean, DCU Institute of Education Prof. Colm.O’Gorman, Acting Executive Dean, DCU Business School Ms. Jennifer.Bruton, Executive Dean, Faculty of Engineering & Computing Ms. Laura.Mahoney, Executive Director of Engagement	Albert College Building Room AG01	
0930–1000	Meeting with Chief Operating Officer, Dr. Declan Raftery	AG01	
1000-1300	PRG Private Meeting Time- final discussion on recommendations	NRF Seminar Room	
1300-1345	PRG working lunch and finalisation of exit presentation	NRF Seminar Room	

1345-1400	Briefing with Area Head and Director of QPO on key recommendations	NRF Seminar Room	
1400-1430	PRG Exit Presentation- ground floor nursing lecture theatre	HG23 Nursing Building	