

Quality Assurance / Quality Improvement  
Internal Quality Review Programme  
2014-2015



Quality Improvement Plan

**Estates Office**

*August 2015*

## **Contents**

1. Introduction
2. Responses To Recommendations in the Peer Review Group Report
3. Summary of One-Year Plan
4. Summary of Three-Year Plan
  
5. Appendices
  - 5.1. Estates Office Quality Committee (for the Self-Assessment Report)
  - 5.2. Peer Review Group members
  - 5.3. Estates Office Quality Committee (for the Quality Improvement Plan)
  - 5.4. Prioritised Resource Requirements

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

This Estates Office Quality Improvement Plan (QulP) has been developed in response to the extensive Peer Review Group (PRG) Report which was issued in May 2015, as part of the Estates Office Quality Review Process.

The Estates Office would like to thank the Peer Review Group (PRG) and all the staff representatives who met with the PRG during the site visit. We very much appreciate the time and effort that people gave to make this a worthwhile and positive process for the Estates Office. We would also like to sincerely thank the staff in the Quality Promotion Office and everyone who participated in the staff survey and the focus groups during the development of the Estates Office Self Assessment Report.

A copy of the PRG Report was circulated to all Estates Office staff in June 2015 and a meeting took place to discuss the recommendations of the PRG. A Quality Improvement Plan was drafted and then circulated to all staff for review before being finalised.

## **2. RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE PEER REVIEW GROUP REPORT**

The Estates Office welcomes the recommendations of the Quality Review which by in large reflect the areas highlighted by the Estates Office in the Self Assessment Report.

The review process has provided a platform to collect feedback and information from Estates Office customers which will assist in improving the services the Estates Office delivers across campus.

The Quality Review process has been very timely. The Incorporation and the addition of All Hallows will prove challenging and the process has allowed the Estates Office to consider its position within the University alongside its strengths and weaknesses. A new Estates strategy is to be written utilising both the recommendations of the PRG Report and the SWOC analysis drafted as part of the Estates Office SAR.

The Estates Office Quality Review Committee has responded to the various recommendations and identified actions and timelines for implementation.

- Recommendations that have already been implemented
- Recommendation that will be implemented within 1 year.
- Recommendations that will be implemented within 3 years.
- Recommendations that may not be implemented as they can be demonstrated to be unreasonable or impractical.

The following notation is used in the recommendations for improvement.

**P1:** A recommendation that is important *and* requires urgent action.

**P2:** A recommendation that is important, but can (or perhaps must) be addressed on a more extended time scale.

**P3:** A recommendation which merits serious consideration but which is not considered to be critical to the quality of the ongoing activities in the Area.

Additionally, the PRG indicate the level(s) of the University where action is required: A: Area under review U: University Senior Management

Recommendation Number	Priority	Addressee	PRG Recommendation	Estates Office Response	University Response
			<b>Strategic Planning and Management of Financial and other Resources</b>		
1	P1	A/U	Develop a cohesive and comprehensive Estates Strategy covering existing and future requirements of the overall university estate, including a number of supporting and enabling strategies e.g. Space Strategy.	The Estates Office recognises its importance as a strategic asset and agrees with the need for a clearly defined and comprehensive strategy that will encompass the current and future requirements of the University. We will contribute to the Estates Strategy through the COO's office.  (See One Year Plan, Action 1 for further information)	The Estates Office plays a central role in the development of the new Campus Development Plan and its subsequent implementation. The development of a 3 year Estates Strategic Plan is welcomed and the COO will appoint a working group to draft it.
2	P1	A/U	Adopt a more strategic planning approach by linking the Estates Strategy (ref Recommendation 1) to specific plans for: (a) Campus development to include capital and significant refurbishment of items above one million euro for existing buildings. (b) Strategic maintenance for each of the next 5 years to include business critical items of infrastructure. (c) Annual repairs and maintenance.	The Estates Office welcomes this recommendation and on foot of this recommendation will develop detailed plans to implement following the development of the Estates Strategy.  (See One Year Plan, Action 1 for further information)	The University agrees with this response.

Recommendation Number	Priority	Addressee	PRG Recommendation	Estates Office Response	University Response
3	P1	U	Give consideration to moving the utilities budget to a University core expense.	<p>On foot of the recommendation from the PRG, the Senior Management Group has agreed to split the utilities budget from the Estates Office core operating budget out into a separate budget.</p> <p><b>Complete</b></p>	University management has included the utilities budget as a separate budget lien to give greater visibility of this very significant non-pay cost and also to ensure it is viewed as a truly institution wide overhead cost and not an element of the operational budget of the Estates Office.
4	P1	A/U	In conjunction with University management, review the current Estates Risk Register. Confirm, in particular, that the risk weightings applied accurately reflect the likely and potential impact of the strategic / operational / financial / reputational perspectives within the defined DCU risk assessment criteria.	<p>The Estates Office will continue to work in conjunction with University Management to review the weightings applied and ensure they accurately reflect the likely and potential impact for the University.</p> <p><b>(See One Year Plan, Action 2 for further information)</b></p>	Agreed – this is carried out as part of the annual risk management process.
			<b>Organisation and Staffing</b>		
5	P1	A/U	<p>Undertake a review of the Estates Office from an organisational structure perspective with a view to identifying:</p> <p>(1) Current and future reporting structure needs along with associated skills and competencies requirements, which should take into account the Incorporation Programme and Innovation Campus administrative requirements.</p>	<p>1. Proposals to address the organisational structure, including the addition of the new campuses, have been drafted are currently awaiting responses from the University in the context of post-incorporation DCU</p>	A new organisation structure has been agreed (subject to resources) for the post-incorporation Estates Office.

Recommendation Number	Priority	Addressee	PRG Recommendation	Estates Office Response	University Response
			(2) A staff training/development plan to address any skills and competencies deficits and requirements for succession planning. In relation to staffing requirements, consider the need for a systems manager type role to roll out and integrate various systems, particularly to support the Incorporation programme and future needs and taking account of possible developments referred to in recommendation 9.	2. The Estates Office agrees with the need to determine staff training and development needs, in particular due to the current campus development plans and the Incorporation Process in collaboration with Human Resource Training and Development Unit.  (See One Year Plan, Action 10 for further information)	Succession planning is an issue that can only be addressed where resources and flexibility within the Employment Control Framework become available. The appointment of a Systems Manager is being considered in the context of the post-incorporation University.
6	P2	A	Introduce regular, cross-functional staff meetings.	Management meetings to be held on a regular basis.  (See One Year Plan, Action 6 for further information)	<b>Note:</b> The University welcomes this response.
			<b>Functions, Activities and Processes</b>		
7	P1	A	Optimise the effectiveness and efficiency of existing processes by reviewing and re-engineering Estates Office functions, in conjunction with users, using a standard industry approach such as Lean Six Sigma.	The Estates Office agrees that the effectiveness and efficiencies of existing processes must be reviewed. Different industry approaches will be considered and, where necessary, appropriate training will be sought and external facilitation employed.  (See Three Year Plan, Action 3 for further information)	<b>Note:</b> The University welcomes this response.
8	P2	A	Develop a new Estates Office Quality Handbook and improve the website in respect of the new developments.	Both the handbook and the website will be developed over the coming year.  (See One Year Plan, Action 3 and Action 4 for further information)	<b>Note:</b> The University welcomes this response.

Recommendation Number	Priority	Addressee	PRG Recommendation	Estates Office Response	University Response
9	P1	A	Working in partnership with Information Systems and Services (ISS), review the future of the Estates helpdesk in conjunction with key stakeholders to include a requirements brief and a full appraisal of solution options.	<p>The Estates Office agrees that there is an urgent need to further develop the Estates Helpdesk in order to enhance its functionality and allow it to be rolled out over the incorporated institutions.</p> <p>The Estates Office and ISS will to work in partnership to review the current Estates Helpdesk and to develop a long term solution.</p> <p><b>(See One Year Plan, Action 8 and Three Year Plan, Action 5 for further information)</b></p>	The University Management are fully supportive of the concept of the Estates Office and ISS developing a single integrated Helpdesk function. Initial steps in this regard have been taken for the 2015/2016 academic year with an integrated Classroom Helpdesk approach been the two units.
10	P2	U/A	Review governance arrangements of subsidiary / commercial entities with a view to developing a more consistent approach to Estates works that will enable increased efficiencies and cost effectiveness.	Estates Office has reviewed this. Any areas which are the direct responsibility of the Estates Office are governed by public procurement and subject to DCU's health and safety and insurance requirements.	DCU subsidiary companies receive cost effective services from the Estates Office. The companies are located on a fully serviced campus environment, with significant overheads which have to be recovered. All of the subsidiary companies operate very distinctive business with very different requirements from the Estates Office.
			<b>Accommodation</b>		
11	P1	A/U	Undertake a review of current and future Estates Office space requirements with a view to identifying a more appropriate building / location which reflects the strategic role of the Estates office.	The Estates Office agrees with the need for a more appropriate accommodation and a location has been identified; however funding is currently not available.	It is fully accepted that the Estates Office is located in facilities that are no longer fit for purpose. In the context of the

Recommendation Number	Priority	Addressee	PRG Recommendation	Estates Office Response	University Response
					new Campus Development Plan and the acquisition of new campuses the location of the Estates Office will be reviewed.
12	P2	A	Commence digital archival and indexing of all as-built drawings and maintenance manuals following on from a recommendation in the previous quality review.	<p>The Estates Office welcomes this recommendation. This is considered a priority issue in the Estates Risk Register and is deemed urgent as the main DCU building drawings are housed in a portakabin and a basement which carries fire and flood risks. Many of these records are irreplaceable.</p> <p>Further quotations are being obtained with the objective of commencing the process by digitising the most frequently used and critical building drawings since it is recognised that digital archiving of all material is currently cost prohibitive.</p> <p><b>(See Three Year Plan, Action 4 for further information)</b></p>	<p><b>Note:</b></p> <p>At this time, the cost associated with full Digital Archiving remains prohibitive. However the University welcomes the fact that an alternative, scaled-down, solution to mitigate this risk is being examined.</p>
			<b>Customer / Stakeholder Perspective</b>		
13	P2	A	Develop a comprehensive communications plan from both internal and external perspectives.	<p>The Estates Office agrees on the need for a communications plan. An internal group has examined how this can be achieved and is moving ahead with a number of initiatives to improve communications which will include the development of a communications plan.</p> <p><b>(See Three Year Plan, Action 2 for future information)</b></p>	<p><b>Note:</b></p> <p>Communicating the volume and breadth of activities undertaken by the Estates Office needs to be more effective – this is fully accepted by University Management.</p>



Recommendation Number	Priority	Addressee	PRG Recommendation	Estates Office Response	University Response
14	P2	A	Progress and communicate the energy conservation agenda across the university.	<p>The energy conservation agenda will be progressed via the Estates Office website and the on-going E3 Bureau activities along with local initiatives.</p> <p><b>(See One Year Plan, Action 9 for further information)</b></p>	The University accepts the Estates Office approach in this regard with the limited resources available.
15	P2	A	<p>Consider implementing some ‘quick wins’ (ref Section 4.9 in PRG report) to improve and build on relationships with the various stakeholders in the University community.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase levels of lighting to the Avenue leading from the Ballymun Road entrance</li> <li>2. Provide readily available and published information on opening hours of buildings</li> <li>3. Introduce staff access to barrier at Albert College to enable easy access from one side of the campus to the other</li> <li>4. Review the work permit system</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The Ballymun Road entrance was recently improved and the lighting is fit for purpose.</li> <li>➤ The Estates website is currently being updated to include more information on opening hours of buildings.</li> </ul> <p><b>(See One Year Plan, Action 4 for further information)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The operation of the barrier is a health and safety priority and this priority remains.</li> <li>➤ The work permit system is currently under review.</li> </ul> <p><b>(See One Year Plan, Action 5 for further information)</b></p>	<p><b>Note:</b></p> <p>Completed.</p> <p>Welcomed</p> <p>Review of this campus access point to be carried out as part of the Campus Permeability Study.</p> <p>Accepted.</p>

## SUMMARY OF THE ONE YEAR PLAN

	<b>Action</b>	<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Lead</b>
<b>1</b>	Implementation of strategic maintenance for each of the next 5 years – elements already in place but will expand with incorporation and addition of All Hallows.  (PRG Recommendation 2)	June 2016	Mike Kelly Richy Kelly Ger McAvoy
<b>2</b>	Review of current risk register.  (PRG Recommendation 4)	Quarterly meetings	Mike Kelly
<b>3</b>	Develop a new Estates Office Quality Handbook.  (PRG Recommendation 8)	December 2015	Kathleen Whelan
<b>4</b>	Improve the Estates Office website in conjunction with the DCU Communications and Marketing Department.  (PRG Recommendation 8 & 15.2)	March 2016	Coreen Malone
<b>5</b>	Review work permit system.  (PRG Recommendation 15.4)	June 2015 Ongoing review	Liam O'Reilly
<b>6</b>	Introduction of regular, cross-functional staff meetings.  (PRG Recommendation 6)	September 2015	Mike Kelly
<b>8</b>	Meet with ISS to discuss the needs going forward of the Estates Office Helpdesk.  (PRG Recommendation 9)	December 2015	Mike Kelly
<b>9</b>	Progress and communicate the energy conservation agenda across the university.  (PRG Recommendation 14)	Ongoing Review	Richy Kelly
<b>10</b>	Develop a staff training plan to address any skills and competencies deficits and requirements for succession planning. (subject to available funding).  (PRG Recommendation 5.2)	March 2016  Ongoing review – gaps also being identified subject to Incorporation	Kathleen Whelan

## SUMMARY OF THE THREE YEAR PLAN

	Action	Timeline	Lead
1	Contribute to the Estates Strategy. (PRG Recommendation 1)	September 2016 in line with incorporation	Kathleen Whelan
2	Development of an Estates Office Communications Plan. (PRG Recommendation 13)	December 2016	Kathleen Whelan
3	Reviewing of Estates Office functions and processes, and researching the potential of different industry approaches. (PRG Recommendation 7)	Ongoing review to 2018	Mike Kelly (See Action 9, One Year Plan) Kathleen Whelan
4	Obtain quotes and commence digitally archiving building drawings (subject to available funding). (PRG Recommendation 12)	To be completed by 2017	Ger McAvoy
5	Helpdesk / Systems Manager / Development of the Estates helpdesk in conjunction with key stakeholders to include a requirements brief and a full appraisal of solution options. (PRG Recommendation 9)	Ongoing to 2018  Submission has been made to the University relating to resources to carry out this work – response is awaited	Mike Kelly

**APPENDIX 1                      Estates Office Quality Committee (for the SAR)**

Richard Kelly	Deputy Director of Estates
Gerard McEvoy	Estates Manager
Coreen Malone	Senior Administrator
Kathleen Whelan	Cleaning & Waste Manager
Michael Woods	Mechanical & Electrical Engineer
Dave Faherty	Assistant Facilities Manager
Alan Mangan	Incorporation Manager
Aidan Kearns	Innovation Campus Facilities Manager
Seamus Keating	Duty Security Supervisor

**APPENDIX 2                      Peer Review Group members**

Mr. Chris Abbott, Director of Facilities, University of the West of England (Chair)  
Mr. Mark Kelly, Managing Director, Healy Kelly Turner & Townsend  
Mr. Robert Reidy, Director, Buildings and Estates, University of Limerick  
Dr. Denise Proudfoot, School of Nursing and Human Sciences, Dublin City University (Rapporteur)  
Ms. Barbara McConalogue, Director, Information Systems & Services, Dublin City University

**APPENDIX3                      Estates Office Quality Committee (for the Quality Improvement Plan)**

Michael Kelly	Director of Estates
Richard Kelly	Deputy Director of Estates
Gerard McEvoy	Estates Manager
Coreen Malone	Senior Administrator
Kathleen Whelan	Cleaning & Waste Manager

#### 5.4 Prioritised Resource Requirements

<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Cost Estimate</b>
Digitalising Building Drawings	€80,000
Training and Development	€20,000
Helpdesk Review & Development	€50,000

Full proposals for these resource requirements will be made to the Quality Promotion Committee