Trinity College Dublin
Coláiste na Tríonóide, Baile Átha Cliath
The University of Dublin

Quality Review of
Estates and Facilities

20 – 22 February 2018

External Reviewers:
Mr Mike Clark (Chair), University of Brighton
Mr Mark Poland, University College Cork

Internal Facilitator:
Ms Deirdre Savage, Trinity College Dublin

Table of Contents

Table of Contents   **Page**

1   Executive Summary

1.1   The Estate & Facilities Strategy has been assessed in terms of the documentation provided within the Estate Facilities Directorate (E&F) Self-Assessment Report (SAR) and the Appendices contained within.

1.2   We have undertaken the review within the parameters laid down by the Terms of Reference for the Quality Review of the Estates and Facilities Directorate as issued to us by the Quality Office of Trinity College Dublin.

1.3   Section 5 of this report – Key Observations and Recommendations identifies:

      i.   Where evidence of good practice has been identified;
      ii.   Areas where weaknesses were noted;
      iii. Where the College should implement recommendations to ensure continued improvements in the services offered by the Estate & Facilities Directorate; and
      iv. Other areas considered that were deemed outside of the five key items in the Terms of Reference.

1.4   We believe it is of paramount importance that where the need for further action and support have been noted in the above section of our report, that the College commits to providing the level of support deemed necessary to enable the ongoing improvements in service to be maintained.

1.5   Our overriding impression was one of a well-functioning department that had been operating in and continues to operate in a very demanding environment, both in terms of the fiscal constraints still evident in publicly funded organisations and also the higher education sector as a whole.

1.6   We found much evidence from those we met that E&F has successfully reversed some of the more recent negative views of the directorate, based on the successful outcomes of past projects. It is also reassuring to note that the PESTLE and SWOT analysis undertaken by E&F in the SAR, demonstrates a strength of character of E&F to consider both the internal and external challenges facing the directorate, including their own weaknesses and to provide a strategy to address them in the coming months and years.

1.7   Unless the three-year tender cycles used by E&F are a requirement of national procurement guidelines, extended contract durations could be beneficial in terms of securing further value for money and improved levels of service quality. This can be managed through proper benchmarking and more stringent termination rights should the service provider not meet quality and performance benchmarks

1.8   Whilst E&F may not be considered as the perfect operating model by all we met, it is still very much highly regarded by its peers and the external professionals who support them in their quest to ensure the highest standards of higher education estates practices are in place at the

College.

1.9   Given the College's unique setting, it is imperative that specific recommendations relating to the fabric of the Estate are implemented without any further delay.

2   Introduction

2.1   A review of Trinity College Dublin Estates and Facilities Directorate took place from the 20 – 22 February 2018. The Review Team were: Mr Mark Poland, Director Buildings & Estates, University College Cork, Ireland; and Mr Mike Clark, Director of Estates & Facilities Management, University of Brighton and Chair of the Association of University Directors of Estates (AUDE, UK). Mr Poland and Mr Clark agreed between them that Mr Clark would act as the Chair of the External Quality Review Panel.

2.2   The site visit of 2.5 days included a range of meetings with internal and external stakeholders and the tours of and visits to on-site and off-campus facilities. Further detail of which can be found in the schedule of meetings is attached as Appendix A.

2.3   The Review Team wish to acknowledge the comprehensive suite of documentation prepared in advance of the review by the Self-Assessment Review Team on behalf of the staff of the Estates & Facilities Directorate. The Review Team also wish to acknowledge Ms Deirdre Savage for her able guidance in the role of Internal Facilitator and also Ms Yseult Thornley who acted as Rapporteur/Note Taker for the review.

3   Context

3.1   Trinity College Dublin is the oldest university in Ireland, and one of the oldest in Europe, today Trinity sits at the intersection of the past and the future, and is ideally positioned as a major university in the European Union. The College occupies a beautiful and historic campus in the heart of Dublin. In part residential, its fine buildings, built over the centuries, ensure a collegiate atmosphere which provides an outstanding environment for research and teaching.

3.2   The first brick buildings of the 1590s occupied only a small part of what is now Front Square. The next significant phase of development took place in the 18th century with a string of classical buildings being developed on the western half of the campus: new Library (1712-32), the Printing House (1733-4), the West Front (1752-9), the Dining Hall (c.1760-65), and the Provost's House (1759-61). During the second half of the 18th century Parliament Square slowly emerged, shaped by the Public Theatre (1777-86) and the new Chapel (1787-98). The campus gradually spread eastwards with the next significant building development phase occurring in the second half of the 20th century.

3.3   In terms of physical development since 1950, the College contributed to the small stock of fine modernist architecture in Dublin, beginning with the Berkeley Library (1965-6), the Arts Building (1977-8), the Dublin Dental Hospital, the O'Reilly Institute (1989), the Ussher Library (1999-2001) and the Trinity Long Room Hub (2008-10). But by 2000 the College had expanded beyond the traditional island campus, the Trinity Biomedical Sciences Institute in Pearse Street, (2008-2011) the most

ambitious construction project in the College's history, has become the strongest physical statement of the College's outward movement.

4   Terms of Reference

4.1   The Terms of Reference for the External Quality Review are, for ease of reference included in Appendix B.

5   Key Observations and Recommendations

The key observations and recommendations of the Review Team are documented against each of the Terms of Reference for the Review below:

5.1   *(i) The Estates & Facilities Strategy in terms of its fitness-for-purpose to respond to the College strategies, the internal and external environment, emergent risks and opportunities nationally and internationally.*

5.1.1   The Estate & Facilities Strategy has been assessed in terms of the documentation provided within the Estate Facilities Directorate (E&F) Self-Assessment Report and the Appendices contained within.

We found evidence of good practice in the following areas:

5.1.2   E&F continue to provide an excellent front-line service that is well received by the student and staff community alike. This is evidenced by the significant positive feedback received in the open-meetings with a broad range of the College stakeholders.

5.1.2   The PESTLE and SWOT analysis demonstrate a strength of E&F to consider both the internal and external challenges facing the directorate, including their own weaknesses and to provide a strategy to address them in the coming months and years.

5.1.3   E&F have identified the need to provide quality spaces for the College to innovate at a faster pace than your competitors, both domestically and internationally.

5.1.4   E&F are clear in their commitment to supporting the College in its objective to be a global leader in university sustainability. Again, this is evidenced by the overwhelmingly positive support from those engaged in the sustainability and biodiversity across the College.

Areas where weaknesses were noted:

5.1.5   Although E&F have acknowledged the need to benchmark its operations, what and against whom such comparisons are made will be critical decisions to ensure such benchmarking is reliable and a meaningful form of assessment against which improvements can be monitored and measured. We have noted the references to benchmarking with the Self-Assessment Report provided by E&F and further benchmarking could include:

Property Efficiency
a. Non-Residential Income (€) per m^2 of Net Internal Area (NIA)
b. Teaching Income (€) per m^2 of Teaching space NIA
c. Research Income (€) per m^2 of Research space NIA
d. Total Property Costs (€) per m^2 of Gross Internal Area (GIA)
e. Total Capital Expenditure as % of Income
f. Total Capital Expenditure as % of Insurance Replacement Value (IRV)
g. Total Maintenance Expenditure as % of Income
h. Total Maintenance Expenditure as % of Insurance Replacement Value (IRV)

Energy
a. Energy Consumption (kWh) per Student FTE
b. Total Energy Costs per m^2 of Gross Internal Area

Space
a. Non-Residential GIA in m 2 per Student and Staff FTE
b. Total Non-Residential NIA per Student FTE
c. Core Teaching Space per Taught Student FTE
d. Academic Office NIA per Academic Staff FTE
e. Support Office NIA per Support Office Staff FTE

Building Condition and Age
a. Total Building Condition Assessment A + B
b. Functional Suitability Grades 1 + 2*
c. Construction Data post-1980
d. Cost to Upgrade C+D to B
e. Cost to Upgrade C+D to B as % of Income

* Functional Suitability is a rating used by the UK's Higher Education Standards Agency (HESA) and is used to assess the 'usability' of space within the estate. A summary of the approach is included in Appendix C.

5.1.6   We did not see evidence of an Environmental Management System (EMS) in place. ISO 14001:2015 is the international standard for environmental management systems. EcoCampus (https://loreusltd.com/mod/page/view.php?id=1164) is a scheme which offers a flexible phased approach to implementing an environmental management system for the higher and further education sector. Participants gain recognition at each stage of the process through a series of awards from bronze through silver, gold and platinum. The platinum award conforms to the requirements of the international environmental management standard ISO 14001.

5.1.7   Communication of the wide ranging activities of the work done by E&F is not visible at a range of levels and this is to the great detriment of those working within E&F. At one level, whilst past, less positive issues remain associated with E&F, there is much to celebrate e.g: the €10m Medium Voltage project. Conversely, there must be more structured communication from the E&F senior team to the wider E&F community and beyond.

The College should implement the following recommendations to ensure continued improvements in the services offered by E&F:

5.1.8   The College should ensure that an appropriate auditing mechanism within E&F is established to maintain the momentum and progress established to date.

5.1.9   In terms of the comments made on communication, the College should provide the necessary support to E&F, working with the College's Public Affairs & Communication team to ensure that E&F provide a consistent level of information about its activities.

5.1.10   In terms of ensuring the ongoing positive outcomes for sustainability described in (5.1.4) above, the College should consider reviewing the existing arrangements for the delivery of sustainability initiatives so that this is done in a co-ordinated way. One option is the creation of a new role that is responsible for the co-ordination of all sustainability work across the College.

5.1.11   Further consideration should be given by the College in terms of the sustainability standards being used by E&F in the design of new buildings, the refurbishment of existing ones and the general environmental management of the estate. The reviewers have noted good practice at UCL (https://www.ucl.ac.uk/greenucl/resources/construction/Sustainable-Building-Design) and Yale University (https://sustainability.yale.edu/planning-progress/campus-projects-action/buildings/sustainable-building-design).

5.1.12   It is also noted that the Sustainable Energy Authority of Ireland (SEAI) offer supports through its Excellence in Energy Efficiency Design (EXEED) programme. EXEED) enables organisations establish a systematic approach to design, construction, and commissioning processes for new investments and upgrades to existing assets. The EXEED Certified program aims to influence and deliver new best practices in energy efficient design management. EXEED designs, verifies, and manages optimum energy performance and management at the earliest stages of the lifecycle. Grants to support the EXEED process are also available.

5.1.13   The College should also give further consideration to use of newer, more innovative environmental standards. The WELL Building Standard is the world's first building standard focussed on human health and wellness (http://delos.com/about/well-building-standard/). It marries best practices in design and construction with evidence-based medical and scientific research.

Although an American development, it is being used by the innovative UK developer Stuart Lipton in a significant London commercial development and has also been used by Arup in the fit-out of their new offices in Cork.

The College should consider its adoption as it seems an appropriate framework within which to progress its environmental, well-being and sustainability agendas.

5.2 *(ii) The effectiveness to date of the 2015/16 E&F restructuring: We note that E&F has undergone a major restructuring programme in order to provide more integrated services and to provide enhanced services to its customers.*

We found evidence of good practice in the following areas:

5.2.1 We were impressed with the desire of the unit to constantly challenge its own ways of working and to strive to provide enhanced services to the College community.

5.2.2 We noted that the restructuring is at an early stage and that proposed It enhancements will improve the efficiency of the service desk function and allow better tracking and feedback to customers who log requests etc.

5.2.3 We were delighted to hear that SLA's put in place with the Accommodation Office and the Commercial Revenue Office have been developed and that the level of service provided is considered to be of high quality, responsive and reasonable value given the market conditions that apply.

Areas where weaknesses were noted:
5.2.4 Lack of acceptance from some front line staff of need and rationale for change.

5.2.5 Perception from some users that the 'traditional' means of getting work done had been now routed through the service desk and that works were taking longer than before.

The College should implement the following recommendations to ensure continued improvements in the services offered by E&F:

5.2.6 Follow through with completing the organisational restructuring.

5.2.7 Undertake a review annually of the lessons learned using surveys and focus groups and continue to evolve the service delivery in line with feedback from customers and staff.

5.2.8 Roll out enhanced IT solution (PLANON) ASAP and to ensure sufficient training and communications support for E&F with its implementation...

5.2.9 Work with staff on communicating the need for change and ensure that all staff are adequately trained and aware of job expectations.

5.2.10 Communicate to all customers clearly the level of service the E&F can provide and track closely the actual performance versus planned.

5.2.11   Develop and communicate effective FAQ's on the full range of services provided by E&F.

5.3   *(iii) Fitness for purpose of the Campus infrastructure and environment in support of the quality enhancement of the Student experience, Teaching & Learning, Research & Innovation and the Visitor Experience, having regard to the resources available.*

We found evidence of good practice in the following areas:

5.3.1   Provision of high quality facilities in recently completed and planned capital development projects.

5.3.2   Effective response maintenance programmes in place along with highly committed and experienced staff who provide a high level of service in constrained financial conditions.

5.3.3   The ability of E&F to successfully deal with the growth in visitor numbers and the success of Trinity as a major tourism destination. This should also be seen in the growth of student and staff numbers, and the size of the estate in recent years.

5.3.4   Well-presented external landscaped areas with high level of cleanliness and this is supported by visitor feedback.

5.3.5   Recent investment in upgrading of campus electrical infrastructure.

5.3.6   Ongoing investment in energy improvement initiatives.

Areas where weaknesses were noted:

5.3.7   A high proportion of buildings in Category C condition requiring high levels of investment (€100m plus liability).

5.3.8   Inadequate resources or medium to long term plan to address Backlog Maintenance Deficits.

5.3.9   Academic departments dispersed in multiple locations in unsuitable accommodation.

5.3.10   Lack of Student Facilities (new capital development planned)

5.3.11   Weaknesses in Safety Management system as defined in Quadra Report.

The College should implement the following recommendations to ensure continued improvements in the services offered by E&F:

5.3.12   Commission a Conservation Plan for campus estate to inform the Estates Strategy\enhance awareness among staff of significance of campus built\landscape heritage

5.3.13   Put in place a funded Backlog Maintenance Programme to address the Backlog Maintenance deficit over the medium to long term.

5.3.14   Complete as a matter of urgency the Estates Strategy and Campus Masterplan.

5.3.15   Implement as a matter of urgency all aspects of Quadra report and put in place an annual reporting system to provide assurance of compliance with safety management system.

5.3.16   Develop further in conjunction with the Student Body informal and social/common learning spaces for student use.

5.4   *(iv) The value for money achieved in the delivery of services by Estates and Facilities.*

We found evidence of good practice in the following areas:

5.4.1   It has been confirmed by the College that 75% of E&F's gross operational non-pay budget of €18.3m is competitively tendered. The vast majority of the non-pay budget, service contracts were let on a three-year tender cycle. Of the remaining 25%, procurement is carried out through existing frameworks, competitive quotes or is below the threshold for tendering.

5.4.2   Unless the three-year tender cycles referred to above are a requirement of national procurement guidelines, extended contract durations could be beneficial in terms of securing further value for money and improved levels of service quality. This can be managed through proper benchmarking and more stringent termination rights should the service provider not meet quality and performance benchmarks

5.4.3   Consultancy services for capital projects were also competitively tendered with an appropriate level of quality/price apportionment in the tender documents.

Areas where we felt there was room for improvement included:

5.4.4   In terms of the consultations/meetings undertaken, there were a number of concerns raised about the lack of transparency about the charging system operated by E&F. This is easily resolved by having a clearly worded summary of how and why the charging strategy works in the way it does.

5.4.5   Given the size of the future capital programme, the College should support E&F and its various consultant teams in identifying the best means of procuring such works given the ongoing volatility in the tendering market. The focus should be on securing best value over the whole life of the programme, rather than on short-term successes.

The College should implement the following recommendations to ensure continued improvements in the services offered by E&F:

5.4.6 The College should seriously consider the implications of the deferment of maintenance works. Although undertakings have been given about further investment in addressing backlog (deferred maintenance), the evidence is that previous maintenance budgets have been the early victims of recent budget cuts.

5.4.7 The consequences of such actions can be seen in the summary below where the financial implications of deferment are clearly indicated:

Condition Rating	Action Required	Budget Requirement (% of estimated current construction cost of modern equivalent asset)
Excellent	Preventative maintenance	2%± (= 1.5% preventative maintenance + 0.5% unplanned maintenance)
Good	Condition based maintenance	4%±
Fair	Repairs	20%±
Worn	Major repairs and/or rehabilitation	60%±
Poor	Replacement	100%±

5.4.8 Alternatively, the UK's Higher Education Standards Agency (HESA) has recommended that the following methodology is provided as an example of best practice in carrying out building condition assessment; it is not a requirement that this method is used. However, it is expected that the assessment will be undertaken by an appropriately qualified and experienced professional using an objective assessment methodology.

Each building can be given a condition grade based on the relationship between repair and rebuilding costs as follows:

$X=R/IRV$ where R= net cost of all currently identified repairs at the point of the annual assessment update, and IRV = net replacement value of the building, based upon its current function (using BCIS published data). Repair costs should include those associated with ensuring legislative compliance (see Current cost of legislative compliance). To ensure comparability, both repair costs and rebuilding costs should be net, i.e. excluding all associated professional fees, statutory fees, contingencies and VAT etc. and should be at present day values, excluding inflation.
As a general guide, where X is:
- < 5%, this indicates condition A (or where the building is less than 5 years old),
- between 5% and 20% indicates condition B,
- between 20% and 50% indicates condition C,
- >= 50% indicates condition D.

5.5 *(v) The prioritisation of action under the six Transformation Areas and related proposals as outlined by Estates & Facilities in its Self-Assessment Report (SAR) (§6.3 and §6.4) with a particular focus in*

the context of this review on Quality and Performance.
We support the thrust of the proposals in the six transformational areas identified. We would recommend that an appropriate specific list of actions/responsibilities is assigned and that KPIs are established and monitored as part of the annual operational process.

As an interim measure, we have considered the six Transformation Areas identified within E&F's SAR and reviewed each one against the observations made and feedback received during the review process. This is very much a high-level assessment and provides a further level of understanding of the actions being taken by E&F to ensure improvements in the service offered continues to be made. The ratings are as follows:

Red	-	Very little evidence was provided that E&F were addressing the action in question. Immediate measures required to address our concerns.
Amber	-	There is some evidence that E&F have measures in place addressing the actions in question, but further input from E&F is required to resolve these issues.
Green	-	Demonstrable evidence that E&F have measures in place that are addressing the actions in question. E&F to continue to demonstrate this remains the case.

5.5.1 Support the Strategic Plan

Estates & Facilities shall continue to support the university strategic plan and contribute positively to the building of a sustainable community in Trinity by:

	Transformation Area	RAG
a)	Advocate for the Strategic Plan initiatives and principles at all times	G
b)	Creating and sustaining a campus that the community can be proud of, is safe, and is efficient and effective in its operations	A
c)	Enhancing Estates & Facilities professional image	A
d)	Reducing silo-based work practices	G
e)	Promoting Estates & Facilities people as the 'go-to' professionals for a range of demands, and as trusted advisors for the complexities of property, projects and operational management	A

f)	Engaging with the local community at several levels, including continuing engagement with local authorities, to improve relationships and outcomes	**A**
g)	Participating in, and leading where possible, the initiatives and projects relating to university shared services and improvements, where these initiatives have tangible benefits for estates service delivery, such as combined helpdesk functions	**G**

5.5.2 Improve the Customer Experience

Estates & Facilities shall improve the customer experiences in services it offers by:

	Transformation Area	RAG
a)	Listening to our customers, with increased focus on listening to the student body	**G**
b)	Undertake frequent surveys and taking action from feedback	**A**
c)	Re-focusing all services on the relevant customer, or multiple customer types	**G**
d)	Simplifying access to our services for our customers, by raising awareness and make our services legible and accessible for all customers	**A**
e)	Improve communications to our customers at all levels	**A**
f)	Embracing technology as a tool to improve our customers' experience and assisting us to provide the most efficient and effective service	**G**
g)	Increasing our customer satisfaction rating over the term of this process	**G**
h)	Creating a set of clear and unambiguous documents to allow our customers and colleagues to see the services we can and will offer, the context of procedures and practices and the measurement of our performance	**G**
i)	Reviewing the services we provide and communicate positively with our customers about the Service Catalogue provisions, and manage expectations, along with the ability to scale our services at cost, through the active use of our Service Catalogues	**A**
j)	Improving the customer perception of the Estates & Facilities	**G**

5.5.3 Quality and Performance

Estates & Facilities will build a culture of quality and performance by:

	Transformation Area	RAG
a)	Building on this QR process and previous initiatives to finalise a ground-up set of key performance indicators, service levels and operational plans	**A**
b)	Using positive change management and providing support to our staff to prevent alienation and help embrace change as an investment	**A**
c)	Examine the effectiveness of how we execute transactions to build credibility in our services	**G**

		RAG
d)	Focusing on transformations to improve ourselves	**G**
e)	Communicating effectively to all colleagues in Estates & Facilities and beyond	**R**
f)	Creating a learning organization and culture within Estates & Facilities by continuous up-skilling, training, information and incremental improvements	**A**
g)	Empowering staff at all levels to assist in creating 'mistake-proofing' mechanisms	**A**
h)	Benchmarking ourselves against best practice and exemplar organizations and create links with other organizations for mutual benefit	**G**
i)	Increasing our organisational and project management maturity levels through recognized maturity model processes (e.g., P3M3©)	**A**
j)	Engaging and excelling in Trinity-wide planning and initiatives	**G**
k)	Allowing ourselves to use practical applications of tools and techniques (without creating unsustainable conditions) from recognised quality management philosophies and processes	**G**

5.5.4 **Futureproof**

Estates & Facilities will prepare for the future by:

	Transformation Area	RAG
a)	Leveraging the brand of our land and estate to enhance the relative attractiveness of Trinity over its key competitors	**G**
b)	Consolidating our resources to protect our ability to provide quality core services	**G**
c)	Investing and improving the condition of the building stock to increase longevity and allow more intensive and appropriate use, which will require and continuation of annual central funding allocations in addition to the recurrent budget	**A**
d)	Using the physical assets of the university to optimise efficiency	**A**
e)	Creating managerial 'space' to allow managers to think smart about how to further increase effectiveness and efficiency from all perspectives	**A**
f)	Making our services scalable, flexible and agile enough to respond quickly to marketplace and university changes	**G**
g)	Using the new legibility that our customers will have of our service levels and performance, communicate the effect of the changes to our customers	**A**
h)	Helping our customers continue with their pursuits in the light of changes;	**G**
i)	Staying on top of legislative changes and requirements	**A**
j)	Leveraging ICT (with investment)	**G**
k)	Review the need for, and prepare flexibility, to deal with the need for all extensions and any new services required by our customers or external requirements	**G**

5.5.5 **Supporting the Commercial Revenue Unit (CRU)**

Estates & Facilities will support and enable the works of the CRU and other divisions to attract additional income to the University by:

	Transformation Area	RAG
a)	Continuing a very high level of frequency and depth of communications with the CRU	G
b)	Engaging with greater speed in projects and processes	G
c)	Facilitating events and operations that support the commercial agenda	G
d)	Being a trusted advisor to the Director of Commercial Revenue, the Chief Operating Officer and the Provost on sensitive and operational matters relating to events and initiatives	G
e)	Create and incubate opportunities for commercial revenues	A

5.5.6 **Motivate**

Estates & Facilities will motivate staff to achieve value by:

	Transformation Area	RAG
a)	Listening to our staff	A
b)	Engendering a sense of pride in the workplace	G
c)	Fostering an ethos and sense of responsibility and buy-in to Estates & Facilities objectives	A
d)	Using non-financial incentives at every appropriate opportunity	A
e)	Carefully studying flows, practices, consumables, inputs and outputs to minimise waste	G
f)	Reducing the cost of transactions	A
g)	Allowing staff to contribute, at all levels, to our continuous improvement	G
h)	Taking training opportunities and encouraging growth	G

5.6 **Other areas considered**

The review team also identified a number of issues during the review that warranted further analysis and recommendation and these are set out below.

5.6.1 **Estate Strategy**

We commend the approach of the College in identifying the importance and progressing the development of the Estates Strategy/ Masterplan. We particularly commend the work of the Bursar in providing the necessary academic leadership in the process.

We recommend that the Director of Estates plays a lead role with the Bursar in the development of the strategy and that the Strategy\Masterplan are progressed as a matter of urgency in 2018.

We also recommend that future Estates Strategies are aligned with the overall academic strategy planning cycle.

5.6.2 Space Management

The College needs urgently to review its existing space policy to ensure that it can respond to future needs. In particular we recommend that all teaching space be centrally allocated to improve utilisation and transparency and to improve the student experience.

Given the size of the Trinity estate and especially the heritage areas of the estate, it is likely that a dual approach to space use between the modern and heritage areas is adopted as there will be limitations in terms of the flexibility of heritage space, compared to that clearly evident in more modern buildings.

The College should also review the resources necessary to support the proper management of such a valuable resource as those currently allocated are, in the reviewers' opinion, not sufficient to do this task effectively.

5.6.3 Learning Spaces

We note that the Trinity Education Project supported the principle that: "the entire campus should be viewed as a teaching and learning space and the development of a strategy for the increased provision of informal learning spaces."

We did not see any recent examples where interventions had been made within the College to demonstrate that there had been any significant progress in this area. It is important to acknowledge that Learning Spaces has become a discipline of its own and should not necessarily be seen as an adjunct to the work of the space manager.

Given the level of expertise and knowledge of the estate that lies within E&F, we recommend that they work collaboratively with the Trinity Education Project to support the academic drive for an enhanced Teaching and Learning Environment.

Furthermore, the reviewers observed areas of the College (eg; Arts Building) where students were sitting on the floor, even though, there was space for furniture to be located. We believe with modest amounts of investment, there are some quick wins to be had in providing new furniture that would enhance the student experience and improve the utilisation at the same time.

5.6.4 Project Management

Both reviewers were pleased to see that the College had taken significant steps with the setting up of the Programme Management Office (PMO) to oversee all aspects of project management undertaken at the College.

However, we were concerned to hear the proposals to move towards the generic approach to the management of projects, regardless of professional discipline, provided that you could demonstrate sufficient 'competencies' to undertake such work.

The College is not alone in undertaking a significant capital programme, or, experiencing difficulties during the development and implementation of them. The universities of Cambridge, Glasgow, Edinburgh, LSE, Oxford and UCL are all currently undertaking significant capital projects and we would recommend that the College considers what good practice is being carried out amongst these universities before it adopts a bespoke system that may not ultimately deliver best value.

In relation to capital project management we recommend that E&F work closely with the PMO to streamline the management process in relation to small to medium size projects and ensure full alignment with the Department of Public Expenditure and Reform's Capital Works Management Framework for all projects (http://constructionprocurement.gov.ie/capital-works-management-framework/).

Additionally, we recommend that E&F and the PMO consider what research is available around the management of construction projects and the direction of project management generally. Suggested reading includes KPMG's Climbing the Curve (2015 - https://assets.kpmg.com/content/dam/kpmg/pdf/2015/04/global-construction-survey-2015.pdf) and the Future of Project Management, a joint study by the Association of Project Managers, Arup and the Bartlett School of Construction and Project Management https://www.arup.com/publications/research/section/future-of-project-management

5.6.5   **Governance**

During the course of the review, a point commonly raised was the perceived lack of a specialist construction/real estate representative on the Board.

Such appointments are common and serve to provide a Board member who is familiar with the complexities of construction and real estate issues and is able to act as a filter and provide reassurance in terms of the level of detail often presented in reports that is not immediately apparent to lay members.

Additionally, they can play a 'mentoring' role for the Director of Estate & Facilities and others involved in the strategic decision making process on estates and real estate issues.

6   Conclusions

6.1   Trinity College, Dublin is one of the best university campuses in the world, marrying its tremendous heritage of the last 426 years with the

more modern additions added during this time and currently evidenced by the construction of the new Business School.

6.2   However, due to the financial austerity measures imposed on the College due to the Country's financial position, the upkeep of the estate and especially its heritage elements have suffered underinvestment over many years due to the significant reduction in funding from the Higher Education Agency. To ensure that this does not begin to further deteriorate, the College must provide adequate funding for E&F to maintain the estate to a standard to which the many students, staff and visitors to the College will expect. Not to do so, in light of the evidence available would be unacceptable and the creation of a Conservation Plan is an important first step in addressing this.

6.3   The performance of the E&F Directorate should be seen in the context of the financial environment within which they (and The College) have been operating over the last ten years or so and in the last 20 years, the size of the estate has more than doubled in size, whilst the expenditure per m^2 has significantly reduced.

6.4   E&F's Self-Assessment Report (SAR) is an excellent self-critique document that has very honestly looked inwardly on the performance of the Directorate and provided solutions for where improvements are clearly very necessary. The SAR should be used as an ongoing management tool to ensure continued improvement is achieved.

6.5   The College's performance in environmental and sustainability matters is to be congratulated and is a great example of like-minded people coming together for the overriding benefit of the College. However, there is more that the College can do to further embed environmental and sustainability across all its areas of operation and suggested avenues of opportunity and precedent are provided in the main body of the report.

6.6   At a strategic level, the disconnection of E&F from the detailed preparation of the new Estate Strategy could have consequences in the future (E&F Self-Assessment Report – Page 78). The Estate Strategy will need to be operationalised at some point and this is where theory meets practice as ideas developed in isolation to E&F have to be implemented and the wider environment within which E&F operate begins to influence outcomes.

6.7   E&F would greatly benefit from more formalised knowledge sharing amongst its peers. The Association of University Directors of Estates (AUDE) has existed in the UK for over 25 years and in spite of the competitive nature of the higher education sector within the UK, its members are able to share many areas of common ground thus avoiding having to reinvent the wheel each time a supposedly insurmountable problem is encountered

Appendix A

Schedule of Meetings

Time	Meeting
	Day 1: Tuesday 20th February 2018

09.10 Meet Reviewers and escort to Trinity College for first meeting
Quality Office, TCD

09.30 – 10.15 **Introductory Meeting with College Officers**

Attendees:
Ms Geraldine Ruane (Chief Operating Officer), Ms Veronica Campbell (Bursar), Ms Roisin Smith (Quality Officer),
External Reviewers, Internal Facilitator

10.15 – 11.00 **Finance Meeting**

Attendees:
Ms Geraldine Ruane (Chief Operating Officer), Mr Paul Mangan (Director of Estates and Facilities), Mr Brendan Leahy (Head of Facilities and Services), Mr Brian O'Connor (Corporate Services Division (CSD) Finance Partner), Mr Peter Foran (Corporate Services Division (CSD) Project Accountant), Mr Keith Creedon FSD (Financial Planning & Risk Manager)
External Reviewers, Internal Facilitator

11.30 – 13.00 **Estates and Facilities Strategy and discussion of issues arising in the Self-Assessment Report**
Attendees:
Mr Paul Mangan (Director of Estates and Facilities),
Estates and Facilities Senior Management Team – Mr Greg Power (Head of Capital Projects and Planning), Mr Pat Mc Donnell (Head of Estates Strategy), Dr Katharine Murray (Head of Safety & Safety Risk Management), Mr Brendan Leahy (Head of Facilities and Services), Mr David Marley (Campus Service Manager), Ms Moira Bailey (Premises Services Manager), Ms Patricia Gray (Administrative Support Manager),
External Reviewers, Internal Facilitator

14.00 – 15.00 **Pearse Street Range walk around and meeting with Security, Mailroom and porterage staff**
Attendees:
Mr Paul Mangan (Director of Estates and Facilities), Mr Brendan Leahy (Head of Facilities and Services),
External Reviewers, Internal Facilitator

15.00 – 16.00 **Major Capital Project Governance and Planning Meeting**

Attendees:
External Design Team for Capital Projects:
Mr Niall McCullough (McCullough Mulvin Architects), Mr Mark Coady (Turner & Townsend Consultant Project Managers), Mr Kevin Kinsella, (Linesight Project Managers), Mr David Cahill, (Scott Tallon Walker, Architects), Mr Leo Harmon (Independent Monitor for the Trinity Business School), Professor Kevin O'Kelly (Dean of Students)
Internal Project Sponsor, Printing House Square project: External Reviewers, Internal Facilitator

Time	Meeting
16.15 – 17.30	**Tour of Facilities–recent refurb projects e.g. Arts Building, Theatre, Printing House Square, Business School, TBSI, etc.** Attendees: Mr Paul Mangan (Director of Estates and Facilities), Mr Greg Power (Head of Capital Projects and Planning), External Reviewers, Internal Facilitator

Day 2: Wednesday 21st February 2018

09.00 – 09.30	**Business/day planning** External Reviewers, Internal Facilitator
09.30 – 10.30	**Estates Strategy** Attendees: Professor Veronica Campbell (Bursar and Director of Strategic Innovation), Mr Paul Roberts (Turnberry Consulting (Management Consultants) External Reviewers, Internal Facilitator
11.00 – 12.00	**Teaching & Learning, Research Environment** Attendees: Prof Darryl Jones (Dean of AHSS), Prof Linda Doyle (Dean of Research), Professor Michael Gill, (Interim Head of School Medicine), Professor Michael O Siochru (Head of Department of History), Professor Carol O' Sullivan (Head of School of Computer Science and Statistics), Trinity Education Project (TEP) Learning Spaces representatives - Professor Kevin Mitchell (Associated Dean of Undergraduate Science Education), Ms Orla Sheehan (Academic Services Division Manager), Professor Anne-Marie Brady (Head of School for Nursing and Midwifery), Mr Declan Reilly (Disability Officer), Ms Helen Shenton (College Librarian), Mr Kevin Keane (President of the Students Union), Mr Shane Collins (President of the Graduate Students Union), External Reviewers, Internal Facilitator
12.00 – 13.00	**Estates and Facilities staff** Attendees: Estates and Facilities staff, (cross section of staff from the various areas) External Reviewers, Internal Facilitator
14.30 – 15.15	**Commercialisation** Attendees: Commercial Revenue Unit – Mr Tony Dempsey (Head of Accommodation), Ms Moira O'Brien (Catering Manager), Mr Adrian Neilan (Commercial Director), External Reviewers, Internal Facilitator
15.15 – 16.00	**Project Analysis and Business Cases** Attendees: Programme Management Office – Mr John O' Sullivan, Director of Programme Management Office), Mr Ian Matthews (Chief Financial Officer TCD), External Reviewers, Internal Facilitator

Time	Meeting
16.30 – 17.30	**Sustainability/Biodiversity Initiatives** <u>Attendees</u>: Professor John Parnell – (Chair, Grounds and Gardens Advisory Committee), Ms Catherine McCabe – (Chair, Estates Policy Committee), Ms Paula Murphy – (Registrar), Mr Kieron McGovern (Engineering Services Manager), Mr Simon Benson (Student Green Campus Committee), Mr Joe Borza (Sustainability Consultant), External Reviewers, Internal Facilitator
17.30- 18.00	**Reviewers private time** External Reviewers, Internal Facilitator

	Day 3: Thursday 22nd February 2018
08.15 – 09.45	**Tour of Off-campus facilities and meeting with grounds/support staff** <u>Attendees</u>: Mr Paul Mangan (Director of Estates and Facilities), Ms Ann-Marie Looney (Accommodation Officer Trinity Hall), Ms Roja Fazaeli (Warden Trinity Hall), Student Reps, External Reviewers, Internal Facilitator,
10.00 – 12.30	**Preparation time for draft report and exit presentation. Morning coffee and lunch included.** <u>Attendees</u>: External Reviewers, Internal Facilitator
12.30 – 13.00	**Wrap-up meeting with Director of Estates & Facilities, and senior management team** <u>Attendees</u>: Mr Paul Mangan (Director of Estates & Facilities), Mr Greg Power (Head of Capital Projects and Planning), Mr Pat Mc Donnell (Head of Estates Strategy), Dr Katharine Murray (Head of Safety & Safety Risk Management), Mr Brendan Leahy (Head of Facilities and Services), Mr David Marley (Campus Service Manager), Ms Moira Bailey (Premises Services Manager), Ms Patricia Gray (Administrative Support Manager), External Reviewers, Internal Facilitator
13.05 – 14.00	**Wrap-up meeting with College Officers** <u>Attendees</u>: Ms Geraldine Ruane (Chief Operating Officer), Ms Veronica Campbell (Bursar), Ms Roisin Smith (Quality Officer), External Reviewers, Internal Facilitator
14.00 – 14.30	**Exit Presentation** <u>Attendees</u>: Mr Paul Mangan (Director of Estates & Facilities), Mr Greg Power (Head of Capital Projects and Planning), Mr Pat Mc Donnell (Head of Estates Strategy), Dr Katharine Murray (Head of Safety & Safety Risk Management), Mr Brendan Leahy (Head of Facilities and Services), Mr David Marley (Campus Service Manager), Ms Moira Bailey (Premises Services Manager), Ms Patricia Gray (Administrative Support Manager), Estates & Facilities Staff, Review contributors External Reviewers, Internal Facilitator

Terms of Reference for Quality Review of Estates & Facilities

Context:
Estates & Facilities is a unit within the Central Services portfolio of Corporate Services Division led by the Chief Operating Officer (COO). Other central services within the portfolio include Human Resources, IT Services, Commercial Revenue Unit, Student Services, Diversity & Inclusion and Programme Management Office and Risk Management.

Purpose of a Review is:
(i)   to provide a structured opportunity for an Area to critically reflect on its activities and plans for development in the context of the Area's and College strategic plans and other strategic initiatives;
(ii) to benefit from a constructive commentary by external reviewers to College that are experts in their field at a senior level;
(iii) to ensure that quality and standards are being maintained and enhanced, and that any areas of concern are identified and addressed;
(iv) to promote the enhancement of the Area's provision as part of a strategy for continuous quality improvement.

Scope of a Review includes:
(i)   The internal quality assurance of the Area under Review;
(ii) The contribution of the Area to College-level strategic initiatives such as the College's Strategic Plan, Estates Strategy, Global Relations Strategy, the Trinity Education Project, the Innovation & Entrepreneurship Strategy, the On-line Education Strategy and the Diversity and Inclusion Strategy;
(iii) Comparisons with similar institutional services nationally and internationally.

Terms of Reference:
The Review Team is invited to assess and make recommendations to the University under the following categories:

(i)   The Estates & Facilities Strategy in terms of its fitness-for-purpose to respond to the College strategies, the internal and external environment, emergent risks and opportunities nationally and internationally.
(ii) The effectiveness to date of the 2015/16 Estates & Facilities restructuring in achieving the cohesiveness of identity, management and resources, and in realising the Directorate's strategic objectives to maximise its contribution to College's academic mission and placement in the city.
(iii) Fitness for purpose of the Campus infrastructure and environment in support of the quality enhancement of the Student experience, Teaching & Learning, Research & Innovation and the Visitor Experience, having regard to the resources available.
(iv) The value for money achieved in the delivery of services by Estates and Facilities.
(v) The prioritisation of action under the six Transformation Areas and related proposals as outlined by Estates & Facilities in its Self-Assessment Report (§6.3 and §6.4) with a particular focus in the context of this review on Quality and Performance.

Appendix C

Higher Education Standards Agency (HESA) guide to Functional Suitability

Functional suitability measures the capability of the space to support its existing function. If the space is vacant, the indicator will assume the last use of that space. If space is temporarily vacant (e.g. due to refurbishment), the same assumption applies.

There is no best practice guidance as the assessment of functional suitability is inherently subjective but the collection of the data is considered to be important from a strategic point of view. Accordingly, HEPs are advised to use functional suitability data with caution for the purposes of comparison/benchmarking against other HEPs.

The following are examples of factors that may need to be considered in setting the functional suitability grade for the room/building, although they should not be seen as prescriptive:

- **environment**: The internal room(s)/area(s) environment in terms of temperature, humidity, fresh air, clean air (if required), lighting levels, day-lighting,
- **layout/plan**: Layout of room(s)/area(s) relative to equipment used, ancillary and related room functions, furniture, circulation and access,
- **location**: The physical location of the room(s)/area(s) relative to the activities that need to use the space, and other spaces these activities need to use,
- **flexibility**: Intrinsic ability of room(s)/area(s) to be altered, amended or changed in terms of size, environment and layout in response to changing demand - this will be a factor of structural and building services design,
- **servicing requirements**: Ability of the room(s)/area(s) fittings, furniture and equipment to meet the identified business demands of the users, such as electrical capacity, data points, etc.,
- **user perception**: The decorative, aesthetic and cosmetic qualities of the room/area from the perspective of users,
- **general external environment**: The quality of external surroundings and settings. This could include factors such as footpath and lighting quality, security perception, building and site appearance, and signage.

Measure the proportion of total Gross Internal Area which is in each of the following four categories. (The sum of the four percentages will be the total Gross Internal Area for the HEP).

Grade 1 Excellent - the room(s)/building(s) fully support current functions. There are no negative impacts upon the functions taking place in the space.

Grade 2 Good - the room(s)/building(s) provides a good environment for the current function in all or most respects. There may be shortfalls in certain areas, but these have only a minor effect upon current functions.

Grade 3 Fair - the room(s)/building(s) provides a reasonable environment for current functions in many respects, but has a number of shortfalls. These shortfalls may be

causing mismatches between space and function that is having a more significant effect upon current functions than Grade 2 rooms.

Grade 4 Poor - the room(s)/building(s) fail to support current functions and/or are unsuitable for current use. The operational problems associated with such space are major, and are constraining current functions in the space. Space in this grade may require alternative solutions, rather than straightforward improvements in particular features of the space.

Functional suitability measures the capability of the space to support its existing function. If the space is vacant, the indicator will assume the last use of that space. If space is temporarily vacant (e.g. due to refurbishment), the same assumption applies.

Estates and Facilities Quality Review

Review Carried Out Feb 2018. Report Received 19 April

Departmental Response, including comments from the Chief Operating Officer (COO).

1. Positive and encouraging Review

1.1   E&F welcomes the findings in the review. In particular we welcome the reviewers' support for the restructuring of the Directorate and a recognition that we are open to challenge and change traditional ways of working.

1.2   We note many positive references to the work and satisfaction rating of the Directorate and are encouraged by the acknowledgement of a well-functioning and highly regarded area and the recognition that we have reversed some more recent negative views.

1.3   The confirmation that E&F provides an excellent front line service is a validation of the commitment and enthusiasm of front line staff to the university and its community.

1.4   It is pleasing also that the reviewers acknowledge the quality of our Self-Assessment Report including our SWOT and PESTLE analysis and the transformation targets that we have set.

1.5 There is a recognition of the Directorate's commitment to provide an enhanced service and quality space to support the College's innovation targets. This is evidenced by the reviewers' reference to our strengths in procurement and in the development of SLAs.

1.6 The strong endorsement of our performance on sustainability and environmental matters is noted, as are the suggestions for further work in this area.

1.7 Previously E&F had a loose association with AUDE (Association of University Directors of Estates) and has now made arrangements to become full members of the Association.

2. Areas for improvement and refocussing

2.1   We note also that the Review identifies areas for improvement and refocussing. Some of these are in our direct control and we are taking steps to address these.

2.2   We have noted in particular the need for improved communication internally and externally and we are already engaged in measures to address this. The success of our communication will depend on support from the University's Public Affairs and Communications Office together with additional resourcing for our own communications.

2.3   The Reviewers picked up on the recommendations set out in a 2017 external review of University Safety Office. A plan is in place and timeline set to implement the key recommendations in this review.

2.4   The reviewers have made very helpful suggestions regarding the collection of statistics and KPIs to identify items such as property efficiency, space allocation, energy use, etc. and we have started work on this.

2.5   There are excellent recommendations that are fully supported by E&F management in relation to investment in the infrastructure, addressing backlog maintenance, sustainability and energy conservation and space management. These recommendations confirm representations that the Directorate has made over time.

The reviewers have made suggestions regarding the categorisation of space by functional suitability and for the introduction of an environmental management system that will be explored. Implementation of these recommendations will require resourcing and proposals will be brought forward in the implementation plan to progress these recommendations. In this context we refer to 2 sections in particular in the report:

> *1.4   We believe it is of paramount importance that where the need for further action and support have been noted in the above section of our report, that the College commits to providing the level of support deemed necessary to enable the ongoing improvements in service to be maintained.*

> *1.9   Given the College's unique setting, it is imperative that specific recommendations relating to the fabric of the Estate are implemented without any further delay.*

2.6   The review contains suggestions relating to the management of programmes of capital projects and these will be considered with colleagues in the Programme Management Office.

3. Recommendations Requiring Policy Review

3.1   There are also a number of recommendations that will require policy decisions outside the Directorate.

3.2   Some, such as appropriate investment in the infrastructure, relate directly to increased budgetary allocation in order to implement the recommendation.

3.3   Another recommendation, endorsed by E&F management, arises from the concern that the disconnection of E&F from the detailed preparation of the new Estate Strategy could have consequences in the future. The reviewers observe that

> *"the Estate Strategy will need to be operationalised at some point and this is where theory meets practice as ideas developed in isolation to E&F have to be implemented and the wider environment within which E&F operate begins to influence outcomes."*

We note and support the recommendation that the Director of Estates plays a lead role with the Bursar in the development of the strategy and that the Strategy\Masterplan are progressed as a matter of urgency in 2018

4. Next Steps

In the coming months E&F will draw up a project plan to implement the recommendations of the Quality Review, while maintaining progress and momentum on the recent achievements and improvements in the area that have been acknowledged by the reviewers.

PMM
Version 3 incorporating E&F Management and COO comments
3 May 2018