QUALITY REVIEW OF

HEALTH & SAFETY OFFICE
&
SECURITY DEPARTMENT

15 – 17 OCTOBER 2007

PEER REVIEW REPORT

PEER REVIEW GROUP:
External Reviewers: **Mr Andy Fahy, RTE**
                            Mr Tom Merriman,
                            Trinity College Dublin

Internal Reviewers: **Dr David Redmond,**
                            Registrar, NUIM
                            Ms Agnes Neligan,
                            Librarian, NUIM

Table Of Contents:

Introduction

Two external assessors, Mr Andrew Fahy, Security Manager, RTE and Mr. Tom Merriman, College Safety Officer, Trinity College, Dublin, conducted an external review of the Health and Safety Office and the Security Department in NUI Maynooth. The review was carried out over three days – October 15, 16 and 17 2007. The programme for the review is attached at appendix I.

The Security Services have developed and evolved since the appointment of the first security officer in Maynooth College in 1970. The Department was put on a formal footing in 1997 with the establishment of the Security Office and the appointment of the first Head of Security. The current Head of Security has been in post since 2001. He supervises 15 full-time security officers, most of who have many years experience on campus (up to 22 years as is the case with one officer). The Security Office staff provide professional security services to the College community to ensure a secure and safe environment for all persons working, studying or visiting the campus. These services include the prevention, detection and handling of criminal and anti-social behaviour, the protection of property, the implementation of traffic management arrangements and the management of emergencies.

The Safety Office was established in 1999 following the appointment of the University's first full time Safety Officer. The Safety Office provides professional safety advice and guidance to University management and to the broader University community. Its aim is to ensure the provision of a safe and healthy environment for all persons working, studying or visiting the campus. The services provided by the Safety Office include guidance and advice on existing and upcoming legislation and regulation, co-ordinating and assisting managers in achieving regulatory compliance, initiating and developing policies for University approval, carrying out or assisting in hazard identification and risk assessment exercises, accident investigation, insurance management, organisation and provision of safety-related training, record keeping and event safety management.

The Safety Office is staffed by one full-time professional Safety Officer and one half-time Executive Assistant and reports to the Director of Corporate Affairs.

Process and Methodology

The external reviewers followed the standard NUI Maynooth Quality Assessment review process.

We reviewed Self Assessment Reports, met with the Quality Office team and the internal reviewers. We followed the programme of meeting, inspections and discussions (both formal and informal) with management and staff of the departments being reviewed and with users of the services (see Appendix I).

We got a very positive response from all the staff in the departments under review. The work of the managers and staff in both departments met with universal acclaim from all the people we met. We got an impression of a great sense of community, particularly from the students we met, and a great sense of commitment to the University from all the staff we met. The staff in both departments are dedicated, committed to the organisation and are happy and content to continue working there.

We were impressed by the level of engagement in the process of staff at all levels in the departments and the honest, candid and constructive feedback received from them.

We would like to thank all involved for the welcome and co-operation that we received. This made our job easier, enjoyable and gave us a wider and more enlightened understanding of the operations that go on in each department.

The Report

Both external reviewers participated fully in the review of both departments. The two departments are separate departments that provide separate but complimentary services to the University Community. For historic and other reasons they are often considered as one. There are treated individually in this report which we have divided into two sections – the first dealing with the Health and Safety Office, the second dealing with the Security Department

Health and Safety Office

Role Clarity

Safety management is an integral part of the management of any organisation. In an educational institution with a huge range of hazards from ordinary office/industrial type hazards through to chemical, biological, radiological hazards and the like the management of safety is often seen as the function of a specialist. The role and responsibilities of senior managers are set out in the HSA guidance document '*Guidance for Directors and Senior Managers on their Responsibilities for Workplace Safety and Health'*. The role of the Safety Officer is to support and advise managers and to give technical assistance.

It appears that the Safety Officer in NUI Maynooth is involved in micro-managing safety issues throughout the University. While he clearly has a role is such issues this should not be to the detriment of a more strategic and policy-based role. Managers and the Safety Officer need to understand their respective roles in managing safety at unit/department level. A clear statement of roles, either as a job description, or a section in the University Safety Statement, should be set down and communicated to all.

It was evident that there was some confusion over the role of the Safety Officer in managing the Security Services. In our discussions some respondents (both staff and students) reported that they would take up security issue directly with the Safety Officer. This may be because of the historical situation when the Safety Officer managed the security services in between appointments of a Head of Security or because of the close relationship between the two departments or the fact that the Safety Officer deputises for the Head of Security (and vice versa) during holidays and other absences. While both departments provide complimentary services and co-operate closely to achieve a common aim this confusion is detrimental to the individual managers exercising their roles and authority. Clarity of role through an explicit statement of function and authority for both managers would assist (along with the recommendations below to appoint a deputy or assistant to Head of Security and to the Safety Officer).

Deputy Safety Officer

NUI Maynooth is a large organisation with about 1000 employees serving the needs of about 8,400 students in a dynamic environment where they are presented with a huge range of hazards. The Safety Officer appears to put in an inordinate amount of time, during and outside of normal hours dealing with his work and there is a danger of negative impact on his health and his personal life. He requires assistance to allow him to take a more strategic and policy driving role while at the same time ensuring that the day-to-day issues that need to be centrally co-ordinated or carried out are done – e.g. fire drills, accident investigations. In addition it is inappropriate that, in his absence, persons who do not have either the professional training or experience to execute this role deputise him for.

We therefore recommend the appointment of an Assistant Fire/Safety Officer to deal with day-to-day safety matters (full-time or part-time initially but whose only role in the organisation is safety in order to avoid conflict with any other function that s/he might have).

Role of the Executive Assistant

A half-time Executive Assistant works with the Safety Officer. It appears that, in addition to carrying out administrative, office management, clerical and record-keeping duties, she carries out certain technical functions such as ergonomic assessments. Again there is an inconsistency in these roles given that there are significant demands for both types of functions that are difficult to meet with one half-time employee. While the Executive Assistant is trained to carry out these technical functions these duties are more appropriate to a safety professional.

We recommend the Executive Assistant's role is clearly defined and documented and confined to duties appropriate to the job title – this will free up some time to more fully address the administration of the department. The appointment of an assistant Fire/Safety Officer will facilitate this.

There is a significant amount of administrative work in the Safety Office and the Executive Assistant's job may need to be expanded to a full-time position that could serve both the Safety Office and the Security Department as part of the Directorate of Corporate Affairs. The co-location of both departments within the Directorate offers opportunities for efficient sharing of support services while enhancing the administration of both in the short term.

Office Space

The Safety Officer and the Executive Assistant are housed in one large office in Riverstown Lodge on the North Campus. There is no separate space available for meetings, private discussion, confidential telephone calls or reflective working. The office is remote from the Directorate and from the Head of Security with whom it work closely. The nature of the work and the relationship of the Safety Office with the Occupation Health Services require facilities for confidential discussion and secure confidential record keeping.

We recommend that the Safety Office and the Head of Security be housed in appropriate accommodation within or adjacent to the Directorate of Corporate Affairs. This will help to improve communication up and down the line, facilitate the co-operation that is an integral part of both jobs and offer opportunities to enhance the administrative support provided to both departments.

Pre-Planning of Capital Projects

Design teams often do not have the same level of experience of issues particular to certain types of buildings such as laboratories as those who spend their working lives using or dealing with such buildings. Their focus is often on aesthetic and practical operational considerations rather than on safety in the use of such facilities. In order to avoid the repetition of past mistakes that have a safety, health or security significance the Safety Officer and the Head of Security should have input, at planning stage, into new capital developments and refurbishment works. This should be formalised by having a sign-off or notification procedure or other similar formal arrangement.

Communications

The Heads of the two departments under review have developed a very close working relationship and are in close communication with each other on a daily basis. This communication is informal and mostly unrecorded. Without wishing to destroy this relationship or to destroy the informal environment, there is a need to structure the relationship and communication and to bring it closer to the team of managers that they are a part of. Team meetings of Heads of Departments in the Directorate of Corporate Affairs or some similar forum could help achieve this. This will be facilitated by the co-location of the two heads in offices that house the Directorate. In addition both heads should publish annual reports setting out what has been achieved in the previous year and what is proposed for the coming year. Such reports, broadly communicated to the University community would help in removing the role confusion. We are conscious that unnecessary bureaucracy should not be introduced but believe that, on balance, the introduction of these formal arrangements will assist in the delivery of a quality service.

The Safety Office makes good use of web-based communication but there is scope for enhancing this communication and information sharing e.g. safety policies, minutes of Safety Committees, links to external agencies etc on the web. There is also scope to use the web to improve communications in the Security Department e.g. emergency procedures, personal and building security advice etc.

We were surprised to hear that both managers involved themselves in student health and welfare matters, particularly outside of normal working hours. Apart from dealing with an emergency situation as a first responder it is not appropriate for the Safety Officer or the Head of Security to be called in to manage student welfare situations or crises or to deal with the families of ill, injured or unstable students. They do not have the training, experience or responsibility to handle such situations. There needs to be put in place a network of contacts and communications which first responders (whether security officers or resident assistants) can use to get the assistance of student support services.

External Relationships with Enforcing Agencies

The University is supervised or assisted by a range of statutory enforcing agencies. In order that the two managers keep on top of what is happening the relationship with these agencies should be managed and contacted through the relevant department, Garda and emergency services through the Security Department, Fire Services, Health and Safety Authority, Environmental Protection Agency, Radiological Protection Institute of Ireland and Health Services Executive (where relevant) through the Safety Office.

Lone/Late Working

A Lone/Late Working Policy should be put in place setting out the framework for assessing the circumstances and conditions in which after-hours access to buildings, in particular for lone-working is acceptable. Its focus should be the protection of the safety, health and security of lone/late workers and allow for tighter security supervision of building after normal working hours. This policy should address lone working by security officers and the procedures and controls in place to assure their safety and security.

Summary

The external reviewers acknowledged the contribution of all involved in the review. The reviewers recognised the huge amount of work done by both Heads of Department, a significant part of which is outside normal working hours. The striking feature that came across in review was the role confusion and overlap between the two managers. This section of the report concentrates on improvements in management structures in the Safety Office that will allow the Safety Officer to ensure the delivery of comprehensive quality services to students and employees of the University.

Summary of Recommendations (Safety Office)

Short term;

- Clearly define and communicate the role of the Safety Officer
- Differentiate the functions of Safety Officer and the Head of Security
- Document and communicate the role and responsibilities of Heads of Departments/Units in managing safety within their area of responsibility
- Establish appropriate duties only for the Executive Assistant
- Set up the environment to formalise the relationship between the two managers and between each manager and the Directorate of Corporate Services to include
    - Team meetings
    - Annual reporting and service plans
    - Co-location of offices in the Directorate
    - Shared support services

Medium term;

- Appoint an assistant Fire/Safety Officer
- Provide additional administrative support (possibly on a shared basis)
- Provide adequate and appropriate office accommodation
- Make departmental budgets available (see 'Security' section of report below)
- Put in place arrangements for out of hours contact with Student Support services that do not rely on Safety Officer or Head of Security managing student welfare situations

Other recommendations;

- Formalise arrangements for Safety Office inputs into capital projects and refurbishments
- Use web-based communications for two way flow of safety information throughout the University
- Relationships with the appropriate external agencies (fire services, HSA, EPA etc.) should be managed and co-ordinated through the Safety Office
- A Lone /late working policy should be put in place addressing the risks associated with
    - After-hours access to buildings
    - Lone working in buildings
    - Lone working by security staff

SECURITY

Historical.

Historically it could be said that the needs of Security have not been given the priority required in the planning process over the years within the university. Neither has it kept pace with the developments in the Security industry in particular in the use of technology. Maynooth University has grown by enormous steps within a relatively short time. The development of the North Campus has come about in a fragmented manner. Hence a more comprehensive view of Security needs going forward of the total site has not engaged the planners.

The Planning Process and Delivery of Services

Another fact that seems to have played a major part in the major deficit of security installations is the manner of the delivery of services and facilities generally within the university. Many instances were pointed out to us where building plans were developed and delivered when the needs of security were given no prominence. It was then too late and expensive to effect change or remedy the defect. There are certain services, the delivery of whom, have major effects on the quality and impact of security. i.e. building design, access routes, lighting, landscaping, site layout, road design, traffic-flows, business plans, site management, apartment management, accommodation etc. It is apparent that the delivery of these services at Maynooth University is not undertaken in an integrated manner and on a consultative basis. We would strongly recommend that this be addressed as a matter of urgency.

The Needs of Security and S.H.W.

It is important in all major organisations that staff in Safety, Health and Welfare and Security are cognizant of the needs of one another. An acceptance is also necessary that what impacts on one will or may impact on the other. It appears to us that the role the manager of Safety, Heath and Welfare and the role of the Head of Security is somewhat blurred.
It is important to be aware of all the inherent dangers that are associated with University life at present because of the ages, background, nationality and cultural needs of people attending there. Maynooth University is no different. However because of its open campus layout, the close proximity of a main road and the interconnection between the North Campus and South Campus there are added risks. Because of the inherent dangers there is an added need that the responsibility for management of these risks on a 24 hour basis is clearly identified. We would suggest that a clear line be drawn between the role of the Head of Security and the role of the Manager of Safety Health and Welfare. It is also important that they work closely together but that there is a clear identity of each role.

It is also important that a clear line of management exist between both posts and senior management within the University Management structure.

Staffing and the Delivery of Security.

Security is provided at Maynooth University on a 24-hour basis. There are 15 permanent security staff together with the Head of Security at present within the Security Department. We are of the view that the best value is not being achieved with the present roster structure within the department.
Because of the manner in which rosters are organised it is a fact that on a nightly basis there is one security person working on the South Campus and one on the North Campus. Allied to this fact is the demand on the time of the security officer allocated to the South Campus to deal with the needs of the accommodation business being undertaken in St. Patricks. It appears that on many occasions the security person cannot attend to lock up duties and the setting of alarms in the various buildings until a very late hour.
It is also not appropriate that a Security Officer would be on their own in the North Campus. Where will help come from in an emergency? Also it appears that the one female security officer in the department works on her own in the North Campus while on night duty. This practice should not be continued.

We recommend that the restructuring of the Security Department be undertaken at an early date. It is possible with the drawing up of new rosters that the same amount of people will be working at all times. It is recommended that there should be 4 Security staff working at any one time in order to manage North and South Campuses. There should be two security officers in the South Campus and two on the North Campus. There may be historical difficulties with this, but with the goodwill of all concerned it will have major beneficial effects on both sides.

The methods of communication within the department should be looked at. It is important that all staff are kept informed of matters that affect the department and their conditions of employment. A proper reporting system of security incidents should be in place. The manner in which reports are dealt with should be transparent and there should be feedback to staff when necessary.

It is also important that all times there is someone in a supervisory capacity working to deal effectively with emergencies as they arise and also to ensure the adherence to best practices and standards. We recommend that an internal promotional procedure be put in place to ensure that a supervisor is in place on each shift. This will not necessitate an increase in staff and will be an incentive within the department and should lead to more effective systems and a buy in by staff.

We also recommend that a deputy Head of Security be appointed. It is not possible for the current Head of Security to manage all the day to day demands of the department and

also deal with the varied issues that   should be dealt with by him in developing his role both as Head of Security and within the University. We recommend that a precise job description be written for the position of deputy head of security and that many of the functions carried out by the current Head of Security be delegated to this appointee.

Use of Technology.

Because of all the reasons as outlined above, the use of Security Technology within the University leaves a lot to be desired. It is safe to say with a prudent spend on security technology and the proper management of it, a more effective security service will be delivered. It is absolutely necessary that a managed approach be made to investment in technology. The many aspects of Security Technology i.e. access control, cctv, intruder alarms, panic alarms, fire alarms , infrastructure alarms, I.P. technology and visitor control should be managed in an integrated manner.

Because of the inherited position that now exists with the use of technology and to ensure that proper planning is put in place going forward, we recommend that an extensive Security Survey be undertaken at an early date. It is important that such survey be undertaken by a reputable company or person and that they would not be a supplier or installer and would not tender for any works emanating from the survey. It may be prudent to have the particular specification required for the tendering process formulated by an extern expert.

Emergency Plans.

No emergency plan exists for Maynooth University.   An emergency plan should be compiled at an early date. The needs of business continuity within the university should be addressed in this plan.

In the event of an emergency there is a need that the Head of Security should have access to data that will allow him to manage the emergency in a proper manner. It is a matter for the Head of Security to make the proper arrangements within the University to achieve this and he should be facilitated in achieving this.

Budgets

We recommend that an appropriate running budget be allocated to each Department on an annual basis. This would meet the ongoing needs of each department. It will allow each manager to deal more effectively with day to day demands and will bring a responsibility to the post that is not there already. Capital spends on major installations would be managed within the University capital programme.

RECCOMENDATIONS*

We recommend that certain matters can be undertaken as a priority in the first instance without delay. These measures will achieve a major improvement and will not incur major expenditure. We also recommend the adoption of a planned 3 to 5year programme to ensure delivery of an agreed suitable security plan for the expanding university.

Priority

- The level of lighting on both Campuses be examined. In particular the lighting at the Moyglare Gate, the pedestrian entrance near Dunnes Stores and the Bridge be improved immediately.

- A programme of severe pruning/cutting of trees be undertaken immediately to improve the lighting quality.   Some lights are now in the middle of trees.

- An intercom should be installed at the front gate to the South Campus and this should be linked into the Security Communication system.

- A barrier should be erected at the entrance to the North Campus from the Kilcock Road. This should be controlled by Security staff and should have the facility to allow students/staff access and egress with their cars after closing hours.

- Lights and CCTV be put in place as soon as possible at both entrances to the bridge connecting North and South Campus.

- Restructure the Security Department as recommended above.

- Carry out Security Survey of University as recommended.

- Examine the role of Security in the running of the accommodation at St. Patricks. It should not be part of the duties of the Security officer to involve themselves here.

- Clarify the role of Head of Security and Manager of Safety Health and Welfare.

- Introduce a structure within the Services/Facilities Sections in the University that accommodates and recognises the needs of Security in the planning and delivery of any facility or service.

- Conclude an Emergency Plan for the University as recommended.

Recommendations relating to the Safety Office are at page 8

- Look at the historical practice of undergraduates/staff having the facility to remain on campus in buildings at late hours. This practice runs against good security practices and prevents security staff in securing and locking down the building. Exemptions when deemed necessary can be given.

Short Term 1 to 3years

- Examine the results of the Security Survey. Agree and implement a progressive schedule of installation of an integrated Security programme which encompasses the use of access control, cctv, and alarms using the best and most up to date technology in a co-ordinated manner.

- Consider the employment of a project manager to facilitate the delivery of this programme.

- In the light of the development of a building and expansion programme, the site of a Security Control room at a strategic point on the campus should be agreed. The proper security management of the site should be developed from here and should form part of the delivery programme.

Long Term 1 to 5 years.

- Evaluate the progress of the delivery of technology and the use of same.

- Take into account the impact of new buildings on the campus with the delivery of the agreed programme.

- Consider a new Security survey after three years to analyse the effectiveness of what has been achieved to date.

Appendix I

Programme of discussions, interviews and inspections

SECURITY DEPARTMENT & HEALTH & SAFETY OFFICE QUALITY REVIEW

DAY 1 – MONDAY 15 OCTOBER 2007

TIME	DETAIL	VENUE	PRESENT
3.30 – 3.45	Welcome & Briefing	Students Union Room 3	Andy Fahy, Tom Merriman, Saranne Magennis/ Agnes Neligan
3.45 – 5.00	Staff Reception	Students Union Room 4	Andy Fahy Tom Merriman Brendan Ashe Mary O'Leary John McElligott & Dept Staff Saranne Magennis Agnes Neligan Members of QPSC Marguerite Lohan
8.00	Dinner	Carton House Hotel	Andy Fahy David Redmond Saranne Magennis Agnes Neligan John McElligott Brendan Ashe

DAY 2 – TUESDAY 16 OCTOBER 2007

TIME	DETAIL	VENUE	PRESENT
8.00 – 9.00	Peer Review Team Breakfast Meeting	The Oval Suite Glenroyal Hotel	Andy Fahy Tom Merriman David Redmond Agnes Neligan
9.30 – 10.00	Meeting: External Reviewer with HOD	Brendan Ashe's Office	Tom Merriman Brendan Ashe
9.30 – 10.00	Meeting: External Reviewer with HOD	John McElligott's Office	Andy Fahy John McElligott
10.00 – 10.30	Tour of the Campus	North & South Campus'	Andy Fahy Tom Merriman Brendan Ashe John McElligott
10.30 – 11.00	Meeting: External Reviewers with Representative from Safety Committee Coffee	Council Room	Andy Fahy Tom Merriman Austin Power Niall McKeith
11.00 – 12.30	Meeting: External Reviewers with Individual Staff	Registrar's Conference Room	Andy Fahy Tom Merriman Dept Staff
12.30 – 2.00	Lunch	Pugin Hall	Andy Fahy Tom Merriman Frank Fitzmaurice
2.00 – 4.00	Meeting: External Reviewers with Individual Staff	Registrar's Conference Room	Andy Fahy Tom Merriman Dept Staff
4.00 – 5.00	Reception with Students	Students Union Room 3/4	Andy Fahy Tom Merriman NUIM Students St Patrick's College Students
5.00 -	Meeting: External Reviewer with Individual Staff, if needed	Registrar's Conference Room	Andy Fahy Dept Staff
7.30	Dinner	Lemongrass Restaurant, Glenroyal Hotel	Andy Fahy

DAY 3 — WEDNESDAY 17 OCTOBER 2007

TIME	DETAIL	VENUE	PRESENT
9.00 – 10.00	Meeting: External Reviewers with Individual Staff	Registrar's Conference Room	Andy Fahy Tom Merriman Dept Staff
10.00 – 10.30	Meeting: External Reviewers with Resident Assistants	Registrar's Conference Room	Andy Fahy Tom Merriman John Shevlin Greg White Jessica Lehnardt Shu Jiang Sean Jones
10.30 – 11.00	Meeting: External Reviewers with Executives of Students Union Coffee	Registrar's Conference Room	Andy Fahy Tom Merriman Executives of Students Union
11.00 – 12.00	Drafting Report	Council Room	Andy Fahy Tom Merriman
12.00 – 1.00	Peer Review Team Meeting	Council Room	Andy Fahy Tom Merriman David Redmond Agnes Neligan
1.00 – 2.00	Lunch	Pugin Hall	Andy Fahy Tom Merriman Saranne Magennis
2.00 – 3.45	Drafting Report & Preparation for Exit Interview	Council Room/Registrar's Conference Room	Andy Fahy Tom Merriman
3.45	Exit Presentation	Council Room	Andy Fahy Tom Merriman David Redmond Agnes Neligan Saranne Magennis Brendan Ashe Mary O'Leary John McElligott & Dept Staff Members of QPSC

_____   _____

Mr Andy Fahy   Mr Tom Merriman

_____   _____

Dr David Redmond   Ms Agnes Neligan