

Board of Management Audit & Assurance Committee

Date of Meeting	Tuesday 23 May 2023
Paper No.	AAC4-D
Agenda Item	5.2.2
Subject of Paper	Internal Audit Report – Building Contract Management
FOISA Status	Disclosable
Primary Contact	Henderson Loggie
Date of production	28 April 2023
Action	For Discussion and Decision

1. Recommendations

The Committee is asked to consider and discuss the report and the management responses to the internal audit recommendations.

2. Purpose of report

The purpose of this review is to provide management and the Audit and Assurance Committee with assurance on key controls relating to the curriculum and financial plans in place for City of Glasgow College and their alignment with the regional plan for Glasgow and the college student number targets.

3. Key Insights

This internal audit of Building Contract Management provides an outline of the objectives, scope, findings and graded recommendations as appropriate, together with management responses. This constitutes an action plan for improvement.

The Report includes a number of audit findings which are assessed and graded to denote the overall level of assurance that can be taken from the Report. The gradings are defined as follows:

Good	System meets control objectives.
Satisfactory	System meets control objectives with some weaknesses present.
Requires improvement	System has weaknesses that could prevent it achieving control objectives.
Unacceptable	System cannot meet control objectives.

4. Impact and implications

Refer to internal audit report.

LEVEL OF ASSURANCE

Good

City of Glasgow College

Building Contract Management

Internal Audit report No: 2023/02

Draft issued: 18 April 2023

Final issued: 28 April 2023



Contents

		Page
Section 1	Management Summary	
	• Overall Level of Assurance	1
	• Risk Assessment	1
	• Background	1
	• Scope, Objectives and Overall Findings	2
	• Audit Approach	2
	• Summary of Main Findings	3 - 4
	• Acknowledgements	4
Section 2	Main Findings and Action Plan	5 - 14

Level of Assurance

In addition to the grading of individual recommendations in the action plan, audit findings are assessed and graded on an overall basis to denote the level of assurance that can be taken from the report. Risk and materiality levels are considered in the assessment and grading process as well as the general quality of the procedures in place.

Gradings are defined as follows:

Good	System meets control objectives.
Satisfactory	System meets control objectives with some weaknesses present.
Requires improvement	System has weaknesses that could prevent it achieving control objectives.
Unacceptable	System cannot meet control objectives.

Action Grades

Priority 1	Issue subjecting the organisation to material risk and which requires to be brought to the attention of management and the Audit and Assurance Committee.
Priority 2	Issue subjecting the organisation to significant risk and which should be addressed by management.
Priority 3	Matters subjecting the organisation to minor risk or which, if addressed, will enhance efficiency and effectiveness.



Management Summary

Overall Level of Assurance

Good	System meets control objectives.
-------------	----------------------------------

Risk Assessment

This review focused on the controls in place to mitigate the following risks on the City of Glasgow College ('the College') Strategic Risk Register as at March 2023:

- Failure to achieve improved performance (net risk score: 10);
- Negative impact of statutory compliance failure (net risk score: 10); and
- Failure of Business Continuity (net risk score: 12).

Background

As part of the Internal Audit programme at the College for 2022/23 we carried out a review of the College's internal Helpdesk facility, which is utilised to log estates related issues and requests, and the processes surrounding estates change requests and malicious damage repairs. The Audit Needs Assessment, agreed with management and the Audit and Assurance Committee in March 2022, identified this as an area where risk can arise and where Internal Audit can assist in providing assurances to the Board of Management and the Principal that the related control environment is operating effectively, ensuring risk is maintained at an acceptable level.

The College's new campuses were funded through a Non-Profit Distributing (NPD) arrangement, whereby a private consortium, Glasgow Learning Quarter (GLQ), designed, built and will maintain the campuses over a 25-year period. The College will make unitary charge payments to the consortium over this period. Under the contract GLQ is responsible for Hard Facilities Management (FM) services such as building and fabric maintenance (both planned and reactive). Responsibility for Soft FM, such as cleaning and grounds maintenance, is split between the College and GLQ.

The College uses software to log estates related issues and requests which was developed in-house. Staff can log these jobs directly onto the software via Enquirer, or staff and students can phone helpdesk staff who will record the job on the software. Jobs received are then assigned to College staff or to external contractors. Once jobs are completed they are marked as complete on the Helpdesk software and an email is automatically sent to the person who requested the work.

Under the College's contract with GLQ, the College can make deductions for jobs that have not been completed within the required response and rectification times (subject to contractual conditions and exclusions). A spreadsheet called PayMech is provided by GLQ and this highlights these deductions, and is subject to review by Estates staff before any action to invoke the deductions process is approved.



Scope, Objectives and Overall Findings

This audit reviewed the arrangements in place to monitor the performance of GLQ against the terms of the contract, excluding planned maintenance which was reviewed separately in accordance with the Audit Plan for 2022/23 (internal audit report 2023/03, issued April 2023).

The overall objective of the audit was to determine whether appropriate controls have been put in place to ensure that the College receives value for money from the unitary charge payments made to GLQ.

The table below notes each secondary objective for this review and records the results:

Objective	Findings		
	1	2	3
The secondary objectives of our audit will be to ensure that:			
	No. of Agreed Actions		
1. Reported repairs are registered, classified and allocated to relevant contractors in a timely manner.	Good	-	-
2. Reported repairs are controlled, monitored and completed on a timely basis.	Good	-	2
3. 'Customer' feedback is sought where appropriate on the quality of the repair work.	Good	-	-
4. Trend analysis and reporting is carried out on the performance of the Help Desk.	Good	-	-
Overall Level of Assurance	Good	-	2
	System meets control objectives.		

Audit Approach

Building on the internal audit work performed in this area in 2017/18 (internal audit report 2018/06, finalised 28 August 2018) we reviewed the terms of the contract with GLQ in terms of reactive estates work to identify respective contractual obligations. Through discussion with the Building Contract Compliance Manager, Head of Estates, and Head of Facilities Management, and through review of documentation, we then documented the systems and controls which have been put in place to ensure that these responsibilities are met. Within this report, we have reported on areas where expected controls were found to be absent, or where controls could be further strengthened.

Compliance testing was carried out where necessary to ensure that the controls in place are operating effectively.



Summary of Main Findings

Strengths

- The College Helpdesk system continues to provide a robust basis for reporting, classifying and allocating reactive repairs to College staff or FES FM in a timely manner. The process has been documented in a detailed Reactive Maintenance Procedure;
- A range of staff have access to the Helpdesk to enable jobs to be assigned by managers with the relevant knowledge of the correct person to allocate jobs to;
- We confirmed that all of the 30 reactive repair jobs selected for sample testing had been completed by FES FM on a timely basis and were within the contract response and rectification times. It was in fact noted that all jobs had been closed off on the same day they were transferred to FES FM, although the rectification period for 'routine' jobs allowed up to two working days, indicating a highly satisfactory level of performance against contract timescales throughout the period of the 2022/23 academic year which we tested. This is reflected in the significant fall in deductions made through the Payment Mechanism (PayMech) process in the past two years;
- There is a detailed Payment Mechanism Review Procedure setting out a range of checks that are performed by Estates staff on a monthly basis on receipt of the PayMech spreadsheets from GLQ / FES FM. Audit checks normally cover approximately 30-40% of jobs per month;
- We selected a sample of eight GLQ malicious damage claims for audit testing and found that there was sufficient evidence of malicious damage, which was confirmed as accepted by the College;
- We selected a sample of six low value changes (LVCs) for audit testing and found that: a Record of Low Value Change Notice had been completed in each case; costing and timing had been provided by GLQ and approved by the College; works were confirmed as completed by GLQ and accepted by the College; and GLQ had subsequently invoiced for the agreed amount. There had been no high and medium value change requests made by the College in the 2022/23 academic year to the date of our testing;
- There is a process for following up all repairs undertaken by FES FM to ensure these have been adequately completed. As part of the process to close jobs on the College Enquirer system, a report is run and Estates staff physically check or verify via email or telephone call a sample of these. In addition, as the staff who requested the repair get an automatic notification email when the job is completed, then they would respond to the email if the fault is not satisfactorily fixed and these jobs would be checked, and FES FM requested to re-attend if necessary;
- Monthly Service Reports and an Annual Performance Report continue to be received from FES FM for College management review. These contain a large amount of performance information; and
- A Facilities Management Report is prepared for the College's Finance & Physical Resources Committee, providing a progress update on the College estate and facilities management, including on the operation of the Helpdesk.

Opportunities for Improvement

- Estates staff periodically run a report of jobs in progress to see when they have been closed on the FES FM Maximo system. Details of closed jobs are then input into the College Enquirer system. When marking a job as closed on Enquirer, the current date and time is set as the default. Estates staff normally amend the date to the actual date that the job was noted as completed on Maximo, but from our testing we noted four instances where the date of input had been left as the default date. We have recommended that the actual date of completion of jobs should always be entered on Enquirer. In all cases the time of input was left rather than amending to the time that the job was noted as completed on Maximo. Discussion at the audit closure meeting indicated that there is no need to record the time completed in Enquirer and that this field could be removed; and



Summary of Main Findings (continued)

Opportunities for Improvement (continued)

- The Record of Low Value Change Notice includes a section for confirmation of acceptance of the proposal from GLQ. From our sample testing we noted that this was completed in all cases however it was not signed and dated by the person providing the College confirmation and we have recommended that this is done. In all but one instance, for a minor change costing £665.44, we were provided with email evidence of who authorised acceptance of the proposal. For the instance where there was a change without email approval, management advised that the proposal was verbally accepted by the Head of Estates.

Acknowledgments

We would like to take this opportunity to thank the staff at the College who helped us during the course of our audit visit.

Main Findings and Action Plan

Objective 1 - Reported repairs are registered, classified and allocated to relevant contractors in a timely manner.

Reactive Repairs

Estates staff, other College staff, students or visitors can identify an issue and raise this for attention. Students or visitors would flag this up with reception or other College staff, who would in turn log this in the Helpdesk system.

All College staff have access to the College Helpdesk which can be accessed by a) calling an extension number and Operations staff will log a call into the Helpdesk for Estates staff to pick up; or b) through the online portal 'Enquirer'. Text is entered in the software and submitted and this generates a fault ID number and appears in the 'Open Requests' section that Estates staff have access to. Any urgent items (trigger words such as leak, flood, lift, fire etc.) generate a text message to a group of people including the Head of Estates and Building Contract Compliance Manager. The information recorded includes: description of issue; date and time; name of person raising; department of staff member; category; and location.

Estates staff assess all faults logged on Enquirer under 'Open Requests', 'Estates – Maintenance / Repair' and either escalate to FES FM (the contractor used by GLQ) or change the category of the job for the relevant area, editing the job description if the job is to be completed by an internal member of staff e.g., a particular trade. Estates staff send requests electronically on Enquirer through to FES FM's Maximo system, unless after 3.45pm when urgent jobs need to be telephoned to FES FM's Stirling headquarters. Other managers (e.g. Building Services Manager, Head Janitor or Head of Facilities Management) are responsible for reviewing the 'Open Requests' and allocating the jobs relating to their area to staff for actioning.

Estates staff consider the category and the priority and can change this prior to submitting faults to Maximo. Although GLQ / FES FM have the facility to change the priority classification on PayMech submission, they do not currently make any changes, and any changes made would be subject to review by Estates staff as an integral part of the analysis of the monthly PayMech spreadsheet. The Building Contract Compliance Manager advised that in practice no changes are made to the College classification unless requested by or agreed with the College through the process.



Objective 1 - Reported repairs are registered, classified and allocated to relevant contractors in a timely manner (continued).

Reactive Repairs (continued)

Per the contract Service Level Specification, the response and rectification times for each category of repair are noted below:

Category	Response Period	Rectification Period	Indicative Examples
Routine	8 hours	2 working days	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leaking tap. Sticking door handle. Electrical socket not working in an area which will not affect the function of the room.
Important	4 hours	8 hours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leaking heating pipe/radiator. Damaged electrical socket / switch facia plate. Equipment fault which could affect provision of service. Blocked toilet.
Urgent	1 hour	4 hours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of utilities services. Broken window. Fire Alarm or External fire door fault. Lift failure – with or without an occupant or Door access system fault. No hot / cold water or Single zone heating failure.

There may be occasions where FES FM engineers identify an issue and raise this directly on the Maximo system for actioning rather than via the College's Helpdesk.

As part of our audit testing, we selected a sample of 30 reactive repair jobs that had been logged on Enquirer between August 2022 and mid-March 2023 and allocated to FES FM. We found that: the Helpdesk recorded all actions taken and the actions appeared reasonable; categorisation (type of job) and prioritisation appeared reasonable; and all jobs had been allocated to FES FM in a timely manner. The Helpdesk system continues to provide a robust basis for reporting, classifying and allocating reactive repairs to College staff or FES FM in a timely manner. The process has been documented in a detailed Reactive Maintenance Procedure.



Objective 2 - Reported repairs are controlled, monitored and completed on a timely basis.

Reactive Repairs

FES FM or the College operative undertake the work and mark this off as closed. Estates staff periodically (up to three times per week) run a report of jobs in progress to see when they have been closed on Maximo. Details of closed jobs are then input into the College Enquirer system. As part of this process, Estates staff physically check or verify via email or telephone call a sample of these, which are highlighted on the report. The Building Contract Compliance Manager advised that generally small jobs such as blocked toilets, door batteries and the like are closed-off, and faults with equipment and / or anything causing Estates an issue is checked first e.g. main doors. The Reactive Maintenance Procedure notes that around 50% of all jobs are checked, which the Building Contract Compliance Manager advised that Estates strive to do, although there is no overall record kept on the numbers and it does vary between reports.

In addition to the checks carried out by Estates, as the staff who requested the repair get an automatic notification email when the job is completed, then they would respond to the email if the fault is not satisfactorily fixed and these jobs would be checked, and FES FM requested to re-attend if necessary.

We found that all of the 30 reactive repair jobs selected for sample testing had been completed by FES FM on a timely basis, within the contract response and rectification times noted under Objective 1. It was in fact noted that all jobs had been closed off on the same day they were transferred to FES FM, even although the rectification period for 'routine' jobs was up to two working days, indicating a highly satisfactory level of performance against contract timescales throughout the 2022/23 academic year to date. With the exception of two jobs from March 2023, the job details were agreed to the monthly Payment Mechanism ('PayMech') Review spreadsheet (refer next section). The PayMech spreadsheet for March 2023 had not been received by the College at the time of our audit testing.



Building Contract Management

Objective 2 - Reported repairs are controlled, monitored and completed on a timely basis (continued).

Observation	Risk	Recommendation	Management Response	
<p>As noted above, Estates staff periodically run a report of jobs in progress to see when they have been closed on Maximo. Details of closed jobs are then input into the College Enquirer system.</p> <p>When marking a job as closed on Enquirer, the current date and time is set as the default. Estates staff normally amend the date to the actual date that the job was noted as completed on Maximo, but from testing we noted four instances when the date of input had been left. In all cases the time of input was left rather than amending to the time that the job was noted as completed on Maximo.</p> <p>Discussion at the audit closing meeting indicated that there is no need to record the time completed in Enquirer and that this field could be removed.</p>	<p>Information on when jobs are completed is not always accurate on the College Enquirer system however it should be noted that the FES FM Maximo system is used to produce monitoring reports.</p>	<p>R1 To ensure consistency between Enquirer and Maximo the actual date of completion of jobs should always be entered on Enquirer, not the date of input. Consideration should be given as to whether the actual time of completion should also be entered on Enquirer or whether this field should just be removed.</p>	<p>We will ensure the close date in Enquirer and Maximo match and are consistent.</p> <p>We will remove the time field altogether.</p> <p>To be actioned by: Head of Estates</p> <p>No later than: 31 August 2023</p>	
			Grade	3



Objective 2 - Reported repairs are controlled, monitored and completed on a timely basis (continued).

PayMech

A record of all reactive repair jobs is kept via the monthly 'PayMech' Review spreadsheet prepared by GLQ / FES FM. The key information included in the PayMech spreadsheet for each job is: the date the job was transferred to FES FM's system; the date and time the job was initially responded to; the date and time the job was completed; the category of the job (routine, important, urgent); the number of days the job took to complete; if response and rectification times were met; reasons for delays and fails; and any deductions to be applied using standard rates. Estates staff check a sample of jobs each month and add columns to the PayMech spreadsheet confirming whether the information is agreed or not agreed and add comments, including any queries for discussion with FES FM. The spreadsheet is returned to FES FM who would update for any agreed amendments. From review of a sample of three monthly PayMech reports we noted that comments are normally added to explain why no deduction has been made for apparent response or rectification performance failures. This can be for a variety of reasons e.g. a malicious damage claim has been agreed, there was restricted access to make the repair, temporary repairs were carried out or FES FM was waiting on parts etc., and the circumstances would always be agreed by the College.

There is a detailed Payment Mechanism Review Procedure. Sample checking by Estates staff includes confirming dates and times to Maximo, confirming categorisations are correct and that deductions have been applied where appropriate and correctly calculated. The Payment Mechanism Review Procedure does not note the percentage of jobs to be sample checked however the Reactive Maintenance Procedure states that Estates will strive to sample at least 50%. In practice, management advised that audit checks normally cover approximately 30-40% of jobs per month, which was the case for two PayMech reports selected for sample testing. We noted that only 6.4% of jobs had been checked in August 2022, which had been impacted by staff absences. Overall, the level of testing carried out was considered to be more than adequate.

In internal audit report 2018/06 – Infrastructure Contract Management / Helpdesk, finalised 28 August 2018, we recommended that the College should review the checks that are undertaken on PayMech with a view to improving the checking process and providing enhanced reporting and efficiency through the use of standard spreadsheet functionality. For example to:

- check whether the response and rectification periods were within the contractual requirements (pass or fail) based on dates and times in the PayMech spreadsheet;
- check whether the classification (minor, medium, major) on reactive repairs provided by the College had been changed by GLQ / FES FM;
- check that the correct penalty had been applied, including calculation of the number of days;
- recalculate and check addition of the penalties to ensure they were correctly calculated and collated; and
- check that the final PayMech spreadsheet agreed to the initial (checked) PayMech spreadsheet and incorporates any agreed changes.



Objective 2 - Reported repairs are controlled, monitored and completed on a timely basis (continued).

PayMech (continued)

From discussion with the Head of Estates and Building Contract Compliance Manager and review of documentation it was established that this recommendation has not been implemented. Management is of the view that the use of the spreadsheet functionality described is not required as failures and deductions are now at a much lower level and, as previously noted, in practice no changes are made to the College classification of repairs. At the time of our previous review there was also a backlog in agreeing the monthly PayMech figures. We have accepted that the manual checks on the PayMech spreadsheet are sufficient given the improved performance levels, although did note from our sample testing a small error that had not been picked up in the calculation of a deduction for one job. A deduction of six days (£192.35) had been made in October 2022 and this had been duplicated as part of a deduction of 32 days made in November 2022. This error was therefore in favour of the College.

Deductions had been made in two of the three months tested and we agreed the total deduction shown in the PayMech report to the GLQ credit note.

Malicious Damage Claims

The contract with GLQ stipulates that where a reactive repair is considered to be caused maliciously then the College will pay for rectification of the damage in addition to the unitary charge (which covers all other reactive jobs).

As soon as possible after a job has been logged on the Helpdesk, by either FES FM or the College, and FES FM considers this was caused by malicious damage, then GLQ must inform the College. This is done via the Malicious Damage Report form with a record of any evidence to support the claim (e.g. photographs) being received into the Estates generic email box. The Head of Estates would normally go and see the damage for himself.

If in reviewing the malicious damage claim, the College agrees that this was caused by malicious damage / vandalism / misuse, then the Malicious Damage Report form is returned stating this. The College is responsible for any reasonable costs incurred for GLQ to rectify. If in reviewing the malicious damage claim, the College does not agree that this was caused by malicious damage / vandalism / misuse, then the form is returned stating this and GLQ must rectify. In this case, the College is not responsible for any costs incurred for GLQ to rectify.

The College has a spreadsheet that records the malicious damage jobs raised. The Malicious Damage Report form is completed with the costs for the job and these are noted on the spreadsheet. Backup is provided for all costs charged e.g. subcontractor invoice. GLQ raise an invoice for malicious damage claims.

We selected a sample of eight malicious damage claims for audit testing and found that there was sufficient evidence of malicious damage, which was confirmed as accepted by the College. At the time of testing, costings and invoices had only been provided in two instances and management advised that GLQ may not bill for small items.



Building Contract Management

Objective 2 - Reported repairs are controlled, monitored and completed on a timely basis (continued).

Building Changes

The contract with GLQ sets out four types of building changes:

- Derogated low value changes: the contract sets out a range of minor changes that can be carried out by the College Estates staff;
- Low value changes (LVC): these are changes that are listed in the Small Works Catalogue or have a cost of less than £5,000;
- Medium value changes: these are changes between £5,000 and £100,000; and
- High value changes: these are changes over £100,000.

All requested changes from College staff (unless a LVC initiated directly by Estates) require to be submitted via an official change request form, available on MyConnect. This should detail the nature of the change, the location and a clearly demonstrated safety, curriculum or business need for the change. Approval from faculty / section directors is required, along with budget codes, before this can be considered.

The College Estates team collate and review the requested changes, liaising with the relevant faculty for any clarifications. All requested changes are logged onto a tracker. The College has slowed the change process down in recent years for budget reasons, and they are now at a much lower level with only LVCs in the 2022/23 academic year to date. Unless there is an urgent requirement, LVCs are now considered three times per year. The Head of Estates and Building Contract Compliance Manager discuss these with the Vice Principal Corporate Services and decide which changes to approve based on the demonstrated safety, curriculum or business need.

Once the College Estates team has approved the request, and gathered all necessary supporting information, this is then raised with GLQ for costing. The 'Record of low value change notice' form is emailed to GLQ.

GLQ review and cost the change – contacting the College Estates team for any clarification needed – before returning the form to the College for approval within five business days (if not a complex change) by email, with a quote attached. Where applicable, GLQ must use costs based on those detailed in the Small Works Catalogue. GLQ should also indicate a timescale of when they expect to be able to carry out the change if approved.

The costs are then reviewed by the College – either by the Estates team within authorisation levels or if a faculty is paying for the change, then Estates will advise the faculty the cost and ask if they wish to proceed. Once a decision has been made on whether to accept the costs or not, a member of the Estates team completes the change request form indicating whether GLQ should proceed with the change or whether the College wish to withdraw the change request. The College must notify GLQ within five business days if they object to any aspect of GLQ's response.

Once complete, GLQ notifies the College via the relevant section of the change request form (via email). This is known as a completion notice. Estates staff and faculty staff will check that the change has been made as required. The College then confirms or queries completion via the same form that is emailed back to GLQ to confirm acceptance / query. GLQ then raise an invoice for checking and approval by the College.



Building Contract Management

Objective 2 - Reported repairs are controlled, monitored and completed on a timely basis (continued).

Building Changes (continued)

For medium and high value changes, a business case must be completed and submitted to the Executive Leadership Team for approval. The remainder of the process is similar to the above, with only different forms and timescales, and approval being required by the Vice Principal Corporate Services at each stage.

We selected a sample of six LVCs for audit testing, all of which had been initiated by Estates, and found that: a Record of Low Value Change Notice had been completed in each case; costing and timing (generally 'ASAP') had been provided by GLQ and approved by the College; works were confirmed as completed by GLQ and accepted by the College; and GLQ had invoiced for the agreed amount.

Observation	Risk	Recommendation	Management Response		
The Record of Low Value Change Notice includes a section for confirmation of acceptance of the proposal from GLQ. From our sample testing we noted that this was completed in all cases however it was not signed and dated by the person providing the College confirmation. In all but one instance, for a minor change costing £665.44, we were provided with email evidence of who authorised acceptance of the proposal. For the change without email approval, management advised that the proposal was verbally accepted by the Head of Estates.	It is not immediately clear who confirmed acceptance of the proposal from GLQ to verify that it was within their authorisation level.	R2 The section of the Change Notices where the College confirms acceptance of the proposal from GLQ should be signed and dated by the College representative providing the confirmation.	We will ensure Change forms are signed and dated for cost acceptance. To be actioned by: Head of Estates No later than: 31 May 2023		
			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Grade</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </table>	Grade	3
Grade	3				



Building Contract Management

Objective 3 - 'Customer' feedback is sought where appropriate on the quality of the repair work.

As previously noted, as part of the process to close jobs on the College Enquirer system, a report is run and Estates staff physically check or verify via email or telephone call a sample of these. The Building Contract Compliance Manager advised that generally small jobs such as blocked toilets, door batteries and the like are closed-off, and faults with equipment and / or anything causing Estates an issue is checked first e.g. main doors. The Reactive Maintenance Procedure notes that around 50% of all jobs are checked, which the Building Contract Compliance Manager advised that Estates strive to do, although there is no overall record kept on the numbers and it does vary between reports.

In addition to the checks carried out by Estates, as the staff who requested the repair get an automatic notification email when the job is completed, then they would respond to the email if the fault is not satisfactorily fixed and these jobs would be checked, and FES FM requested to re-attend if necessary.

For building changes and malicious damage claims, Estates staff would normally physically inspect the jobs.



Building Contract Management

Objective 4 - Trend analysis and reporting is carried out on the performance of the Help Desk.

Monthly Service Reports and an Annual Performance Report continue to be received from FES FM for College management review. These contain a large amount of performance information including:

- The total number of events on the Helpdesk each month;
- The number of events at each campus;
- The number of jobs meeting the contract response and rectification timescales;
- The number of days that any Functional Area has been Unavailable or Unavailable but Used;
- The level of any deductions made each month;
- Details of any complaints and compliments received;
- Utilities profiles for City and Riverside campuses;
- Details of malicious damage claims and whether accepted by the College;
- Details of change notices; and
- A summary of the status of each of the Performance and Availability standards across the year.

Trend analysis is carried out by the College Estates team looking at the number and percentage of total jobs for common repairs covering door batteries, door (other), toilet not flushing, windows.

A Facilities Management Report is prepared for the College's Finance & Physical Resources Committee, providing a progress update on the College estate and facilities management. This includes a chart showing the open reactive maintenance events per month on the Helpdesk for the current year, with comparative figures going back to academic year 2016/17. There is also information on the amounts deducted through the Payment Mechanism with comparative information from the previous two years, which shows a significant fall in deductions made, reflecting the significant improvement in the services delivered by GLQ / FES FM.



Aberdeen 45 Queen's Road AB15 4ZN
Dundee The Vision Building, 20 Greenmarket DD1 4QB
Edinburgh Ground Floor, 11-15 Thistle Street EH2 1DF
Glasgow 100 West George Street, G2 1PP

T: 01224 322 100 **F:** 01224 327 911
T: 01382 200 055 **F:** 01382 221 240
T: 0131 226 0200 **F:** 0131 220 3269
T: 0141 471 9870

Henderson Loggie LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in Scotland with registered number SO301630 and is a member of PrimeGlobal, a global association of independent accounting firms, the members of which are separate and independent legal entities. Registered office is: The Vision Building, 20 Greenmarket, Dundee, DD1 4QB. All correspondence signed by an individual is signed for and on behalf of Henderson Loggie LLP. Reference to a 'partner' is to a member of Henderson Loggie LLP. A list of members' names is available for inspection at each of these addresses.

