STAFF CONSULTATION MEETING: CAPITAL WORKS
CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
FACILITIES AND SERVICES DIVISION 2010 - 2011
MEETING NOTES

A summary of the meeting held on Thursday 28 October at 2.30pm in the Seminar Room, Innovations Building is provided below.

Present:  Karen Hill, Change Manager (Facilitator)
          Cheryl Cairns, Ian Duff, Michael Wright, Chris Neal

Absent:   Lino Fiorese and Harry Stephenson

In Attendance:  Sally Webster (Senior Workforce Planning/Change – HR Division)

1. Meeting Purpose

Karen Hill, as facilitator very briefly went through the stages of the change process including active consultation via:
- Meeting with all staff members;
- Meetings with individual work groups (without management representatives); and
- Meetings with Management in relation to the self review process.

Attendees were updated on the change management process to date and the objectives of the process; these being to capture the existing strengths of the Division so it can move forward leveraging what works well and improving on what does not. The facilitator explained the purpose of the meeting and the rules of engagement, noting that staff, if not able to attend the session or were not comfortable in sharing their views in the open sessions, could meet individually with the facilitator or send feedback directly to her.

Discussion Points

2. Strengths of F&S

- F&S is very important to the ANU;
- The Division has the ability to make a large impact;
- Sense of autonomy in positions; and
- The sense of responsibility and the challenges.

3. Areas for Improvement

- It was agreed that the physical location of F&S staff is a real hindrance;
- Clarity is needed on who works for who - transparency on roles and responsibilities and delegations (in terms of delegating work);
- A detailed organisational chart was suggested (clear in structure and reporting lines);
- It was agreed by the attendees that there are too many silos and not enough communication within the Division. Better planning was needed;
- There was concern that staff feel disjointed and not part of the team – location is a big part of this problem;
- The workload is increasing offering much less time for reviewing or ‘blue sky’ thinking;
- It was noted that the area does a lot with less compared to other universities;
- It was discussed that lower level support is required to be able to concentrate on bigger more strategic tasks;
- The attendees suggested that a broader-flatter structure would be better, as long as roles were clearly defined and known by all;
- Better transparency of Divisional budget;
- There is a perception that managers are too busy to lead. But is a double edge sword - more work delegated out, more staff may be required;
- Attendees felt that the Division needs to be a 'listening division' rather than a 'telling division';
- There is a concern regarding the management of official files and the (insecure) off site location at Spring Valley Farm. It was also felt that clarification in the form of guidelines on what paperwork needs to be kept and for how long. As this is currently unclear staff have a 'keep everything' mentality;
- An induction program for new staff is essential. Including a checklist for new projects so staff (consistently) knows what needs to be done. Currently a sink or swim based learning curve;
- It was discussed that there is a lack of time and resources to be able to adequately interact, explain and follow up with clients;
- A proper project management system is critical;
- It was agreed that the Division has a culture of favouritism – resulting in equality in how people are managed. Also gender inequality;
- There was a concern that within the Division there is a fear of speaking out on equality issues;
- Lack of regular feedback, and systematic support; and
- The aging workforce and succession planning was raised as an issue within the Division.

4. **Training suggestions**
   - HR training for managers
   - Time management

5. **Client Relationships**
   - It was felt that the Division is seen as 'blame monkeys', not helped by spreading too thinly to try to manage external expectations;
   - There were concerns that the Division has trouble making decisions. For example the amount of time and effort spent trying to fix a problem, when if a decision was made and money spent in the first place, there would be no problem;
   - Clients need to be educated on the rules and regulations of what the team work within;
   - It was explained that 80% of what the group does could be planned. Therefore, the client can be in agreement before the work goes ahead;
   - Attendees felt that F&S should be a listening division rather than a telling division;

Meeting was concluded at 3.30pm