STAFF CONSULTATION MEETING  
HALL ADMISSIONS OFFICERS AND ADMINISTRATION STAFF  
REVIEW OF THE ADMINISTRATION ARRANGEMENTS WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY ACCOMMODATION DIVISION  

MEETING NOTES  

Stage 2 of the Change Management Process for the Review of Administration Arrangements within the University Accommodation Division comprises 3-4 weeks of consultative meetings with staff and students, ranging from smaller workshops through to individual meetings. These meetings offer staff the opportunity to provide feedback on the recommendations as outlined in the review.

A summary of the meeting held on Monday 23 August 2010 at 11.30am in the Conference Room, John Yencken Building is provided below.

Present: Karen Hill, Change Manager (Facilitator)  
X9 attendees representing Admissions Staff  

Apologies: N/A  
Absent: N/A  
In Attendance: Karen Ford, Change Consultant (HR)

1. Meeting Purpose.

The purpose and structure of the meeting was outlined by the facilitator:

- An update on the consultation process to date and next steps;  
- A discussion regarding the possibility of a closer alignment of Admissions and the Registrar’s Division;  
- An opportunity for feedback, commentary and questions on the recommendations from the Review.

2. Admissions - Issues and Concerns.

- The facilitator re-iterated that the discussion is not intended to include the administration process for admissions, explaining that this is being reviewed in parallel, chaired by Liz Dean with Luce Andrews (Head of Hall - Fenner) taking an active project management role together with Trish Low from UAS;  
- Attendees were in agreement that a review is important because the existing Admissions process is extremely confusing for both ANU staff and students:  
  - The end-to-end process is not documented;  
  - There is no single authority for the process;  
  - Roles and responsibilities are not clear;  
  - There are too many people involved with various aspects;  
- It was noted that there had been a consultation process regarding the Admissions process; attendees explained that they had provided comments and suggestions but it did not appear that these had been “taken on board”;  
- Admissions is seen as an important service to students; attendees concurred that improvements are needed so that students have clearer information about the process and key contacts;  
- Attendees explained that they have their own systems in place but the lack of an authoritative, documented and easily accessible admissions procedure is problematic when an Administration Officer
is on leave and another staff member is required to cover their role, it would also be beneficial when responding to enquiries from students and their parents;
- Administration Officers advised that they would typically spend between 50-70% of their time on Admissions (depending on the Hall); the level of involvement by the Head varied across Halls;
- Attendees explained that the time taken on Admissions could sometimes be at the expense of other aspects of their roles.

3. **Recommendation 5: Investigate the Viability of Transferring the UA/ Halls Residential Admissions Function into the Registrar’s Division.**
   - There was a strongly held view that while an alignment could be beneficial, the role of Admissions is highly specialised and should continue to be delivered through localised Admissions Officers (attendees explained that this model works well because the person has detailed knowledge of the accommodation configurations available in their building);
   - Attendees explained that they currently have “minimal contact” with the Registrar’s Division.

4. **Team Work and Knowledge Sharing.**
   - Attendees explained that they used to meet as a group on a bi-monthly basis but this is not happening at present;
   - It was agreed that information sharing should be improved and that joint meetings between Admissions and Registrars teams would be beneficial for knowledge sharing;
   - Attendees also explained that increased interaction and information sharing with Heads of Halls would be beneficial (for example updates regarding ANU procedure changes) and that they would like to see stronger communication channels between Heads of Halls, Administration and Admissions staff.

5. **Other Concerns and Issues.**
   - It was agreed that there is a pressing need to educate other areas of the broader ANU community on the Admissions process (for example International Recruitment and Academic Colleges). It was apparent to attendees that prospective students are being advised they will be able to secure accommodation in a Hall of their choice and therefore they often “just turn up” expecting a room to be available;
   - The accommodation guarantee some times gave the impression to students that they would get in to the Hall of their choice;
   - Attendees explained that they were aware students did not feel that they were getting “value for money” with regards to Admissions because they do not perceive that they receive a good service;
   - Attendees explained that areas such as UA provide valuable assistance and support (“front counter service”) but they are doing so to the detriment of their core business and that while the support is appreciated they have not been trained in the admissions process;
   - Circa 4,000 accommodation offers are processed at any one time and it was agreed that there are improvements that could be made to what is currently a manual process (through quality checking, process efficiencies and overcoming technology barriers) but this is impeded by resourcing constraints;
   - It was agreed that additional resourcing is needed for Admissions but that thorough consideration should be given to the optimal model to provide an integral and end-to-end process including the ‘front counter’ and telephone service for students.

6. **Summary.**
   - Attendees agreed that the worst case scenario would be for the new Admissions model to be more complex than the current one;
   - A consistent approach and model for Admissions with clear, easily accessible policies and procedures was viewed as essential be it in a centralised or decentralised structure;
   - Additional dedicated resourcing for Admissions was viewed as important if the student experience is to be improved in this area;
   - Attendees noted their openness to positive changes and their enthusiasm for process improvements but reiterated their wish that these changes be made through a process of open consultation and discussion.

Meeting was concluded at 12.30 pm