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 Friday 27 August 2010 at 11.00am in the Dining Room, Ursula Hall is provided below.

**Present:**
Karen Hill, Change Manager (Facilitator)
Kellie Bertolin (Ursula Hall)
Katie Boyd (Burton & Garran Hall)
Emilia Ciampa (Toad Hall)
Maxine Harrison (Burton & Garran Hall)
Hannah James (Ursula Hall)
Sarah Portelli (Bruce Hall)
Jeanette Robinson (Burton & Garran Hall)
Susanne Smethills (Fenner Hall)
Kelly Stephen (Toad Hall)
Bruce Thornton (Maintenance, Fenner Hall)
Samuel Voller (Burton & Garran Hall)
Lucinda Watt (Toad Hall)

**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 opportunity for those staff who were unable to attend previous meetings to participate in a discussion around key strategic themes and recommendations from the Review of the Administration Arrangements within the University Accommodation Division;
- An opportunity for additional feedback, commentary and questions on these themes and recommendations.
2. Discussion Points.

- Several attendees reiterated their concerns (raised at previous meetings) regarding the recruitment and retention of Halls staff; a number of staff are on fixed term contracts which are due to expire at the end of the year and the review does not allow permanent recruitment for open positions which is causing great uncertainty;
- Attendees were keen to know the Review outcomes explaining that the uncertainty was affecting morale and causing stress and pressure on staff;
- Attendees also asked when roles and responsibilities would be confirmed; the facilitator advised that this would be done holistically as an outcome of the Review;
- It was agreed that strong leadership will be key to the successful implementation of the report recommendations; team building forums and on going discussion groups for knowledge sharing and review purposes were seen as essential for the new department to be a successful and cohesive unit;
- Attendees also noted the importance of an advocate for Halls staff and a mechanism for informing them of ongoing professional development opportunities which are available to them;
- The facilitator confirmed the importance of an integrated department which is supported and enabled by the Administration function and in which all staff take personal and proactive responsibility for “making things work”;
- Clarification on the role of Facilities Manager was requested and the facilitator advised that a decision regarding this current vacancy has not yet been made;
- Attendees noted that they would welcome joint discussion meetings with University Accommodation Services and agreed that this would be useful given the extent to which their roles and responsibilities “overlapped”;
- The structure of maintenance was discussed and the facilitator referred attendees to the maintenance meeting notes available on the Intranet advising that a central reporting line with locally located staff would be beneficial for knowledge sharing and process efficiencies.

3. Timelines.

Attendees requested clarification regarding the timelines for the report and the implementation of any approved recommendations. The facilitator advised:
- Any structural changes (for example the disestablishment of UA) would not be likely to take effect till 01 January;
- The report must be endorsed by the Project Steering Committee before it can be released for comment; it is anticipated that the final report will be available by mid September and that there will be a 2 week period for comments including Town Hall discussion forums;
- The facilitator reminded the group that the VC and PSG may not accept all the recommendations in the report and that it will be a high level document that will not extend to operational detail such as job descriptions;
- A progress review would be likely to occur at 12 and then 24 months after implementation in order to consider if the initial objectives of the review have been met, what progress has been made and what is working / not working.

Meeting was concluded at 12.00