STAFF CONSULTATION MEETING  
FACILITIES MANAGER AND HALLS MAINTENANCE 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 Tuesday 11 August 2010 at 2.00pm in the Conference Room, John Yencken Building is provided below.

Present:  
Karen Hill, Change Manager (Facilitator)  
Mark Rawlinson (Facilities Manager, UAS)  
Adam Agius (Maintenance, Bruce Hall)  
Brian Francis (Maintenance, Ursula Hall)  
Colleen Jones (Housekeeping, Bruce Hall)  
Jorma Piirainen (Maintenance, Toad Hall)  
Sashi Prasad (Housekeeping, Bruce Hall)  
Glen Wolski (Maintenance, Toad hall / Burton & Garran Hall)  
Willy Weijers (Maintenance, Burton & Garran Hall)

Apologies:  
N/A

Absent:  
N/A

In Attendance:  
Karen Ford, Change Consultant (HR)

1. Meeting Purpose

The purpose of the meeting was outlined by the facilitator

- A discussion around key strategic themes and recommendations from the Review of the Administration Arrangements within the University Accommodation Division;
- An opportunity for feedback, commentary and questions on these themes and recommendations;
- Attendees were offered the opportunity for individual meetings if required.

2. Scope of the Review – Inclusion of Housekeeping and Catering Staff

- Attendees asked if ANU housekeeping and catering staff are included in the Review. The view was that the Review focuses on administration and management functions and housekeeping and catering staff should be included as they report in to the Administration Managers;
- Housekeeping staff explained the close interaction that their roles have with Admissions and with Maintenance;
- The facilitator acknowledged the concern of this group and agreed to note this matter as an issue for consideration but advised that these roles are out of scope for the report.
3. **Structure and Reporting Lines of the Maintenance Function**

- Attendees felt the first Review lacked clarity and detail in particular with respect to the proposed reporting structure; it inferred an intention to centralise the maintenance function in one location;
- The facilitator explained that there are different options that could be considered and asked for the group’s views on a model where maintenance staff are physically based in different locations (as is the case at present) but reporting to a central manager;
- Attendees concurred that this model could have some benefits (leave coverage and skills transfer for example) but stressed that local knowledge (of the building) is important;
- The current model where maintenance is located “on site” was considered efficient; enabling maintenance to provide “same day service” and a “familiar face” to students (the latter being particularly important from a security perspective);
- Attendees explained there is currently an informal approach to collaboration (for example utilisation of specialist skills within the group) and communication. They acknowledged, and were supportive of, the idea that this could be enhanced and leveraged through a more formal reporting structure, for example the implementation of regular meetings for knowledge sharing;
- There was concern about the potential implementation of a central maintenance budget and a preference to retain the current model of an individual budget for each hall;
- Attendees questioned who would own maintenance assets such as tools if there was a centralised model. The current approach is one of informal “lending” and it was noted that this works well but could be difficult under a centralised reporting model;
- It was agreed that a centralised purchasing model “makes sense” (although it does take longer to make a purchase) but that budgets and assets should ideally continue to be managed locally.

4. **Career Development**

- Attendees explained that their Statements of Expectation are managed by the Halls and that the extent to which they were able to access career development opportunities at ANU was variable;
- Some attendees considered that they received good access to career development opportunities such as ANU training while others noted that they did not.

5. **Reporting of Maintenance Issues**

- Attendees were asked to describe how maintenance issues are logged and tracked;
- The process for logging maintenance issues varied across the Halls and tracking was generally done via an Excel spreadsheet but there was no consistent format for the latter which does not enable a streamlined reporting process for the ANU as an organisation.

6. **Other Discussion Points**

- Attendees strongly requested that their roles remain physically based in the Halls explaining that their interaction with local management was critical to their ability to deliver an efficient service to the Halls;
- There was concern that a centralised model and a disconnection from the student community could reduce service standards and be detrimental to the student experience (for example the slow response time for jobs logged in Maximo was noted);
- Attendees noted that they currently operate in a “semi-autonomous” role while reporting to an Administration Manager and operating as their “right hand” they were of the view that this arrangement works well, performance management is effective and delivers what the students need;
- It was noted that the centralised charging model does not work well as there is no transparency of charges; where the fees go and what is charged.

7. **Summary**

- The issue of greatest concern was that of physical relocation; a physical relocation to a zoned maintenance team was regarded as the ‘worst case’ scenario and a concern was raised that Halls could simply refuse to use this service and employ and alternate person to do the maintenance.

Meeting was concluded at 3.00 pm