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 Wednesday 18 August 2010 at 12.00 in Ursula Hall is provided below.

Present: Karen Hill, Change Manager (Facilitator)
Areti Metuamate, PARSA President and Sub Dean (Toad Hall)
Elise Adams, PARSA Representative (Graduate House)
Tully Fletcher, ANUSA
Nolan Brice (Burton and Garran Hall)
Kelly Burgess (Ursula Hall)
Ed Collett (Ursula Hall)
Sarah Collum (Ursula Hall)
Nick Francis (Ursula Hall)
Hannah James (Ursula Hall)
Oliver Lake (Ursula Hall)
Ashleigh Moreton (Ursula Hall)
Emilie Patterson (Ursula Hall)
Peter Tindale (Ursula Hall)
Madeline Vaughan (Ursula 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:

- 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.

2. Review Process to Date.

- The facilitator provided an update on the Review process, including consultation meetings to date, and clarified the scope of the final report (recommendations for the administration arrangements of University accommodation, comments regarding management aspects and other issues for consideration);
- Attendees were advised that 6 written submissions have been received to date together with constructive feedback and comments from the consultation meetings.
3. **Recommendation 1: Establish an Executive Level Committee to Oversee Strategic Planning for Residential Communities.**

- The facilitator advised that there was general support for a Committee to have a strategic planning role for residential communities across the campus;
- Attendees requested further information on the role of the committee, its chair and its membership;
  - Role: Would be “big picture” looking at long term issues such as budgeting and tariffs which should enable increased transparency and accountability for students in these matters;
  - Structure: To be determined but potentially chaired by Head of Residential Communities Department (if established), the report will include a recommendation for secretarial support;
- Attendees noted that it was not apparent to students that they were welcomed on this Committee and requested voting rights for the ANUSA and PARSA;
- Students were concerned that it would be difficult for presidents to obtain visibility of issues discussed at Committee meetings (in particular financial expenditure) if they were not Committee members;
- It was agreed that, as Committee members, Heads of Halls should be required to produce and distribute operational plans for Halls;
- Attendees agreed in principle with the suggestion of a Committee with a strategic and budget making role; it would provide a “student voice” and enable transparency of budgets and decision making (budgetary information relating to Halls is not currently shared with students);
- It was agreed that if possible, the Committee should report up to Council; this would give Council visibility of Halls issues.

4. **Recommendation 2: Disestablish the UA Division and replace with Residential Communities Department.**

- The facilitator noted that consultation feedback to date indicated that this was a good idea in principle but there was a clear message regarding the importance of consistency and familiarity of staff in Halls;
- Attendees expressed concern that the problems of the past would be replicated into a new “re-badged” structure, the facilitator advised that this new department is not intended to be the same as UA and will have a different structure, delegations, reporting lines, administrative support and culture;
- The Head of this new Department would be required to bring strong management skills and experience of residential life and should have delegations. The establishment of this role was strongly supported;
- It was noted by attendees that the current model of Heads of Halls reporting to the PVC (Students) does enhance the student experience but it was also recognised that the PVC (Students) currently has a large portfolio. It was agreed that a new role of Head of Residential Communities should assume an operational role and alleviate some of the workload of the PVC (Students).

5. **Recommendation 4: Transfer the UA Business Services Unit into Facilities and Services.**

- The facilitator noted that there was no strong support for this department to move to facilities and Services but that a closer alignment to the Registrar’s Division was perceived as a good idea.

6. **Recommendation 9: Establish a Halls Maintenance Zone Team. To be Managed by the UA Facilities Manager and Report to F&S**

- Attendees agreed that efficiencies could be made in the management of university accommodation;
- It was acknowledged that some services could potentially done “out of house” (example maintenance and cleaning) but attendees stated that it is essential for administration to remain “in house”;
- The facilitator noted the importance of a “consistent face” in Halls was acknowledged and understood but explained that an important outcome of the Review will be to assess existing administration processes and identify roles and responsibilities and areas of duplication.

7. **Summary**

- It was agreed that stability post-review was important together with a culture of increased transparency, openness to feedback and continuous improvement.

Meeting was concluded at 1.00pm