PROGRESS REPORT AS OF 11 AUGUST 2010 (IMP)

REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY ACCOMMODATION DIVISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Submissions Received</th>
<th>Consultation Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Burton and Garran Hall (Brice, Fabian and Croker)</td>
<td>Week of 2 August &amp; 9 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ANU Halls Sub Dean (Bruce, Toad and Ursula)</td>
<td>• Mick Serena, Director, F&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff and Residents of Ursula Hall</td>
<td>• ANUSA, PARSA, Hall Presidents, Sub-Deans and Student Representatives (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accommodation Business Services Staff</td>
<td>• Tim Beckett, Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• University House (Richards)</td>
<td>• David Sturgiss, CFO, F&amp;BS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emerging Themes/Issues from Consultation

1. **Process** - Lack of consultation and understanding of residential life;
   - How will students benefit from the proposed changes?
2. Lack of independence and neutrality of the review;
   - Very strong feelings on both points above from the majority of staff and students.
3. **Recommendation 1** – Strong support for an executive level committee to oversee strategic planning for residential communities. General consensus about membership and issues that should be addressed at the committee (big picture and long term). Agreement that it should not be a forum for mediation about operational issues. Student representation critical and an understanding of who is responsible for decisions.
   - Reporting Relationships and Senior Management – Consistent concerns have been expressed about reporting relationships as they currently stand (i.e. Heads of Halls reporting to PVC and UA reporting to F&S). There is also strong consensus that a review of these relationships in twelve months is not ideal. This is causing some anxiety and uncertainty.
4. **Recommendation 2** – No major objections to establishing a Residential Communities Department. What this department will include and its reporting relationships are under consideration. Obviously there is some disappointment and a feeling of loss in relation to the disestablishment of UA for those staff who work within it.
5. **Recommendation 3 & 4** – Whilst some stakeholders understand the requirements for efficiency and effective administration and what role centralisation could play in this, there is no strong support for this to occur in F&S via the joint business services group. Some reasons provided are a mix of incorrect strategic alignment, and the need for dedicated resources for accommodation administration.
6. **Recommendation 5** – There is broad acknowledgement that the admissions process needs attention to ensure there is a consistent and streamlined University approach. This is currently under consideration.
through a separate process. There is certainly some support for involvement of the Registrar’s Divisions (which aligns to their mission) but that the Halls should continue to be heavily involved.

7. Recommendation 6 – There has been no specific discussion on SLA’s except for some concern about unrealistic expectations in terms of what they can deliver (i.e. a culture of cooperation and collaboration must exist before they are truly effective). An alternative approach is a Service Charter which sets up service expectations and mutual obligations.

8. Recommendation 7 – Most stakeholders can see the value of transferring this function to F&BS, however this is not without concern (i.e. loss of control over data and descriptions, accuracy and responsiveness).

9. Recommendation 8 – Depending on the stakeholder, there are different views about where Administration Managers should report to and their roles and responsibilities. Hall staff and students believe it is essential that they remain connected to a Hall and there are logical efficiencies in this. Alternative views are that staff require more exposure to the University as a whole and be provided with a career path beyond the Hall if they chose. More work needs to be done to explore this recommendation and alternatives which may see the same outcome.

10. Recommendation 9 – More consultation is required on this point. This recommendation does fit with F&S strategic goals and there are benefits to greater collaboration and cooperation in this area. Most stakeholders in Halls are concerns that staff should be located in the Hall, be responsive to client needs but there is some support for management oversight.

11. Other
   • Budget delegations remain an important issue. This cannot be resolved until the structure is final.
   • Clarification of all roles and responsibilities within the Halls (a holistic view).
   • Efficiencies can be achieved through better utilisation of current business systems (i.e. reporting of maintenance)

Please note: Staff and students have been very generous with their time and information in Stage 2 of the consultation process. Whilst the above are some of the main points coming out of these meetings, this report is not designed to capture all comments from meetings and written submissions. Notes from meetings will be available on the web in summary form.

Karen Hill
Change Manager
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