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 09.30 at Fenner Hall is provided below.

**Present:**
- Karen Hill, Change Manager (Facilitator)
- Laura Clarke, President, Fenner Residents Committee
- Josh Lickiss, Residential Scholar

**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.**

- Attendees commented on the "vague" nature of the Review documentation explaining that it was not clear how it will enhance the student experience because the aims and objectives were not clearly articulated;
- Attendees conveyed the concerns of the students regarding the lack of consultation with them during the first stage of the change management process;
- The 2009 Review process was not viewed as a useful experience; students were given short notice of consultation meetings which were negative in tone and not conducive to open discussion;
- Students requested that the importance of consulting with them as a stakeholder group be noted.

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

- Concern was expressed that the same problems of the past would be replicated into a new structure; this appears to be a change of name only;
The facilitator advised that in practice the focus, and some of the reporting lines, of this Department will be different to UA, explaining that it is intended to be an integrated department, the structure of which operates with strong cooperation and collaboration to deliver accommodation services to students;

- Attendees noted that there is a lack of transparency in the current accommodation model and that it is not clear what the fees they pay to UA are being used for;
- Attendees noted their concerns regarding a centralised budget and the importance of Heads of Halls being engaged with any budgeting process so that the individual needs of the Halls are met (for example the buildings are of different ages and therefore have different maintenance issues);
- Attendees reinforced the importance of the Halls retaining their autonomy and identity noting their concern that a change to a centralised reporting line could impact the ability of the Head of Hall to make decisions (in particular with regard to maintenance issues) and to direct their strategic vision for the Hall;
- Familiar faces and rapport were important to students; attendees noted that it was the preference of Hall residents to retain the current accommodation model in this regard;
- The question was raised regarding reporting lines for Heads of Halls; it was agreed that in principle the suggestion they report to the Head of the newly created department was a good idea as it would offer a central point of management and vision for the Halls.

4. **Recommendation 1: Establish an Executive Level Committee to Oversee Strategic Planning for Residential Communities.**

- The facilitator explained that the Executive Committee will have a “big picture” focus, the remit being for long term strategy and planning, noting that it should be seen to be independent and therefore also could redress the noted issues of transparency.

5. **Other Discussion.**

- It was noted that there have been suggestions that the Admissions could move to the Registrars Division;
- The facilitator explained that this had been suggested due to the close alignment of the functions and the opportunities that could be created for closer collaboration and skills development of the staff who work in these areas.

6. **Summary.**

- The accommodation guarantee was seen as a distinguishing factor of ANU by many students when considering university preferences;
- Attendees stated that the key issues and concerns of the students are how the Review will impact them;
- It was noted that the student group sees some of the Review recommendations as being positive (for example there is a clear link between increased career development for Administration staff and the enhancement of the student experience) however, this is not the case for all recommendations in the Review;
- Worst case scenario was agreed to be a loss of staff and /or a loss of capital work (for the Hall residents the immediate priorities are what they observe each day that requires maintenance and repair / replacement).

Meeting was concluded at 10.00am