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 Monday 09 August 2010 at 2.00pm in the Conference Room, University Accommodation Building is provided below.

Present: Karen Hill, Change Manager (Facilitator)
Melissa Hayes - Executive Officer, Accommodation Business Services
Graeme Linder, Finance Manager, Accommodation Business Services
Ting Ting Zhou, Accountant, Accommodation Business Services
Cassandra Beetham, Senior Accommodation Officer
Ida Hope, Finance and HR Officer, Accommodation Business Services

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 and commentary on these themes and recommendations;
- Attendees were offered the opportunity for individual meetings if required.

2. Recommendation 2: Disestablish the existing University Accommodation Division and replace it with the Residential Communities Department.

- The facilitator advised that this recommendation is not negotiable and explained that while the current title of the function is to be disestablished and a new title established, it is intended that the structure and the people in it will remain and potentially could continue in the existing physical location. A range of models will be considered prior to a final recommendation being made;
- Attendees noted that the recommendations were not clearly explained initially; they inferred that their department would be “split up”. This initial interpretation had caused concern and anxiety;
- It was noted by attendees that the terms of reference for the review identified “efficient and effective administration” to be a priority objective. The focus of the review implementation now appeared to be primarily on enhancing the student experience; it is not clear what these efficiencies will look like or how they will be achieved;
It was agreed that student consultation was an important component of the review process especially with regard to potential areas where efficiencies could be made;

There was a strongly held view that this new department should have a head who would be responsible for the strategic direction and final decision making of the committee;

The committee was seen as a good idea in principle but the remit requires clarification and it was seen as preferable that there should be one representative from Halls; a single “voice”.

3. Recommendation 7: Transfer transactional functions to F&BS Shared Services Office

Attendees agreed that the rotation was a good idea in principle; it would offer Administration Managers learning opportunities, skills development and job variety as well as a different perspective on student administration. It was agreed that a minimum of 12 months for this rotation would be required for it to be successful.

4. Where should the University Accommodation Division report to?

- There was concern at the suggestion that the UA Division and Heads of Halls should become one “Residential Communities” Division;
- It was noted that history shows that the model of Heads of Halls reporting to a central department has not worked well due to the dual aspects of these roles (pastoral and budgetary responsibilities);
- It was also felt that the model of these roles reporting to the PVC (Students) is not the optimal solution due to the large portfolio which that role has to manage;
- It was agreed that an alternate solution of a new role being created was a good idea but first there is a need for clarity as regards to the plan for the new Accommodation Division;
- It was agreed that this new role has potential to improve communication channels with Halls and that the person would need to have an appreciation of pastoral and academic issues as well as strong management capabilities.

5. Service Level Agreement

- The suggestion of a Service Level Agreement between Halls and the UA function was not viewed as a positive solution because it could potentially limit the ability of the UA staff to ensure that appropriate ANU processes are followed; this could be of detriment to the university;
- It was noted that these agreements have been established in the past but have not proved successful.

6. Other Discussion Points

- Attendees noted that in line with the remit to improve efficiencies, in the longer term they would like to see greater utilisation of the existing business systems which their department currently offers e.g. on-line logging of maintenance issues by students;
- A holistic review of the roles and responsibilities was seen as an important aspect of this review process rather than a piecemeal approach;
- Attendees would like to see further clarification / quantifiable information on the meaning of “enhancing the student experience”; what does this mean in practice and what are the objectives sought?
- It was noted that needs of students vary, but in general their requirements of the Halls are a comfortable room, quiet, good board and lodging. Not all students have time to take up the academic support. It was recommended that further feedback be obtained from students as to their needs in this regard.

Meeting was concluded at 3.00 pm