



RHODES UNIVERSITY

**RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION  
POLICY AND PROCEDURES:  
SUB-WARDEN POSTS IN UNDERGRADUATE RESIDENCES**

**1. POLICY PARTICULARS**

CONSULTATION WITH: Wardens, SRC representative/s and from time to time, Hall Fellows.

DATE OF APPROVAL BY RELEVANT COMMITTEE STRUCTURE:  
Board of Residences

DATE OF APPROVAL BY SENATE: Not applicable

DATE OF APPROVAL BY ADMINISTRATIVE SUB-COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL:

COMMENCEMENT

DATE: 2003

REVISION HISTORY: Last revision in March 2006.

REVIEW DATE: Every three years

POLICY LEVEL: Student and Wardens

RESPONSIBILITY [Person/Division/Committee accountable for]:

- IMPLEMENTATION & MONITORING: Wardens and Recruitment and Selection Office of the HR Division
- REVIEW AND REVISION: Recruitment and Selection Office of the HR Division through calling for feedback from Wardens and SRC.

REPORTING STRUCTURE:

As regards the implementation of the policy: House Wardens → Hall Wardens → Vice-Principal → Vice-Chancellor → Council

As regards the driving of the policy: R&S Manager → HR Director → Vice-Principal → Vice-Chancellor → Council

## **2. POLICY STATEMENT**

### **2.1 POLICY DECLARATION:**

The vision statement of Rhodes University indicates that the institution will strive to produce outstanding internationally-accredited graduates who are innovative, analytical, balanced and adaptable, with a life-long love of learning. The institutional maxim of “where leaders learn” suggests a commitment to providing students with opportunities to develop their leadership skills. The residential system and the posts of sub-warden within this system provides one such opportunity.

In its mission statement, the University makes a commitment to provide an attractive, safe and well-equipped environment that is conducive to good scholarship and collegiality. Given that x% of students are in residence, the appointment of persons who are able to contribute to ensuring such an environment is very important.

As such, Rhodes University pays significant attention to the recruitment and selection of staff in order to ensure the fair treatment and to secure the appointment of persons who will be able to contribute towards the success of the University.

### **2.2 POLICY OBJECTIVES:**

The objectives of this policy are to ensure:

- fair labour practices consistent with the requirements of the Employment Equity Act;
- values and practices consistent with the Constitution of South Africa and those of Rhodes University;
- clarity as regards the implementation of employment equity/affirmative action measures;
- the efficient and effective recruitment and selection of staff to meet the staffing needs of the University, using sound human resource practices; and
- consistency between this policy and any other relevant institutional policies in particular the University’s Equity Policy.

### **2.3 POLICY APPLICABILITY:**

This policy is applicable to all individuals applying for vacant Sub-Warden posts.

### **2.4 DEFINITIONS:**

Competencies	These are the requirements for the job in terms of the knowledge, skills and attributes needed to do the job.
Fair labour practice	According to the Employment Equity Act, a fair labour practice is one which does not directly or indirectly unfairly discriminate against an applicant or a particular group of applicants. An example of direct unfair discrimination would be to eliminate an applicant on an arbitrary basis such as marital status, sexual orientation, religious affiliation etc. An example of indirect unfair discrimination would be a selection practice (e.g. interview

questions, selection criteria, use of selection technique) which creates adverse impact for an applicant or group of applicants.

Job requirements	This refers to the competencies required for the post. See competencies above.
Prior knowledge	This information about an applicant which is not gained through the formal selection process e.g. rumour about a person, information gained through informal networks etc.
Recruitment	The process concerned with ensuring a pool of applicants from which the preferred candidate can be identified. Recruitment strategies include the use of media, search committees, word of mouth.
Selection	This is the process of choosing the right candidate from amongst the pool of applicants.

### **3. POLICY IMPLEMENTATION**

#### **3.1 THE ACTIONS AND PROCESSES BY WHICH THE OBJECTIVES OF THE POLICY WILL BE ACHIEVED:**

##### **3.1.1 Principles which govern the recruitment and selection of staff**

The following principles govern this process:

3.1.1.1 *Strategic importance:* The employment of sub-wardens who are role-models of the values inherent in the the vision and mission of Rhodes University, is important. Employing such individuals should be approached with the commitment, time and energy needed to make an effective decision but bearing in mind the limited period for the appointment of a sub-warden.

3.1.1.2 *Dual focus of quality and equity:* The University believes that the goals of quality and equity are not mutually exclusive and that diversity strengthens the quality of the institution. Tokenism, window dressing and lowering of standards are regarded as inappropriate affirmative action and equity strategies in the Higher Education context and are further rejected on the basis that they undermine human dignity and respect. The selection of staff is based on who will make the “best contribution” to the institution. See Appendix 1 for further detail on what this means within the selection process. Specific practices used to promote diversity and employment equity are included in Appendix 2.

3.1.1.3 *Ethical and legal approach:* The University is an employer committed to ethical and legal practices and will not knowingly engage in practices which undermine an individual’s dignity and respect and unfairly limit their access to employment opportunities. Appendix 3 outlines current practices which are consistent with an ethical and legal approach.

3.1.1.4 *Policy adherence with flexibility:* This policy represents the University’s commitment to how the majority of recruitment and selection practices for sub-warden posts will function. However, the University reserves the right to deviate from this policy in certain circumstances, provided that no

unfair labour practice is committed, that this is the decision of the relevant Selection Committee and that the HR Director endorses this decision.

3.1.1.5 *Shared responsibility:*

- 3.1.1.5.1.1 Hall Wardens and House Wardens need to pay careful attention to the kind of sub-wardens required and communicate these effectively to the Human Resources Division such that selection processes are aligned with these requirements;
- 3.1.1.5.1.2 Staff and Students on the sub-warden selection committees must behave with integrity, seeking to balance the interests of the University, Hall and relevant residence with those of applicants. Appendix 4 outlines their responsibilities in the recruitment and selection process;
- 3.1.1.5.1.3 The Human Resources Division is responsible for providing advice and guidance as to the most efficient and effective way of recruiting and selecting sub-wardens. It is also responsible for continuously improving the process based on feedback and from benchmarking with other institutions; and
- 3.1.1.5.1.4 The Chairpersons of these sub-warden selection committees are responsible for ensuring that a fair, ethical and legal process takes place. The responsibilities of the Chairperson for each stage of the process are outlined in Appendix 5.

3.1.1.6 Cost effective: Significant time is devoted to the selection of sub-wardens. The investment of time and money in this process needs to be balanced with the importance of hiring the right staff who can best make a contribution to the institution, Hall and residence.

## 3.1.2 Recruitment Process

The process for Sub-Warden posts, usually commences two weeks before the end of first semester lectures.

### 3.1.2.1 Eligibility in applying

Only registered Rhodes University students are eligible for appointment to posts of Sub-Warden.

Applications can only be made for the Hall in which the applicant is currently residing, [see agenda item 2] provided that this has been for at least two terms, although preference will be given to applicants from the house in which they are currently residing or have previously resided. This is important given the short duration of these appointments and the need for new appointees to be able to assume their responsibilities with a thorough knowledge of the residence.

**Agenda item 2:** Mr McNeill, Hall Warden, Allan Webb Hall, writes:

\* “The clause restricting Sub-Warden Applications to within a particular Hall only should include the word "normally" to allow for unusual circumstances.”

*The HR Division responds:*

*Relevant phrase can be amended to read:*

Applications normally can only be made for the Hall in which the applicant is currently residing, provided that this has been for at least two terms, although preference will be given to applicants from the house in which they are currently residing or have previously resided and that no candidate residing outside the Hall may be appointed ahead of any internal candidate who is deemed appointable but not recommended for appointment (i.e. a reserve candidate).



**Agenda item 3:**

Ms Jere, Hall Warden, Oriel Hall, writes:

“Appointing at hall level as opposed to appointing from a house raised the issue of a Sub-Warden being appointed to a house in which she has not resided and is therefore unfamiliar with the res.”

*and*

Dr Wilhelmi, Hall Warden, Nelson Mandela Hall, writes:

“Students are reluctant to move residences if not elected to their own Residence.”

*and*

Mr Rafferty, House Warden, Stanley Kidd House, through Dr Wilhelmi, writes:

“The houses are not keen to have someone from another house be selected as a sub-warden for their house.”

*The HR Division responds:*

*The Committee might wish to consider that “normally” candidates may only be considered for appointment to the residence in which they are currently residing.*

These appointments are made for one calendar year only and therefore all such posts become vacant at the beginning of every calendar year. Reappointment to these posts is not automatic and, as a result, Sub-Wardens wishing to reapply for appointment will be treated in the same manner as all other applicants. Sub-Wardens may not serve more than two terms of appointment, i.e. two years. Approval is not required to commence the recruitment process.

**3.1.2.2 Criteria for the Sub-Warden establishment and associated remuneration:**

The financial allocation to each residence for Sub-Wardens is based on a forecast of student numbers in the residences for the following academic year. This is done at the commencement of this process as follows:

8-24 students:	one Minor Sub-Warden
25-34 students:	one Assistant Sub-Warden
35-49 students:	one Sub-Warden
50-60 students:	one Sub-Warden and one Minor Sub-Warden
61-70 students:	one Sub-Warden and one Assistant Sub-Warden
71-80 students:	two Sub-Wardens
81-110 students:	two Sub-Wardens and one Minor Sub-Warden

111-139 students: two Sub-Wardens, one Assistant Sub-Warden and one Minor Sub-Warden  
140 - 160 students: two Sub-Wardens, one Assistant Sub-Warden and two Minor Sub-Wardens

Remuneration:

female Sub-Warden:	75% of a grade B residence fee
female Assistant Sub-Warden:	65% of a grade B residence fee
female Minor Sub-Warden:	55% of a grade B residence fee
male Sub-Warden:	70% of a grade B residence fee
male Assistant Sub-Warden:	60% of a grade B residence fee
male Minor Sub-Warden:	50% of a grade B residence fee

Female and male sub-wardens are paid differently because ...

At the discretion of the Hall Warden the remuneration for any House may be pooled, allowing all incumbents to be paid equally and to be designated as Sub-Wardens. The total of incumbents may be in excess of the establishment within any House, provided that the total remuneration does not exceed the total remuneration applicable to the establishment. This decision needs to be taken prior to the advertising of posts. Once the appointments have been made, the establishment may not be reduced.

Alternatively, the Hall Warden in consultation with the House Wardens may pool the total remuneration for the Hall and distribute this among all Sub-Wardens with the further option that all Sub-Wardens within a Hall receive equal remuneration. This option is subject to a Hall NOT employing FEWER Sub-Wardens than prescribed by the formal establishment.

The alteration of these establishments and remuneration is at the discretion of the Dean of Students and the Director of Human Resources and will usually only be done once every three years at the time of reviewing the policy. Feedback from Wardens will be sought at such as time. Hall Wardens can however, make appeals that the establishment be reconsidered outside of a review cycle where due to changes in a residence and Hall the relevant sub-wardens in that area are being prejudiced relative to their sub-warden colleagues elsewhere.

### **3.1.2.3 Calling for applications**

The Recruitment & Selection Section will forward the advertisement, further particulars and application forms [see Appendix 6] to Hall Wardens two weeks prior to the end of first semester lectures, and, in addition, will post the advertisement, further particulars and application form on the Recruitment & Selection Section's web page. The advertisement will refer students to the Recruitment & Selection Section's web page which will also contain the full job profile and this policy. The salary will not be reflected on the advertisement but will be displayed on the web page. Hall Wardens are responsible for ensuring that students are made aware that the process of recruiting new Sub-Wardens has commenced by posting the advertisement on the Hall and House notice boards.

Should a student elect to apply for a post in more than one residence within the Hall, a **separate** application form should be used for each residence. A student may not serve more than two years as a Sub-Warden.

Application forms will be available from the Hall Warden/House Warden/Hall Secretary (as determined by the Hall Warden) and prospective candidates should return the completed applications to the Hall Secretary no later than the first Friday of the third term.

### 3.1.3 Selection Process

#### 3.1.3.1 *The selection criteria*

Linked to the job requirements [see *Appendix 7 for Job Profile*], the suitable candidates must be able to demonstrate the following competencies (knowledge, skills, personal characteristics):

- 3.1.3.1.1 Sound leadership skills (self-awareness and control, ability to build team spirit in the residence, ability to build trust with others, ability to instil confidence in others).

As leaders, Sub-Wardens are role-models and, as such, may not have been previously found guilty and convicted in the preceding 12 months of a University disciplinary offence by any disciplinary authority in the University and sentenced

- a) to a fine or equivalent amount of community service which is in excess of 20% of the Hall Warden's maximum fine jurisdiction (whoever imposes it); or
- b) to any form of exclusion; or
- c) on more than four occasions for any disciplinary offence committed during the 12 months immediately preceding the application. In all cases, whether suspended or not, this disqualification will end 12 months after the sentence has been completed;

*In addition, candidates who have shown a tendency towards aggressive and violent behaviour are not deemed suitable role-models. Those candidates who are on record as having been reprimanded for or found guilty of such behaviour are not eligible for consideration.*

- 3.1.3.1.2 Excellent interpersonal skills (ability to establish rapport with others, an approachable and friendly attitude);
- 3.1.3.1.3 Sound conflict management skills with a high level of assertiveness and the ability to make sound, fair and timely decisions;
- 3.1.3.1.4 Genuine interest in students with an ability to deal with diversity;
- 3.1.3.1.5 Excellent communication skills with the ability to communicate with both peers and superiors and with good listening skills;
- 3.1.3.1.6 Level of professionalism;
- 3.1.3.1.7 Self-management skills, including time- and stress management and the ability to cope with multiple demands. To ensure that those students appointed are able to cope with their academic workload as well as the responsibilities of being a Sub-Warden and that they can provide academic leadership, students must have a satisfactory academic record.

#### **Therefore, upon application for a post of Sub-Warden**

- a) a candidate shall NOT have failed on average MORE than one full course credit (or two semester credits) in an academic year, and should not fail more than one full credit (or two semester credits) in the year of application ;
- b) a candidate must be able to satisfy the selection committee that he/she has the appropriate time management skills to cope with an academic workload which is more than normal and that assuming the role of Sub-Warden will not be prejudicial to his/her academic career.

Appointments will be made with the provisos

- a) that, after the final examinations, newly-appointed Sub-Warden meet the academic criteria applicable at the time of appointment as stated in 3.1.3.7
- b) that the disciplinary requirements, detailed in section 3.1.3.1 above, are not contravened between the time the offer of appointment is made and the candidate assumes duty.

In the event of the appointment of a reserve candidate, this appointment will also be subject to these provisos. Where there is doubt as to the interpretation of an academic record, the relevant Dean of Faculty will be asked to adjudicate.

### **3.1.3.2 Composition of Hall Sub-Warden Appointments Committee**

For each residence, there will be Hall Sub-Warden Appointments Committee (hereinafter referred to as HSAC) responsible for the screening of applicants and the recommending of suitable applicants. The HSAC will be composed as follows [see agenda items 4]:

Chairperson: a Hall Fellow  
the Hall Warden

all House Wardens (excluding Assistant House Wardens and those House Wardens who do not have the services of Sub-Wardens)

no more than one other Hall Fellow

the Hall SRC representative (who may not be represented by a substitute member)

the Hall Senior Student (who may not be represented by a substitute member)

all Senior House Students or, if a Senior House Student is an applicant, then an elected representative from the relevant House Committee.

#### **Agenda items 4:**

Dr Wilhelmi, Hall Warden, Nelson Mandela Hall, writes:

“Selection by hall makes the process long and cumbersome.”

*HR Division responds:*

*The Committee might decide that the process should allow for two options: Residence Committees (as per 2005 and earlier) and Hall Committees (as per 2006).*

Dr Wilhelmi, Hall Warden, Nelson Mandela Hall Warden, writes:

“Each residence is under-represented on the selection panel. Although the selection committees are relatively large, individual residences are only represented by two people, the warden and the senior student. This is further exacerbated if one of these persons is not available, as was the case with Centenary House last year when the warden had academic commitments out of town.

*and*

Mr Eastment, Assistant House Warden, Guy Butler House, through Dr Wilhelmi, writes:

“I personally would like to see the following structure for the selection of sub-wardens in Guy Butler:

1. Hall Warden (Chair)
2. Hall Fellow
3. Hall Senior Student
4. Hall SRC Rep
5. House Warden
6. One outgoing sub-warden or one member of house comm.
7. One Member of House Comm.
8. One non house comm. Member in second year or above elected in house meeting by students.
9. Centenary and Stanley Kidd Wardens as observers (in case the need to recruit sub-wardens from GB).

The sub-warden selection process for Centenary and Skidd would be on the same day, so that the only people that would need to be changed would be positions 6 & 7.”

Mr J Baxter, House Warden, Centenary House writes, through Dr Wilhelmi, “I am in favour of the panel as described by Doug. It is in essence the "old" one used in the past (i.e. not last year) that worked well in Nelson Mandela Hall. It is however biased in terms of student opinion....

However: I am not in favour of selection of "the" default alternate from an alternate residence, for example if Centenary were to elect their S-Ws and an alternate and two of these people did not accept the position, I am not sure that simply taking one of the alternates from either SK or GH is suitable. I would prefer for the CH panel to select the CH alternate "alternate" - which results in the ridiculous panel experienced last year.

Thus as a compromise/addition to Doug's method/proposal I would suggest that (in this situation) the selection of an alternate (that is outside the relevant residence) be made by a special subcom made up of members selected from the panel. At a minimum this comm/panel could consist of the Hall Warden, Fellow and the relevant Warden. They could then choose from the available alternates i.e. from the alternates chosen from (in this case) SK and GB. I would prefer to have some student input here: For example the Hall S. Student and House S. Student (at least) however experience has shown that these situations usually arise during the vac. If the University is prepared to have a conference call type situation then panel could be all of those mentioned above. Else just the "staff"....”

*and*

Professor Adesina, Hall Warden of Kimberley Hall, quoting minutes of Oct 2006 meeting of the Hall Committee, advises that problems identified were:

- “(a) Not enough student representation
- (b) Committee is too big and seen as intimidating and unwieldy.”

Professor Adesina writes:

“My only addition concerns the size of the committee. You might remember that I raised the problem of non-representation of serving sub-wardens on the HSAC when the policy was under discussion last year. I don't think increasing student representation will be onerous in

terms of the size of the committee. We need more student representation on the committee. My sense is that it is in fact useful for students to get used to facing large interview committees before they get into the real world—they cannot determine the size of their interview panels when seeking employment with Eskom, AngloGold, or Department of Foreign Affairs. One, obviously cannot argue that large HSAC size is a problem and then ask for more student representatives.

One way of dealing with the size may be to remove the requirement that both the Hall Head/Senior Student AND the Hall SRC Representative must be present at every selection meeting. As long as a student is designated to fill the roles that either of the two (especially the SRC Rep) plays, I think it is possible to have two or three panels meeting in parallel. I have had no problem with designating one or more of the House Wardens to act in my place as chair. While we used the RSAC system, I brought one male and a female warden in as chair, so that each of us took charge of two residences each.

I will, however, argue for retaining the HSAC-concept in general. It gives an overview of the selection in the Hall as a whole and the process moved a lot quicker than in previous years.”

**Agenda item 5:** Mr J Baxter, House Warden, Centenary House, writes, through Dr Wilhelm: “I would also like to see the inclusion of specific guide-lines with regards to a procedure to follow if the House Warden is on academic leave! Leaving them out is not appropriate especially since academic leave is planned for well in advance. The simplest solution I can think of is to have this process moved forward, for the particular residence, to accommodate the relevant Warden. Academic leave is a "requirement" for academic growth and with the strong emphasis on placing academics into the Wardening system I believe it is a matter that HAS to be addressed, properly!”

A quorum would comprise at least a 50% representation of Wardening staff and a 50% representation of student members.

The HSACs must ensure fairness and accountability as regards the composition and activities of Selection Committees as per the University’s Employment Equity Policy and Supporting Protocol for Appointments, inter alia:

- those individuals who serve on HSACs must have some level of insight into the post of Sub-Warden;
- those individuals who serve on HSACs must be aware of their selection responsibilities, including that they need to be present at every stage of the selection process, from the initial short-listing to the final selection decision;
- Chairpersons of HSACs must have the necessary expertise to conduct fair and equitable selection processes, and they must be aware of their responsibilities as far as the University’s Employment Equity Policy is concerned;
- there is legitimate representation of a diverse range of people;
- all members of HSACs are responsible for ensuring a fair, legal and sound selection process, and that the confidentiality of applicants is respected and ensured.

### 3.1.3.3 Screening and short-listing of applicants

The selection process should be set in motion as soon as possible after the closing date for applications (i.e. the first Friday of the third term) and should be completed within *five weeks* of the start of the third term. The HSAC must conduct the short-listing process within eight working days of the closing date for applications. This will allow Recruitment & Selection to make offers of appointment by the last day of the third term which, in turn, will allow students to make timeous decisions regarding remaining in residence as opposed to seeking accommodation elsewhere.

The HSAC may elect to conduct an abbreviated short-listing process by interviewing those applicants who meet *at least* the following criteria:

- i) an acceptable disciplinary and conduct record (as defined in section 3.1.3.1)
- ii) an acceptable academic record (as defined in section 3.1.3.7)
- iii) have lived in a residence in the Hall for which the application is being made for at least two terms.

The HSAC will meet to identify suitable candidates for interview, ensuring that the following issues receive full attention:

1. evaluation of each candidate's suitability (i.e. whether they are worthy of appointment) relative to the following competencies, based on the application submitted:
  - a) leadership, measured by past positions held at the University and disciplinary record. (An applicant may not have been previously found guilty and convicted of a University disciplinary offence by any disciplinary authority in the University and sentenced
    - to a fine or equivalent amount of community service which is in excess of 20% of the Hall Warden's maximum fine jurisdiction (whoever imposes it); or
    - to any form of exclusion; or
    - on more than four occasions for any disciplinary offence committed during the 12 months immediately preceding the applicationin all cases whether suspended or not. This disqualification will end 12 months after the sentence has been completed.
  - b) genuine interest in students, measured by the level of meaningful involvement in residence, Hall and University activities and the motivation for applying for post;
  - c) level of professionalism demonstrated in the completion of the application;
  - d) self-management skills, measured by the anticipated involvement in activities during the period of appointment, and the current ability to cope with academic demands.

Therefore, upon application for a post of Sub-Warden

- i) a candidate shall NOT have failed on average MORE than one full course credit (or two semester credits) in an academic year, and should not fail more than one full credit (or two semester credits) in the year of application;
2. documenting of these decisions, including reasons for the non-recommendation of candidates for short-listing [*see Appendix 8*];
  3. deciding on which candidates should go through to the next stage of the selection process; and

4. proposing/confirming what key interview questions will be asked to address the competencies identified.

Consistent with the University's Employment Equity Policy and Supporting Protocol for Appointments:

5. Selection Committees must identify all candidates who may be worthy of appointment (not simply the three or four best candidates) on the basis of proven merit or potential; and
6. in the short-listing of such candidates, Selection Committees must endeavour to include members of designated groups.

#### **3.1.3.4 Notification of candidates not short-listed for interview**

Applicants who have not been short-listed for an interview should be notified within two working days of the short-listing process in writing by the Hall Secretary. Unsuccessful applicants will receive feedback from the Chairperson, if requests for such feedback are made.

#### **3.1.3.5 Conducting the interviews**

The HSAC is responsible for conducting fair and equitable interviews, through the running of structured interviews [see *Appendix 9*], ensuring that:

- the questions to be asked are related to the job competencies (note that the questions will have been determined at the short-listing meetings);
- careful consideration is given to the use of any questions that may be perceived to be unfair or discriminatory by candidates;
- the same/similar core questions are asked of each candidate (probing is feasible provided it is around the same core competency);
- each candidate is presented with similar demands within the interview situation;
- where possible, the introduction of prior knowledge about the candidate is well managed; [see **agenda item 6**]

**Agenda item 6:** Professor Adesina, Hall Warden, Kimberley Hall, quoting minutes of Oct 2006 meeting of the Hall Committee, advises that an additional problem identified was: "Better guidelines are needed for dealing with prior knowledge."

- any concerns due to prior knowledge are raised with the candidate, giving him/her the opportunity to respond;
- each candidate is assessed relative to the competencies identified;
- there is consistency in rating of candidates; and
- these assessments are documented for later discussion.

#### **3.1.3.6 The Selection Decision**

The selection decision usually takes place immediately after all the interviews have been conducted. Alternatively, another meeting can be called for this purpose.

The decision on whom to appoint involves [see *Appendix 10*]:

- discussing all the evidence collected for each criteria for each candidate;
- recording in writing the reasons why any persons were not recommended for appointment;
- making the final decision on whom to recommend for appointment, and
- making a final decision regarding the first and second reserve candidates.

In addition, consistent with the University's equity strategy, the considerations outlined in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 must be adhered to. (REMOVED REFERENCE TO EQUITY REQUIREMENTS AS THESE ARE ALREADY IN APPENDICES).

A recommendation for appointment shall be supported by a simple majority of the members of the HSAC, subject to section 4.8 below. If the HSAC is deadlocked by an equal number of votes, the committee will reconvene within 48 hours to reconsider the decision taken and to vote again. Should the Committee remain deadlocked, the Chairperson will exercise his/her casting vote.

#### **3.1.3.7 Concerns regarding the Fairness of the Process**

Approval of recommendations will be subject to all members of the HSAC agreeing that the selection process followed was fair and that legislative and University policy requirements were met. This discussion should be facilitated by the Chairperson of the HSAC.

Should there be any concerns regarding the fairness of the process, specifically that a practice has unfairly prejudiced one or more candidates, such a concern should be shared by *at least two* members of the HSAC. In such case, the matter will immediately be referred to the Director of Human Resources. Where there is evidence of any problems, the Director of Human Resources or his/her nominated representative will conduct an investigation. The recommended appointment will be kept on hold until the matter has been resolved.

#### **3.1.3.8 Approval and confirmation of appointments**

- 3.1.3.8.1 The Chairperson, after confirmation by the HSAC that a fair, objective decision was reached, should submit the prescribed forms and the applicable applications via the Hall Warden (if the Hall Warden is not the Chairperson) to Recruitment & Selection within two working days.
- 3.1.3.8.2 Within two working days of all documentation having been received by Recruitment & Selection, this documentation will be forwarded to the Dean of Students.
- 3.1.3.8.3 The Dean of Students will give his/her approval by no later than the last Monday of the third term. Should the Dean of Students have a concern with any recommendation, he/she consult with the Hall Warden.
- 3.1.3.8.4 By no later than the last day of the third term, Recruitment & Selection will:
  - (a) send letters of offer to the successful candidates indicating that, after the final examinations, newly-appointed Sub-Wardens meet the academic criteria applicable at the time of appointment as stated in 3.1.3.7 and that the disciplinary requirements, detailed in section 3.1.3.1 above, are not contravened between the time the offer of appointment is made and the candidate assumes duty,
  - (b) notify each unsuccessful reserve candidate of the outcome of the selection process and the procedure to be followed in the event of a vacancy occurring in the relevant residence,
  - (c) notify candidates who have been interviewed but who have not been recommended for appointment or as reserve candidates that their applications have not been successful.
- 3.1.3.8.5 As soon as the final academic results become available, the Dean of Students will check the academic records of prospective Sub-Wardens. Where a student has an unsatisfactory

academic record that year, the offer of appointment will be withdrawn after consultation with the Hall Warden.

- 3.1.3.8.6 In the event of a successful candidate not assuming duty for any reason, the first reserve candidate will be appointed *automatically* subject to his/her having a satisfactory academic record in the year in which the recruitment and selection process was conducted. Before such an appointment is made, however, the relevant Hall Warden will be consulted.

### **3.1.3.9 Record keeping**

Consistent with its commitment to transparency and the right of the applicant to written feedback, the University will document the criteria used within each selection process and the decisions taken about each candidate relative to these criteria. Furthermore, the University will be open about how equity considerations impact on decisions in the recruitment and selection process.

In the minute [*see Appendix 11*], the following data will be reflected:

- the number of applications received for each race and gender group as well as from applicants who were disabled;
- the applicants short-listed and their demographic profile;
- the recruitment process;
- the selection procedure: criteria, process including interview questions used, the evaluations of individual candidates and the decisions taken, including why applicants were not successful;
- the view of the Selection Committees as to the fairness of the process.

### **3.1.3.10 Training to ensure implementation of Policy**

The need for training to ensure the effective implementation of this Policy is recognised. All Chairpersons of HSACs will be obliged to undergo training on the recruitment and selection requirements of the labour legislation. Other individuals participating in the HSAC but who have not been formally trained, should ensure that they fully understand their responsibilities as regards this Policy. Here the Hall Warden must spend time with the relevant individuals explaining the procedures.

## **3.2 REVIEW PROCEDURE:**

Formal review of this policy will take place every three years.

## Appendix 1: Understanding the concept of “best contribution”.

In its Equity Policy, Rhodes University argues that:

1. Equity must be recognised as an integral component of the future of the University. Diversity will make Rhodes University a more dynamic, stronger and more effective institution; and
2. The goals of quality and equity are not mutually exclusive and that diversity can strengthen the quality of Rhodes.

Rhodes University and its staff and students believe that the institution must employ those that will make the best contribution to the institution. However, in understanding what is meant by best contribution, traditional notions of merit may need to be questioned. The University advocates that in assessing what constitutes the “best contribution” that the context in which the decision is to be taken must be considered. Such a context includes the institutional and strategic imperatives for quality assurance, excellence and transformation as well as the residential environment including inter alia the staffing and student profile and its culture.

Therefore, in making an appointment, the selection committee must consider these contextual considerations (i.e. the needs and status quo of the department in which the vacant post is situated) which include

- (i) the need to transform the institution (including the residential system);
- (ii) the need to balance the composition of staff in terms of educational qualifications and background, experience, seniority, race, gender, age, and disability;
- (iii) the willingness and ability to support an individual appointed on potential including resource implications of doing so and the University’s ability to meet the necessary resource requirements;
- (iv) balancing the University’s commitment to the employment of South Africans with the importance of employing foreign national; and
- (v) the need to create a supportive environment for all students and staff, irrespective of their background.

Also of importance is that in ensuring diversity amongst the staff and that adequate and acceptable role models are present within the University, the institution must consider the employment of nationals as well as foreign nationals. Given the University’s Vision to be “an outstanding internationally-recognised academic institution which proudly affirms its African identity”, there is a need to balance the employment of South African citizens with the need to seek good applicants freely and to appoint the person who will make the best contribution to each particular vacancy. It is only being appointed in the context of international competition that Rhodes University and its staff will realise the institution’s Vision. The University will however, seek to appoint as many South African citizens as possible to its academic and support staff. Within the selection process, nationals will not be disadvantaged through preference being given to foreign nationals. However, there may be circumstances where the best contribution would be made by a foreign national.

## Appendix 2: Recruitment and Selection Practices that are used to promote employment equity and diversity

Within the selection process, to ensure fairness and accountability, and to promote employment equity and diversity, the following take place:

- The **competencies for the post** of sub-warden are identified at the outset of the process. In this way, objective criteria for selection are identified independent of who the applicants might be.
- The **competencies for the post** are used consistently throughout the recruitment and selection process i.e., the competencies are not altered during the selection process.
- All **applicants must be assessed using the same techniques** (e.g. if one applicant is to be asked a key question linked to a particular competency, then all candidates should be asked this question).
- Care is taken to ensure that the techniques used are **not culturally or gender biased**.
- In the **short-listing of applicants**, Selection Committees are asked to identify all worthy candidates and not simply the top 3 or 4 candidates for the next selection process. Without engaging in tokenism and ensuring that the requirements for short-listing are met (i.e. that the basis requirements of education and experience are met), Selection Committees are encouraged to include members of designated groups in the short-list. This strategy recognises that selecting individuals on paper has its limitations.
- The committee must be able to **substantiate/provide reasons** why a candidate was unsuccessful relative to the identified competencies. The Chairperson is responsible for doing this.
- Selection Committees must select the person whom they believe will make the **best contribution** to the University (see Appendix 1);
- In choosing the preferred candidate/s, **consideration is given to the potential** of applicants from designated groups to meet the job requirements. However, the residence in which the individual is placed must have the ability to support such an individual who is going to need mentoring and coaching and on the job training;
- Where it is **difficult to differentiate between candidates** in trying to determine the best candidate, preference will be given to the member of the designated group. Where both may be members of designated groups, preference will be given to nationals. Where both individuals are nationals and members of designated groups, the demographic profile of that department/division/faculty or that of the occupational category of staff will be considered in making a decision (e.g. in the case of clerical staff which are predominately women, preference could be given to a male). Where a person with a disability has applied, consideration must be given to how the environment and/or job can be adapted without the institution experiencing undue hardship (refer to the Staff Disability Policy for further details);

- **Foreign nationals** must not be discriminated against unfairly.
- **Feedback**, if sought, is willingly provided to applicants in the spirit of trying to help them develop.
- Chairpersons of Selection Committees are encouraged/required to undergo training on this policy and be able to identify what constitutes fair and unfair labour practices.
- **Statistics** are kept of the recruitment and selection process to assess the demography of those employed.

### **Appendix 3: Ethical and legal practices**

Rhodes University is committed to executing the recruitment and selection process in an ethical and legal manner.

Therefore:

1. It is the responsibility of a person on the selection committee to indicate, to the Chairperson, any form of relationship that may exist with any applicant or prospective applicant which may benefit or prejudice such an applicant.
2. The Chairperson of each Selection Committee will at the outset of the short-listing process remind members of the Selection Committee of the above and clarify that no such relationship exists.
3. In the event of a relationship, the Selection Committee will discuss how to manage any potential benefit or prejudice to applicants. If feasible, this may involve the exclusion of the individual from the recruitment and selection process.
4. No prior knowledge about applicants will be introduced into the process before the short-listing of applicants as this process is based purely on the documentation presented by the applicants. Once short-listing has taken place, the Chairperson will ask if any members of the Committee have any prior knowledge about any of the candidates. Should this be the case, the Committee will then discuss how to manage this knowledge in order to be fair to the particular applicant, to other applicants and to the institution. A minimum requirement is that an applicant should be informed about prejudicial information in the interview and be given an opportunity to contest that information.

## Appendix 4: Roles and responsibilities of the members of the selection committee

Anyone participating in the recruitment and selection of staff is expected to execute the responsibilities in this regard with due care.

This means:

- Ensuring familiarity with the Recruitment and Selection policy for Sub-wardens and adhering to its requirements. In this regard, individuals are provided with the appendices of this policy in their Selection files and are requested to read this. Those unsure of requirements are invited to either ask the Chair for clarity;
- Having some level of expertise or insight in the discipline/field of the post being filled;
- Being properly prepared for each meeting of the selection committee;
- Taking responsibility for ensuring that a fair, legal and sound selection process takes place<sup>1</sup>;
- Being accountable for the decision taken;
- Not responding to requests for feedback by candidates. Such feedback must be channelled through the Chairperson of the committee unless otherwise decided by the selection committee;
- Respecting and ensuring the confidentiality of applicants; and
- Ensuring that a balance is achieved between meeting the needs of the residence, Hall and the needs of student applicants.

---

<sup>1</sup> In this regard, members of the Union are not representing the union's perspective on the specifics of candidates and who should be appointed but rather the union's interests that a fair, legal and defensible process was followed.

## Appendix 5: Responsibilities of Chairperson

### 1. At the first meeting of the Selection Committee

#### 1.1 Confirmation of reading of Policy document:

- Confirm that members of the Selection Committee have read the appendices of R&S Policy for Support Staff posts
- Clarity whether the policy has been understood or whether any points need clarification
- Remind the Committee of their responsibilities

#### 1.2 Job Profile:

- Check that the job profile and that the selection committee is satisfied with the detail of this profile
- Please remember that the Selection Committee has no authority to change the job profile (except for minor typographical changes)
- If the key responsibility areas or the job requirements need alteration, the profile must be returned to the relevant section of the HR Division as such a change may impact the grading and therefore, salary of the job.
- Ensure that the members of the selection committee understand the nature and demands of the job

#### 1.3 Recruitment Strategy:

- Consider the proposals of the HR representative and/or Manager/Head as regards the recruitment strategy for this post
- In the case of a proposal for advertising internally only, screening or positioning the post as a development opportunity, and if relevant, clarify what the Manager/Head has done as regards alerting current staff to the opportunity. HR to provide some input on “feeder” posts i.e. posts for which the vacant post provides an opportunity for advancement
- Pay close attention to what may need to be done to search for members of designated groups including whether a Search Committee is required
- Confirm the recruitment strategy to be pursued including time frames for the placing of the advert and closing date for applications.

#### 1.4 Criteria Specification Form:

- Allow the HR representative to present the competency grid which recommend how the competencies will be measured in the selection process
- Guide discussion and together with the selection committee, confirm the competency grid.

#### 1.5 Advert & Selection Strategy:

- Consider and confirm the advert to be placed by the HR Division
- Consider the proposals of the HR representative as regards the selection process to be followed inter, alia discussing whether multiple screenings will take place and who will do this, who on the selection committee will be involved in what stages of the selection process
- Remember to consider the use of alternative methods of selection
- Confirm the selection strategy, bearing in mind that for certain jobs, a standardised process is required.

#### 1.6 Further Particulars:

- If relevant, check if further particulars will be provided. If so, confirm who will do this and by when HR needs the information

- Such particulars may include: the job profile, information about the University, department/division/section/unit, information about Grahamstown if applicants are likely to be from outside of Grahamstown, information about service conditions attached to that post, and any unusual elements of the selection process.

### **1.7 Dates of meetings:**

- Confirm with the members of the selection committee as to the dates for further meetings of the Committee. These dates are provided to applicants for the post.

### **1.8 Reminders:**

Inform members of the selection committee of their responsibilities namely that:

- If they are aware of any relatives, friends, business associates applying for this post, they should indicate this to the committee so that the committee can decide if the person should recuse themselves from the process
- The individual applications are to be kept confidential i.e., no member of the committee may discuss with someone outside of this committee the names of those who has applied or the details of such applications.
- Members of the selection committee are expected to participate meaningfully in this process by ensuring that they have read the necessary documentation, that they are aware of the requirements of the job, that they are familiar with the requirements of the policy for Support Staff and adhere to these requirements, and that they attend relevant meetings as determined by the selection committee
- Reading the documentation as regards what is “best contribution” within the context of the committee.

## **2. At the short-listing meeting of the Selection Committee**

### **2.1 Declare any relationship to applicants:**

- Ask whether there is anyone on the Committee who has a personal or social relationship with an applicant or is related to one of the applicants.
- If someone on the Committee indicates this, the Committee should decide how best to proceed to ensure fairness to all applicants.

### **2.2 Policy Checks:**

Check that members of the selection committees have short-listed as follows:

- The competencies identified for short-listing have been used
- The suitability (i.e. whether they are worthy of appointment) of each candidate has been assessed relative to the competencies identified
- The reasons for ratings given are documented.

### **2.3 Restrict Prior Knowledge:**

Remind the members of the selection committee that any prior knowledge of the candidates may not be introduced until after the short-listing process for interviews has taken place.

### **2.4 Consideration of Demographics of Applicants:**

- Consider the equity profile of the applications received
- Discuss with the committee whether they are satisfied with this demographic profile and if relevant, with the search process undertaken
- If the selection committee is of the opinion that a further search is needed, you are required to bring this to the attention of the Manager of Recruitment and Selection. At this point in time, you may wish to reconvene the selection committee at a later date.

## 2.5 Making the Short-Listing Decision:

- Remind the committee of those who are likely to have been excluded on the basis of ineligibility (see point 3.1.3.3 of the Policy) or to have had poor test results for similar jobs in the last 6 months (see point 3.1.4.1 point 3 of the Policy)
- Together with the selection committee and contingent on the selection process, decide on who will go through to the next round of the selection process
- Remember that the committee must endeavour to include members of designated groups.
- If the next stage of the selection process is an interview, remember that the committee is encouraged to short-list no more than 5 people.
- If there are applicants who are foreign nationals, a decision needs to be taken as to how quickly the post needs to be filled and whether having a vacant post pending the approval of a work permit for a foreign national is viable given the work and demands of the department.
- Should this not be a consideration, then consideration must be given as to whether the Selection Committee, on behalf of the institution, can in good faith argue to the Department of Home Affairs that there were no suitable applicants who are South Africans.

## 2.6 Introduction of Prior Knowledge:

- Once short-listing for the interview has taken place, ask the committee members whether anyone has any information about any of the candidates which needs to be brought to the attention of the rest of the committee.
- Remind the committee that only RELEVANT information should be introduced and that this means: information about the potential work habits and behaviours of an individual, comments about the person's competence to do the job, any information that would make the employment of individual a high risk for the institution. Emphasise that information relating to moral judgements (e.g. someone is having an affair with someone) should not be raised.
- Emphasise that should a candidate challenge a selection decision, that the onus would be on the Selection Committee to provide evidence of why the person was not chosen.
- Should any information be introduced, guide discussion on how to deal with this information to ensure (i) fairness to other applicants and (ii) fairness to the individual concerned, i.e. will similar information be accessed from other applicants and if so how, and how will the issue be raised with the individual? and (iii) fairness to the institution.

## 2.7 Confirm Next Stage of Process:

Confirm what will happen next in the selection process e.g. collection of referee's reports, conducting of reference checks, conducting of practical test, interview and who will be responsible for the different processes.

## 2.8 Confirmation of Interview Questions:

Where an interview is the next step in the selection process, consider the questions prepared and confirm what questions will be asked and who on the selection committee will ask what questions. Ensure that all members of the committee understand the questions.

## 2.9 Disability Issues

In addition, where the University is aware of an applicant's impairment as stated on the application form, it must be noted that the University's Disability Policy for Staff indicates that :

- (i) Reasonable accommodation will be made within the appointment process

- (ii) The impact of the impairment will be explored with the candidate to ascertain his/her specific needs. This will in no way impact the final selection decision but may impact whether or not an offer is made to the individual;
- (iii) The University may request that a further medical or functional testing take place to determine the applicant's actual or potential ability to perform the essential functions of a specific job. Such tests will only take place after the suitability of the person for the job has been determined.

### **3. At the Selection Interview**

#### **1.1 Policy Checks:**

Check that members of the selection committees have:

- Read any relevant documentation e.g. where referee's reports or reference checks have been conducted
- Prepared their interview questions and fully understand what needs to be asked and what appropriate answers will be.

#### **1.2 Reminders:**

Remind the members of the selection committee that:

- Questions asked must be related to the relevant job competencies
- The same KEY questions must be asked of each candidate. Even where a member of the selection committee feels that his/her question has been addressed, the question must still be asked e.g. "I think you have answered this question but you may like to add something so I am going to ask it anyway. {pose question}."
- Probing is possible and necessary if an incomplete answer is provided. Remember that the committee needs to be able to assess the candidates on the competencies identified and thus needs sufficient information to do so.
- As Chair, you have the right to veto any questions that are unfair (i.e. blatantly discriminatory, irrelevant, or which represent an invasion of privacy which is not permissible in terms of the job requirements)
- Check whether any information arising from the referee's reports/reference checks needs to be pursued with a candidate and discuss how to deal with this information to ensure (i) fairness to other applicants and (ii) fairness to the individual concerned.
- The interview is also an opportunity for the candidates to select the University as an employer. It is therefore, important that each member of the selection committee conduct him/herself appropriately to enhance the image of the University.

#### **1.3 Ensure the sufficient information is available:**

- It is your responsibility as Chair to ensure that sufficient information is available in order for the selection committee to make an informed decision.
- Therefore, if a question is asked and not sufficiently explored by one of the members of the selection committee, it is your responsibility to probe further. Also, before making the final selection decision, confirm with the committee that it has sufficient information about each candidate in order to make an informed decision.

#### **1.4 Feedback:**

- Remember that as Chair, you will be required to give feedback to (i) internal candidates should they request such feedback and (ii) to external candidates should they contest the process and decision taken.
- Remember that internal candidates will be informed as soon as possible of the recommendation of the committee (both successful and unsuccessful candidates) and the committee should confirm who will do that. The Chair is responsible for doing this, unless otherwise decided by the Selection Committee.

### 1.5 Making the Selection Decision:

- Remember to look at all the evidence collected for each candidate – be careful of making a decision only based on the interview data.
- Other data from other selection techniques should be presented
- Discuss each candidate along each criteria using the information gathered.
- Ensure that accurate records of this discussion are kept so that accurate feedback can be given to candidates.
- Remember to consider equity issues as outlined in the policy. If there are candidates of similar competence, remember that the member of the designated group must be preferred. If both candidates are members of designated groups, the national must be preferred. If both candidates are members of designated groups and nationals, look at the equity profile of the department/division/unit/section as well the University profile for that group of staff before making a firm decision.
- In the case of a strong contender for appointment who is a foreign national, remember that the University will have to report to the Department of Home Affairs in good faith that no suitable nationals applied and were suitable for this post.
- All candidates who are suitable for appointment must be identified and these individuals must be ranked in order of competence relative to the job profile.
- Remember that any applicants with a disability must be treated in terms of the University's Disability Policy for Staff.

### 1.6 Development Issues:

- Guide the committee in identifying, from the list of applicants, members of staff from a designated group who are not worthy of appointment but who have potential.
- The committee shall then task the Manager: Human Resources Development with looking at ways to enhance such individuals' employability.

### 1.7 In the case of current staff moving to a new job:

Where a vacancy has been filled with a current staff member and the individual has indicated that they wish to take up the post, remind the future Head/Manager to contact the current Head/Manager to discuss the transfer of the staff member. Refer the person to the policy in this regard.

### 1.8 Fairness Check and Minute of the Selection Committee:

Once the final selection decision has been taken, the Chair must check that the Committee is satisfied that the process was fair and the minute should be completed and signed by the relevant parties. Any concerns with the process must be documented.

