

# UNIVERSITY OF DAR ES SALAAM



## **GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF LEADERS OF ACADEMIC UNITS THROUGH THE SEARCH PROCESS**

(As approved by the University Council during the 164<sup>th</sup> meeting held on  
24<sup>th</sup> November 2005)

Issued by the Office of the Chief Academic Officer

January 2006

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Content	Page
1. Background .....	1
2. Search Guidelines for the appointment of Heads of Departments, Faculty/School Deans, and Institute Directors .....	3
3. Policy and Procedures for the appointment of Heads of Departments, Faculty/School Deans, and Institute Directors at the University of Dar es Salaam.....	6
4. Attributes of a Suitable Candidate for Appointment as Dean, Director, or Head of Department .....	8
5. Matrices for Assessment of Attribute of Candidates for the appointment of Heads of Departments, Faculty/School Deans, and Institute Directors .....	10

## BACKGROUND

Usually three forces representing key stakeholders are responsible for driving decisions regarding leadership in Universities (especially the public ones). University faculty (teaching staff) prefer to be led by their own colleagues who would give preference to their needs, observe professional ethics, defend and promote academic freedom and excellence. University administration while not opposed to the above, additionally prefer leadership that would respond to its demands, support administration policies, identify with their goals and priorities and implement their decisions, policies and at times directives without question. The political leadership also has a stake in university leadership. They give priority to a leadership that will maintain law and order, keep the institution going, maintain positive/supportive/friendly relations between the institution and government, and be willing, ready and able to carry out all government directives without question.

Ideally, University staff would prefer to freely elect their leadership, university administration would prefer "a technocratic search method", one while containing a semblance of objectivity of rationality, lends itself to their influence, while government would prefer an outright appointive mode. Historically various groups at different places and times have pushed for the different appointment modes or their hybrids. More often than not combinations of the above have been used to try and accommodate the interests of the various groups. Therefore, the University of Dar es Salaam has not been an exception from this. Passed in the heydays of the single party state, the University of Dar es Salaam Act No. 12 of 1970 was clearly driven by the appointive mode, giving enormous powers to the Chief Academic Officer (CACO) to nominate individuals "who in his opinion, are qualified" [University of Dar es Salaam Act No. 12 of 1970, Section 23 (2)]. The Act did not spell out how CACO was to arrive at the names that he was supposed to submit for consideration for appointment as Deans, Directors and Heads of Department. He was only required to consult with the Senate, and "having regard to the recommendations, if any, made by the Faculty Board". Following such submission, Council was to "proceed to elect a Dean or as the case may be, a Director" [University of Dar es Salaam Act No. 12 of 1970, Section 23 (2)].

The feeling of alienation and exclusion from the process led to changes in 1973 which introduced an elective procedure as a way of getting the three names from units. Senate at its 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting in 1973 agreed that the initial nomination of candidates for Deanship should be by election within relevant faculty (Minute 254.6.1). These names were then forwarded to CACO for further processing as required by the University Act of 1970. This elective-cum-appointive combination continued, albeit with difficulties. These included campaigns, attempts by outgoing incumbents to impose their favourites, and other problems that generated divisions within units. In view of such complications in 1997 the University Council decided to substitute the elective component with the search committee method. Hence, the appointment of Deans, Directors and Heads of Department for the 2000/2001 – 2002/2003 triennium was for the first time done through the search committee/appointive mode. However, there was dissatisfaction and concerns regarding the abandonment of the elective procedure, more so at a time when the country was in transition to democracy. The University of Dar es Salaam Academic Staff Assembly (UDASA) made a presentation to Council at its 139<sup>th</sup> meeting. Council decided the UDASA paper be discussed at the various University organs and conclusions and recommendations from such discussions be presented to Council for decision.

After consultations in various units, a report was subsequently presented to Council. At its 150<sup>th</sup> meeting held in June 2002, Council adopted new additional procedures that among other things sought to streamline the search committee procedure. The appointment of Deans, Directors and Heads of Department for the 2003/04 – 2005/06 Triennium was done in accordance with the revised procedures. There was an attempt to make the search process comprehensive, and open. Search results were presented at Faculty/Institute Boards and Departmental meetings. Following the conclusion of the exercise and upon instructions from the University Council CACO on July 11, 2003 appointed a committee to carry out a post-mortem analysis of the search process, and to draw out lessons for further improvement or otherwise of the search process. The committee carried out a thorough analysis of the historical genesis of the search process at UDSM. It analyzed thoroughly the merits and de-merits of the search appointive process versus the elective process

and prepared a draft report that was then circulated to Colleges, Faculties, Institutes, and Departments. Views from the academic units were incorporated into the second draft. The guidelines and procedures for the appointment of leaders of academic units at the University of Dar es Salaam as proposed in the second draft reports were subsequently approved by the University Senate on 19<sup>th</sup> October 2005. Council at its 164<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> November 2005 endorsed the proposed guidelines and procedures for the appointment of **Heads of Departments, Deans of Faculties/Schools, and Directors of Institutes** at the University of Dar es Salaam through the search process as presented here below. The Senate proposal that the guidelines and procedures be realigned to reflect the Universities Act No. 7 of 2005 though good in principle was found inappropriate in law to do at this time. This can however be done later after the University has secured its charter and the University Council has passed regulations on the day to day management of the University.

#### SEARCH GUIDELINES FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS, FACULTY/SCHOOL DEANS, AND INSTITUTE DIRECTORS

##### Preamble

The process began in 2001 to modify the search method in response to just concerns from key constituencies especially UDASA should continue. The search method and democracy are not allergic to each other and they need not be opposed to each other. It is possible to have a democratic search process; one that searches for competent leaders democratically. Thus, the guidelines here below are based on this notion.

##### The Search Guidelines

1. A three-person committee chaired by CACO should appoint the search committees. Other members of the committee should be the Director of Undergraduate Studies and Director of Post-Graduate studies.

2. The search committee should comprise three members from outside the unit; one of them must be a senior academic member of staff and he/she will chair the committee.
3. The search process should start early and to be staggered. Three phases should be followed. Thus, incoming Principals to be appointed by December 31; incoming Deans and Directors to be appointed by April 1; and Heads of Department to be appointed by end of June of the last year of the triennium.
4. Attributes of the candidates should be objectively assessed clarified as specified in this documents.
5. Matrix tables as hereby appended should be used to arrive at appropriate scores on the attributes of the candidates.
6. All selection criteria of candidates should be binding and should be applied uniformly.
7. Interviews should be regarded as a critical component of the search process. Therefore, the search committees should interview a certain minimum number of people in each unit. These should be obtained through stratified sampling from the following groups: Teaching staff, administrative/technical staff and students (post-graduates and undergraduates).
8. Any members of the relevant academic unit should be allowed to make oral or written submissions to the search committee if they wish to do so.
9. Short-listed candidates should be interviewed. This is necessary to getting the necessary information about the candidates including their knowledge of the institution, vision, leadership and management capabilities and strategies, and their willingness to take up the post.
10. Appointment of Deans/Directors and Heads of Department should be seen as a regular University activity and mainstreamed as such at all levels.
11. As much information as possible from Departments, Institutes, Faculties, Colleges, and Central Administration should be made available to search committees.
12. The search process should also be mainstreamed within the University decision-making process. In this context, search committees should be regarded and act as secretariats of

- Departmental meetings or Faculty/Institute Boards. Having carried out a thorough search as directed by CACO, such committees should carry out the critical function of synthesizing all the information obtained through interviews, and documents. They should submit a short list of names and reasons for the short-listing to the meetings. Boards/Departmental Meetings should process these names in the same way that they do other business including voting where necessary (e.g. evaluating candidates for appointment as members of staff). The committee/secretariat should submit their recommendations as well as the decisions of the Boards/Departmental Meeting to CACO.
13. Efforts to admit more female students and to recruit female members of academic staff should continue.
  14. The criteria and standards of appointment should not be lowered or changed to favour any group. History indicates that efforts have been made in the past to appoint deserving females. The University has also benefited from the service of deserving females as CACO, Deans, Directors and Heads of Department.
  15. Prospective leaders should be asked whether or not they are willing to serve before they are appointed. This should be done in the course of the search process
  16. The University to design and operationalize an attractive incentive package, commensurate with the relevant post, for all leaders namely, Heads of Departments, Deans and Directors. In addition to the said monetary incentive, there should be other amenities for them to facilitate their work.
  17. Provisions of section 10(ii) of the Academic Staff Performance Assessment Guidelines to be implemented.

In view of the above guidelines the following policy and procedures should also be followed.

POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS, FACULTY/SCHOOL DEANS, AND INSTITUTE DIRECTORS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF DAR ES SALAAM

The procedures for appointment of Deans/Directors and Heads of Departments shall comply with the provisions of section 23(2) of the University of Dar es Salaam Act No. 12 of 1970 and the following additional provisions until when provisions of the Universities Act No. 7 of 2005 come into force:

1. After consultation with the Directors of Postgraduate and Undergraduate Studies, CACO shall appoint a Search Committee which shall recommend three names as candidates for the posts of Dean/Director or Head of Department as the case may be. CACO shall be guided by the assessment matrix in selecting members of the Search Committee in accordance with Sections 23 2.1 – 2.2 of the University Act No. 12 of 1970.
2. In complying with the requirements of 1 above, in respect of Muhimbili University College, CACO shall have recourse to the requirements of the Muhimbili University College of Health Sciences Act No. 9 of 1991.
3. The Search Committee will comprise of academic staff members of, or above the rank of lecturer from outside the relevant faculty or institute provided that the chairman/convenor of the Search Committee is a senior academic staff member. The same assessment matrix will be guide the Search Committee by in recommending the three candidates.
4. The Search Committee will recommend three candidates of, or above the rank of senior lecturer/senior research fellow for consideration for posts of Dean of a Faculty/Director of an Institute or Head of Department. Where there are no eligible/qualified candidates the Search Committee may search from lecturers/research fellows.
5. The Search Committee shall use documentary data from relevant University units and interviews with members of staff in the unit/related units, the candidates themselves and students.

Members of the University community may make written or oral submission to the Committee.

6. The Search Committee will use the data indicated in 3.5 above to complete its task in relation to the assessment matrix, prepare a final ranking, after considering gender issues, of the candidates and submit its report to CACO.
7. CACO shall seek the views of the Department, Faculty or Institute Board and Senate as the case may be, on the three names recommended by the Search Committee.
  - i. The Search Committees for the Department, Faculty/Institute, as the case may be, will be the secretariat to the particular unit for the process and ordinary meetings of the respective units through normal procedures including voting where necessary, will be used to get views on the suitability and ranking of the relevant candidates.
  - ii. The Head of Department, Faculty/Institute Board Chairperson will submit a report on the views of the relevant unit to CACO. Where any of these leaders is one of the candidates the particular unit shall select a chairperson, who will also be responsible for forwarding a report to CACO, from among its members.
8. The selection process of candidates for the posts of Principal, Dean/Director and Head of Department will be done in three distinct stages:
  - i. Search/selection of Principals of University Colleges will be done in October- December period of the last year of the triennium;
  - ii. Search/selection of Deans and Directors will be done in January – March period of the last year of the triennium; and,
  - iii. Search/selection of Heads of Departments will be done in the April – June period of the last year of the triennium.
9. The rest of the procedures will be as stipulated in section 23 (2) – (6) of the University Act No. 12 of 1970.

## ATTRIBUTES OF A SUITABLE CANDIDATE FOR APPOINTMENT AS DEAN, DIRECTOR, OR HEAD OF DEPARTMENT

When recommending candidates for the positions of Dean, Director, or Head of Department, Search Committees should evaluate candidates based on the following attributes and award scores on each attribute as indicated in the matrices that are attached to these guidelines. Search teams need to be exposed to the matrix tables and the common values before embarking on the search process. It is suggested that a seminar be held for search teams before they embark on the search exercise.

### 1. Leadership ability

- a) Knowledge of the Institution
- b) Vision for the institution/unit
- c) Strategizing ability
- d) Creativity, independent thinking and initiative ability
- e) Command of respect
- f) Role model including good ethical behaviour and professionalism

### 2. Managerial ability

- a) Planning ability
- b) Control and monitoring of programmes
- c) Coordination
- d) Team work
- e) Delegation
- f) Evaluation
- g) Accountability
- h) Experience

### 3. Public Relations

- a) Language and communication
- b) Personality
- c) Protocol observation
- d) Respect for others
- e) Ability to sell the institution
- f) Participation in societal issues

### 4. Academic Leadership

- a) Teaching

- b) Research
- c) Publications
- d) Consultation
- e) Consultancy
- f) Professional standing (recognition)
- g) Mobilization of research funds
- h) Dedication and ability to mentor and groom young people to become good academicians and administrators
- i) ICT literacy and advocacy

**MATRICES FOR ASSESSMENT OF ATTRIBUTE OF CANDIDATES FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF DEAN, DIRECTOR, OR HEAD OF DEPARTMENT**

**Table 1 Assessment of Leadership Ability**

S/N	Candidates names	Knowledge of Institution <sup>1</sup>	Vision of Institution/ Unit <sup>2</sup>	Strategic ability <sup>3</sup>	Creativity, independent thinking, initiative ability <sup>4</sup>	Command of respect <sup>5</sup>	Role Model <sup>6</sup>	Total score	Rank
1									
2									
3									
4									
5									
6									
7									
8									
9									

- 1 How well does the incoming leader know the institution, how long has he worked in or been associated with the institution or unit? **15 points**
- 2 Where does he want to see the institution heading, does he/she have any ideas of the direction in which he/she would like to see the institution moving? **20 points**
- 3 What strategies does he/she have to see the institution moving in the direction of its vision? Does he/she have any plans to execute the strategies? **20 points**

- 4 Candidate's creative ability to move the institution forward including new initiatives he/she is going to take to make sure the institution achieves the vision **20 points**
- 5 Candidates image and status in the public, how much respect he/she command **15 points**
- 6 Whether the candidate stands as a role model for his peers and young academics to emulate. Does the candidate have good ethical behaviour and Professionalism? **10 points**



**Table 2 Assessment of Managerial Ability**

S/N	Candidates names	Planning ability <sup>1</sup>	Control monitoring ability <sup>2</sup>	Coordination <sup>3</sup>	Team work <sup>4</sup>	Delegation <sup>5</sup>	Evaluation <sup>6</sup>	Account ability <sup>7</sup>	Expe rience <sup>8</sup>	Total Score	Rank
1											
2											
3											
4											
5											
6											
7											
8											
9											

12

- 1 Candidate’s ability to plan and strategize for the institution **15 points**
- 2 Candidate’s ability to take charge of, to impose and dispose and to keep oneself informed **15 points**
- 3 Candidate’s ability to systematically link and synchronize programmes and other institution activities for mutual enrichment, economy and efficiency **15 points**
- 4 Candidate’s ability to elicit and sustain cooperation **10 points**
- 5 Candidate’s ability to entrust power, work and responsibilities to others **10 points**
- 6 Candidate’s ability to evaluate others **10 points**
- 7 How accountable is the candidate both in terms of academics and financial accountability **15 points**
- 8 How much managerial/leadership experience does the candidate **10 points**

**Table 3 Assessment of Attitude of Public Relations**

S/N	Candidates Names	Language, communication <sup>1</sup>	Personality <sup>2</sup>	Protocol observance <sup>3</sup>	Respect for others <sup>4</sup>	Ability to Sell Institution <sup>5</sup>	Participation in Societal Issues <sup>6</sup>	Total Score	Rank
1									
2									
3									
4									
5									
6									
7									
8									
9									

13

- 1 Candidate’s ability for self-expression both orally and in written form. **15 points**
- 2 Personal appearance of the candidate? **20 points**
- 3 Candidate’s ability to observe formality requirements and practices; e.g. dress code, and punctuality etc. **15 points**
- 4 Candidate’s respect to other people and their ideas including his/her ability to socialize within the unit **20 points**
- 5 Candidate’s ability to sell the institution including how he/she relates to government, the relevant industry, other academic institutions, and civil society **20 points**
- 6 Candidate’s ability to participate in societal activities including charity missions **10 points**

**Table 4 Assessment of Ability in Academic Leadership**

S/N	Candidates Names	Teaching <sup>1</sup>	Research <sup>2</sup>	Publications <sup>3</sup>	Consultancy <sup>4</sup>	Professional rating <sup>5</sup>	Mobilize Research Funds <sup>6</sup>	ICT Literacy advocacy <sup>7</sup>	Total Score	Rank
1										
2										
3										
4										
5										
6										
7										
8										
9										

14

- 1 Candidate's teaching ability including quantum of supervision **20 points**
- 2 Candidate's research quantum and quality **20 points**
- 3 Candidate's publication volume and quality **10 points**
- 4 Candidate's consultancy volume and quality **20 points**
- 5 Candidate's command of respect and professional recognition **10 points**
- 6 Candidates ability to mobilize research funds **10 points**
- 7 Candidate's ability to communicate using modern information technology **10 points**