

Guidance for the selection of a SPREP Director

While the Selection Advisory Committee established under Rule 3 of the *Rules of Procedure for Selection of Director* is responsible for determining its own procedures, the Chairperson is invited to refer to the following guides to assist the process.

Key steps in the selection process

1. Establish committee and advertise position
 - a. SPREP Meeting establishes selection advisory committee
 - b. SPREP Meeting agrees selection criteria
 - c. Secretariat designates an officer to provide administrative assistance to the committee – organise advertisements, receive and acknowledge applications, provide support on the process as requested by the Chairperson
 - d. Advertise vacancy and invite applications addressing the criteria
2. Assess written applications:
 - a. Committee members assess written applications individually
 - b. Committee as a whole discusses assessments and agrees on a short list
 - c. Circulate short list to SPREP Members for comment
3. Interview shortlisted applicants:
 - a. Committee members assess interviews individually
 - b. Committee as a whole discusses assessments and agrees on a final suitability ranking
4. Select preferred candidate:
 - a. Chairperson reports the recommendations to the SPREP Meeting
 - b. SPREP Meeting decides on a preferred candidate and alternatives
 - c. Preferred candidate is offered the position

Suitability ratings scale

The same scale should be used at all stages of the selection process, for all applicants. It is important to distinguish the applicants considered suitable to perform the duties from applicants that are not assessed as suitable. Here is an example of a scale. During a recruitment process, the Secretariat will work with the Selection Advisory Committee to tailor the scale to the actual selection criteria and weighting for that exercise. Previous Director selection processes have used numeric values for the criteria, accommodating criteria weightings.

(A) Suitable to perform the duties	
Highly suitable	The applicant has demonstrated exceptionally well developed and relevant skills and abilities, and the appropriate personal qualities in relation to the selection criteria. His/her performance as Director would be outstanding.
Very suitable	The applicant possesses highly developed and relevant skills and abilities, and would perform consistently well against the selection criteria as Director.
Suitable	The applicant possesses relevant skills and abilities, and would be generally effective against the selection criteria as Director.
(B) Not / not yet suitable to perform the duties	
Needs development	The applicant possesses some skills, abilities and personal qualities relevant to the criteria, but is limited on others. S/he would require further development to meet the standard required of a Director.
Unsuitable	The applicant is unable to demonstrate that they possess adequate skills, abilities and personal qualities in relation to the criteria.

Individual assessments: guide for committee members

Applicant	Eligible (Y/N)	Addressed all criteria (Y/N)	Suitability rating and score against selection criteria*						Comments
			1	2	3	4	5	6	

* To facilitate committee discussion, each member could individually identify for each candidate (a) a rating against each criterion, from highly suitable to unsuitable, and (b) a ranking against other candidates against each criterion, based on a numeric score. Here is an example based on a previous Director selection process that could guide the use of numeric score for the criteria:

90 - 100	Highly suitable	Only awarded when all requirements of this criterion are met in an outstanding manner.
75 - 89	Very suitable	The requirements of this criterion are fully covered in all material aspects.
60 - 74	Suitable	The requirements of this criterion are adequately covered with no deficiencies.
35 - 59	Needs development	The requirements of this attribute are at least barely adequately covered, with some deficiency, and would need considerable improvement if this criterion is to be met.
0 - 34	Unsuitable	The requirements of this criterion are not addressed or are unacceptable or have not been met.

Committee’s assessments: guide for the decision on shortlisting

Applicant	Indicative rating	Indicative rating against selection criteria*						Comments
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
To be offered an interview:								
Reserves:								

* For the purpose of developing a short list, the committee need not arrive at consensus on a specific rating – it may be sufficient to give a range (e.g. suitable-very suitable).

Final report / recommendations

The selection advisory committee should present its recommendations to the SPREP Meeting in a way that clearly identifies and justifies the committee’s conclusions regarding the suitability of the applicants who were interviewed. The following should be included in the report:

Applicant	Overall rating	Agreed suitability ratings against selection criteria*						Comments
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
Recommended applicant:								
Other suitable applicants in order:								
Not / not yet suitable applicants:								

* The committee should compare their individual ratings and rankings, and as much as possible arrive at a consensus ranking of the candidates and rating against each criterion. The report’s commentary and justification can outline any other issues.