



UNIVERSITY OF DAR ES SALAAM

**GUIDELINES FOR IDENTIFICATION AND
AWARD OF BEST WORKERS**

2024

**GUIDELINES FOR IDENTIFICATION AND AWARD OF BEST WORKERS
(2024)**

©University of Dar es Salaam

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	iii
FOREWORD	vi
Definitions of Key Terms	vii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background	1
1.2. Objectives and Justification	2
2. SCOPE OF THE GUIDELINES	3
3. CATEGORIES OF AWARDS	4
3.1. Awards for Academic Staff	4
3.2. Awards for Administrative and Technical Staff	4
4. ELIGIBILITY	6
5. SELECTION MODALITY	6
6. AWARDS COMMITTEE	9
6.1. Composition	9
6.2. Terms and Qualifications of Committee Members	9
6.3. Responsibilities	10
6.4. Decision Making by the Award Committee	11
7. DEPARTMENTAL SELECTION COMMITTEES	13
7.1. Composition	13
7.2. Responsibilities	13
8. CONFLICT OF INTEREST	14
9. SELECTION CRITERIA FOR THE ACADEMIC STAFF AWARD CATEGORY	15
9.1. Selection Criteria for Tutorial Assistants and Assistant Lecturers	15
9.2. Selection Criteria for Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, Associate Professors, and Professors	16
10. SELECTION CRITERIA FOR THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND TECHNICAL STAFF CATEGORY	17
11. TYPES OF AWARDS	18
12. AWARD CEREMONY	19
13. AMENDMENT OF THE GUIDELINES	19
14. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GUIDELINES	19
15. APPEAL PROCESS	20
16. APPENDICES: NOMINATION AND VOTING SCENARIOS	22

16.1. Nomination for departmental best workers for all three groups.....	22
16.2. Voting for departmental best workers for all three groups.....	25
16.3. Nomination of candidates among administration and technical staff at the Unit level	28
16.4. Voting for the Best Worker among Administration and Technical Staff at the Unit Level	29
16.5. Nomination of Candidates in the Administration Directorates.....	30
16.6. Voting for the Best Worker in the Administration Directorates	31

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CCC&STC	Chief Corporate Counsel and Secretary to the Council
CI	Confucius Institute
CMU	Communication and Marketing Unit
CoAF	College of Agricultural Sciences and Food Technology
CoET	College of Engineering and Technology
CoHU	College of Humanities
COI	Conflict of Interest
CoICT	College of Information and Communication Technologies
CoNAS	College of Natural and Applied Sciences
CoSS	College of Social Sciences
CVL	Centre for Virtual Learning
DES	Directorate of Estates Services
DF	Directorate of Finance
DHRMA	Directorate of Human Resource Management and Administration
DICA	Directorate of Internationalisation, Convocation and Advancement
DICT	Directorate of Information and Communication Technology
DIEN	Directorate of Innovation and Entrepreneurship
DPDI	Directorate of Planning, Development and Investment
DPGS	Directorate of Postgraduate Studies
DRP	Directorate of Research and Publications
DPS	Directorate of Public Services
DSS	Directorate of Social Services
DSTS	Directorate of Students Services

DUCE	Dar es Salaam University College of Education
DUS	Directorate of Undergraduate Studies
DVC	Deputy Vice Chancellor
DVC-PFA	Deputy Vice Chancellor Planning, Finance and Administration
GIS	Geographic Information System
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IDS	Institute of Development Studies
IGS	Institute of Gender Studies
IKS	Institute of Kiswahili Studies
IMS	Institute of Marine Sciences
IRA	Institute of Resource Assessment
MCHAS	Mbeya College of Health and Allied Sciences
MRI	Mineral Resources Institute
MUCE	Mkwawa University College of Education
PMU	Procurement Management Unit
QAU	Quality Assurance Unit
RAAWU	Researchers Academician and Allied Workers Union
SJMC	School of Journalism and Mass Communication
SoAF	School of Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Technology
SoED	School of Education
SoMG	School of Mines and Geosciences
TATAKI	Taasisi ya Taaluma za Kiswahili
THTU	Tanzania Higher Learning Institutions Trade Union

UDASA	University of Dar es Salaam Academic Staff Assembly
UDBS	University of Dar es Salaam Business School
UDSE	University of Dar es Salaam School of Economics
UDSM	University of Dar es Salaam
UDSoL	University of Dar es Salaam School of Law
VC	Vice Chancellor

FOREWORD

It is a well-established fact that staff performance is critical to the overall success of any organization. Cognizant of this fact, private and public organizations invest time and resources to ensure the steady employees performance. As higher learning institutions strive to attain intended targets within the triple spheres of teaching, research and consultancy, they must also take a closer and keen interest in employees' performance. Henceforth, staff performance has to be supported, monitored, appraised, recognized and appropriately rewarded.

Recognition of staff competence via awards can enhance their self-image and social standing and propel them to attain better outputs and results. Awards can be a convenient mechanism to spot role models. They may also set and convey the University's expected standard behaviour and norms and induce reciprocal behaviours among staff. The wide-held assumption is that when staff members bask in the glow of institutional praise, they will likely be inspired to work harder over the long term. As a prime University in the country, UDSM should be able to lead by example by inculcating a culture of valuing and acknowledging processes leading to excellence instead of results only.

These guidelines are designed to facilitate the process of honouring staff members who embody the University's commitment to nurturing and sustaining diverse learning, working and living environments; staff who foster cordial relations with the University's key customers. These guidelines do not preclude individual Units/staff from giving personal gifts to their colleagues, provided University funds are not used for this purpose, and the awards to be conferred do not match the titles stipulated in the current document.

Prof. William A.L. Anangisye
VICE CHANCELLOR

Definitions of Key Terms

For the purposes of these guidelines, unless the context otherwise requires:

- "*Academic staff*" means staff member falling under section 20 (1) (b) of the University Act (2005) and section 3 of the Revised Harmonised Scheme of Service for Academic Staff in Public Universities and Constituent Colleges of July 2022.
- "*Administrative and technical staff*" means staff members falling under rule 20 of the University of Dar es Salaam Charter, 2007 which include all officers of the University employed on permanent or fixed term contracts who are not members of the academic staff.
- "*Anonymous voting*" means staff members cast their votes via a paper-based system, i.e., ballot papers, or online voting forms, without revealing the voters' identity while ensuring the protection of their privacy.
- "*Award*" means recognition or honour given to staff members for their achievements and contributions.
- "*Conflict of Interest*" means a situation which occurs when a staff member is involved in multiple interests, which could potentially interfere with their ability to act impartially while serving as a member of the Award Committee and Departmental Award Committee. Further clarification is provided in provision 5 of the current guidelines.
- "*Making progress*" means a staff has not necessarily achieved the best performance in an evaluation parameter but has demonstrated a significant and consistent performance improvement in the past 2 years.
- "*Nomination*" means a process of proposing a candidate for the best worker award through a written or verbal statement to the Award Committee or Departmental Selection Committee.
- "*Online form*" means a secure and customised interface allowing staff members to input and submit their voting preferences electronically per provision 4.3 (viii) of the current guidelines.
- "*Preferential voting*" means a system of voting whereby the voter or elector indicates his or her order of preference for each of the candidates

listed on the ballot paper, with “1” being the highest, i.e., most preferred ranking.

- “*Valid vote/ballot*” means a vote that is counted as legitimate and fulfils the requirement set out in provision 4.3 (vii) of the current guidelines.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background

The University of Dar es Salaam has been selecting the best workers at units and university levels for many years without having approved guidelines. The lack of such guidelines for selecting the best workers resulted in the exercise being subjective but also in complaints from members of staff. As a result, the best workers' selection process lacked credibility, which led to halting the exercise for several years. With this backdrop, it was deemed important to resume acknowledging and celebrating top-performing staff's achievements through clearly stipulated guidelines. Cognisant of the fact that recognising and rewarding the institution's best workers for their hard work is the surest way of moulding an effective, motivated, and productive workforce, the present guidelines, henceforth, seek to institute, among others, clear and tangible incentives for UDSM staff to perform at a consistently optimal level.

Organizations usually offer several kinds of awards, which fall into two broad types: prospective and retrospective. Prospective awards are pre-announced, meaning that the criteria for potential candidates are publicized in advance. Staff members can thus work towards fulfilling the set criteria to clinch the award. In contrast, retrospective awards are issued to appreciate a well- executed task, role or assignment and are unveiled as a 'surprise package' to recipients. The current guidelines address prospective and retrospective awards, with the former dominating the award categories to be presented to deserving University staff. Retrospective awards include the long service award for staff members who have offered the most extended service to the University. Within these two broad types, these guidelines stipulate criteria for granting specific categories of awards: academic staff awards (for junior and senior academic staff), and administrative and technical staff awards.

The guidelines also aim to nurture a culture of competition without creating resentment or divisions among staff members who feel they are not adequately compensated for their top-notch performances and outputs. The guidelines are

also intended to set in motion a best worker selection process which is not only perceived to be fair and transparent but also is practically feasible to implement for all categories of UDSM staff. Moreover, the entire process of developing the present guidelines considered the unique stature of UDSM as the oldest and prime higher learning institution in the country with a diverse group of talented and skilled staff.

1.2. Objectives and Justification

The Best Worker Guidelines are aligned with the need to operationalise goal five of the UDSM Vision 2061, i.e., inspiring and motivating staff and students, and article 4(2) (m) of Act No. 7 of 2005, the University of Dar es Salaam Charter, *citing instituting and awarding medals, prizes and other distinction awards and forms of assistance and sponsorship for the advancement and dissemination of knowledge as one of the objectives and functions of the University*. The Guidelines are also aligned with Objective Code (E) of the UDSM Strategic Plan for the 2020/21-2025/26 period, which commits University resources (both material and human resources) to strengthen its institutional and operational efficiency with the aim of increasing staff performance and improving staff retention. These guidelines are also consistent with articles 2.6.2 (i) of the UDSM Human Resources Management Policy and Operational Procedures (Revised Version of 2022), which require the University to *establish and maintain a conducive working environment to motivate all employees to perform their duties at their best*, and article 2.6.1 (ii) which reiterates the need to *ensure that there are mechanisms in place for rewarding outstanding performance in various areas including excellence in academic activities and administrative services, long service and dealing with poor performance*. More importantly, article 2.6.3 (i) of the UDSM Human Resource Management Policy directs the DHRMA to *develop clear guidelines on rewarding outstanding performance in various areas, including innovation, teaching, public service and administrative/support services*. Furthermore, these Guidelines have been developed in response to observations raised following a stakeholder analysis of UDSM employees' expectations of the University, including (i) a transparent and fair appraisal system; (ii) staff participation and feedback; (iii) recognition and participatory

approach; (iv) fair and competitive opportunities; and (v) professional advancement. In sum, the objectives of the Guidelines are:

- i. To put in place a reliable system which encourages, motivates, and incentivises UDSM staff in their academic and administrative pursuits and ward off biases and favouritism in the process of selecting best workers.
- ii. To introduce and promote the culture of recognising and rewarding progress made by members of staff to improve performance or achieve excellence. If a staff has demonstrated a significant and consistent progress in improving performance, he/she should be rewarded even when he/she has not necessarily come out as an outstanding performer in the respective awarding year.
- iii. To celebrate and recognise outstanding service by UDSM staff for activities, initiatives, practices and/or projects that have contributed to the delivery of exceptional or significantly improved outputs to UDSM's staff, students, partners, stakeholders, and community at large.
- iv. To set in motion an impartial and transparent process that recognises individual staff's adherence to ethical conduct and behaviours within the spirit of the Code of Ethics and Conduct for the Public Service.
- v. To spell out the potential conflict of interest situations or scenarios in selecting the best workers at units and university levels.
- vi. To institute a best worker selection process that assures due consideration of staff members' preferences amidst different sizes of the voting constituencies of UDSM units, departments, colleges, and institutes.
- vii. To provide an internal remedial process for staff who feel aggrieved at the outcome of the best worker selection process.

2. SCOPE OF THE GUIDELINES

The present guidelines shall apply to all campus colleges, schools, faculties, institutes, and directorates as established by the Council on the recommendations of the Senate in accordance with the University Act. However, it does not apply to the Dar es Salaam University College of Education (DUCE) and Mkwawa

University College of Education (MUCE) which, as constituent colleges, because they have their respective best worker guidelines.

3. CATEGORIES OF AWARDS

There shall be two main categories of awards as follows:

3.1. Awards for Academic Staff

There shall be two sub-categories of awards for the academic staff as follows:

- i. Tutorial Assistants and Assistant lecturers
- ii. Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, Associate Professors, and Professors.

3.2. Awards for Administrative and Technical Staff

Another major category of awards shall be for the UDSM staff falling under the administrative and technical cadres as per the approved schemes of service.

Table 1: Summary of Award Categories

UNIT LEVEL		Staff Categories		
	Total No. of Departments	Academic Staff <i>[to be selected as best workers]</i>	Administrative & Technical Staff <i>[to be selected as best workers]</i>	Total Winners
Colleges				
CoET	6	2	1	3
CoICT ¹	2	2	1	3
CoNAS	6	2	1	3
CoHU	7	2	1	3
CoSS	5	2	1	3
CoAF	4	2	1	3
MCHAS	16	2	1	3
SCHOOLS				
UDBS	4	2	1	3
SoED ²	3	2	1	3
UDSoL	3	2	1	3
SJMC		2	1	3
SoAF	2	2	1	3

¹ CVL staff shall vote under the Department of Computer Science and Engineering of CoICT.

² SoED best worker selection process for administrative and technical staff shall include nursery and primary school teachers.

UNIT LEVEL		Staff Categories		
	Total No. of Departments	Academic Staff [to be selected as best workers]	Administrative & Technical Staff [to be selected as best workers]	Total Winners
SoMG	3	2	1	3
UDSE	2	2	1	3
INSTITUTES				
IDS		2	1	3
IKS	2	2	1	3
IRA		2	1	3
IMS	4	2	1	3
CI		2	1	3
IGS		2	1	3
MRI	3	2	1	3
DIRECTORATES				
Vice Chancellor			1	1
DICA				
DICT				
PMU				
QAU				
CMU				
Chief Internal Audit Unit				
DVC-Academic			1	1
DPGS				
DUS				
DVC-PFA			1	1
DHRMA				
DPDI				
DSTS				
DES				
DF				
DSS				
DVC-Research			1	1
DRP				
DPS				
DIEN				
GRAND TOTAL		42	26	67

4. ELIGIBILITY

Staff members eligible for the best worker selection cycle shall fulfil the following conditions:

- i. Staff who are permanent, pensionable, and have served for at least one year.
- ii. Contractual staff with not less than two years contract.
- iii. Individuals demonstrated remarkable progress in their work.
- iv. Should not be part of the top university management (Vice Chancellor (VC), Deputy Vice Chancellor Academic, Deputy Vice Chancellor Planning Finance and Administration, Deputy Vice Chancellor Research, and Chief Corporate Counsel and Secretary to Council (CCC&STC) or senators (Principals, Deans, and Directors)
- v. Should not be on academic leave, sabbatical leave for more than six months, or on leave without pay.

5. SELECTION MODALITY

The following selection modality shall be employed:

- i. Nomination of individuals to be voted for as best workers:
 - a) The initial stage at unit and group levels shall be nomination by colleagues. The main selection method shall be preferential voting whereby staff members (electorates) shall rank three (3) eligible nominees (candidates) in order of preference to be voted for as best workers. Every staff member of the unit or group qualifies to nominate potential candidates and to be nominated, including self-nomination.
 - b) Electorates shall rank three eligible candidates in order of preference by writing a number next to any 3 candidates (or by selecting a number in a digital system) to indicate their preferred choices.
 - c) Electorates shall vote in order of preference by specifying their first choice with a "1" (equivalent to 3 points), second with a "2" (equivalent to 2 points), and third with a "3" (equivalent to 1 points).

- d) For a nomination vote to be considered valid, the staff member must rank three candidates for every position and shall not award them [the three candidates] the same ranking.
 - e) Computation of nomination vote tallies and weighted scores for the different awards categories shall be done in conformity with the respective voting scenarios 1 (Academic staff) and 2 (Administrative and technical staff) in the Appendices.
 - f) The first three candidates with majority votes cast shall be declared the nominees to be voted for in search of the best worker in the unit or group.
- ii. The nomination in (a) shall be followed by voting.
 - a) All eligible voters in a given unit or group will vote for one candidate from the three nominees
 - b) Computation of vote tallies and weighted scores for the different awards categories shall be done in conformity with the respective voting scenarios in Appendices 16.1 to 16.6.
 - c) The candidate with a majority of the votes cast shall be declared the winner.
 - d) For units (Colleges, Schools, and Institutes) with less than six administration and technical staff, nomination and voting processes will involve the entire unit instead of each respective department as demonstrated in Appendices 16.3 and 16.4.
- iii. The Committees (i.e. the Award Committee and Departmental Selection Committees) overseeing the selection shall ensure that the best worker nominees and eventual winners garner broad support among the UDSM staff.
- iv. If no candidate wins most first-preference votes, the one with the least preference votes shall face elimination, and the respective Committee shall conduct a fresh vote between the two remaining candidates until one candidate secures an outright majority.
- v. To be considered valid, an election or voting round must involve at least 75% of the staff members in the relevant unit.

- vi. In the academic staff award category, departmental members shall cast two votes to select one senior and one junior academic staff member as the best workers in their respective departments.
- vii. Votes garnered by best workers at the Departmental level shall be compared to get the best workers of the respective colleges, schools, and institutes.
- viii. Names of the two best workers at the university level, i.e., one each from the academic, and administrative and technical staff categories, shall be selected from a pool of the best college, schools and institute workers.
- ix. The voting process shall be monitored in real-time using an online form/dashboard that breaks down each voting round for the respective committee to pick the winner.
- x. The respective committee shall ensure staff members are aware of the evaluation criteria for selecting best workers and the voting process, including the timeline for voting.
- xi. Campaigns are not allowed at any stage of selecting best workers and an attempt to do so will be considered as a voter inducement incidence.
- xii. Staff members should refrain from committing any foul play³ or voter inducement⁴ that will undermine the integrity and fairness of the best worker selection process.
- xiii. A staff member implicated in committing foul play and voter inducement shall be disqualified from participating in the selection process and may be subjected to further disciplinary measures in accordance with the relevant University's policies and regulations.

³ Foul play refers to any actions or statements intended to intimidate or coerce fellow staff members into voting a certain way or discouraging them from voting altogether (**voter intimidation**), spreading false or misleading information about other eligible nominees (**misinformation and disinformation**), and engaging in personal attacks and character assassinations (**mud-slinging**).

⁴ Voter inducement refers to the practice of offering incentives or rewards to fellow staff members in exchange for their support or for voting in a particular way. This can include various forms of inducement, such as offering money, gifts, or favours.

6. AWARDS COMMITTEE

6.1. Composition

The Awards Committee shall be composed of eleven (11) staff members. These members shall be appointed to serve the Award Committee based on the following distribution:

- i) At least **six** members should be Academic staff.
- ii) At least five members should be Administrative and technical staff.
- iii) At least **three** members should be drawn from the Off-campus units out of Dar es Salaam.
- iv) At least **one** member should be drawn from the Off-Campus units in Dar es Salaam.
- v) At least **four** members should be drawn from the Main Campus units.
- vi) **one** member should represent UDASA.
- vii) **one** member should represent THTU.
- viii) **one** member should represent RAAWU.
- ix) At least **four** members should be women.
- x) At least **one** member should be a staff with disability.

6.2. Terms and Qualifications of Committee Members

- i) Committee members shall be full-time staff employees employed at the University for a Minimum of two years.
- ii) Chairperson should be a professor with unquestionable integrity.
- iii) All Committee Members shall be staff with the ability to interpret and observe the guidelines and all other relevant University instruments related to staff welfare applied to this exercise.
- iv) Committee Members shall be staff with a track record of exercising impartiality and transparency in their execution of the mandate placed under these guidelines.
- v) Committee Members shall maintain confidentiality about the internal discussions of the committee. Information about committee deliberations shall not be shared with anyone outside the Committee.

- vi) All Committee Members shall be appointed by the VC from the list recommended by the DVC PFA and based on the categories specified in 4.4.1 (i-ix).
- vii) Members of the Awards Committee shall serve a non-renewable three-year term.
- viii) If a staff member ceases to be a Committee member for any reason (death, incapacity or indiscipline), another eligible staff member shall be appointed with immediate effect.
- ix) During their service to this Committee, members of the Awards Committee are eligible to receive an award.
- x) If members of the Committee are eligible for nomination, they should be excluded from participating in the awarding process at the respective stage as provided in sub-section 9 on conflict of interest.

6.3. Responsibilities

The Awards Committee shall:

- i) Receive and compile names of nominated individuals from designated colleges.
- ii) Compute grading from the departmental /groups level after considering attributes from other sources as specified in section 4.4.3 (ix).
- iii) Make decisions by voting.
- iv) Announce results at the college level in a timely manner.
- v) Evaluate and rank the nominees and ultimately forward recommendations to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor PFA.
- vi) Send awards recommendations to the University management.
- vii) Prepare the Awards booklet to be used for announcing winners at the Annual Awards Ceremony and VC Gala Dinner.
- viii) Handle appeals for the selection made at the department level, and the Committee decision on the matter is final.
- ix) Ensure transparency and fairness are exercised during the voting and selection processes, and that all staff members have an equal opportunity to participate.

- x) The Committee will be in charge of managing the awards nomination process through the automated system.
- xi) Monitor any instances of foul play or voter inducement during the selection process.

6.4. Decision Making by the Award Committee

The Award Committee shall:

- i) Encourage and facilitate discussions to build consensus among Committee members regarding the top nominated candidates from unit level. The goal is to reach a consensus on the finalists for the recipients of the University best worker award.
- ii) Hold a vote to make the final decision on the recipients of the University level award.
- iii) Administer a scoring system to objectively evaluate the nominees for the University level award.
- iv) Each Committee member shall independently score the nominees based on the scoring scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents poor performance and 5 represents exceptional performance.
- v) Each score will be multiplied by the corresponding weight assigned to the criterion.
- vi) Finally, weighted scores will be summed up for each nominee.
- vii) In determining the overall suitability of the nominees for the University best worker award, each Committee member shall make evaluations based on the following four additional criteria:
 - a) Employee performance reports for the 12 months preceding the award date (40%) [**Performance**] as reported in the staff performance appraisal system;
 - b) Adherence to the Code of Ethics and Conduct as per the university and government guidelines (30%) [**Ethical conduct**];
 - c) Observance of the UDSM Clients Charter (20%) [**Service delivery**]. For academic staff, grades for this component will be based on the results of students evaluation of process after being improved and automated and

- d) Compliance to the University financial rules and regulations (10%)
[**Resource accountability**].
- e) Here under is an example of how the weighted voting score by the Award Committee should be calculated:
- f) Nominee A:
 - Performance reports: 4 (40% weight) = 1.6
 - Ethical conduct: 5 (30% weight) = 1.5
 - Service delivery: 3 (20% weight) = 0.6
 - Financial compliance: 4 (10% weight) = 0.4
 - Total weighted score= **4.1**
- g) Nominee B:
 - Performance reports: 5 (40% weight) = 2.0
 - Ethical conduct: 4 (30% weight) = 1.2
 - Service delivery: 5 (20% weight) = 1.0
 - Financial compliance: 3 (10% weight) = 0.3
 - Total Weighted Score = 4.5
- viii) The score obtained in (v) above will be combined by the score from the voting process to get an overall winner.
- ix) The Committee shall make reference to the following instruments in their evaluations:
 - a) Employees performance reports.
 - b) Personal files.
 - c) UDSM Clients Charter.
 - d) Code of Ethics and Conduct.
 - e) Internal audit reports. and
 - f) Any other relevant university policy, guidelines, or report as may be deemed necessary
- x) The Committee is given the mandate to communicate with any member of the university community, including leaders at all levels of the university management, in search of additional information about a candidate, if deemed necessary and agreed upon by the Committee. Such a communication will ONLY be made by the Committee chair after the Committee decision.

- xi) If the committee, in its evaluation for declaring best workers, will establish serious misconduct issues for a staff member with majority score from the voting results, then such staff members shall not be declared the best worker at that level even if he/she has an overall higher score.

7. DEPARTMENTAL SELECTION COMMITTEES

All awards selection processes at the Departmental level shall be presided over by a duly appointed Departmental Selection committee.

7.1. Composition

Each Departmental Selection Committee shall be composed of at least 3 but not more than 5 staff members as follows:

- i) Two members shall be an academic staff and the other administrative staff.
- ii) They shall be selected by the members of the respective department to serve as chairperson and secretary of the Selection Committee.
- iii) The academic staff shall be selected from among senior members of staff who shall also serve as the Committee's chairperson.
- iv) Both members should be individuals with unquestionable integrity.

7.2. Responsibilities

The Departmental Selection Committees shall:

- i) Describe the process and criteria used for selecting the best workers for the department;
- ii) Prepare shortlists of eligible members to be voted for based on the established criteria;
- iii) Preside over the voting process allowing all departmental staff members to vote for the best worker through an online poll or paper ballots;
- iv) Announce results in a staff meeting or any other agreed approach (e.g., through an *online awarding management system*);
- v) Submit results to the University-wide Award Committee; and
- vi) Implement decisions of the Award Committee on appeals.

8. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Conflict of interest (CoI) is generally recognized as a situation where there is a risk that a professional judgement or decision could be influenced by some secondary interest. In the context of the Award Committee and Departmental Selection Committees, CoI derives from a committee member's relationship with a nominee. Members of the Award Committee and Departmental Selection Committees should avoid the appearance of any impropriety by adhering to the following guidelines:

- i) Members of the Award Committee or Departmental Selection Committees ought to self-identify any relationships that might be perceived as a source of potential bias and inform the Committee Chair of the CoIs before any nominations, reviews, or appeals have been discussed.
- ii) If CoIs are identified, the conflicted committee members will recuse themselves from discussions related to the corresponding nominations. Recusal means that the committee member will refrain from any commentary/input regarding the conflicted nomination before or during the decision-making process and will absent him/herself during committee discussions of the conflicted nomination.
- iii) When the chair has a CoI with a nomination, the deputy chair will preside over the discussion of that nomination.
- iv) Any person who has been nominated for an award (whether on an individual or team basis) should exempt himself/herself from deliberations on his/her nomination.
- v) Members of the Committee will absent themselves from the decision-making process should a staff for whom the member is related in one way or another [i.e., as a spouse, son, daughter, brother or sister] be nominated for an award.
- vi) Members of the Committee need only to absent themselves from consideration of that specific nomination, not the entire review process.

9. SELECTION CRITERIA FOR THE ACADEMIC STAFF AWARD CATEGORY

Staff members shall use the following criteria in evaluating eligible nominees for the academic staff category.

9.1. Selection Criteria for Tutorial Assistants and Assistant Lecturers

- i) Has effectively participated in preparing and supervising tutorials and seminars and in some instances delivering lectures for undergraduate programmes (**Effective teaching and supervision**).
- ii) Has effectively participated in setting, invigilating and marking undergraduate examinations (**professional supportive roles**).
- iii) Has demonstrated willingness to tutor and mentor students (**mentorship**).
- iv) Has sought mentorship from senior academic staff and commit to be guided by a specific senior staff as per the departmental arrangement (**commitment to learn and be mentored**).
- v) Has demonstrated ability to accept and fulfil responsibilities, including administrative duties as directed by the Head of Department (**collegiality**).
- vi) Has regularly participated in staff-student seminars and workshops organized by the respective Department or College/Institute/School or the University (**engaged scholarship**).
- vii) Has demonstrated ability to strike a balance between fulfilling departmental responsibilities and individual career advancement (**maintaining focus**).
- viii) Has maintained good relationships with academic, administrative and technical staff (**interpersonal relationship**).
- ix) Has performed duties as per the assigned responsibilities through employees' performance management information system's rating (**performance appraisal**).
- x) Though not necessarily the best in performing duties, the staff has demonstrated significant, consistent, and progressive performance improvement in the past two years (**rewarding progress and growth**).

- xi) Has unreservedly offered community services to the expectations of the University stakeholders and clients (**effective outreach**).

9.2. Selection Criteria for Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, Associate Professors, and Professors

- i) An academic who has made an impact on students through knowledge sharing and receives excellent feedback (**Effective teaching and supervision**).
- ii) Has provided outstanding service⁵ to the university and her stakeholders (**quality service delivery**).
- iii) Has contributed immensely to UDSM's vision, mission and strategic direction (**contribution to the corporate vision**⁶).
- iv) Has developed, coached, led, and motivated individuals and teams (**leadership and mentorship**).
- v) Has used innovative methods, approaches, techniques or information to work smarter or more efficiently (**innovativeness and creativity**).
- vi) Has taken risks in the pursuit of excellence (**risk-taking - out of the box**⁷).
- vii) Has seen alternative ways to view or define challenges and develops innovative solutions to problems large or small (**problem-solving ability**).
- viii) Has inspired, supported and respected the endeavours of others (**teamwork and inspiration**).
- ix) Has demonstrated a record of multiple service activities or a single major activity over a sustained period (**performance consistency**).

⁵ Refers to the ability of the staff members to consistently meet and occasionally even exceed UDSM's stakeholders whether through advising, development of programs or improvements to University systems, policies or operations that affect students.

⁶ The staff member has been creative in seeking ways to provide or improve university core services that increases efficiency while decreasing cost.

⁷ Academic staff members can express risk-taking behaviour in various ways, for instance, experimenting with new teaching techniques, technologies or unconventional approaches (such as flipped classrooms or experiential learning activities), engaging in unconventional or controversial research topics, or challenging established paradigms within their field, which might involve exploring uncharted territories or pushing the boundaries of current knowledge.

- x) Has proven to be an active researcher and attracted consultancy assignments to the University (**activeness in research and consultancy**).
- xi) Has regularly produced quality publications in credible publishing outlets (**impressive publication record**).
- xii) Has observed professional and ethical behaviour and practices in and outside the University (**code of ethics and conduct - ethical behaviour**).
- xiii) Has maintained good relationships with academic, administrative and technical staff (**interpersonal relationship**).
- xiv) Has performed duties as per the assigned responsibilities through employees' performance management information system's rating (**performance appraisal**).
- xv) Though not necessarily the best in performing duties, the staff has demonstrated significant, consistent, and progressive performance improvement in the past two years (**rewarding progress and growth**).

10. SELECTION CRITERIA FOR THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND TECHNICAL STAFF CATEGORY

Staff members shall use the following selection criteria in evaluating eligible nominees for the administrative and technical staff category.

- i) Has shown to have improved the quality-of-service provision for students, staff, and other university stakeholders (**quality service provision**).
- ii) Has displayed evidence of contributions to creating an enabling culture of excellence within the University's administration (**promotion of the culture of excellence**).
- iii) Has contributed immensely to UDSM's vision, mission and strategic direction (**contribution to the corporate vision**).
- iv) Has used innovative methods, approaches, techniques or information to work smarter or more efficiently (**innovativeness and creativity**).

- v) Has demonstrated a record of multiple service activities or a single major activity over a sustained period (**performance consistency**).
- vi) Has taken risks in the pursuit of excellence (**risk-taking - out of the box⁸**).
- vii) Has developed, coached, led, and motivated individuals and teams (**leadership and mentorship**).
- viii) Has proven to have observed professional and ethical behaviour and practices in and outside the University (**code of ethics and conduct - ethical behaviour**).
- ix) Has proven to have good relationships with academic, administrative and technical staff (**interpersonal relationship**).
- x) Has proven to perform duties per the assigned responsibilities through employee performance management information system's rating (**performance appraisal**).
- xi) Has inspired, supported and respected the endeavours of others (**teamwork and inspiration**).
- xii) Though not necessarily the best in performing duties, the staff has demonstrated significant, consistent, and progressive performance improvement in the past two years. (**Rewarding progress and growth**).

11. TYPES OF AWARDS

The following awards shall be provided to the best workers:

- i) University-level best workers: a certificate, trophy, plaque and cash prize;
- ii) Unit-level best workers: a certificate and cash prize.
- iii) The cash prizes for various best workers' award categories shall be as follows:
 - a) Two million shillings for each of the two winners of the university-level best workers.

⁸ Administrative and technical staff members can manifest risk-taking behaviour in variety of ways such as propose and oversee execution of new ideas, initiatives or process improvements that deviate from the status quo, explore alternative approaches to problem-solving while remaining relevant in their roles. It also includes assuming leadership roles in high-stakes projects or initiatives that involve significant uncertainty.

- b) Five hundred thousand shillings for unit-level [i.e. Department, College, School, Institute, and Directorate] best workers.

12. AWARD CEREMONY

- i) Best workers' awardees shall be invited to a celebratory ceremony followed by a VC dinner gala.
- ii) University-level best workers' awardees should be invited and facilitated to attend the annual workers' day (May Day) celebrations.

13. AMENDMENT OF THE GUIDELINES

- i) The University shall, from time to time, monitor and evaluate these guidelines' effectiveness based on its implementation feedback;
- ii) These guidelines shall be reviewed every three years (if necessary) from the date of approval; and
- iii) In case of identified implementation challenges, the University shall, at any time, revise the respective clauses to make the necessary amendments.

14. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GUIDELINES

- i) The office of the DVC-PFA shall oversee the implementation of these guidelines;
- ii) The University shall develop a digital information system to facilitate the selection of best workers;
- iii) Developing a digital system should be prioritised as a critical tool in operationalising these guidelines to enable all qualified staff to participate in the best worker selection process, regardless of one's physical location, and
- iv) University management shall ensure inclusion of the timetable for the best worker selection process in the University Almanac.
- v) The selection process for University and unit levels awards should be conducted between January and March of each calendar year.
- vi) The university shall set aside financial resources, as part of its annual budgetary allocations, for the facilitation of the best workers' selection process and the offering of awards.

- a) Funding for the University level awards and Award Committee activities should come from the DVC PFA Office budget.
 - b) Funding for the Units level awards and Departmental Award Committees should come from the respective unit budgets.
- vii) The university shall improve and automate existing student evaluation process of academic staff to ensure objective and credible results. Such results should contribute to staff performance in the best worker selection process.

15. APPEAL PROCESS

- a) A staff who feels that a mistake has been made regarding eligibility or interpretation and application of these guidelines were flouted at the unit-level of the award process may:
 - i. Ask the Award Committee to have her/his nomination, or that of another staff, reconsidered by sending, within 14 calendar days from the conclusion of the selection process, a request for review.
 - ii. The Award Committee shall reconsider the appeal and notify the appellant in writing of its decision and reasons for its decision within 14 calendar days of receipt of the appeal letter.
 - iii. The decision of the Award Committee on appeal requests referred to it shall be final.
 - iv. The Award Committee may, in determining any appeal, reject or accept the appeal.
 - v. Where the Award Committee determines an appeal, the Committee shall either nullify previous results and order a fresh voting and nomination process or uphold the results of a previously concluded voting and nomination process.
- b) A staff who feels that a mistake has been made regarding eligibility or interpretation and application of these guidelines were flouted by the Award Committee at the university-level of the award process may:
 - i. Ask an Appeal Panel of three members to be constituted by the VC, to have her/his nomination, or that of another staff, reconsidered

by sending, within 14 calendar days from the conclusion of the selection process, a request for review.

- ii. The Appeal Panel shall determine the appeal and notify the appellant in writing of its decision and reasons for its decision within 14 calendar days from the date of appointment.
- iii. The decision of the Appeal Panel on matters appeal requests referred to it shall be final.
- iv. The Appeal Panel may, in determining any appeal, reject or accept the appeal.
- v. Where the Appeal Panel determines an appeal, it shall either nullify previous results and order a fresh voting and nomination process or uphold the results of a previously concluded voting and nomination process.

16. APPENDICES: NOMINATION AND VOTING SCENARIOS

16.1. Nomination for departmental best workers for all three groups

Appendix 1: Nomination of Candidates to be voted for as departmental best workers for Senior Academic Staff (first group), Junior Academic Staff (second group) and Administrative and Technical Staff (third group).

Assumptions/Condition:

- In reference to eligibility criteria in section 4 (i) -(v), all members of the department are eligible to nominate and to be nominated, including self-nominations.
- At least 75% of all eligible staff members in the department **must** participate in the nomination of candidates to be voted for as best workers.
- Staff members who are eligible voters may nominate candidates to be voted as best workers even if they fail to participate in the voting stage.
- Each staff has 6 points to distribute to 3 candidates in order of ranking preferences: 1st choice =3 points; 2nd choice = 2points; 3rd choice = 1 point.
- All eligible voters **must** nominate three candidates in order of ranking preferences.
- The denominator for computing weights is equal to the number of voters (N) in a department x number of points each staff has to distribute to 3 candidates (N x 6).

Total Dept Votes	Staff Group	Staff name	Votes / Points	Weight (100%)	Departmental Nominees
Department 1 (45 staff members): Total votes/points = 45 X 6 = 270)					
270	Sr Academic Staff	Sr Staff1	72	0.27	D1 Sr Nominee2
		Sr Staff2	27	0.10	
		Sr Staff3	36	0.13	
		Sr Staff4	45	0.17	D1SrNominee3
			

Total Dept Votes	Staff Group	Staff name	Votes / Points	Weight (100%)	Departmental Nominees	
		Sr Staff nSr		0.30	D1SrNominee1	
	Jr Academic Staff	Jr Staff 1	9	0.03		
		Jr Staff 2	45	0.17	D1JrNominee 2	
		Jr Staff 3	18	0.07		
		Jr Staff 4	99	0.37	D1JrNomine e1	
			
			
		Jr Staff nJr	27	0.10	D1JrNominee3	
	Admin & Technical Staff	Adm Staff 1	33	0.12	D1AdmNominee3	
		Adm Staff 2	49	0.18	D1AdmNominee2	
		Adm Staff 3	18	0.07		
		Adm Staff 4	87	0.32	D1AdmNominee1	
			
			
		JrStaff nAdmin	27	0.10		
	Department 2 (26 staff members): Total votes/points = 26 X 6 = 156)					
	156	Sr Academic Staff	Sr Staff1	28	0.18	D2SrNominee3
			Sr Staff2	17	0.11	
Sr Staff3			46	0.29	D2SrNominee1	
Sr Staff4			12	0.08		
...				...		
...				...		
Jr Staff nSr			18	0.12	D2SrNominee2	
Jr Academic Staff		Jr Staff 1	13	0.08	D2JrNominee3	
		Jr Staff 2	22	0.14	D2JrNominee1	
		Jr Staff 3	10	0.06		
		Jr Staff 4	7	0.04		
			
			
		Jr Staff nJr	16	0.10	D2JrNominee2	

Total Dept Votes	Staff Group	Staff name	Votes / Points	Weight (100%)	Departmental Nominees
	Admin & Technical Staff	Adm Staff 1	13	0.08	D2JrNominee3
		Adm Staff 2	22	0.14	D2JrNominee1
		Adm Staff 3	10	0.06	
		Adm Staff 4	7	0.04	
		
		
		AdmStaffAdm	16	0.10	D2JrNominee2
Department 3 (58 staff members): Total votes/points = 58 X 6 = 348)					
348	Sr Academic Staff	Sr Staff1	18	0.05	D3SrNominee3
		Sr Staff2	6	0.02	
		Sr Staff3	15	0.04	
		Sr Staff4	21	0.06	D3SrNominee2
		
		
		Sr Satff nSr	30	0.09	D3SrNominee1
	Jr Academic Staff	Jr Staff 1	6	0.02	
		Jr Satff 2	47	0.14	D3JrNominee2
		Jr Satff 3	78	0.22	D3JrNominee1
		Jr Satff 4	9	0.03	
		
		
		Jr Satff nJr	36	0.10	D3JrNominee3
	Admin & Technical Staff	Adm Staff 1	18	0.05	
		Adm Staff 2	87	0.25	D3AdminNominee2
		Adm Staff 3	129	0.37	D3AdminNominee1
		Adm Staff 4	27	0.08	
		
		
		Adm Staff nAdm	45	0.13	D3AdminNominee3

16.2. Voting for departmental best workers for all three groups

Appendix 2: Voting for departmental best workers for Senior Academic Staff (first group), Junior Academic Staff (second group) and Administration and Technical Staff (third group) based on the top three candidates nominated for each group.

Assumptions/Condition:

- In reference to eligibility criteria in section 4 (i) - (iv), all members of the department are eligible to vote and to be voted for if nominated.
- At least 75% of all members of staff in the department must participate in voting for the three nominated candidates.
- Staff members who are eligible voters may vote for best workers even if they did not participate in the nomination process.
- Each staff has 6 points to distribute to 3 candidates in order of ranking preferences: 1st choice =3 points; 2nd choice = 2points; 3rd choice = 1 point.
- All eligible voters must vote for ONE candidate.
- The denominator for computing weights is equal to number of voters (N) in a department.

Dept total votes	Staff Group	Staff name	Vote	Weight (100%)	Departmental Best worker	College Winners
Department 1: Votes = 45 staff members						
45	Senior Academic Staff	SrNominee1D1	26	0.58	SrWinnerD1	Sr winner
		SrNominee2D1	6	0.13		
		SrNominee3D1	13	0.29		
	Junior Academic Staff	JrNominee1D1	15	0.33		
		JrNominee2D1	19	0.42	JrWinnerD1	
		JrNominee3D1	11	0.24		

Dept total votes	Staff Group	Staff name	Vot e	eight (100%)	Departmenta l Best worker	College Winners
	Admin & Technic al Staff	AdmNominee1D 1	8	0.18		
		AdmNominee2D 1	22	0.49	AdmWinner D1	
		AdmNominee3D 1	15	0.33		
Department 2: Votes =26 staff members						
26	Senior Academi c Staff	SrNominee1D2	6	0.23		
		SrNominee2D2	6	0.23		
		SrNominee3D2	14	0.54	SrWinnerD2	
	Junior Academi c Staff	JrNominee1D2	3	0.12		
		JrNominee2D2	15	0.58	JrWinnerD2	Jr Winner
		JrNominee3D2	8	0.31		
	Admin & Technic al Staff	AdmNominee1D 2	14	0.31	AdmWinner D2	
		AdmNominee2D 2	5	0.11		
AdmNominee3D 2		7	0.16			
Department 3: Votes = 58 staff members						
58	Senior Academi c Staff	SrNominee1D3	26	0.45	SrWinnerD3	
		SrNominee2D3	13	0.22		
		SrNominee3D3	17	0.29		
	Junior Academi c Staff	JrNominee1D3	16	0.28		
		JrNominee2D3	13	0.22		
		JrNominee3D3	29	0.50	JrWinnerD3	
	Admin & Technic al Staff	AdmNominee1D 3	15	0.26		
		AdmNominee2D 3	10	0.17		

Dept total votes	Staff Group	Staff name	Vot e	eight (100%)	Departmenta l Best worker	College Winners
		AdmNominee3D 3	3 3	0.57	AdmWinner D3	Adm Winner

16.3. Nomination of candidates among administration and technical staff at the Unit level

Appendix 3: Nomination of candidates among administration and technical staff to be voted at the Unit (College/School/Institute) level instead of the departmental level

Assumptions:

- Total number of staff members in the college/school/directorate is 72 of whom the total number of admin and technical staff is 9.
- Staff nominate 3 candidates out of 9 administration and technical staff members.
- Each staff has 6 points to distribute to 3 candidates in order of ranking preferences: 1st choice = 3 points; 2nd choice = 2 points; 3rd choice = 1 point.
- All staff members nominate 3 candidates out of 9 in order of ranking preferences.

Total Points	Dept	Staff members	Points gained	Weight (100%)	Nominees
Department 3 (72 staff members): Total points = 72 X 6 = 432					
432		Staff 1	68	0.16	Nominee3
		Staff 2	36	0.08	
		Staff 3	77	0.18	Nominee2
		Staff 4	26	0.06	
		Staff 5	35	0.08	
		Staff 6	109	0.25	Nominee1
		Staff 7	38	0.09	
		Staff 8	25	0.06	
		Staff 9	17	0.04	

16.4. Voting for the Best Worker among Administration and Technical Staff at the Unit Level

Appendix 4: Voting for the Best Worker from among 3 nominated administration and technical staff when they are voted at the Unit (College/School/Institute) level instead of the departmental level.

Assumptions:

- Total number of staff members in the college/school/directorate is 72, of whom the total number of admin and technical staff is 9.
- Each staff has 6 points to distribute to 3 candidates in order of ranking preferences: 1st choice =3 points; 2nd choice = 2points; 3rd choice = 1 point.
- Each staff member vote by choosing 1 candidate out of 3 nominees.

Total Dept Votes	Staff members	Vot es	Weight (100%)	Best Worker	
No of voters = 72					
72	Nominee1	22	0.31		
	Nominee2	39	0.54	Winner	Best worker
	Nominee3	11	0.15		

16.5. Nomination of Candidates in the Administration Directorates

Appendix 5: Nomination of candidates among administrationon and technical staff to be voted in the administration directorates.

Assumptions:

- Total number of administrationon and technical staff members in the directorate 35.
- Staff nominate 3 candidates out of 35 administrationon and technical staff members.
- Each staff has 6 points to distribute to 3 candidates in order of ranking preferences: 1st choice =3 points; 2nd choice = 2points; 3rd choice = 1 point.
- All staff members nominate 3 candidates out of 35 in order of ranking preferences.

Total points	Staff members	Points gained	Weight (100%)	Nominees	
No. of participating staff members in the directorate= 35: Total points =35 X 6 = 210)					
210	Staff 1	34	0.16	Nominee3	Qualified
	Staff 2	18	0.09		
	Staff 3	39	0.19	Nominee2	Qualified
	Staff 4	13	0.06		
	Staff 5	16	0.08		
	Staff 6	51	0.24	Nominee1	Qualified
	Staff 7	19	0.09		
	Staff 8	13	0.06		
	Staff 9	7	0.03		

16.6. Voting for the Best Worker in the Administration Directorates

Appendix 6: Voting for the Best Worker from among 3 nominated administration and technical staff in administration directorates

Assumptions:

- Total number of staff members in the directorate is 35.
- Each staff has 6 points to distribute to 3 candidates in order of ranking preferences: 1st choice =3 points; 2nd choice = 2points; 3rd choice = 1 point.
- Each staff member vote by choosing 1 candidate out of 3 nominees.

Total points	Staff members	Votes	Weight (100%)	Best Worker	
Total No of voter = 35					
35	Nominee1	7	0.20		
	Nominee2	19	0.54	Winner	Best worker
	Nominee3	9	0.26		