**RT/RA Selection SOP**

2018-05-03

Note: This procedure will be carried out in March/April each year. The timing should be such that the House Association (HA) election result is known by the time RT/RA candidate interview starts. This allows unelected HA candidates to be considered for RA positions.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Tasks** | **Steps and Descriptions** | **Person in charge**  |
| Announcement(Mid March) | * Send an email to all students, informing them to submit resume/CV by email if they like to apply for RT/RA
* Deadline is one week from announcement
* In the email, explain the selection criteria:
	+ Peer evaluation by current RT/RA
	+ Score by Selection Committee
* Also provide a link to this SOP
 | College Office |
| Peer evaluation (Soon after application deadline) | * Develop a Google form with
	+ student ID and name of the evaluator
	+ one entry for each current RT/RA (the form should not indicate which RT/RA applies for next year's position)
	+ one entry for each other RA applicant
* Conduct a peer evaluation session as follows:
	+ Each current RT/RA gives a 2-minute summary of his/her work in the past academic year
	+ After that, each current RT/RA scores all entries in the form (0 to 5, 0 being rejected with remarks, 5 being best. See scoring criteria below).
	+ If a RT/RA applicant is not known by an evaluator, leave it blank
	+ Stop the Google form from accepting new entries afterwards
 | RF |
| Student survey (December and/or March) | * Develop a Google form with
	+ student ID and name of the evaluator
	+ input field for name of RT/RA
	+ input field for a score (1 to 5, 5 being best)
	+ suggestions for RT/RA
* Collect inputs from
	+ Year 1 students in CPED classes (along with course evaluation)
	+ Other students by email announcement
* Results from the survey are used in
	+ Selection of outstanding RT/RAs
	+ Scoring by Selection committee
 | RF |
| Interview (Soon after application deadline) | * Interview all new and returning RT/RA candidates.
* Each Committee member scores each candidate (see scoring criteria below)
 | Selection committee |
| Finalists selection | * Sets a target ratio for male-female and local-nonlocal students
* Sets a nominal weight distribution:
	+ Peer evaluation: 50%
	+ Committee member: 50% divided by the number of members
* Calculate the combined score for each candidate based on the weight distribution
* Screen the candidates by gender and by locality
* Perform a sensitivity analysis by varying the weight distribution. If one or more candidates enter or leave the finalist group as a result of weight changes, consider a more focus evaluation for the candidates (e.g. student survey, floor management review, secondary interview)
* Arrive at a finalist group
 | Selection committee |
| Result dissemination | * Notify all finalists by email
* Notify those not selected as finalists. Include the Masked score table (see below).
* At the request of a candidate, College Office may let the candidate know his/her candidate number in the masked table
 | College Office |
| Contract signing | * Finalists are required to sign a contract, which includes the dates of RT/RA training. The appointment is contingent upon completion of the training
* Finalists are asked to fill in some basic information for publishing on CKPC's website
* Finalists are asked to review this SOP
 | College Office |

**Scoring criteria:**

* + For existing RT/RA candidates
		- Floor management, including pantry management
		- Floor communication and activity organization
		- Results from student surveys
		- Satisfactory completion of assigned tasks (e.g. CPED, Physical Education activities, liaison with exchange and international students, resolution of complex issues)
		- Attendance of regular meetings
	+ For both new and existing RT/RA candidates
		- Teamwork and conflict resolution
		- Personal communication skills
		- Responsibility and being punctual
	+ For new RT/RA candidates
		- Potential compared to existing RT/RA's
		- Participation and contribution to college life
		- Enthusiasm for the position

**Weight distribution for sensitivity analysis**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Peer evaluation | Selection committee\* |
| Scenario A | 40% | 60% |
| Scenario B | 50% | 50% |
| Scenario C | 60% | 40% |

\* The percentage is equally distributed among the Selection Committee members

**Masked score table examples**

* + The shaded candidates are not selected
	+ The columns A, B, C correspond to the three scenarios in the sensitivity analysis

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Female Candidates** | **(A)** | **(B)** | **( C)** |
| Candidate 14 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Candidate 9 | 4.3 | 3.8 | 4.4 |
| Candidate 6 | 3.6 | 3.4 | 3.6 |
| Candidate 2 | 3.6 | 3.4 | 3.6 |
| Candidate 12 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 2.7 |
| Candidate 23 | 2.3 | 1.8 | 2.2 |
| Candidate 1 | 1.9 | 2.7 | 2.1 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Male Candidates** | **(A)** | **(B)** | **( C)** |
| Candidate 13 | 5.0 | 4.9 | 5.0 |
| Candidate 8 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 4.5 |
| Candidate 7 | 3.2 | 3.5 | 3.3 |
| Candidate 11 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
| Candidate 5 | 1.7 | 2.2 | 2.0 |