



## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>ASSESSMENT PANEL .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>PERFORMANCE PROCESS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>5</b>

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Municipal Systems Act, 2000 (Act 32 of 2000) prescribes that the municipality must enter into a performance based agreement with all s56 and s57-employees and that performance agreements must be reviewed annually. The performance agreements therefore establish the performance relationship between the employer and the employee and require that the performance of the employee needs to be evaluated at least twice per annum.

The evaluations reported on in this report focussed on the midyear performance of the senior management for the 2014/15 financial year. It focussed on the actual work delivered in terms of the Annexure A of the performance agreement for first semester (July to December) of the financial year ending 30 June 2015 and had a developmental focus.

The performance of the following managers were evaluated:

- ∂ Municipal Manager
- ∂ Director Corporate Services
- ∂ Director Financial Services
- ∂ Director Technical Services

## **ASSESSMENT PANEL**

For purposes of evaluating the performance of the employees, an evaluation panel constituted of the following persons was established in terms of the performance agreement and the applicable persons attended the sessions as was necessary for the different persons to be evaluated:–

- ∂ Cllr N Hermans, Mayor;
- ∂ Cllr E Humphries, Portfolio Chairperson for Financial Services;
- ∂ Cllr B Mdala, Portfolio Chairperson for Technical Services;
- ∂ Cllr S Mlenzana, Portfolio Chairperson for Corporate Services;
- ∂ Mr A Mpela, Municipal manager
- ∂ Mr M Puley, Member of the Audit committee;
- ∂ Mr I Visser, Municipal Manager of Emthanjeni Municipality;

The role of the panel members can be summarised as follows:

- ∂ The municipal manager was the primary evaluator of the performance of the directors.
- ∂ The Mayor was the primary evaluator of the performance of the Municipal Manager.
- ∂ The portfolio councillors were the secondary evaluators of the performance of the directors.

- ∂ The Municipal Manager from Umsobomvu Municipality observed the evaluation process and added value with regard to benchmarking from own experiences.
- ∂ The member of the Audit Committee will report to the Committee and the Council on the objectivity and the fairness of the process and the evaluations done.

## PERFORMANCE PROCESS

The section regarding the CCR part of the Annexure A of the performance agreements was changed to competencies in terms of R21 of January 2014. Directors must be evaluated on all competencies on an equal basis and the scoring must be based on Annexure B of the agreement which prescribe the evaluation criteria for each of the twelve competencies. To cater for this comprehensive items, the CCR evaluation sheets of each director were distributed to the directors for the following:

- To answer all the prescribed questions relating to each of the competencies after which the document calculated the score for each based on a “yes” or “no” answer.
- After this self-evaluation the documents were submitted to the municipal manager for his overview and agreement.

The SDBIP midyear 2014/15 results and the evaluation forms with the completed CCR scores were distributed to the members of the committee. Each employee prepared himself for evaluation purposes. The panel was briefed and updated with the actual evaluation process that was followed with regard to the CCR part and that will be followed for the KPI part before the commencement of the evaluations sessions.

During the evaluation for each employee:

- ∂ The Municipal Manager welcomed the members and the employee and explained the purpose of the evaluation and the process.
- ∂ The panel was introduced and the role of panel members confirmed.
- ∂ It was explained that the evaluation will have a developmental focus and will mostly focus on KPI's where targets were not met or lagging behind at the end of December 2014 as indicated in the SDBIP report. It provided the opportunity to identify areas where challenges are experienced and to discuss corrective measures that can be implemented to ensure performance before the end of the financial year.
- ∂ Scoring was done in terms of evidence provided and with mutual agreement of all parties present. The scoring was based on the following rating scale. As this was 'n midyear evaluation, the scores given for the KPI part of the agreement was overall a “3”:

Rating	Level	Description
5	<b>Outstanding Performance</b>	Performance far exceeds the standard expected of an employee at this level. The appraisal indicates that the Employee has achieved above fully effective results against all performance criteria and indicators as specified in the PA and Performance plan and maintained this in all areas of responsibility throughout the year.

## Umsobomvu Municipality: Midyear 2014/15 Performance Reviews report

4	<b>Performed significantly above expectations</b>	Performance is significantly higher than the standard expected in the job. The appraisal indicates that the Employee has achieved above fully effective results against more than half of the performance criteria and indicators and fully achieved all others throughout the year.
3	<b>Fully effective</b>	Performance fully meets the standards expected in all areas of the job. The appraisal indicates that the Employee has fully achieved effective results against all significant performance criteria and indicators as specified in the PA and Performance Plan.
2	<b>Performance not fully effective</b>	Performance is below the standard required for the job in key areas. Performance meets some of the standards expected for the job. The review/assessment indicates that the employee has achieved below fully effective results against more than half the key performance criteria and indicators as specified in the PA and Performance Plan.
1	<b>Unacceptable performance</b>	Performance does not meet the standard expected for the job. The review/assessment indicates that they employee has achieved below fully effective results against almost all of the performance criteria and indicators as specified in the PA and Performance Plan. The employee has failed to demonstrate the commitment or ability to bring performance up to the level expected in the job despite management efforts to encourage improvement.

- ∂ The committee members were asked to overview the evaluation of the CCR's that was done beforehand as mentioned above and asked to indicate if they were in agreement.
- ∂ The approach can be summarised as follows:
  - Feedback on performance by the employee per KPI with relevant POE.
  - Questions from the panel
  - Discussion by the panel members

### ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

The outcome of the final Performance Assessments is documented on the attached score sheets. The final scores were derived from the score allocated to each key performance indicator by the primary assessor being the Municipal Manager for the other senior managers, multiplied by the weight allocated to the respective indicator / group of indicators.

The feedback for each of the employees evaluated is as indicated in the attached score sheets for the following employees:

- ∂ Mr T. Mosompha: Overall Score: **68%**
- ∂ Mr B Kapp: Overall Score: **68%**
- ∂ Mr D Visagie: Overall Score: **68%**
- ∂ Mr A Mpela: **68%**

### CONCLUSION

1. The individuals must ensure that sufficient POE is available for audit purposes of all the actual results.

2. The Mayor requested that the chairperson of the MPAC also be included as part of the evaluation committee as the committee has an important performance oversight role to play.
3. Due to changed circumstances and the availability of funding, a few targets and KPI's on the top layer SDBIP will need to be adjusted and a document to this extent will be submitted to council for approval.
4. In terms of section 34(3) of regulation GNR 805 of 1 August 2006 a copy of the performance assessment results of the municipal manager must be submitted to the MEC responsible for local government in the relevant province as well as the national minister responsible for local government, within fourteen (14) days after the conclusion of the assessment.

\*\*\*\*\*