

**Performance Reviews**

**Report**

**Senior Managers**

**30 September 2021**

**Final 2020/21**



**Kareeberg  
Municipality**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**INTRODUCTION ..... 3**

**ASSESSMENT PANEL..... 3**

**EVALUATION PROCESS ..... 3**

**ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES ..... 5**

**CONCLUSION ..... 5**

## 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 formally reviewed twice per annum. 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 for the 1<sup>st</sup> semester of the 2020/21 financial year were done on 18 March 2021.

After the Adjustments budget in February 2021, the Top Layer SDBIP was adjusted and therefore the Annexure A's of the applicable directors had to be adjusted accordingly.

The evaluations reported on in this report focussed on the final-year performance of the senior management for the 2020/21 financial year. The evaluations focussed on the actual work delivered in terms of the Annexure A of the performance agreement for the financial year ending 30 June 2021.

The performance of the following managers was evaluated:

- ◆ Mr W de Buin – CFO;
- ◆ Mr C van Zyl – Head Corporate Services; and
- ◆ Mr A van Schalkwyk – Chief Operational Manager.

## ASSESSMENT PANEL

For purposes of evaluating the performance of the employees, an evaluation panel constituted of the following persons was established:–

- ◆ Cllr G Saal;
- ◆ Mr Z Mjandana; acting Municipal Manager;
- ◆ Mr F Roodman; Chairperson of the Audit Committee; and
- ◆ Mr I Visser; Municipal Manager of Emthanjeni Municipality.

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

- ◆ The acting Municipal Manager was the secondary evaluator of the performance of the senior managers.
- ◆ The Councillor was the secondary evaluator of the performance of the senior managers.
- ◆ The Municipal Manager from Emthanjeni Municipality observed the evaluation process and added value with regard to benchmarking from own experiences.
- ◆ The Chairperson 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.

## EVALUATION PROCESS

The evaluation forms with the SDBIP Final 2020/21 results and the CCR scores as were determined during the midyear evaluation were distributed to the members of the committee beforehand. Each employee prepared himself for

evaluation purposes. Before the commencement of the evaluation sessions, the panel was briefed with the legislative senior manager performance agreement and evaluation processes and agreed on the process that will be followed.

During the evaluation for each employee:

- ◆ The members and the employee were welcomed and the attendance of the panel members confirmed.
- ◆ As part of the approach to this evaluation, it was explained that the evaluation will focus on the actual work delivered in terms of Annexure A of the performance agreement for the period ending June 2021. The content and weighting of these indicators (KPI's) and the respective key performance areas (KPA) are documented in the Annexure A of each agreement.
- ◆ The scoring was done in terms of evidence provided and in the absence of the senior manager.
- ◆ The scoring was based on the following rating scale for operational KPI's:

Rating	Level	Description
5	<b><i>Outstanding Performance</i></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.
4	<b><i>Performed significantly above expectations</i></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><i>Fully effective</i></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><i>Performance not fully effective</i></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><i>Unacceptable performance</i></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 scoring was based on the following rating scale for the CCR's:

Rating	Level	Description
1	<b>Poor</b>	Do not apply the basic concepts and methods to proof a basic understanding of local government operations and requires extensive supervision and development interventions.
2	<b>Basic</b>	Applies basic concepts, methods, and understanding of local government operations, but requires supervision and development intervention.
3	<b>Competent</b>	Develops and applies more progressive concepts, methods and understanding. Plans and guides the work of others and executes progressive analysis.
4	<b>Advanced</b>	Develops and applies complex concepts, methods and understanding. Effectively directs and leads a group and executes in-depth analysis.
5	<b>Superior</b>	Has a comprehensive understanding of local government operations, critical in strategic shaping strategic direction and change, develops and applies comprehensive concepts and methods.

- ◆ The approach was as follows:
  - ∞ Feedback on performance by the employee per KPI.

- ∞ Questions from the panel.
- ∞ Discussion by the panel members.
- ∞ Scoring determined by the members of the panel.

### ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

The final scores were derived from the score allocated to each key performance, multiplied by the weight allocated to the respective indicator / group of indicators. All the final scores for each KPI and CCR were added together and the total represents the overall rating and the outcome of the performance appraisal.

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

- ◆ Mr W de Bruin: Final Score: **75.00%**. According to paragraph 11.3 of the signed performance agreement, a performance bonus of **11%** of total package should be paid once the annual report for 2020/21 has been tabled and adopted, as prescribed by section 8 (1) of Regulation 805.
- ◆ Mr C van Zyl: Final Score: **80.40%**. According to paragraph 11.3 of the signed performance agreement, a performance bonus of **14%** of total package should be paid once the annual report for 2020/21 has been tabled and adopted, as prescribed by section 8 (1) of Regulation 805.
- ◆ Mr A van Schalkwyk: Final Score: **86.40%**. According to paragraph 11.3 of the signed performance agreement, a performance bonus of **14%** of total package should be paid once the annual report for 2020/21 has been tabled and adopted, as prescribed by section 8 (1) of Regulation 805.

### CONCLUSION

- ◆ The senior managers must ensure that sufficient POE is available for audit purposes of all the actual results.

\*\*\*\*\*