

Kareeberg Municipality

Snr Managers: Midyear 2021/22
Performance Reviews Report
7 March 2022



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 2021/22 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 2022 and had a developmental focus.

The performance of the following managers were 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 W Links; Portfolio councillor for Corporate Services; and
- ◆ Mr A van Schalkwyk; acting Municipal Manager;

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

- ◆ The Councillor was the secondary evaluator of the performance of the senior managers and the primary evaluator of Mr van Schalkwyk.
- ◆ The acting Municipal Manager was the primary evaluator of the performance of the senior managers.

EVALUATION PROCESS

The evaluation forms with the SDBIP Midyear 2021/22 results and the CCR scores were distributed to the members of the committee beforehand. Before the commencement of the evaluations session, the panel was briefed with the legislative senior manager performance agreement and evaluation processes and agreed on the process that will be followed.

As part of the approach to this evaluation, the evaluation focused on the actual work delivered in terms of Annexure A of the performance agreement for the period ending December 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 and with mutual agreement of the primary and secondary evaluators. As this was a midyear evaluation, it had a developmental focus, most of the scores given for the operational KPI part of the agreement was mostly a “3”:

The scoring was based on the following rating scale for operational KPI’s:

| Rating | Level | Description |
|--------|--|--|
| 5 | Outstanding Performance | 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 | Performed significantly above expectations | 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 | Fully effective | 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 | Performance not fully effective | 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 | Unacceptable performance | 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 | Poor | 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 | Basic | Applies basic concepts, methods, and understanding of local government operations, but requires supervision and development intervention. |
| 3 | Competent | Develops and applies more progressive concepts, methods and understanding. Plans and guides the work of others and executes progressive analysis. |
| 4 | Advanced | Develops and applies complex concepts, methods and understanding. Effectively directs and leads a group and executes in-depth analysis. |
| 5 | Superior | 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:

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

ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

The outcome of the final Performance Assessments is documented on the attached summary of the score sheets. 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: 53.36%
- ◆ Mr C van Zyl: Final Score: 68%.
- ◆ Mr A van Schalkwyk: Final Score: 68%

CONCLUSION

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