

# Cederberg Municipality

Performance Reviews Report  
Senior Managers  
Midyear 2018/19  
27 February 2019



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**INTRODUCTION ..... 3**

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

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

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

**CONCLUSION ..... 5**

## Cederberg Municipality: Midyear 2018/19 Performance Reviews report

### 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 2018/19 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 2019 and had a developmental focus.

The performance of the following managers were evaluated:

- ≈ Mr L Volschenk; Municipal Manager;
- ≈ Mr R Bent; Director Integrated Development Services; and
- ≈ Mr E Alfred; Chief Financial Officer.

### ASSESSMENT PANEL

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

- ≈ Cllr W Farmer, Executive Mayor and Portfolio Councillor for Financial Services;
- ≈ Mr L Volschenk; Municipal Manager;
- ≈ Mr D Frantz, IDP & Performance Management Coordinator.

Cllr J Meyer, Portfolio Councillor for Integrated Development Services could unfortunately not attend but delegated his responsibility to the Executive Mayor.

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

- ≈ The Municipal Manager was the primary evaluator of the performance of the managers.
- ≈ The Mayor was the primary evaluator of the performance of the Municipal Manager and the secondary evaluator of the performance of the directors.
- ≈ The IDP and Performance Management Coordinator is responsible for performance management in the municipality and provided clarity and support as were needed.

### EVALUATION PROCESS

The evaluation forms with the SDBIP Midyear 2018/19 results and the CCR scores, as well as self-evaluations were distributed to the members of the committee beforehand. Each employee prepared himself for evaluation purposes. Before the commencement of the evaluations sessions, the panel was briefed with the legislative senior manager performance agreement and evaluation processes and agreed on the process that will be followed.

## Cederberg Municipality: Midyear 2018/19 Performance Reviews report

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 December 2018. 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 with mutual agreement of all parties present. As this was a midyear evaluation that 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.

## Cederberg Municipality: Midyear 2018/19 Performance Reviews report

### ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

The outcomes of the performance assessments are documented on the attached score sheets. The final scores were derived from the score allocated to each key performance indicator multiplied by the weight allocated to the respective indicator for the applicable period. The final score for each KPI and CCR are added together and the total represents the overall rating and the outcome of the performance appraisal. As different total weights are applicable depending on the period evaluated, the final total score is converted back to 80% for operational KPI's and 20% for CCR's.

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

≈ Mr L Volschenk: **68.00%**

≈ Mr R Bent: **66.00%**:

≈ Mr E Alfred: **66.33%**:

### CONCLUSION

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

\*\*\*\*\*