

MIDYEAR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF MUNICIPAL MANAGER FOR THE 2020/21 FINANCIAL YEAR

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 evaluation reported on in this report focussed on the midyear performance of the **Municipal Manager** for the 2020/21 financial year as he is currently the only senior manager appointed. 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 2021 and had a developmental focus.

The evaluation was done on 11 February 2021.

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

- ≈ Cllr N Qunta, Executive Mayor;
- ≈ Cllr F Kamfer;
- ≈ Mr D Frantz, IDP & Performance Management Coordinator.

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

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

The evaluation form with the SDBIP Midyear 2020/21 results was distributed beforehand.

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 2020. The content and weighting of these indicators (KPI's) and the respective key performance areas (KPA) are documented in the Annexure A of the 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.

Cederberg Municipality: Midyear 2018/19 Performance Reviews report

Rating	Level	Description
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 outcome of the performance assessment is documented on the attached score sheet. 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 of Mr H Slimmert is 66.61%.
