

EPHRAIM MOGALE

LOCAL MUNICIPALITY

☎ 111
MARBLE HALL
0450
☎ 013-261 8400
☎ 013-261 2985



Leeuwfontein Office (013) 266 7025
Elandskraal Office (013) 268 0006
Zamenkomst Office (013)973 9160
Traffic Section (013) 261 8400

EXTRACTS FROM THE MINUTES OF THE 1ST SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING OF
EPHRAIM MOGALE LOCAL MUNICIPALITY HELD ON MONDAY THE 31ST AUGUST 2015

FILE/S: 4/2/5

SC1/02/2015 MIDYEAR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT REPORT OF MANAGERS
DIRECTLY REPORTING TO THE MUNICIPAL MANAGER

4/2/5

RESOLVED

1. That Council takes note of the report.
2. That members of the panel be listed in the report.
3. That the information be presented in an elaborative way and must be convincing as it is economical.
4. That legislation guiding the composition of the panel members be clearly quoted and the composition be modified where necessary.
5. That the Municipal Manager implements the decision accordingly

L.B. MODISHA
SPEAKER

31 AUGUST 2015

FINALISATION BY:

Referred to *M.M.'s office.*by Municipal Manager

.....
M.M. Mathebela
Municipal Manager

31/08/2015.
.....
Date Received

EPHRAIM MOGALE LOCAL MUNICIPALITY

**2014/2015 MID YEAR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR MANAGERS
DIRECTLY ACCOUNTABLE TO MUNICIPAL MANAGER**

1. Introduction

The report intends to present the results of 2014/2015 mid-year performance assessment, which took place on the 30th July 2015 and 14th August 2015 for Director Corporate Services, Infrastructure, CFO and Community Services. It also outlines the processes, procedure followed, and make final recommendations.

The Municipality consists of six directorates which are constituted as follows:

1. Municipal Manager
 2. Finance
 3. Infrastructure Services
 4. Planning and Economic Development
 5. Corporate Services
 6. Community Services
7. However four (4) Directors participated in the reviews: Director Corporate Services, Infrastructure Services, CFO and Community Services. The Municipal Manager and Director Planning and Economic Development did not participate in the reviews due to the following reasons:

No	DIRECTORATE	REASONS	DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR
1.	Municipal Manager	The post was vacant and occupied by the Acting Municipal Manager and was filled by a new incumbent at the time of assessments.	N.S Mashamba
2.	Planning and Economic Planning	The post was vacant and occupied by an acting Director and her period expired, and was vacant at the time of assessments	K.S Shongwe

2. BACKGROUND

In terms of Local Government: Municipal planning and performance management regulations, 2001, the municipality adopted the Performance Management Framework wherein it makes provision for the municipality to develop mechanism, systems and processes for monitoring.

The municipality is mandated, in terms of sec (20), to evaluate and assess the performance of the Municipal Manager and managers directly reporting to the Municipal Manager, and it further outlines that the performance system must :

- a) Provide for reporting to the municipal council at least twice a year
- b) Be designed in a manner that enables the municipality to detect early indications of under-performance and
- c) Provide for corrective measures where under-performance has been identified.

Section 28 (1) of Local Government: Municipal performance regulations for municipal managers and managers directly accountable to municipal managers (2006) further states that: the performance of the employee in relation to his or her performance agreement must be reviewed quarterly with the understanding that the first and third quarter may be verbal if performance is satisfactory.

The 2014/2015 mid-year assessment report has been compiled in terms of the above section and the overall performance of the institution as at 31 December 2014 is as follows:

num ber	Key area	performance	Total number of KPIs	number of KPI's achieved	number of KPI's not achieved	KPI's not applicable for the quarter	performance percentage per KPA for 2013/2014
1	Spatial Rationale		2	2	0	0	100%
2	Municipal transformation and institutional development		41	24	5	2	58.53%
3	Local economic development		2	0	0	0	0%
4	Basic service delivery and Infrastructure development		41	20	13	15	48.78%
5	Financial viability and management		8	5	3	2	62.5%
6	Good governance and public participation		19	15	1	3	78.94%
	TOTAL		113	66	22	32	58.4%

Notification of the participants to the process

Participants were notified of the process in advance;

3. Attendance of the invited panel members and related challenges

All invited panel members attended the reviews.

4. Member orientation to the process

Both the Directors to be assessed and the panel members were taken through the process before the actual assessment, and the session was formal and open for discussions and engagements

6. Documents used in the process for reference

The following documents were utilized in the process for reference:

- 2014/2015 approved SDBIP.
- Performance agreements for the financial year 2014/2015
- Portfolio of Evidence as submitted by Directors.
- Municipal Performance Regulations for municipal managers directly accountable to municipal manager 2006
- Performance Management System Framework

7. Performance Appraisal

Candidates were assessed on their performance on the six key performance Areas (KPA) and core competencies (CCR) as outlined in item 27 (4)(a) of the municipal performance regulations (2006). KPAs, KPI and Core competencies were weighted against which scores were determined. Candidates scored themselves and the panel scored them as they presented and provided evidence. Final score was then agreed upon between the panel and the candidate. KPA weighted 80% and Core Competency Requirements weighted 20% of the overall score of the candidates were then given rating as per assessment rating calculator.

Scoring system

The following table below is the scores that range from 5-1 with clear definition as outlined in the performance Regulation 2001:

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL OF KPAs AND CCRs				
LEVEL	DESCRIPTION	RATING	ASSESSMENT SCORE	PERFORMANCE BONUS RATIOS
Level 5: Outstanding Performance	Performance far exceeds the standard expected for the job in all areas of the manager. The manager has achieved exceptional results against all performance criteria and indicators specified in the Performance Plan and maintained this in all areas of responsibility throughout the year.	5	75 – 100	Maximum bonus allowed into. Regulations are between 10% and 14% of person's inclusive annual remuneration package. The % are as follows: 75 – 76% = 10% 77 – 78% =11% 79 – 80% =12% 81 – 84% =13% 85 – 100% =14%

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL OF KPAs AND CCRs

LEVEL	DESCRIPTION	RATING	ASSESSMENT SCORE	PERFORMANCE BONUS RATIOS
Level 4: Performance significantly above expectations	Performance is significantly higher than the standard expected for the job in all areas. The manager has achieved above fully effective results against more than half of the performance criteria and indicators specified in the Performance Plan and fully achieved all others throughout the year.	4	65 – 74	Maximum bonus allowed into. Regulations are between 5% and 9% of person's inclusive annual remuneration package. The % are as follows: 65 – 66% = 5% 67 – 68% = 6% 69 – 70% = 7% 71%- 72% = 8% 73% – 74% = 9%
Level 3: Fully effective	Performance fully meets the standard expected for the job in all areas. The manager has achieved effective results against all significant performance criteria and indicators specified in the Performance Plan and may have achieved results significantly above expectations in one or two less significant areas throughout the year.	3	51 – 64	No bonus

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL OF KPAs AND CCRs				
LEVEL	DESCRIPTION	RATING	ASSESSMENT SCORE	PERFORMANCE BONUS RATIOS
Level 2: Performance not fully satisfactory	Performance is below the standard required for the job in key areas. The manager has achieved adequate results against many key performance criteria and indicators specified in the Performance Plan but did not fully achieved adequate results against others during the course of the year. Improvement in these areas is necessary to bring performance up to the standard expected.	2	31 – 50	No bonus
Level 1: Unacceptable performance	Performance does not meet the standard required for the job. The manager has not met one or more fundamental requirements and/or is achieving results that are well below the performance criteria and indicators in a number of significant areas of responsibility. The manager has failed to demonstrate the commitment or ability to bring performance up to the level expected despite efforts to encourage improvement.	1	Less than 30	No bonus


Summary of actual performance

no	Name of the Director	Financial Year	KPAs scores	CCR Scores	Overall scores	Performance Ratings
1.	Khabo Ramosibi	2014/15	30	22	52	3
2.	Mahubila Radingwana	2014/15	44	20	64	3
3.	Makoko Lekola	2014/15	46	18	64	3
4.	Mathebela Monica	2014/15	39	25	64	3

CONCLUSION

The institutional performance based on the above Municipal key performance areas and individual scores is at 58.4 % which can be classified at performance level two (performance not fully satisfactory) in terms of the Municipal Performance regulation.

The targets will have to be carried over to the next quarter



.....
MATHEBELA M.M.
MUNICIPAL MANAGER