# UMSOBOMVU MUNICIPALITY

## Snr Managers Midyear 2024/25 4 March 2025

# 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 2024/25 financial year. It focussed on the actual work delivered in terms of the Annexure A's of the performance agreements for first semester (July to December) of the financial year ending 30 June 2025.

The performance of the following managers were evaluated:

- Mr T Msengana; Municipal Manager;
- Mrs S Felix, Snr Manager Corporate Services; and
- Mr S James, Snr Manager Community Services.

## ASSESSMENT PANEL

For purposes of evaluating the performance of the employees, an evaluation panel constituted of the following persons was established and the applicable persons attended the sessions as was necessary for the different persons to be evaluated:–

- Cllr M Toto, Executive Mayor and Portfolio Councillor for Finance;
- Cllr L Zakhe, Portfolio Councillor for Community Services;
- Cllr L Tyindyi, Portfolio Councillor for Corporate Services; and
- Mr T Msengana, Municipal Manager.

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

- The Mayor was the primary evaluator of the performance of the Municipal Manager.
- The Municipal Manager was the primary evaluator of the performance of the senior managers.
- The portfolio councillors were the secondary evaluators of the performance of the senior managers.

## EVALUATION PROCESS

The evaluation forms with the SDBIP Midyear 2024/25 results and the CCR scores as were determined during the final evaluation for 2023/24 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.

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 2024. 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 is 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 is 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:
  - Feedback on performance by the employee per applicable KPI for the period.
  - Questions from the panel
  - Discussion by the panel members
  - Scoring determined by mutual agreement

## ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

The outcome of the 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 T Msengana: 67.67%
- Mrs S Felix: 65.67%
- Mr S James: 64.33%

## CONCLUSION

- In terms of section 34(3) of regulation GNR 805 of 1 August 2006 a copy of the performance assessment results of the municipal manager must be submitted to the MEC responsible for local government in the relevant province as well as the national minister responsible for local government, within fourteen (14) days after the conclusion of the assessment.

**********