

**UITTREKSEL UIT:**

**HANTAM MUNISIPALITEIT**

**NOTULE VAN 'N RAADSVERGADERING GEHOU OP WOENSDAG 30  
OKTOBER 2019 OM 10H00 IN DIE RAADSAAL, KOMMANDO KANTORE,  
DORPSTRAAT,CALVINIA**

**TEENWOORDIG**

Rdl. R.N. Swartz (Burgemeester)  
Rdl. K. Alexander  
Rdl. A.J.E. Claassen  
Rdl. H. De Wee  
Rdl. G.Gous  
Rdl. Rdl. J.H.N. Klaaste  
Rdl. J.E. Steenkamp  
Rdl. F.J. Sterkse

**AFWESIG MET VERSKONING**

Rdl. H.C. Steenkamp (Skriftelike Verskoning)

Verskoning word deur die Voorsitter aanvaar.

**AMPTENARE**

Mnr. J.I. Swartz	Munisipale Bestuurder
Mnr. J.H. Langner	Bestuurder: Begroting & Tesourie
Mnr. R. Van Wyk	Afdelingshoof: Tegnies
Me. S. Felix	Hoof: IDP/LED
Me. M. Jooste	Hoof: Interne Ouditeur
Me. E. De Wet	Afdelingshoof: Korporatiewe Dienste
Me. J.C. Louw	Admin Beampte: Komitees

**AFWESIG MET VERSKONING**

Me. L.C. Claasen (Skriftelike Verskoning)

Verskoning word deur die Voorsitter aanvaar.

Mnr. W.C. Jonker (Geen Verskoning)  
Mnr. J.R. Van Wyk (Geen Verskoning)

Verskonings word nie deur die Voorsitter aanvaar nie.

**R06/10-19 FINALE PRESTASIE EVALUERINGS VAN ARTIKEL 54A EN 56  
SENIOR BESTUURDERS VIR FINANSIËLE JAAR 2018/2019**

**BESLUIT:**

1. Dat die Raad kennis neem van die prestasie van die artikel 54A en 56 senior bestuurders soos geëvalueer volgens die finale prestasie evalueringsverslag vir die 2018/2019 finansiële jaar.
2. Dat die jaarlikse prestasie bonusse uitbetaal word aan senior bestuurders nadat die jaarverslag aan die Raad voorgelê is.

Voorstel: Rdl. F.J. Sterkse

Sekondant: Rdl. K. Alexander

# HANTAM MUNICIPALITY

**Snr  
Managers  
Final 2018/19  
9 Oct 2019**

**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 formally reviewed twice per annum. 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 for the 1st semester of the 2018/19 financial year were done on 19 March 2019.

With the Adjustments budget in February 2019, the Top Layer SDBIP was adjusted and therefore the Annexure A's of the applicable directors had to be adjusted accordingly.

The evaluations reported on in this report focussed on the final-year performance of the senior management for the 2018/19 financial year. The evaluations focussed on the actual work delivered in terms of the Annexure A of the performance agreement for the financial year ending 30 June 2019.

The performance of the following managers were evaluated:

- ∞ Mr R van Wyk - Senior Manager: Technical and Community Services;
- ∞ Mr W Jonker - Senior Manager: Finance and Corporate Services; and
- ∞ Mr J Swartz – Municipal Manager

### **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 R Swartz, Mayor and responsible for Financial Services;
- ∞ Cllr K Alexander, Portfolio Councillor for Corporate Services;
- ∞ Cllr H de Wee Portfolio Councillor for Technical Services;
- ∞ Cllr G Gous , Portfolio Councillor for community Services;
- ∞ Mr J Swartz, Municipal Manager;
- ∞ Mr A Titus, Chairperson of the Audit committee; and
- ∞ Mr R Beukes, Municipal Manager of Kamiesberg Municipality.

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

- ∞ The Municipal Manager were the primary evaluator of the performance of the senior managers.
- ∞ The Executive Mayor was primary evaluator of the performance of the Municipal Manager.
- ∞ The Portfolio Councillors was the secondary evaluator of the performance of the senior managers.
- ∞ The Chairperson of the Audit Committee will report to the Committee and the Council on the objectivity and the fairness of the process and the evaluations done.
- ∞ The Municipal Manager from Kamiesberg Municipality observed the evaluation process and added value with regard to benchmarking from own experiences.

### **EVALUATION PROCESS**

The evaluation forms with the final 2018/19 SDBIP results and the CCR scores as were determined during the midyear evaluation 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 June 2019. 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.
- ∞ The scoring was based on the following rating scale for operational KPI's:

Rating	Level	Description
5	<b><i>Outstanding Performance</i></b>	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	<b><i>Performed significantly</i></b>	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

## Hantam Municipality: Final 2018/19 Performance Reviews Report

Rating	Level	Description
	<b><i>above expectations</i></b>	half of the performance criteria and indicators and fully achieved all others throughout the year.
<b>3</b>	<b><i>Fully effective</i></b>	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.
<b>2</b>	<b><i>Performance not fully effective</i></b>	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.
<b>1</b>	<b><i>Unacceptable performance</i></b>	Performance does not meet the standard expected for the job. The review/assessment indicates that the 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
<b>1</b>	<b>Poor</b>	Do not apply the basic concepts and methods to proof a basic understanding of local government operations and requires extensive supervision and development interventions.
<b>2</b>	<b>Basic</b>	Applies basic concepts, methods, and understanding of local government operations, but requires supervision and development intervention.
<b>3</b>	<b>Competent</b>	Develops and applies more progressive concepts, methods and understanding. Plans and guides the work of others and executes progressive analysis.
<b>4</b>	<b>Advanced</b>	Develops and applies complex concepts, methods and understanding. Effectively directs and leads a group and executes in-depth analysis.
<b>5</b>	<b>Superior</b>	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 KPI.
- Questions from the panel
- Discussion by the panel members
- Scoring determined by mutual agreement

### 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 Jan Swartz: **Final Score: 87.00%**. According to paragraph 11.3 of the signed performance agreement, a performance bonus of **14%** of total package should be paid once the draft annual report for 2018/19 has been tabled to council, as prescribed by section 8 (1) of Regulation 805.
- ∞ Mr R van Wyk: **Final Score: 81.40%**. According to paragraph 11.3 of the signed performance agreement, a performance bonus of **14%** of total package should be paid once the draft annual report for 2018/19 has been tabled to council, as prescribed by section 8 (1) of Regulation 805.
- ∞ Mr W Jonker: **Final Score: 84.60%**. According to paragraph 11.3 of the signed performance agreement, a bonus of **14%** of total package should be paid once the draft annual report for 2018/19 has been tabled to council, as prescribed by section 8 (1) of Regulation 805.

### CONCLUSION

1. The senior managers must ensure that sufficient POE is available for audit purposes of all the actual results.
2. Senior managers must ensure that all KPI's on the SDBIP system are updated on a monthly basis to avoid audit challenges.

\*\*\*\*\*

# HANTAM MUNISIPALITEIT/MUNICIPALITY



## TEENWOORDIGHEIDSREGISTER / ATTENDANCE REGISTER

VERGADERING/ MEETING: FINALE PRESTASIE EVALUERINGSSESSIE 2018/19

DATUM / DATE: WOENSDAG, 09 OKTOBER 2019

TYD / TIME: 08H00

LOKAAL / VENUE: KOMITEEKAMER KOMMANDO GEBOU – CALVINIA

NAAM EN VAN/ NAME & SURNAME	ORGANISASIE/ ORGANISATION STRAAT ADRES/ ADDRESS	KONTAKBESONDERHEDE/ CONTACT DETAILS	E-POS / E-MAIL	HANDTEKENING/ SIGNATURE
KOOS ALEXANDER	RAADSLID	063 1448 679	alexhantamx@gmail.com	
GERALDENE GOUW	RAADSLID	073 3502580	geraldene.gouw@gmail.com	
HENRY DE WEE	RAADSLID	078 255 3707	hdewe@gmail.com	
JES SWARTZ	MUN. BEST	079 6602614	jswartz@hantam.gov.za	
A. Siew	OK Nootsitter	074-583 5175	abraham.titus@mbdqa.com	
Rufus Bouwer	Kommissie: Mun	078 1984237	rufus@kommissie.hantam.gov.za	
Royce Swartz	Hantam	072 671 2627	arnes25@gmail.com	
H. Vermeulen	Ignite	0824578652	hvermeulen@igniteconsult.co.za	
R van Wyk	Hantam Mun	027-3418500	vanwyk@hantam.gov.za	
Werner Gouwe	HANTAM MUN	027-3418508	wjouw@hantam.gov.za	

