



HANTAM
MUNICIPALITY

HANTAM
MUNICIPALITY

2025/26

SECTION 57 EMPLOYEES

MID-YEAR ASSESSMENT



Performance. Accountability.
Service Excellence.



FOCUSED ON
RESULTS



COMMITTED TO
OUR PEOPLE



DELIVERING VALUE
TO OUR COMMUNITIES

www.hantam.gov.za

Contents

.....	1
1. BACKGROUND	3
2. EVALUATION PERIOD	3
3. EVALUATION PANEL	3
4. PERFORMANCE PROCESS	4
4.1 Preparation	4
4.2 Moderation	4
4.3 Panel Assessment	4
5. ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES	6
6. CONCLUSION	6

1. BACKGROUND

The Municipal Systems Act, 2000 (Act 32 of 2000) prescribes that the municipality must enter into a performance-based agreement with all s56-employees and that performance agreements must be reviewed annually. The performance agreements of the s57-employees (s56-appointees and the managers reporting directly to the municipal manager) therefore establish the performance relationship between the employer and the employee and require that the performance of the employee needs to be formally evaluated at least twice per annum.

In accordance with the Local Government: Municipal Performance Regulations for Municipal Managers and Managers directly accountable to Municipal Managers, 2006 ("the Regulations"), managers must be evaluated on a quarterly basis in relation to his or her performance agreement. The annual performance appraisal must involve an assessment of the achievement of results as outlined in the performance plan. Each KPA should be assessed according to the extent to which the specified standards or performance indicators have been met and with due regard to ad hoc tasks that had to be performed under the KPA. Furthermore, each CCR should be assessed according to the extent to which the specified standards have been met. An overall rating is thereafter calculated by using the applicable assessment-rating calculator. The overall rating represents the outcome of the performance appraisal.

As such Hantam Municipality, required assistance in facilitating the annual evaluations for the the Municipal Manager and the managers directly accountable to the Municipal Manager for the 2025/26 mid-year (1 July 2025 to 31 December 2025).

2. EVALUATION PERIOD

The evaluations reported on in this report focussed on the mid-year performance of the senior management for the 2025/26 financial year. The evaluations focussed on the actual work delivered in terms of Annexure A and Annexure B of the performance agreement for the mid-year (1 July 2025 to 31 December 2025).

3. EVALUATION PANEL

The evaluation panel, established in terms of the Regulations consisted of the following members for evaluating the performance of the employees-

Name	Designation	Role in panel
K Alexander	Mayor	Chairperson of panel for assessment of Municipal Manager
H De Wee F Faroa S Koopman	Councillor	Part of assessment panel of the respective portfolio

Name	Designation	Role in panel
J Fortuin	Municipal Manager	Chairperson of panel for assessment of Senior Managers
E Kapank	Chairperson of the Audit and Performance Audit Committee	Observer for openness and transparency
G Mathys	PMS Manager	Observation
M Adams	Internal Auditor	Observation

The panel conducted the mid-year review of the performance of the following managers:

- Senior Manager Finance and Corporate Services: W Jonker – (01 July-30 September 2023)
- Senior Manager Technical and Community Services: R van Wyk – (01 July – 31 December 2023)

*The Senior Manager Financial and Corporate Services, Mr W Jonker left the organisation at end September 2023 and therefore is no longer in service of the Hantam Municipality. He was invited to attend the evaluations but however on the day no response was received also no self-evaluation was provided. The panel therefore concluded the evaluation in his absence.

4. PERFORMANCE PROCESS

4.1 Preparation

The performance information from the performance agreements and actual performance from the SDBIP were captured into the evaluation scorecard (excel based) which was utilised for self-evaluations, moderations and during the panel evaluation.

4.2 Moderation

The managers and Municipal Manager conducted a self-assessment based on the performance captured on the evaluation scorecard. The Acting Municipal Manager held a meeting with the manager to discuss his self-assessment of his performance prior to the panel assessment to clarify any matters that requires clarification. The Acting Municipal Manager, as the managers' direct supervisor, conducted a moderation on his ratings.


4.3 Panel Assessment

The programme followed was distributed with the moderated self-assessed evaluation forms. Each employee prepared himself/herself for evaluation purposes. The panel Evaluation Committee conducted the meeting on site. The panel was briefed and updated with the actual evaluation process to be followed before the commencement of the evaluation sessions.


During the evaluation procedures:

- The Acting Municipal Manager welcomed the members and the employee and explained the purpose of the evaluation and the process that will be followed during the evaluation.
- The panel was introduced, and the role of panel members confirmed.

- The Acting Municipal Manager explained that all the KPI's evaluated were discussed and investigated. The POE's for all the KPI's are available.
- The Acting Municipal Manager indicated that the self-assessed performance of the managers was moderated prior to the panel assessment.
- The evaluation focused on the performance of each department / section as well as the operational indicators linked to the National Key Performance Areas as per Annexure A of the performance contract signed by the employer and the employee for the financial year. The operational indicators are weighted in terms of importance and the municipal strategy and form 80% of the overall assessment.
- The remaining 20% of the overall assessment is comprised of the competencies of the Competency Requirements stipulated in section 26(8) of Regulation R805, Local Government: Municipal Performance Management Regulations for Municipal Managers, 2006 (published in Government Gazette No 29089 of 1 August 2006 and Government Notice R21 of January 2014), as agreed between the employer and employee.
- Scoring was done in terms of evidence provided and the panel members' experience in the work environment. A rating scale of 1 – 5 was used to rate each kpi and CCR as prescribed by the Regulations. The scoring was based on the following rating scale:



Operational Indicators



Competencies

- The following information was considered during the evaluation:
 - The performance agreements
 - The submission(s) of the employee
 - The SDBIP reports
- The approach can be summarised as follows:
 - Feedback on performance by the employee
 - Questions from the panel
 - Discussion by the panel members
 - Feedback on the overall result of the evaluation and the development areas identified during the evaluation
- The virtual meeting was recorded and all scoresheets will be emailed to the panel for signature (a recording of the meeting is available on request). Managers confirmed verbally at the end of each assessment that they are comfortable with their final score awarded by the panel and that they accept their final score.

5. ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES

The outcome of the performance assessments is documented on the summary scoresheets. The final scores were derived from the score allocated to each key performance indicator or group of indicators by the primary assessor being the Mayor for the Municipal Manager's assessment and the Municipal Manager for the other Section 56 employees and the secondary assessor being the respective portfolio councillor(s), multiplied by the weight allocated to the respective indicator / group of indicators.

The final scores awarded during the evaluations were as follows:

Name	Mid-year assessment
Mr J Fortuin	63.47%
Mr Riccardo Van Wyk	87.91%
Mr Rowen Ferris	74.67%
Ms Elize De Wet	58.21%
Mr Riaan van Wyk	68.04%

These scores are considered as the final score and an adjustment of any score will be made by considering an appeal or plead by an employee in terms of the agreement and based on the facts submitted by the individual. The primary assessor will then uphold or adjust the score on the basis of considered factual merit and not on the basis of method of calculation or computation.

Developmental areas were also identified and documented on the scoresheets where applicable. The actions to address the developmental areas identified are agreed and documented on the Personal Development Plan which forms part of the performance agreement where applicable.

Corrective measures as was discussed will be made to the SDBIP 2023/24 together with the Adjustment Budget process.

6. CONCLUSION

The evaluations were done objectively and in terms of the agreements.

It is recommended that Council take cognizance of the performance evaluation process that was followed.



IGNITE ADVISORY SERVICES (PTY) LTD