

**PSC GUIDELINES
ON
THE EVALUATION OF HEADS
OF DEPARTMENT
2003/2004 FINANCIAL YEAR**



**ISSUED BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ANNEXURES	3
GLOSSARY OF TERMS	4
1. INTRODUCTION	5
2. EVALUATION PANELS	6
3. SECRETARIAT	8
4. EXECUTING AUTHORITY	9
5. EVALUATION PROCESS	10
6. REVIEW	14

ANNEXURES

Annexure A	Contact list of Public Service Commissioners
Annexure B	Verification Statement regarding comments on achievement of Key Result Areas and Core Management Competencies by the HoD
Annexure C	Structuring of evaluation meetings
Annexure D	Written advice by the evaluation panel on the performance of the HoD
Annexure E	Decision by the Executing Authority regarding the evaluation

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

PSC or Commission	Public Service Commission
CMC	Core Management Criteria
EA	Executing Authority
FOSAD	Forum of South African Directors-General
HoD	Head of Department
KRA	Key Result Area
MEC	Member of Executive Council
The Minister/MPSA	Minister for the Public Service And Administration
MTEF	Medium-Term Expenditure Framework
Office	Office of the Public Service Commission
PA	Performance Agreement
PMDS	Performance Management and Development System
Premier	Head of a province in the Republic of South Africa
President	Head of State of the RSA

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 In order to facilitate the evaluation of heads of department in terms of the approved framework, the Public Service Commission (Commission or PSC) issues guidelines on an annual basis, at the latest by **31 July** of each year. The Commission guidelines are accordingly provided in this document for the evaluation of HoDs' performance during the 2003/2004 financial year. For the sake of completeness the framework issued by the Minister for the Public Service and Administration is also repeated as "Regulations" in this document.
- 1.2 As will be noticed, the guidelines have incorporated the **mandatory elements** of the performance management and development system for senior managers (PMDS) implemented with effect from 01 April 2002. These mandatory elements will be put into effect during the 2003/2004 HoD evaluations.
- 1.3 It would be appreciated if the necessary preparations in terms of the framework could be finalized expeditiously so that all required documentation could be submitted by the due dates. As soon as the annual reports are published please forward them to the Office of the Public Service Commission (Office).
- 1.4 The guidelines including the formats of the verification statement and the advice letter provided by the panel to the executing authority are available on the PSC Website at: <http://www.psc.gov.za>.
- 1.5 Any queries regarding these guidelines can be directed to Mr Sifiso Ngema of the Office at the following contact numbers:

Telephone: (012) 352 1210
Cell: 082 829 2830
Fax: (012) 325 8379
Email: SifisoN@opsc.gov.za

2. EVALUATION PANELS

2.1 Regulations

- (a) Executing authorities must appoint evaluation panels to assist them with the evaluation of their HoDs. The nomination of members to serve on evaluation panels is left at the discretion of executing authorities. The evaluation panels can reflect all stakeholders as dictated by the nature of the department concerned and may also involve the peers of HoDs.
- (b) Each evaluation panel appointed by executing authorities for HoDs of national departments will be chaired by either the Chairperson or Deputy-Chairperson of the Commission. Panels appointed for provincial HoDs will be chaired by the Commissioner resident in that province or, in their absence, by a nationally nominated Commissioner (other than the Chairperson or Deputy-Chairperson). The involvement of the Commission on these panels is to ensure, as independent role player, that the evaluation process is fair and equitable and that the same norms and standards are applied to all HoDs in terms of procedures.
- (c) The role of evaluation panels is to advise executing authorities on the performance of their HoDs.

2.2 Guidelines

- (a) The composition of the evaluation panel should be discussed by the executing authority with the HoD involved. Although the final decision on the composition of the evaluation panel remains that of the executing authority, attempts should be made to reach agreement with the HoD in this regard.
- (b) In addition to the Chairperson from the PSC, the panel should not comprise more than four members. It is proposed that panels comprise the following members:
 - (i) A Minister from the same Cabinet cluster in the case of national heads of department and a Member of the Executive Council (MEC) in the case of provincial heads of department.

- (ii) A chairperson of the relevant portfolio or standing committee.
 - (iii) One peer of the HoD (nominated from the FOSAD cluster in which the HoD participates in the case of national HoDs or from amongst the other HoDs in a province in the case of provincial HoDs; national HoDs may also be nominated as peers to serve on provincial panels).
 - (iv) A person representing (a) key client(s) or stakeholder(s) of the department.
- (c) Executing authorities are encouraged to ensure representivity when appointing panel members.
- (d) Executing authorities should, after consultation with panel members on their availability for the panel, confirm their appointment in writing. During the consultation process, the role of the panel should be explained. A copy of these guidelines should be provided to the panel members to this end.
- (d) In order to expedite the finalisation of the evaluation process, the EA should liaise with the Office of the PSC on possible dates for the evaluation and should strive to nominate panel members who will be available on those proposed dates. Executing authorities are responsible for ensuring availability of panel members during scheduled evaluation meetings.

2.3 Administrative requirements

The names and contact details of panel members must be provided to the Public Service Commission by not later than **30 September 2004**. In the case of national HoDs this information must be forwarded for the attention of the Chairperson of the Public Service Commission. The relevant details of panel members for provincial HoDs must be forwarded to the Public Service Commissioner resident in the relevant province. A contact list of the relevant Commissioners is attached at **Annexure A**.

3. SECRETARIAT

3.1 Regulations

- (a) All evaluation panels must be supported by the Secretariat provided by the Office of the Public Service Commission.
- (b) The role of the Secretariat will be to collate and process all information received from HoDs and executing authorities into a reporting format for the evaluation panels and to take minutes of proceedings and assist the panel with the calculation of the final score result based on the evaluation KRAs and CMCs during meetings of the evaluation panels.

3.2 Guidelines

- (a) It is proposed that executing authorities nominate a contact person in their offices to liaise with the Secretariat in order to expedite the evaluation process.

4. EXECUTING AUTHORITY

4.1 Regulations

All executing authorities will participate in discussions of the evaluation panels of their respective HoDs and will provide inputs when deemed necessary or when required by the panel. The advice emanating from the evaluation panel will not be binding on executing authorities and they will still be responsible for the final decisions emanating from the evaluation process.

4.2 Guidelines

- (a) Executing authorities should participate during discussions of the evaluation panels of their respective HoDs, but should recuse themselves once the panel starts to formulate its advice on the level of performance of the HoD.
- (b) Executing authorities should study carefully the advice of the evaluation panel. After applying their minds executing authorities need to take a decision **and communicate that decision to their heads of department.**
- (c) In view of the fact that executing authorities will be participating in evaluation panel meetings, it will be advisable for executing authorities not to deviate from the advice of the evaluation panel unless valid reasons can be provided by the executing authority. If such reasons exist it will be good practice for the executing authority to minute the reasons in his/her decision on the performance of the HoD. The reasons will accordingly be conveyed to the President/Premier and the HoD involved.
- (d) Executing authorities should complete the verification statement by rating each KRA and CMC in the performance agreement of the HoD and also by making comments on the space provided (**see attached Annexure B**).

5. EVALUATION PROCESS

5.1 Regulations

- (a) The evaluation of HoDs will be aligned to the planning and the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) cycles. It therefore follows that evaluation periods will be linked to financial years. Evaluations must cover one financial year.
- (b) HoDs and their executing authorities must complete negotiations and sign performance agreements by the end of April each year. The format provided in the PMDS shall be utilized for all performance agreements (Annexure B). Performance agreements of HoDs must be filed with the Public Service Commission not later than 30 June of each year.
- (c) Progress made in relation to the set objectives in the performance agreements must be reviewed regularly. At a minimum, one formal performance review should take place annually (preferably in the middle of the cycle) in addition to this, a formal end of cycle appraisal session conducted in terms of the framework for the evaluation of HoDs should take place.
- (d) The information to be used during the evaluation process must be forwarded to the Office of the Public Service Commission according to the set dates. The following information will be used during the evaluation process:
 - (i) The performance agreement for the relevant financial year.
 - (ii) The department's strategic plan covering the relevant financial year.
 - (iii) The budget and expenditure report for the relevant financial year.
 - (iv) The department's annual report for the relevant financial year.
 - (v) A verification statement to be completed by the executing authority and HoD detailing the achievement of key result areas and core management competencies provided for in the performance agreement.
- (e) The designated secretariat will collate all information submitted to it and forward it to the evaluation panel for consideration. During the evaluation process, evaluation panels will obtain inputs from both the executing authority and HoD.

- (f) The panel will consider performance for each key result area (KRA) and Core Management Criteria (CMC) and award a score on a scale of 1 to 5 as defined below (The Secretariat will assist with the calculation and the overall score will then determine the level of performance):

LEVEL 5: OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE – Performance far exceeds the standard expected of a member at this level. The appraisal indicates that the HoD has achieved exceptional results against all performance criteria and indicators and maintained this in all areas of responsibility throughout the year.

LEVEL 4: PERFORMANCE SIGNIFICANTLY ABOVE EXPECTATIONS – Performance is significantly higher than the standard expected in the job. The appraisal indicates that the HoD has achieved better than fully effective results against more than half of the performance criteria and indicators and fully achieved all others throughout the year.

LEVEL 3: FULLY EFFECTIVE – Performance fully meets the standard expected in all areas of the job. The appraisal indicates that the HoD has achieved effective results against all significant performance criteria and indicators and may have achieved results significantly above expectations in one or two less significant areas throughout the year.

LEVEL 2: PERFORMANCE NOT FULLY SATISFACTORY – Performance is below the standard required for the job in key areas. The appraisal indicates that the HoD has achieved adequate results against many key performance criteria and indicators but has not fully achieved adequate results against other during the course of the year. Improvement in these areas is necessary to bring performance up to the standard expected in the job.

LEVEL 1: UNACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE – Performance does not meet the standard expected for the job. The appraisal indicates that the HoD 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 HoD has failed to demonstrate the commitment or ability to bring performance up to the level expected in the job despite efforts to encourage improvement.

- (g) The panel will provide advice in writing to the relevant executing authority indicating the level of performance of the HoD. The executing authority, after considering this advice, will make decisions on cash bonus, and salary progression and other actions to be taken (as provided in the PMDS) in terms of the performance of their HoDs.
- (h) The results of the evaluation process must be forwarded to the President and the Premiers.

5.2 Guidelines

- (a) The PSC is responsible for filing of performance agreements of HoDs. Performance agreements for the 2003/2004 financial year should already have been submitted to the Office of the PSC. **All eleven CMCs and Example 2 of the workplan contained in the PMDS are compulsory for HoDs as per approval by the MPSA on request by the Public Service Commission.** However, where these performance agreements have not been submitted, executing authorities should submit them without further delay. Annual reports for 2003/2004 should be provided as soon as they are published.
- (b) In cases of non-compliance with the requirements of the PMDS format of performance agreements (Annexure B), the affected HoDs will not be evaluated in terms of this framework. Executing authorities will have to make representations **directly** to the MPSA on alternative measures to evaluate their HoDs.
- (c) Executing authorities and HoDs should pro-actively commence with the completion of the verification statement and should not wait for the publication of departmental annual reports. Verification statements, strategic plans for 2003/2004 and outstanding performance agreements for 2003/2004 should be submitted to the PSC not later than **30 September 2004**. The format attached as **Annexure C** should be used for the completion of the verification statement. All the required information must be submitted timeously to the secretariat.
- (d) The secretariat should timeously submit collated information to the members of the evaluation panel, ideally three weeks before the evaluation meeting. Evaluation panel members should submit questions for clarification to the executing authority and HoD **via the Secretariat** at least one week before the evaluation meeting. The secretariat will submit a collated list of such questions to the relevant

executing authority and HoD.

- (e) Guidelines on the structure of evaluation meetings are attached as **Annexure D**.
- (f) The evaluation panel should provide its advice in writing to the executing authority, in accordance with **Annexure E**, which will indicate the score in percentage obtained by the HoD as well as the summary of findings. For the purpose of awarding a cash bonus, where applicable, the following table provides parameters on awarding of such a cash bonus for performance that is outstanding or significantly above expectation:

AWARDING OF CASH BONUSES		
CATEGORIES	TOTAL SCORE	CASH BONUS
A: Outstanding performance	85% and above	Between 6 - 8% of the package
B: Performance significantly above expectations	80 – 84%	Between 3 - 5% of the package

- (g) Pay progression is also awarded for an HoD whose performance is rated as fully effective in two successive evaluations. The pay progression is awarded after every 24 months of fully effective performance.
- (h) The written decision by the executing authority can be provided in accordance with the format attached as **Annexure F**, which should be submitted to the Office of the Public Service Commission.
- (i) Executing authorities should also provide a copy of the above decision to the Head: Corporate Services in their departments for implementation.

6. REVIEW

6.1 Regulations

- (a) Where a HoD is dissatisfied with a decision of the executing authority regarding the evaluation she/he may request a review of the matter. The performance agreements of HoDs provide for a dispute settlement procedure according to which a person is identified to whom disputes must be referred for mediation. As a first step, disputes emanating from the performance evaluation of HoDs must be referred to the agreed person. If, however, the dispute cannot be resolved by such a person, the matter can be referred to a Review Committee. A national HoD must lodge his/her dissatisfaction with a Review Committee consisting of the Deputy President and the Minister for Public Service and Administration or their nominees.
- (b) A provincial HoD must lodge his/her dissatisfaction with a Review Committee consisting of the Premier and a MEC nominated by the Premier. A Director-General in the Office of a Premier can refer his/her dispute to a Review Committee consisting of the Deputy President and the Minister for Public Service and Administration or their nominees.

6.2 Guidelines

Disputes referred to Review Committees must contain the following details:

- (a) The written advice of the evaluation panel.
- (b) The decision by the executing authority.
- (c) Reasons for deviating from the advice of the evaluation panel, if applicable.
- (d) Affidavits from both the executing authority and HoD containing full details of the nature of the dispute.

ANNEXURE A

CONTACT LIST OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSIONERS

	NAME	TEL. NO.	FAX. NO.	CELL NO.	E-MAIL ADDRESS	PHYSICAL ADDRESS	POSTAL ADDRESS
NATIONAL	Prof. SS Sangweni	(012) 352 1015 (012) 352 1022	(012) 352 8308	082 801 7363	SSangweni@opsc.gov.za	Commission House, Cnr. Hamilton & Edmund Str, Arcadia, Pretoria	Private Bag X 121 PRETORIA 0001
EASTERN CAPE PROVINCE	Mr M Msoki	(043) 643 4704 (043) 642 2949	(043) 642 1371	082 490 5032	MMsoki@opsc.gov.za	91 Alexandra Road King Williams Town	P O Box 2167 KING WILLIAMS TOWN 5600
FREE STATE PROVINCE	Mr P Helepi	(051) 448 8696	(051) 448 4135	082 774 1651	PHelepi@opsc.gov.za	62 Fedsure Building 3 rd Floor, St Andrew Street Bloemfontein	Private Bag X 20572 BLOEMFONTEIN 9300
GAUTENG PROVINCE	Dr RR Mgijima	(011) 833 5727	(011) 834 1200	082 921 8255	RMgijima@opsc.gov.za	Ten Sixty Six Building 16 th Floor, 35 Prichard street Johannesburg	P O Box 8962 JOHANNESBURG 2000
KWAZULU/NATAL PROVINCE	Ms PM Tengeneni	(033) 345 9997	(033) 345 8505	082 254 5244	PTengeneni@opsc.gov.za	Brasford House 262 Long Market Street Pietermaritzburg	Private Bag X 9130 PIETERMARITZBURG 3200
MPUMALANGA PROVINCE	Mr DW Mashego	(013) 755 4070	(013) 752 5814	083 412 7430	DMashego@opsc.gov.za	19 Russel Street Nelspruit	Private Bag X 11303 NELSPRUIT 1200
LIMPOPO PROVINCE	Mr KE Mahoai	(015) 297 6284	(015) 297 6276	082 537 4996	KMahoai@opsc.gov.za	Kleingeld Trust Building, 81 Biccard Street, Polokwane	Private Bag X9543 POLOKWANE 0700
NORTH WEST PROVINCE	Mr JDS Mahlangu	(018) 384 1000	(018) 384 1012	082 551 4503	SMahlangu@opsc.gov.za	Mmabatho Post Office Building, Ground floor University Drive Mmabatho	Private Bag X2065 MMBATHO 2735
NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE	Mr KL Mathews	(053) 832 6222	(053) 832 6225	082 490 5025	KMathews@opsc.gov.za	55 Carrington Road Monuments Heights Kimberley	Private Bag X5071 KIMBERLEY 8300
WESTERN CAPE PROVINCE	Dr NV Maharaj	(021) 421-3998	(021) 424 3982	082 816 1602	NMaharaj@opsc.gov.za	Golden Acre Building 21 st Floor Cape Town	PO Box 2078 CAPE TOWN 8000

CONFIDENTIAL

ANNEXURE B

SENIOR MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT
NAME OF DEPARTMENT/PROVINCE (AS APPLICABLE)

BETWEEN
(Names and Designations of parties to agreement)

SMS MEMBER:

AND

HEAD OF DEPARTMENT (OR DELEGATED SUPERVISOR)

PERIOD OF AGREEMENT:
(indicate from when until when, i.e a full financial year (from 1 April 200__ to 31 March 200__)

1. JOB DETAILS

Persal number :
 Component :
 Location :
 Salary level :
 Notch (package) :
 Occupational classification :
 Designation :

2. JOB PURPOSE

Describe the purpose of the job (overall focus) as it relates to the Vision and Mission of the Department. Capture the overall accountability that the jobholder has in relation to her/his position.

3. JOB FUNCTIONS

Describe the key functions that the jobholder is required to perform, based on the job profile, and the departmental strategic/operational plan.

4. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS/LINES & ASSESSMENT LINES

The SMS member shall report to theas her/his supervisor on all parts of this agreement. The SMS member shall:

1. Timeously alert the supervisor of any emerging factors that could preclude the achievement of any performance agreement undertakings, including the contingency measures that she/he proposes to take to ensure the impact of such deviation from the original agreement is minimised.
2. Establish and maintain appropriate internal controls and reporting systems in order to meet performance expectations.
3. Discuss and thereafter document for the record and future use any revision of targets as necessary as well as progress made towards the achievement of performance agreement measures.

In turn the supervisor shall:

1. Create an enabling environment to facilitate effective performance by the SMS member.
2. Provide access to skills development and capacity building opportunities.
3. Work collaboratively to solve problems and generate solutions to common problems within the department that may be impacting on the performance of the SMS member.

5. PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL FRAMEWORK

Performance will be assessed according to the information contained in the work plan (attached as Appendix A) and the Core Management Criteria (CMC) framework (attached as Appendix B). The specific KRAs and CMCs together with their weightings are, for example, as follows:

3.1 The KRAs and CMCs during the period of this agreement shall be as set out in the table below.

3.2 The SMS member undertakes to focus and to actively work towards the promotion and implementation of the KRAs within the framework of the laws and regulations governing the Public Service. The specific duties/outputs required under each of the KRAs are outlined in the attached work plan. KRAs should include all special projects the SMS member is involved in. The work plan should outline the SMS member's specific responsibilities in such projects.

KEY RESULT AREAS (KRAs)	Weight
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
TOTAL	100%

3.3 The SMS member's assessment will be based on her/his performance in relation to the duties/outputs outlined in the attached work plan as well as the CMCs marked here-under. Only five CMCs should be selected (✓) from the list that are deemed to be critical for the SMS member's specific job.

CORE MANAGEMENT CRITERIA		Weight	CORE MANAGEMENT CRITERIA		Weight
			TOTAL		100%

6. DEVELOPMENTAL REQUIREMENTS

Provide details on the areas in which development is required. These may relate to the attainment of specific objectives or standards specified for Key Result Areas (KRAs), as well as to the CMCs.

The plan for addressing developmental gaps is attached as Appendix C.

7. TIMETABLE AND RECORDS OF REVIEW DISCUSSIONS AND ANNUAL APPRAISAL

Specify the dates when progress reviews and feedback sessions will take place, as well as the annual evaluation session:

8. MANAGEMENT OF PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES

Identify and specify what actions will be taken in recognition of superior performance or to address poor/non-performance: (These should be based on Chapter 4 of the SMS Handbook).

9. DISPUTE RESOLUTION

- 9.1 Any disputes about the nature of the senior manager’s PA, whether it relates to key responsibilities, priorities, methods of assessment and/or salary increment in this agreement, shall be mediated by:
- 9.2 If this mediation fails, the dispute-resolution procedures referred to in Chapter 4 of the SMS Handbook will apply.

10. AMENDMENT OF AGREEMENT

Amendments to the agreement should be in writing and can only be effected after discussion and agreement by both parties.

11. SIGNATURES OF PARTIES TO THE AGREEMENT

The contents of this document have been discussed and agreed with the SMS member concerned.

Name of SMS member:

Signature:

Date:

AND

Name of supervisor of SMS member:

Signature:

Date:

EXAMPLE 2 (Applicable to all HoDs as approved by the MPSA)

KEY RESULT AREA	KEY ACTIVITIES/ OUTPUTS	PERFORMANCE MEASURES		RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS	ENABLING CONDITIONS
		TARGET DATE	INDICATOR		

APPENDIX B: GENERIC CORE SMS MANAGEMENT CRITERIA AND STANDARDS

This shows one example of a criterion and its standards. The same approach would apply to all others

CRITERIA	STANDARDS		WEIGHTING
	GENERIC	DEPARTMENT SPECIFIC	
Strategic Capability and Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ Gives direction to team in realising the organisation's strategic objectives; ◇ Impacts positively on team morale, sense of belonging and participation; ◇ Develops detailed action plans to execute strategic initiatives; ◇ Assists in defining performance measures to evaluate the success of strategies; ◇ Achieves strategic objectives against specified performance measures; ◇ Translates strategies into action plans; ◇ Secures co-operation from colleagues and team members; ◇ Seeks mutual benefit/win-win outcomes for all concerned; ◇ Supports stakeholders in achieving their goals; ◇ Inspires staff with own behaviour – “walks the talk”; ◇ Manages and calculates risks; ◇ Communicates strategic plan to the organisation; and ◇ Utilises strategic planning methods and tools. 	◇	1, 2, or 3

All eleven CMCs are compulsory for HoDs as per approval by the MPSA on request by the Public Service Commission.

APPENDIX C: PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Competency to be addressed	Proposed actions	Responsibility	Time-frame	Expected outcome

CONFIDENTIAL

ANNEXURE C

VERIFICATION STATEMENT

The following verification statement on Key Result Areas and Core Management Criteria agreed to in each head of department's performance agreement has to be completed by heads of department and their respective executing authorities :

PERIOD UNDER REVIEW		DEPARTMENT	
SURNAME AND INITIALS OF THE HoD		PERSAL NUMBER	
DATE OF APPOINTMENT		GENDER	
RACE			

COMMENTS ON ACHIEVEMENT OF KEY RESULT AREAS AND CORE MANAGEMENT CRITERIA IN PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT (TO BE COMPLETED BY THE HOD): NOTE THAT THIS IS ACCORDING TO APPENDIX A, WORKPLANS (EXAMPLE 2) OF THE PMDS DOCUMENT. THIS IS THE FORMAT PREFERED FOR HEADS OF DEPARTMENT.

KEY RESULT AREA (KRA)	KEY ACTIVITIES	PERFORMANCE MEASURES		WEIGHT %	MILESTONES/COMMENTS	OWN RATING (BY HOD) (1-5)	RATING BY EA (1-5)
		Target Date	Indicator				
1.							
2.							
3.							
4.							
5.							
TOTAL				100%			

CORE MANAGEMENT CRITERIA (CMC)	STANDARD	WEIGHT %	MILESTONES/COMMENTS	OWN RATING (BY HOD) (1-5)	RATING BY EA (1-5)
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
TOTAL		100%			

NB. All eleven CMCs are compulsory for HoDs as per approval by the MPSA on request by the Public Service Commission.

COMMENTS TO THE EVALUATION PANEL BY THE EXECUTING AUTHORITY

The executing authority must alert the evaluation panel to specific areas of the HoD’s performance in terms of the performance agreement, which in the executing authority’s opinion illustrate **performance not fully satisfactory or performance significantly above expectations and outstanding**. A brief explanation must be provided by the executing authority for his/her assessment of each identified area.

HEAD OF DEPARTMENT’S SIGNATURE

DATE:

EXECUTING AUTHORITY’S SIGNATURE

DATE:

ANNEXURE D

STRUCTURING MEETINGS OF EVALUATION PANELS FOR THE EVALUATION OF HEADS OF DEPARTMENT

1. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE EVALUATION PANEL

- 1.1 The role of evaluation panels is to advise executing authorities on the performance of their HoDs
- 1.2 The members of the panel must be objective and must strive to formulate advice based on fact and not assumption. Panel members must therefore be given the opportunity to seek clarity where required from the HoD and executing authority.
- 1.3 The panel must strive to reach consensus at the meeting on the level of performance regarding each KRA and CMC. The total score will influence the final result and level of performance of HoD in the advice to be provided to the executing authority. Minority positions must be minuted and indicated to the executing authority.

2. STRUCTURE OF MEETINGS

The chairpersons of evaluation panels (Public Service Commissioners) will play a significant role in the evaluation of HoDs to ensure that justice is served. They should therefore be well prepared for evaluation meetings and communicate their requirements clearly to the relevant Secretariat.

2.1 The Planning Phase

- 2.1.1 Upon receipt of the names of evaluation panel members, the relevant Commissioner must in consultation with the executing authority decide on a date for the evaluation meeting. The date of the meeting as well as the names and contact details of the panel members must be communicated to the relevant Secretariat. The secretariat will communicate the date of the meeting to the panel members and enquire about their availability.

2.1.2 In order to structure evaluation meetings, Chairpersons may request panel members to prepare questions for clarification to be directed to the relevant executing authority and HoD. These questions should be forwarded to the secretariat at least one week before the panel meeting. The Secretariat must collate the questions into a single document and forward it to the executing authority and HoD.

2.2 THE MEETING

The Chairperson will be responsible for structuring the evaluation meetings. Evaluation panel members should set aside at least two hours for an evaluation meeting. The agenda for an evaluation meeting could be structured as follows:

1. Welcome and introductions
2. Discussion of process/purpose
3. Raising of questions for clarification with HoD and executing authority by the panel
4. Assessment of each KRA and CMC on the basis of the verification statement and the inputs of the EA and HoD
5. Calculation of score and summarising assessment and awarding of the final rating based on the KRAs and CMCs
6. Closure

2.2.1 The Chairperson of the panel must emphasise the importance of confidentiality at the onset of the meeting.

2.2.2 During the meeting the Chairperson must direct discussions and maintain formal meeting protocol.

- 2.2.3 In the event that consensus cannot be reached on the advice to be provided, a majority and minority position must be indicated. The Chairperson should, however, endeavour to achieve consensus.
- 2.2.4 The Chairperson is responsible for summarising the findings of the evaluation panel for minuting by the Secretariat.
- 2.2.5 Any queries regarding the advice by the panel will be directed by the executing authority to the Chairperson of the evaluation panel.
- 2.2.6 The document containing the advice of the panel must be signed at the meeting by all members of the panel.

ANNEXURE E

**WRITTEN ADVICE BY THE EVALUATION PANEL ON THE PERFORMANCE
OF: _____**

FINANCIAL YEAR: 2003/2004

Members of the evaluation panel:

- **Summary of main findings:**

- **Rating scale:**

(Evaluation Panel will circle the appropriate rating)

Rating	Definition of score
5	Outstanding Performance
4	Performance significantly above expectations
3	Fully Effective
2	Performance not fully satisfactory
1	Unacceptable performance

- **Development/training/coaching/guidance and exposure needed by HoD:**

SIGNATURES OF MEMBERS OF THE EVALUATION PANEL

Chairperson: _____

Member: _____

Member: _____

Member: _____

Member: _____

Signed at..... on20

Signed by Head of Department

Signed by the Executing Authority

NAME

NAME

SIGNATURE

SIGNATURE

DATE

DATE