

**PSC GUIDELINES  
ON  
THE EVALUATION OF HEADS  
OF DEPARTMENT  
2002/2003 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 Competencies
EA	Executing Authority
FOSAD	Forum of South African Directors-General
HoD	Head of Department
KRA	Key Result Area
MEC	Member of Executive Council
Minister	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. The Commission guidelines are accordingly provided in this document for the evaluation of HoDs' performance during the 2002/2003 financial year. For the sake of completeness the framework issued by the Minister for Public Service and Administration is also repeated as "Regulations" in this document.
- 1.2 It should be noted that the guidelines have incorporated the **mandatory elements** of the performance management development system for senior managers (PMDS) applicable with effect from 01 April 2002. These mandatory elements will be compulsory during the HoD evaluations in the current financial year.
- 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 Ms Vuyelwa Nhlapo of the Office at the following contact numbers:

Telephone: (012) 352 1206

Cell: 082 787 3668

Fax: (012) 325 8379

Email: [VuyelwaN@opsc.gov.za](mailto:VuyelwaN@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 or a Nationally nominated Commissioner. 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) 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).

- (ii) A person representing (a) key client(s) or stakeholder(s) of the department.
  - (iii) A Minister from the same Cabinet cluster in the case of national heads of department and a MEC in the case of provincial heads of department.
  - (iv) A chairperson of the relevant portfolio or standing committee.
- (c) 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.

### 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 2003**. 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 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 panel 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. It is good practice for the executing authority to minute his/her decision and reason for that decision on the performance of the HoD.
- (c) 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 performance management development system (PMDS) shall be utilized for all performance agreements. 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 minimum, one formal performance review should take place annually (preferably in the middle of the cycle) in addition to the formal end of cycle appraisal session conducted in terms of the framework for the evaluation of HoDs.
- (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.

- (d) 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.
- (e) After the evaluation panel has considered all information submitted to it, it will assess the performance of the HoD using the following rating scale:

**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.

- (f) 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.
- (g) The results of the evaluation process must be forwarded to the President and the Premiers.

## 5.2 Guidelines

- (a) Performance agreements for 2002/2003 should be submitted to the Office of the PSC by 30 June 2003. Annual reports for 2002/2003 should be provided as soon as they are published.
- (b) In cases of non-compliance with the requirements of the format of performance agreements as outlined in clause 5.1(b) above, executing authorities will have to make representations to the MPSA for permission to use the old format of the performance agreement. This deviation is only applicable for the 2002/2003 evaluations.
- (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 and strategic plans for 2002/2003 should be submitted to the PSC not later than **30 September 2003**. The format attached as **Annexure B** 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 C**.
- (f) The evaluation panel should provide its advice in writing to the executing authority, in accordance with **Annexure D**, 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:

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

- (g) The written decision by the executing authority can be provided in accordance with the format attached as **Annexure E**.

## 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**

	<b>NAME</b>	<b>TEL. NO.</b>	<b>FAX. NO.</b>	<b>CELL NO.</b>	<b>E-MAIL ADDRESS</b>	<b>PHYSICAL ADDRESS</b>	<b>POSTAL ADDRESS</b>
<b>NATIONAL</b>	Prof. SS Sangweni	(012) 352 1015 (012) 352 1022	(012) 352 8308	082 801 7363	<a href="mailto:SSangweni@opsc.gov.za">SSangweni@opsc.gov.za</a>	Commission House, Cnr. Hamilton & Edmund Str, Arcadia, Pretoria	Private Bag X 121 PRETORIA 0001
<b>EASTERN CAPE PROVINCE</b>	Mr M Msoki	(043) 643 4704 (043) 642 2949	(043) 642 1371	082 490 5032	<a href="mailto:MMsoki@opsc.gov.za">MMsoki@opsc.gov.za</a>	91 Alexandra Road King Williams Town	P O Box 2167 KING WILLIAMS TOWN 5600
<b>FREE STATE PROVINCE</b>	Mr FK Morule	(051) 448 8696	(051) 448 4135	082 490 5038	<a href="mailto:FMorule@opsc.gov.za">FMorule@opsc.gov.za</a>	St Adrew Centre 113 St Andrew Street Bloemfontein	Private Bag X 20572 BLOEMFONTEIN 9300
<b>GAUTENG PROVINCE</b>	Dr RR Mgijima	(011) 833 5727	(011) 834 1200	082 921 8255	<a href="mailto:RMgijima@opsc.gov.za">RMgijima@opsc.gov.za</a>	Ten Sixty Six Building 16 <sup>th</sup> Floor 35 Pichard street Johannesburg	P O Box 8962 JOHANNESBURG 2000
<b>KWAZULU/NATAL PROVINCE</b>	Mr HGD Zondi	(033) 345 9997	(033) 345 8505	082 490 5046	<a href="mailto:HZondi@opsc.gov.za">HZondi@opsc.gov.za</a>	Brasford House 262 Long Market Street Pietermaritzburg	Private Bag X 9130 PIETERMARITZBURG 3200
<b>MPUMALANGA PROVINCE</b>	Mr DW Mashego	(013) 755 4070	(013) 752 5814	082 490 5016	<a href="mailto:DMashego@opsc.gov.za">DMashego@opsc.gov.za</a>	19 Russel Street Nelspruit	Private Bag X 11303 NELSPRUIT 1200
<b>NORTHERN PROVINCE</b>	Ms MRV Mokgalong	(015) 297 6284	(015) 297 6276	082 490 5012	<a href="mailto:KMokgalong@opsc.gov.za">KMokgalong@opsc.gov.za</a>	Kleingeld Trust Building 81 Biccard Street Pietersburg	Private Bag X9543 PIETERSBURG 0700
<b>NORTH WEST PROVINCE</b>	Mr JDS Mahlangu	(018) 387 3727	(018) 387 3729	082 490 5047	<a href="mailto:SMahlangu@opsc.gov.za">SMahlangu@opsc.gov.za</a>	Garona Building Ground floor University Drive Mmabatho	Private Bag X2065 MMBATHO 2735
<b>NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE</b>	Mr KL Mathews	(053) 832 6222	(053) 832 6225	082 490 5025	<a href="mailto:charline@opsc.gov.za">charline@opsc.gov.za</a>	55 Carington Road Monuments Heights Kimberley	Private Bag X5071 KIMBERLEY 8300

	<b>NAME</b>	<b>TEL. NO.</b>	<b>FAX. NO.</b>	<b>CELL NO.</b>	<b>E-MAIL ADDRESS</b>	<b>PHYSICAL ADDRESS</b>	<b>POSTAL ADDRESS</b>
<b>WESTERN CAPE PROVINCE</b>	Mr B Wentzel	(021) 424 1386	(021) 424 1389	082 490 5045	<a href="mailto:Bwentzel@opsc.gov.za">Bwentzel@opsc.gov.za</a>	124 Adderley Street 4 <sup>th</sup> Floor, Regis House Cape Town	PO Box 2078 CAPE TOWN 8000

CONFIDENTIAL

ANNEXURE B

## 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		AGE	
RACE		GENDER	

**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 PREFERRED 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.							
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>100%</b>			

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

### 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 C

### 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 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. Overview of HoD's performance by the executing authority
4. Comment by the HoD on the questions raised or any other issues deemed important for the panel to know regarding his/her work during the year under review
5. Raising of questions for clarification with HoD and executing authority by the panel
6. Assessment on the basis of the documents before the panel and the above discussion
7. Summarising assessment and deciding on the assessment rating based on the KRAs and CMCs
8. 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 D**

**WRITTEN ADVICE BY THE EVALUATION PANEL ON THE PERFORMANCE  
OF: \_\_\_\_\_**

**FINANCIAL YEAR: 2002/2003**

**Members of the evaluation panel:**

- **Summary of main findings:**

- **Rating scale:**

*(Evaluation Panel will circle the appropriate rating)*

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Definition of score</b>
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..... on .....20**



**Signed by Head of Department**

**Signed by the Executing Authority**

---

**NAME**

---

**NAME**

---

**SIGNATURE**

---

**SIGNATURE**

---

**DATE**

---

**DATE**