DEPARTMENTAL PMDS POLICY

“Improving the value service delivery towards our clients”
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DEPARTMENTAL POLICY ON PMDS

1. PREAMBLE

The Department of Public Safety in the North West Province is committed to improving the lives of its communities (employees). The Department can only achieve this mission through effective delivery of services. Therefore management of employees’ performance is an integral part of effective service delivery.

2. PURPOSE

The policy/guide is designed to help line managers and personnel practitioners to be able to plan, develop performance contracts, monitor employee performance and conduct performance reviews and annual performance assessments. It also provides easy use of the PMDS tools by managers and employees in general.

3. SCOPE OF APPLICATION

This policy/guide applies to all employees appointed in terms of the Public Service Act, 1994 as amended by Act 30 of 2007 in the Department of Public Safety within the North West Provincial Administration, other than employees who are members of senior management whose management of performance is separately provided for.

4. STATUTORY AUTHORIZATION

5. BASIC PRINCIPLES

The Department of Public Safety adhere to the following principles, for the purposes of control; monitoring; compliance and quality assurance, that:

- All employees have a right to be evaluated twice within one performance cycle (in September and March) to determine the level of their performance over a period of at least 6 months. This evaluation will culminate in an annual assessment which summarizes the overall performance after 12 months.

- All employees shall be eligible for performance rewards provided they meet the set criteria.

- The Department will reward good performance with the incentives available at its disposal based on the provisions of the Incentive Policy Framework and it will manage and deal with poor performance using the available interventions.

- The performance management will also be used for the purposes of skills development.

- All performance reports shall be subjected to moderation, unless otherwise directed during a particular performance cycle.

- Employees on probation shall complete, for the purposes of performance rewarding, a separate performance contract starting from 1 April unless the probation period begins on 1 April where the original copy will be used for this purpose.

6. STAKEHOLDERS AND THEIR ROLES

Stakeholders play an important role in the Performance Management System. Notwithstanding the requirements of the PMDS policy the key roles of the stakeholders are hereto identified.
6.1. **Head of Department**

Shall, and not limited to:

- Appoint a Moderating Committee with the minimum composition comprising of representatives from all the programs in the Department;
- Approve implementation of performance outcomes or give direction on what should be done based on the recommendation of the Moderation Committee;
- Ensure that employees are provided with necessary resources to carry out their responsibilities;
- Approve; if she/he deems it appropriate, to exceed the stipulated budget for performance rewards.

6.2. **Human Capital Development Head Shall:**

- Ensure the implementation of the system.
- Ensure the development of Performance Contracts and all related documents.
- Ensure that all stakeholders are properly trained and informed about the PMDS matters.
- Manage and monitor the process; chair at moderating committee meetings.
- Be supportive and drive the process forward and be the overall coordinators.

6.3. **HRD Personnel Practitioners Shall:**

- Monitor the development of all performance documents and implementation in line with Government Policies;
- Give advice to first line supervisors in the preparation of such documents;
- Facilitate and coordinate the moderation process;
• Give advice at moderating committee meetings;
• Cascade training to all managers; give advice on PMDS policy matters;
• Identify problems relating to PMDS broadly;
• Assist with queries/enquiries concerning PMDS and advice on counselling;
• Facilitate information sharing sessions and identify training needs; and
• Administer PMDS review questionnaires.

6.4. **Moderating Committee**

✓ The Moderation process of the PMDS shall be the responsibility and prerogative of the Head of Department in terms of its appointment and responsibilities. This committee shall be reviewed regularly to ensure representativity in terms of gender, race and expertise.

✓ The composition of the committee shall be made up, of at least three officers from each program and also cater for specialised fields in the Department, unless decided otherwise by the Head of Department.

✓ It shall be categorised into three for the purposes of expertise, sharing of the workload, suitable environment for presenters and consistency:

  - **Moderating Committee for levels 1 – 7**: Shall be composed of members who are at levels not less than 8 and not higher than 10
  - **Moderating Committee for levels 8 – 10**: Shall be composed of members who are at levels not less than 11 and not higher than 12.
  - **Moderating Committee for levels 11 – 12**: This committee shall be composed of members who are at levels not less than 13.

6.4.1 **The Moderating Committee shall**:

• Conduct assessment moderating meetings to review and / or ratify assessment outcomes.
• Monitor procedural and substantive compliance with policy.
• Ensure that there is fair and objective assessment of all employees’ performances.
• Provide the HOD with recommendations on the granting of performance rewards and interventions relating to performance assessment reports presented to it.

• The Moderating Committee does not take away the responsibility of the supervisor’s supervisor to overview the performance management actions and assessment outcomes of his or her subordinate supervisor, that is, to ensure equity and consistency in their components.

6.4.2. Moderation actions

• If the Moderating Committee identifies deviations or discrepancies in the assessment report (and having engaged the supervisor in its sitting), it must finalise the moderation process and present the identified deviations or discrepancies in writing. The assessment report(s) must thereafter be forwarded to the Head of Department or his/her delegate for final consideration. Detailed minutes of the decisions must be kept by all role players involved.

The Chairperson of the Moderating Committee shall be a manager dealing with the Human Capital Development functions, she/he shall:

• Create a climate of openness for full participation by all members including the reporting officer.

• In cooperation with the rest of the committee, determine the factors to be assessed or presented. Participate in questioning to lead the committee and to ensure objectivity.

• Establish the climate during the discussions and where consensus has been reached discussion should discontinue. Summarize the discussion particularly where conflicting ideas exist and lead the committee to take a decision on the report.

• Serve as an advisor to the Head Of Department in terms of management and implementation of PMDS in the Department.
6.5. Managers / Supervisors Shall:-

- Assist in developing Performance Contracts of their employees within the first two months (April – May) of a performance cycle;
- Convey the final assessment results in writing; to the employees within five working days after moderation (designated date), highlighting areas of improvement and reasons for any changes in the original scores;
- Also be expected to note, in writing, the deviations and the discrepancies identified during the moderation process.

6.6. Employees Shall:-

- Obtain, complete and sign Performance Contracts;
- Provide the supervisor with the necessary information and evidence of performance

6.7. Union Representative Shall:-

- Not form part of the moderating committee but may be allowed to observe during the proceedings
- Assist the employee in case of an appeal with the intention of advising.

7. STEPS IN THE PMDS AND PROCEDURES

There are procedures to be followed by all stakeholders in the Department. It is important that care should be taken in the process of adhering to them.

7.1. Performance Cycle

The performance cycle as seen here below will assist in terms of when and how should the process be followed.
7.2. Assessment/Review Process

This exercise is initiated and performed by the supervisor in consultation with the employee concerned, at the end of September and March each year.
The employee concerned shall be informed at least a week before the actual assessment/review in order to prepare her/himself.

A one-on-one principle shall be used, in a private quiet place.

An employee shall be deemed to have met the expected outcome unless there is evidence to the contrary (below or above average).

The employee shall be afforded an opportunity to rate her/himself.

A rating of a 4 or 5 should be accompanied by tangible evidence (something to show).

If the supervisor is not convinced by the employee’s own rating, she/he should give her/his supervisor’s rating and remark on the column provided.

7.3. **Moderation Process**

- Moderation will be based on the performance ratings against each Key Result Areas as well as the Generic Assessment Factors.
- The supervisor will present the performance reports of his/her employees before the Moderating Committee and motivate with evidence to justify the scores.
- Each moderator will give her/his own rating against each KRA and GAF based on the supervisor’s motivation/document and evidence provided.
- The chairperson will lead the committee to arrive at a moderating committee’s rating, either through consensus or averaging of the scores; *voting should be discouraged*.
- The chairperson will enter the said scores (agreed scores) on the original document.
- Practitioners will then plot the said scores on the calculator to determine the final score.
The Moderating Committee’s final score will determine the type of reward or intervention and a recommendation to the Head of Department.

7.4. **Performance Outcomes / Rewards**

- The outcome of the performance assessment process will be used to decide on the rewards and interventions for the employees.
- A corrective action shall be considered for employees who consistently perform below fully effective despite performance improvement endeavours.

8. **Qualifying Criteria**

An employee shall qualify for a performance reward if:

- She/He has completed a continuous period of at least 12 months by 31 March each year.
- The performance is at least satisfactory (100%)

9. **Performance Rewards/Incentives**

Employees who meet the qualifying criteria will be rewarded with the following rewards:

- **Pay-progression**: - if an employee’s performance is at least “fully effective” 100%. NOTE: an employee on a Personal Notch or the maximum notch will not qualify for a pay-progression
- **Performance Bonus**: - if an employee’s performance is at least “significantly above expectations” 115%. 
10. Performance Assessment Tools

Only the prescribed assessment tools are to be used for the purposes of recording, managing and evaluating the performance of employees in the Department.

The Heads of Components are entrusted with the responsibility of ensuring that the correct tools are utilized. These tools should not be modified and if a different form is used such a report will be disqualified and will not be processed until the correct form is used; **Note: no deadline will be adjusted for this reason.**

These tools shall be emailed to all Heads of Components and HRD practitioners will advise on the use of such documents.

The following tools are prescribed to be used:-

10.1. **Annexure A**  **Performance Agreement**: - for the purposes of communicating to the employee the performance expectations of the manager.

10.2. **Annexure B**  **Annual Work-plan**: - only one document for the entire 12 months period. The supervisor and the employee agree on the key activities and performance indicators to be achieved during the period.

10.3. **Annexure C**  **Personal Development Plan**: - this form is used to record the skills gaps identified during the contracting process. The gaps should be performance related rather than career oriented. A copy of this form should be immediately forwarded to Skills Planning Division for the development of the WSP.

10.4. **Annexure D**  **Generic Assessment Factors**: - choose factors that are related to the employee’s functions only and included them in the work-plan.

Each factor must be linked to particular KRA.
10.5. **Annexure E**  
**Half-yearly Review Form:** - this form is used to review the performance of an employee on six months basis during a performance cycle *(at the end September and end of March)*. Both the employee and supervisor must make their comments and attach their signatures.

10.6. **Annexure F**  
**Annual Performance Assessment Instrument:** - this form is used to summarize the overall performance for the past 12 months. The scores are averaged and plotted in the electronic calculator to determine the final score.

### 11. Moderation Strategy

Labour relations issues, the financial implications on the value of the rewards and the policy requirements should be considered during every plenary session for the smooth implementation of the PMDS.

### 12. Performance Assessment Appeal Panel

(a) The Performance Assessment Appeal Panel (PAAP) is established by the Head of Department to manage disagreement over ratings referred to in paragraph ‘c’ above.

(b) The Panel must be constituted in such a manner that expertise of the different line function including labour relations is included. The employee concerned may also be represented by a member of her/his employee organisation if he/she so chooses. The Panel must consider all written representations within fourteen working days from the date of being received.

(c) The PAAP **has the following responsibilities** —

(i) To make recommendations to the Head of Department or his/her delegate on the rating of employees where there is disagreement between the employee and the supervisor (having exhausted interventions within the Programme) and/or between the supervisor and the Moderating Committee

(ii) Make recommendations regarding actions to be considered where managers and supervisors did not properly and fairly execute their responsibilities with regard to the PMDS.
(g) In the event of any continued/persistent disagreement over the performance assessment of an employee, involving the employee and his/her supervisor, the employee may, within five days of being informed of the decision of the Performance Assessment Appeal Panel, follow the formal grievance rules of the Public Service. As is the case with other aspects of the PMDS, employees must be informed of the route and processes to be followed in the event of disagreement over performance assessments.

**Labour Relations issues:**

- The moderation process has addressed a number of grievances based on the assessment of some managers.
- In some instances the employee is not aware of any ratings allocated to the report indicating that she/he was not given an opportunity to participate in the development of the assessment documents and the assessment exercise.
- Some employees are ignorant of the implications of the scoring until the outcomes are implemented only to realize that they do not qualify and claim that the score was changed after the signature.
- Some managers would rate an employee below average (2) because she/he could not perform the duties due to circumstances beyond the officer’s control or advantage an officer above others due to favouritism.

**Financial Implications:**

- Unrealistic scoring of activities has over the performance periods led to inflated scores that influence the overall expenditure on performance rewards to be exceeded.
- The Department would need a moderating strategy, suitable to ensure that scores given across the Department are realistic and fair.
- This also will ensure that the bonuses are widely distributed and that pay progression and bonuses are within budgetary provisions.
- The allocation of performance rewards is the responsibility of the Head of Department.
- Managers should be concerned and attempt to create an environment where employees are able to maximize their performance level.

**Policy Requirements:**

- Performance moderation has been one of the measures used to ensure quality assurance, uniformity, and objectivity to avoid unnecessary discriminations and to ensure compliance.
- The policy on Performance Management and Development System Chapter 4 of the SMS Handbook (15.7) and 13.4.6 of Provincial policy No.13 on PMDS indicate that the Executing Authority or Head of Department shall appoint a moderating committee to recommend to her/him on the granting of performance rewards in the Department.
- These policies require that each an every performance report be moderated where the committee will indicate its ratings based on the presentation and evidence of the supervisor. The final score that will determine the performance reward must be the one recommended by the moderating committee.
- The Incentive Policy Framework also advises departments to manage situations like exceeding of the performance reward budget by setting tighter standards for the granting of performance rewards.
- Unrealistic scoring of performance cannot be ignored, deviations or discrepancies are also evident and these require monitoring and quality assurance exercise until the process ends.

### 11.1 Views for the Moderation Strategy

Given the labour relations issues, financial implications and policy requirements; the approach to this process will be based on one of the
following views; which will be deliberated on at an annual moderation conference.

11.1.1 All performance reports for employees on levels 1 – 12 must be presented before the moderating committee by supervisors.

- Based on motivation and evidence forwarded by the supervisor and the submission by an individual employee the committee will give its own ratings.
- The supervisor and or Employees will be expected to submit evidence against any KRA or GAF that is rated “above satisfactory” 4s and 5s and attach it to the assessment document.
- Any KRA or GAF in a performance report without such evidence will be deemed to have been performed at “fully effective” (a rating of a 3).

11.1.2 Moderation should be done on a 10% sample of reports scoring between 100% and 129%; all cases scoring 99% and below and all reports rating 130% and above.

- The reports that will escape the sampling process be regarded as to have been accepted as they are.
- Based on motivation and evidence forwarded by the supervisor and the possible submission by an individual employee the committee will give its own ratings.
- The supervisor and or Employees will be expected to submit evidence against any KRA or GAF that is rated “above satisfactory” 4s and 5s and attach it to the assessment document.
- Any KRA or GAF in a performance report without such evidence will be deemed to have been performed at “fully effective” (a rating of a 3).
11.1.3 The moderating committee will sit on all the performance reports without any presentation by the supervisor and recommend to the Head of Department the determined outcomes.

- The supervisor and or Employees will be expected to submit evidence against any KRA or GAF that is rated “above satisfactory” 4s and 5s and attach it to the assessment document.
- Based on the motivation and evidence forwarded by the supervisor and the individual employee the committee will give its own ratings.

Any strategy based on any view, to be used during a particular performance period, shall be subject to the approval of the Head of Department.

The Directorate HRM will formulate a submission for the HoD’s approval of a moderation strategy for that particular performance period.

12 Conflict Resolution / Grievance / Queries

In the event a dispute arising between a manager and an employee during a review session, the person identified as the mediator in the Performance Agreement, should be invited into such a session. Heads of Components should be seen to have attempted to resolve any dissatisfaction by the employee before she / he attaches the signature.

If an employee is dissatisfied by the outcome of the moderation process, such an employee or supervisor shall be afforded an opportunity to address the moderating committee only the bases of:

- Any information that she/he feels was not considered during the moderation process.

If the employee is still aggrieved or not satisfied, it will be deemed as to have exhausted the internal grievance channels.

The employee may have to use the external agents as prescribed by the Labour Relations Act. (Conflict Resolutions).
## 13 Review

The guide shall be reviewed each and every time a need arises.

### ANNEXURE G

## Road Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
<th>DATE / DEADLINE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance exercise.</td>
<td>Brief &amp; update line managers on policy issues and challenges encountered during the past period.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Identify &amp; analyze needs of supervisors through enquiries and surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation and packaging of reports for moderation.</td>
<td>Capacitating and updating the District HRD Practitioners on PMDS matters.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Practitioners are expected to perform certain functions to ensure compliance at District level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training and briefing of the moderating committee to update members on new developments.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This exercise forms part of consultation with stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To share the moderation strategy.</td>
<td></td>
<td>HRD Practitioners should insist on supervisors submitting documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submission of performance reports for the period ending 31 March each financial year.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical inspection of assessment tools is required to advice on the actual corrections to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To manage and monitor the process of the submission of the reports &amp; ensure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The template here below indicates the functions and the deadlines to be followed from the beginning of a performance cycle to the actual implementation of the performance outcomes.

**ANNEXURE H**

**Moderation Strategy for the Performance Period April 2009 – March 2010**

- Moderation should be done on a 10% sample of reports scoring between 100% and 129%; all cases scoring 99% and below and all reports rating 130% and above.
  - The reports that will escape the sampling process be regarded as to have been accepted as they are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring and provision of support &amp; technical advice to line function.</th>
<th>Submission of Performance Contracts for the subsequent period.</th>
<th>Identification of challenges encountered by managers and formulates interventions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ensure performance contracts are developed inline with the approved PMDS Policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All performance reports for the current period must be submitted on or before the 30 April each year.</td>
<td>All Districts shall be allocated time frames for the moderation process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports that will be submitted later than 30 June will be deemed to have not been submitted.</td>
<td>If there are any reports not moderated upon because of unacceptable reasons, such reports shall be deemed to have been on an average performance level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on motivation and evidence forwarded by the supervisor and the possible submission by an individual employee the committee will give its own ratings.

The supervisor and or Employees will be expected to submit evidence against any KRA or GAF that is rated “above satisfactory” 4s and 5s and attach it to the assessment document.

Any KRA or GAF in a performance report without such evidence will be deemed to have been performed at “fully effective” (a rating of a 3).

**EXEMPTIONS:**

In the following cases moderation is not compulsory except in cases where a dispute may arise between supervisor and incumbent:

- Unavailability of moderation committee members to adjudicate on cases,
- Absence of deputy Chairperson to adjudicate the Performance Assessments of the Head of PMDS unit, this will be done in order to avoid conflict of interests in terms of the chairperson and supervisor concerned for being referee and player
- When the current moderation process does not yield results/ increases backlogs/ lead to unhappiness/ grievances amongst staff member.
- Some deserving cases that may have been compromised by either ignorance or intentionally will be excluded.

In any case of the above the Head of Department shall use his/ her discretion on how best to resolve each case.

**POLICY REVIEW**

This policy and procedures shall be reviewed and revised at least once per year after consultations with and obtaining the necessary approvals from all the relevant stakeholders.

_________________
MR O MONGALE
DEPUTY-DIRECTOR GENERAL
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY

DATE: ____ / ____ / 20__

STAKEHOLDERS SIGNATURES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNION</th>
<th>REPRESENTATIVE SURNAME &amp; INITIAL</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEHAWU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPCRU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

________________________

CHAIRPERSON OF DTC

DATE: ____ / ____ / 20__