

**MINISTRY: PUBLIC SERVICE AND ADMINISTRATION**

**REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA**

**NATIONAL ASSEMBLY**

**QUESTION FOR WRITTEN REPLY**

**DATE: 26 MAY 2023**

**QUESTION NO.: 2007.**

**Mrs C C S Motsepe (EFF) to ask the Minister of Public Service and Administration:**

What consequence management steps has he taken against supervisors who gave their favourite subordinates inappropriately high rates for the Performance Management and Development System? **NW2268E**

**REPLY:**

The department does not have a record of any favouritism reported in the awarding of performance scores.

1. In terms of the department’s Performance Management and Development System for employees on salary levels 2 to 12, the following steps are followed in the Assessment Process:
   1. Self-Assessment;
   2. Supervisory Assessment;
   3. If there is consensus between the supervisor and employee on the rating, the rating becomes a Provisional Assessment Rating (PAR). All employees’ PARs are submitted to the Chief Directorate Assessment Panel for assessment, informed by evidence/motivation, where assessment/moderating is conducted. If there is disagreement that cannot be resolved between the employee and the supervisor on the scores given, the employee and supervisor must each note their reasons on a form. The higher level supervisor may be engaged on the matter, if unsuccessful, this must be submitted to a mutually agreed mediator for mediation. If mediation does not result in a resolution within five days, the written noted are later submitted together with a form to the Chief Directorate Assessment Panel.
   4. The process of assessment moderation:
      1. Chief Directorate Assessment Panel (CDAP), headed by the relevant Chief Director, and further consisting of the Directors in the environment moderates the ratings of all employees in the relevant Chief Directorate, plays a critical role in assessing/moderating the provisional assessment rating of employees. Each supervisor on salary level 9 and above presents the rating scores allocated to employees in that unit to the CDAP and shall substantiate such scores, especially in cases of below average performance, or in cases where a performance bonus may be granted. If the CDAP does not accept the final rating agreed to between the employee and the supervisor, the supervisor must report back to the employee on the outcome of the CDAP recommendations. The CDAP may request the supervisor to rescore with the employee and revert to another sitting of the CDAP. If there is no change to the original final score that was sent back to the employee and supervisor, the CDAP makes a recommendation. The final recommendation of the CDAP is sent to the Branch Validating Committee to be noted as such by the BVC for final recommendation.
      2. Branch Validating Committee (BVC), chaired by a Deputy Director-General of a Branch and comprises of Chief Directors within the Branch. The BVC reviews validates quality assured Annual Performance Assessments based on evidence of the Annual Performance Plan, Annual Operational Plan, Performance Agreements and Workplans to recommend revision or approval. The BVC also verifies consistency and fairness in application of ratings across Chief Directorates and validate appropriate scoring/rating.
      3. Departmental Moderation Committee (DMC), is chaired by the Director-General and comprises of Branch Heads (Deputy Director-Generals) in the department. The DMC ensures that the annual performance assessment is done in a realistic, consistent and fair manner. The DMC further monitors the performance assessment process by obtaining an overall sense of whether norms and standards are being applied consistently and realistically to employees on the same level and validate the assessment overall across the branch for purposes of evaluating ratings, and develop an overall view of the results of the process.
   5. Decision Making: only after a Performance Assessment of an employee on salary level 2 to 12 has been subjected to assessment moderation by the CDAP, BVC and DMC, the outcome of the assessment is processed to the Director-General for approval.
2. Chapter 4 of the SMS Handbook, regulates the Performance Assessment for SMS members (L.13 to 15), the following steps are followed in the Assessment Process:
   1. Self-Assessment;
   2. Supervisory Assessment;
   3. If there is consensus between the supervisor and employee on the rating, the rating becomes an Agreed Rating. All employees’ PARs are submitted to the Departmental Moderation Committee (DMC), informed by evidence/motivation, where assessment/moderating is conducted. If there is disagreement that cannot be resolved between the employee and the supervisor on the scores given, it must be escalated to the mutually agreed Mediator (refer to the Mediator on the Performance Agreement of the employee). If the mediation process fails, the employee and the supervisor shall indicate in writing the nature of the disagreement. They shall sign the performance assessment and forward it to the DMC.
   4. The process of assessment moderation:
      1. The DMC, established by the Executive Authority, shall moderate the performance assessment results. The DMC moderates the performance assessment results against the departmental programme performance and during this process, consider the individual SMS member’s contributions towards the achievements of the organisational objectives.
      2. The DMC may change the assessment scores of SMS members and the department’s annual report and Auditor General’s Opinion and Findings are used to corroborate and allocate appropriate scores..
   5. Decision Making:
      1. Only after a Performance Assessment of an employee on salary level 2 to 12 has been subjected to assessment moderation by the DMC, the outcome of the assessment is processed to the Director-General for approval.
      2. The DMC makes recommendations to the Executive Authority on the level of performance of SMS members and the results are implemented after approval by the Executive Authority or his/her delegate
   6. In view of the extended moderation processes regulated for Performance Management and Development systems on and below SMS level, it does not leave room for a supervisor to be subjective to the extent of awarding a favourite surbordinate inappropriately high rates during Performance Assessments.
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