



LGSETA WORKPLACE SKILLS PLAN QUALITY OBJECTIVES EVALUATION REPORT PLANNING

**Version 1
November 2007**

Name of Municipality:	
Levy No:	
Demarcation Code:	
SDF Name and Contact Details:	
Date of Evaluation:	
Name of Evaluator:	
Contact Details of Evaluator:	
Total Possible Score for WSP:	
Total Score Received:	
Percentage:	
Comment:	80% and above: Good 60% - 79%: Adequate Less that 60%: Not adequate
Evaluators' Signature:	

Section:	Cover Page	
Sub-section:	N/A	
Evaluation Criteria	N/A	
Score & Comments:	N/A	

Section:	Index	
Sub-section:	N/A	
Evaluation Criteria	N/A	
Score & Comments:	N/A	

Section:	Signatories		
Sub-section:	N/A		
Evaluation Criteria	Good – 5 Points	Adequate – 3 Points	Not Adequate – 1 Point
	• Complete & accurate	• Incomplete & accurate	• Incomplete & inaccurate
Source of Verification	• EMP 201, database		
Score & Comments:			

Section:	Executive Summary – Workplace Skills Plan	
Sub-section:	N/A	
Evaluation Criteria	N/A	
Score & Comments:	N/A	

Section:	1: Details of Municipality		
Sub-section:	1.1. Name and Type		
Evaluation Criteria	Good – 5 Points	Adequate – 3 Points	Not Adequate – 1 Point
	• Complete & accurate	• Incomplete & accurate	• Incomplete & inaccurate
Source of Verification	• Demarcation Board, template drop down		
Score & Comments:			
Sub-section:	1.2 Standard Industrial Classification Codes		
Evaluation Criteria	Good – 5 Points	Adequate – 3 Points	Not Adequate – 1 Point
	• Complete & accurate	• Incomplete & accurate	• Incomplete & inaccurate
Source of Verification	• Demarcation Board, template drop down		
Score & Comments:			

Sub-section:	1.3 Contact Details of the CFO			
Evaluation Criteria	Good – 5 Points		Adequate – 3 Points	Not Adequate – 1 Point
	• Complete & accurate		• Incomplete & accurate	• Incomplete & inaccurate
Source of Verification	• Demarcation Board, template drop down			
Score & Comments:				
Sub-section:	1.4 Global Figures			
Evaluation Criteria	Section	Good – 5 Points	Adequate – 3 Points	Not Adequate – 1 Point
	1.4.1 & 1.4.2	• Deviation of no more than 5% of DMB, SARS EMP 201	• Deviation of 6% - 10% of DMB, SARS EMP 201	• Deviation of more than 10% of DMB, SARS EMP 201
	1.4.3 – 1.4.9	• Complete & accurate	• Incomplete & accurate	• Incomplete & inaccurate
Source of Verification	• Demarcation Board, SARS EMP 201 • Demarcation Board, template drop down			
Score & Comments:				

Sub-section:	1.5 Proposed expenditure on training – Municipal Employees		
Evaluation Criteria	Good – 5 Points	Adequate – 3 Points	Not Adequate – 1 Point
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of maximum leveraging of funds for training Budget accurately indicated and correlates to WSP sections S 8 (est cost), S10.2, S 11 Budget for full expenditure including all funding sources <i>At least 2 out of 3 criteria must be met to achieve 5 points</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partial leveraging of training funds, (at least mandatory & discretionary) Accurately indicated Correlates to relevant WSP sections <i>At least 2 out of 3 criteria must be met to achieve 3 points</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grant funds incorrectly stated No evidence of training budget No evidence of additional funds No correlation with relevant WSP sections
Source of Verification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Datanet, WSP/ATR 		
Score & Comments:			

Sub-section:	1.6 Proposed expenditure on training – Unemployed People		
Evaluation Criteria	Good – 5 Points	Adequate – 3 Points	Not Adequate – 1 Point
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of maximum leveraging of funds for training Budget indicated correlates to WSP sections S 4.4, S 4.5, S 6, S 7, S 9, S 10.2, S 13. Proposed expenditure on unemployed from own sources does not exceed 33% of own expenditure on employed <p><i>At least 2 out of 3 criteria must be met to achieve 5 points</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partial leveraging of training funds, (discretionary) Accurately indicated & correlates to relevant WSP sections <p><i>At least 1 out of 2 criteria must be met to achieve 3 points</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence of training budget No correlation with relevant WSP sections Proposed expenditure on unemployed exceeds proposed expenditure on employed
Source of Verification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Datanet, WSP/ATR 		
Score & Comments:			

Section:	2: Primary Skills Development Facilitator			
Sub-section:	N/A			
Evaluation Criteria	Section	Good – 5 Points	Adequate – 3 Points	Not Adequate – 1 Point
	2.1 – 2.9	• Complete & accurate	• Incomplete & accurate	• Incomplete & inaccurate
	2.10 – 2.12	• 2 out of 3 employment equity categories met	• 1 out of 3 employment equity categories met	• No employment equity categories met
	2.13	• Nominated by employees	• Appointed by employer	• Self appointed
	2.14	• Senior management position	• Middle management position	• Junior management position or below
	2.16 & 2.17	• Specialist HR Degree or Post Graduate Diploma and appropriate SDF/EDTP short course training	• Specialist SDF short course training	• No further training.
	2.18	• Participation in all SDF forums	• Participation half of the SDF forums	• No participation in SDF Forums
	2.20	• Training policy developed and approved	• Training policy developed but not approved	• No training policy
Score & Comments:				

Section:	3: Description of Municipality's Consultative Process			
Sub-section:	N/A			
Evaluation Criteria	Section	Good – 5 Points	Adequate – 3 Points	Not Adequate – 1 Point
	3.1, 3.2 & 3.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training Committee exists and is representative of both organised labour and employers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training Committee exists but is not fully representative of all parties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Training Committee
	3.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used workshops and formal meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used formal meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used informal meetings or no meetings at all
	3.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two or more consultative meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one consultative meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No consultative meetings held
3.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four or more different methods of communication used 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two or three different methods of communication used 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No communication or word of mouth only 	
Score & Comments:				

Section:	4: Employment Profile		
Sub-section:	4.1 Total Number of Employees in the Enterprise		
Evaluation Criteria	Good – 5 Points	Adequate – 3 Points	Not Adequate – 1 Point
	<p>At least 4 of the criteria below are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80% Black (inc apprentices) • 52% Women (inc apprentices) • 4% PWDs (inc apprentices) • 50% - 60% of workforce between 31 and 50 • 20% - 30% of workforce between 51 and 65 • 20% - 30% of workforce between 18 and 30 	<p>At least 4 of the criteria below are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 70% Black (inc apprentices) • 45% Women (inc apprentices) • 2% PWD (inc apprentices) • 40% - 50% of workforce between 31 and 50 • 30% - 40% of workforce between 51 and 65 • 30% - 40% of workforce between 18 and 30 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate representation in terms of race, gender and disability, either in terms of absolute numbers or over-representation of particular designated groups in certain SOCs • No apprentices • Any substantial variation from the age distribution given above
Score & Comments:			

Section:	4: Employment Profile			
Sub-section:	4.2 Number of new recruits employed			
Evaluation Criteria	Section	Good – 5 Points	Adequate – 3 Points	Not Adequate – 1 Point
	4.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows clear links to 4.1 and evidence that profile of new recruits substantially addresses race/age /gender imbalances. New recruits include apprentices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some links to 4.1 and some evidence that profile addresses imbalances. New recruits include apprentices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No new recruits, despite vacancies shown in 10.1 OR new recruits do not contribute to addressing imbalances. No apprentices recruited.
Score & Comments:				

Section:	4: Employment Profile			
Sub-section:	4.3 New Labour Market Entrants Employed			
Evaluation Criteria	Section	Good – 5 Points	Adequate – 3 Points	Not Adequate – 1 Point
	4.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10%-15% of total new recruits are new labour market entrants, including apprentices New labour market entrants substantially address race/age /gender imbalances. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Between 5% and 9% of total new recruits are new labour market entrants, including apprentices New labour market entrants partially address race/age /gender imbalances. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than 5% of new recruits are new labour market entrants OR new recruits do not contribute to addressing imbalances. No new labour market entrants are apprentices recruited
Score & Comments:				

Section:	4: Employment Profile			
Sub-section:	4.4 Number of Interns Given Structured Work Experience			
Evaluation Criteria	Section	Good – 5 Points	Adequate – 3 Points	Not Adequate – 1 Point
	4.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interns to the equivalent of 2% or more of total employees given structured work experience • Interns linked to LGSETA scarce skills areas/IDP priority areas • Interns reflect employment equity requirements <p><i>At least 2 out of 3 criteria must be met to achieve 5 points</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interns to the equivalent of 1% of total employees given structured work experience • Interns linked to LGSETA scarce skills areas/IDP priority areas • Interns reflect employment equity requirements <p><i>At least 2 out of 3 criteria must be met to achieve 3 points</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No interns given structured work experience OR • Interns not linked to LGSETA scarce skills areas/IDP priority areas OR • Interns do not reflect employment equity requirements
Score & Comments:				

Section:	4: Employment Profile			
Sub-section:	4.5 Number of 18.2 Learners Given Structured Work Experience			
Evaluation Criteria	Section	Good – 5 Points	Adequate – 3 Points	Not Adequate – 1 Point
	4.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.2 learners to the equivalent of between 2% and 5% of total employees • 80% of 18.2 learners are black • 52% of 18.2 learners are women • 52% of 18.2 learners are PWD • Totals reflect EE targets • Work experience provided in LGSETA scarce skills areas <p><i>At least 4 out of 6 criteria must be met to achieve 5 points</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.2 learners to the equivalent of less than 1% of total employees, or between 5% and 10% of total employees • 70% of 18.2 learners are black • 45% of 18.2 learners are women • 2% of 18.2 learners are PWD • Work experience provided in some LGSETA scarce skills areas <p><i>At least 3 out of 5 criteria must be met to achieve 3 points</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No 18.2 learners given structured work experience, or more than 10% of total employees • No reflection of equity targets • No link to LGSETA scarce skills areas
Score & Comments:				

Section:	4: Employment Profile			
Sub-section:	4.6 Number of Employees who Left the Enterprise			
Evaluation Criteria	Section	Good – 5 Points	Adequate – 3 Points	Not Adequate – 1 Point
	4.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than 5% of the workforce left the enterprise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5% - 8% of the workforce left the enterprise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More than 8% of the workforce left the enterprise
Score & Comments:				

Section:	5: Employee Qualification Profile			
Sub-section:	5.1: Employee Qualification Profile			
Evaluation Criteria	Section	Good – 5 Points	Adequate – 3 Points	Not Adequate – 1 Point
	5.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than 25% of total employees have an NQF Level 1 and below Less than 45% of employees have NQF 2, 3 and 4 More than 30% have NQF 5 and above 80% of 'Directors and Corporate Managers' and 'Professionals' have NQF 6 or above 80% of 'Technicians and Trade Workers' have NQF 5 and above <p><i>At least 3 out of 5 criteria must be met to achieve 5 points</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 25% - 35% of total employees have an NQF Level 1 and below 45% - 60% of employees have between NQF 2 and 4 20% - 30% have NQF 5 and above 60% - 80% of 'Directors and Corporate Managers' and 'Professionals' have NQF 6 or above 60% - 80% of 'Technicians and Trade Workers' have NQF 5 and above <p><i>At least 3 out of 5 criteria must be met to achieve 3 points</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More than 35% of total employees have an NQF Level 1 and below More than 60% of employees have between NQF 2 and 4 Less than 30% have NQF 5 and above Less than 60% of 'Directors and Corporate Managers' and 'Professionals' have NQF 6 or above Less than 60% of 'Technicians and Trade Workers' have NQF 5 and above
Score & Comments:				

Section:	5: Employee Qualification Profile
-----------------	-----------------------------------

Sub-section:	5.2: Process used to complete Employee Qualification Profile			
Evaluation Criteria	Section	Good – 5 Points	Adequate – 3 Points	Not Adequate – 1 Point
	5.2	• Used at least 4 methods	• Used at least 3 methods	• Used less than 2 methods
Score & Comments:				

Section:	6: Strategic Objectives and Measures of Success for Municipalities			
Sub-section:	N/a			
Evaluation Criteria	Section	Good – 5 Points	Adequate – 3 Points	Not Adequate – 1 Point
	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IDP objectives clearly stated Municipal objectives linked to IDP objectives Training and development objectives are clearly linked to municipal objectives EE objectives are clearly linked to training objectives All targets and measures of success are clearly stated and quantifiable <p><i>At least 3 out of 5 criteria must be met to achieve 5 points</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most of these links are made Most of the targets and measures of success are clearly stated and quantifiable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than half of links are made Less than half of the targets and measures of success are clearly stated and quantifiable
Sources of verification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IDP, Employment Equity Plan, HRD Strategy/Policy 			
Score & Comments:				

Section:	7: Sector Priority Skills Areas			
Sub-section:	N/a			
Evaluation Criteria	Section	Good – 5 Points	Adequate – 3 Points	Not Adequate – 1 Point
	7.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80% or more skills are linked directly to the Municipal objectives and to the employee qualification profile 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 60% - 80% of prioritization is linked directly to the Municipal objectives and to the employee qualification profile 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than 60% of prioritization is linked directly to the Municipal objectives and to the employee qualification profile
Sources of verification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 6 and Section 4.1 of the Plan 			
Score & Comments:				

Section:	8: Proposed Programmes – Training for Municipal Employees			
Sub-section:	N/a			
What's new or different	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a new section, in which the programmes that you are going to offer to Municipal Employees are detailed. 			
Evaluation Criteria	Section	Good – 5 Points	Adequate – 3 Points	Not Adequate – 1 Point
	8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80% or more of proposed programmes are linked to Sections 6 and 7, including the employment profile. 80% of interventions are formal, unit standards based interventions Targeted employment categories link to Employment Equity objectives and Qualifications Profile. Estimated cost links to 1.5 <i>At least 3 out of 4 criteria must be met to achieve 5 points</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50% - 80% of proposed programmes are linked to Sections 6 and 7, including the employment profile. 80% of interventions are formal, unit standards based interventions Targeted employment categories link to Employment Equity objectives and Qualifications Profile. Estimated cost links to 1.5 <i>At least 3 out of 4 criteria must be met to achieve 3 points</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than 50% of proposed programmes are linked to Sections 6 and 7, including the employment profile. Less than 80% of interventions are formal, unit standards based interventions Targeted employment categories do not link to Employment Equity objectives and Qualifications Profile. Estimated cost does not link to 1.5
Sources of verification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sections 1.5, 6 and 7 of the Plan 			
Score & Comments:				

Section:	9: Proposed Programmes – Training for the Unemployed			
Sub-section:	N/a			
Evaluation Criteria	Section	Good – 5 Points	Adequate – 3 Points	Not Adequate – 1 Point
	9.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training for the unemployed does not exceed 20% of the cost of training for employees • All interventions are formal interventions • 70% or more of the training leads to full quals • Equity targets are addressed in selection of learners. • Training links to IDP and scarce skills. • Exit opportunities are indicated <p><i>At least 4 out of 6 criteria must be met to achieve 5 points</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training for the unemployed exceeds 20% of the cost of training for employees • Most interventions are formal interventions • 50% - 70% of the training leads to full qualifications • Some equity targets are addressed in the selection of learners. • Training links to IDP and scarce skills. • Exit opportunities are indicated <p><i>At least 4 out of 6 criteria must be met to achieve 3 points</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No training for the unemployed or training exceeds training for employees in terms of cost. • No interventions are formal, unit standards based interventions • Less than of the training leads to full qualifications • Equity targets are not addressed in the selection of learners. • Training does not link to IDP and scarce skills. • No exit opportunities are indicated
Score & Comments:				

Section:	10: Critical and Scarce Skills			
Sub-section:	10.1 Department of Labour Critical and Scarce Skills			
Evaluation Criteria	Section	Good – 5 Points	Adequate – 3 Points	Not Adequate – 1 Point
	10.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table is completed in full • Posts filled and posts vacant relate to posts per organogram • No of vacant posts does not exceed 10% of total posts, or 15% in any given category. • Strategy to fill posts through training and development or recruitment is evident. <p><i>At least 3 out of 4 criteria must be met to achieve 5 points</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table is completed in full • Posts filled and posts vacant relate to posts per organogram • No of vacant posts between 10% and 25% of total posts, or between 15% and 25% in any given category. • Strategy to fill posts through training and development or recruitment is evident <p><i>At least 3 out of 4 criteria must be met to achieve 3 points</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table incorrectly completed, incomplete or inconsistent • Excessive vacancy rates • No strategy to fill posts
Score & Comments:				

Section:	10: Critical and Scarce Skills			
Sub-section:	10.2 LGSETA Scarce Skills			
Evaluation Criteria	Section	Good – 5 Points	Adequate – 3 Points	Not Adequate – 1 Point
	10.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 60% or more of all training, including discretionary grant funded interventions, is linked to Scarce Skills Areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 40% - 60% of all training, including discretionary grant funded interventions, is linked to Scarce Skills Areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than 40% of all training, including discretionary grant funded interventions, is linked to Scarce Skills Areas
Score & Comments:				

Section:	11: No of beneficiaries to receive ABET			
Sub-section:	N/A			
Evaluation Criteria	Section	Good – 5 Points	Adequate – 3 Points	Not Adequate – 1 Point
	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Linked to Sections 5.1 and 7 50% of total people with NQF 1 and below are targeted for ABET training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Linked to Sections 5.1 and 7 30% - 49% of total people with NQF 1 and below are targeted for ABET training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No link to Sections 5.1 and 7 Less than 29% of total people with NQF 1 and below are targeted for ABET training OR No ABET being provided
Score & Comments:				

Section:	12: No of beneficiaries to be trained			
Sub-section:	N/A			
Evaluation Criteria	Section	Good – 5 Points	Adequate – 3 Points	Not Adequate – 1 Point
	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 10% of all employees will receive training • 80% or more beneficiaries are less than 50 years old • 80% or more beneficiaries are black • 52% or more beneficiaries are women • 4% or more beneficiaries are PWD • 80% of training shows clear linkages with IDP, EE and training objectives from Section 6 • The training is equally spread amongst SOCs <p><i>At least 6 out of 8 criteria must be met to achieve 5 points</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Between 5% and 10% of all employees will receive training • 60% - 79% of beneficiaries are less than 50 years old • 60% - 79% of beneficiaries are black • 40% - 51% of beneficiaries are women • 2%-3% of beneficiaries are PWD • 60% - 80% of training shows clear linkages with IDP, EE and training objectives from Section 6 • Training is not equally spread between SOCs but no single SOC dominates <p><i>At least 6 out of 8 criteria must be met to achieve 3 points</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4% or less employees will receive training • Less than 59% of beneficiaries are less than 50 years old • Less than 59% of beneficiaries are black • Less than 39% of beneficiaries are women • Less than 1% of beneficiaries are PWD • Less than 59% of training shows clear linkages with IDP and EE objectives from Section 6 • Training is not equally spread between SOCs and some SOCs clearly dominate access to training
Score & Comments:				

Section:	13: No of Learnerships, Skills Programmes and Apprenticeships			
Sub-section:	N/A			
Evaluation Criteria for Planning and Reporting	Section	Good – 5 Points	Adequate – 3 Points	Not Adequate – 1 Point
	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80% of interventions are linked to Scarce Skills Areas All three types of interventions are indicated 18.2 Learners do not exceed 20% of Total Learners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 60% - 79% of interventions are linked to Scarce Skills Areas 18.2 Learners are between 20% and 30% of Total Learners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than 59% of interventions are linked to Scarce Skills Areas 18.2 Learners are more than 30% of Total Learners
Score & Comments:				

Section:	14: Quality Assurance – Providers Used			
Sub-section:	N/A			
Evaluation Criteria for Planning and Reporting	Section	Good – 5 Points	Adequate – 3 Points	Not Adequate – 1 Point
	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80% or more of Providers used are accredited with the relevant ETQA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 60% - 79% of Providers used are accredited with the relevant ETQA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than 59% of Providers used are accredited with the relevant ETQA
Score & Comments:				