## **City Attorney Performance Evaluation**

December 2017

RATING SCALE D	EFINITIONS (1-5)							
Unsatisfactory (1) -	The employee's work performance is inadequate and definitely inferior to the standards of performance required for the job. Performance at this level cannot be allowed to continue.							
Improvement (2) Needed	The employee's work performance does not consistently meet the standards of the position. Serious effort is needed to improve performance.							
Meets Job (3) Standard	The employee's work performance consistently meets the standards of the position.							
Exceeds Job (4)  The employee's work performance is frequently or consistently above the level of a satisfactory employee.								
Outstanding (5)	The employee's work performance is consistently excellent when compared to the standards of the job.							
Not evaluated (NE)	The employee's work performance was not observed during this evaluation period.							
I. <u>Performanc</u>	e Evaluation and Achievements							
I. City Commission	/ Boards Relationships NE 1 2 3 4 5							
A. Provides sound legal advice to the City Commission,  Boards, Commissions and City staff								

1.	City Commission/ Boards Relationships	<u>NE</u>	_1_		3_	4	5
A.	Provides sound legal advice to the City Commission, Boards, Commissions and City staff.	description .	_	_	***		X
B.	Reporting to the City Commission, Boards, and City staff is timely, clear, concise and thorough.				at a state of the	151	20
C.	Accepts direction/instructions in a positive manner.						X
D.	Keeps the City Commission, Boards, and City staff informed of issues relevant to the requirements of the position.			an ingeneral and an analysis of the same o	attinuit		<u>&gt;&gt;</u>
E.	Dedicates the time necessary to the responsibilities of the position and is readily available to Commissioners.					Adding to the state of the stat	<u> </u>

5. Quantity/Quality		NE	_1_	2	_3_	4	_5_
A. Amount of work performed.							<u>\</u>
B. Completic	on of work on time.						$\searrow$
C. Accuracy.							
D. Thorough	ness.						
Comments:							
6. Personal T	<b>Fraits</b>	NE	1	2	3	4	5
A. Initiative.		_					
B. Judgement						$\sim$	
C. Fairness and Impartiality.						<u>×</u>	
D. Analytical Ability.							<u>~</u>
Comments:	NO SECRET THAT MR S.	44					
	POST YSAR ON DISCHARGE I	FAR	127 N	PLOY	ES.	I ST	IL RESPECT
	ALL THAT HE DOES + HAS	D HOL	D 1410	4 /N	HIGH	ES 100	M. FAPPRE
	ALC THAT HE DOES + HAS	Don	ir far	THE	C17.	4!	
7. Litigation	Administrative Proceedings	<u>NE</u>	1	_2_	3	4	_5_
A. Provides tin City's inter		_				<u>×</u>	
B. Controls are of retained						<u>×</u>	
Comments:							

H 6	D 4			
II. Summa	ary Rating			
Overall Perform as well as overal	ance Rating – Considering light job performance, the fo	ng the results obtained a llowing rating is provid	gainst established perforn ed (circle one):	nance standard
Unsatisfactory	Improvement Needed	Meets Job Standards	Exceeds Job Standards	Outstanding
Comments:	ONS1576NTL	4 15×0000	S STANDAR	205
1760 Q(	100767 KM	CHING 047	STANDING	
	Goals and Objective  d objectives to be achieve		a period:	
	a cojecu ves to be demove	od in the next evaluation	period.	
100	1875			
COMMISSION	RCLAYTON LODEZ			
	TH, CITY ATTORNEY			
ATTEST:	yl Sme	th		
CHERYL SMITH	, CITY CLERK		Dated	

Commissioner Lopez's Evaluation