City Attorney Performance Evaluation

November 1, 2022

RATING SCALE DEFINITIONS (1-	5)
------------------------------	----

Un	satisfactory (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) Standard		The employee's work performance is frequently or consistently above the level of a satisfactory employee.								
Ou	tstanding (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>Performan</u>	ce Evaluation and Achievemo	ents							
1.	City Commission	/ Boards Relationships	<u>NE</u>	1	2	_3_	_4_	_5		
A.		gal advice to the City Commission, ions and City staff.						+		
В.		City Commission, Boards, imely, clear, concise and thorough.						<u></u>		
C.	Accepts direction	instructions in a positive manner.						*		
D.		ommission, Boards, and City issues relevant to the requirements						7		
E.		e necessary to the responsibilities d is readily available to			-			1		

Co	omments:						*!
2.	Legal Research and Review	<u>NE</u>	1	_2_	3	_4_	5_
A.	Effectively identifies legal issues and performs research and investigations.				*******		4
В.	Effectively reviews and interprets legal instruments, reports and documents prepared by departments.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				_	4
Co	omments:						
3.	Employee/Public Relations	<u>NE</u>	1	2	3	4	_5_
A.	Works well with other employees.					7	
В.	Meeting and handling the public while recognizing ethical obligation to the City.						X
Co	omments:					1	
4.	Communication	<u>NE</u>	1	2	3	4	5
A.	Oral communication is clear, concise and articulate.				www.coddwore	all the state of t	¥
В.	Written communications (e.g.) contracts, resolutions and other legal documents are clear, concise and accurate.	S, 			•	Valence	上
Со	omments:						

5. Quantity/	Quality	<u>NE</u>	1		3	4	_5_
A. Amount of	work performed.						4
B. Completion	n of work on time.						1
C. Accuracy.							4
D. Thoroughn	ess.						*
Comments:							
	SX.						
6. Personal T	<u>'raits</u>	<u>NE</u>	1	2	3	4_	5
A. Initiative.			******				_X
B. Judgement							X
C. Fairness ar	nd Impartiality.						X
D. Analytical	Ability.						K
Comments:		n kilonian					
	A-112-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-						
7. Litigation	Administrative Proceedings	<u>NE</u>	_1_	_2_	3	_4_	_5_
	mely and effective representation of the rest in litigation.						7
	nd monitors costs and performance outside legal counsel.		and the last of th				Y
Comments:							

II. Summary Rating
Overall Performance Rating – Considering the results obtained against established performance standards as well as overall job performance, the following rating is provided (circle one):
Unsatisfactory Improvement Needed Meets Job Standards Exceeds Job Standards Outstanding
Comments: I have worked with 7 different City Attorney's during my tenure on the Commission And I CAM BAY that Shawn is One of the best ones.
COMMISSION AND FCAN BAY That Shawar 18
one of the best ones
III. Future Goals and Objectives Specific goals and objectives to be achieved in the next evaluation period: Admiral = Cut
TAXI Ordinance
OMMISSIONER JIMMY WEEKLEY
SHAWN D. SMITH, CITY ATTORNEY
ATTEST:
CHERYL SMITH, CITY CLERK Dated