FROSS ZELNICK LEHRMAN & ZISSU, P.C. 2013 - 2014 PERFORMANCE REVIEW

NAME:	
POSITION:	
DATE OF HIRE:	
REVIEWED BY: .	

THIS FORM IS DESIGNED AS A TOOL TO AID IN PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND MERIT REVIEW.

DIRECTIONS

- 1. Read each item carefully and consider specific instances of the employee's performance to justify your rating.
- 2. Score each factor independently without regard to age, race, color, religion, sex, national origin, physical disability or mental disability.

CRITERIA FOR SALARY ADJUSTMENTS AND PERFORMANCE RATINGS

<u>OUTSTANDING</u>	Performance significantly and consistently exceeds expension	ected
--------------------	--	-------

results for the position in all major areas and overall results are clearly due to sound planning, execution, and management <u>not</u> unanticipated or "windfall" conditions. This means that virtually any knowledgeable observer would understand the overall high

quality of results in all areas.

SUPERIOR Performance is at the expected level in all areas and overall

results exceed that level to a significant degree in some

important areas.

GOOD Performance is at the expected level and overall results are

satisfactory.

MARGINAL Performance below the acceptable level, either because the

employee in the position is new and has not yet reached an acceptable level, or because the overall quality of results has

diminished since the last evaluation.

UNSATISFACTORY: Performance clearly below the acceptable level and there is no

reasonable expectation that the employee is capable of meeting the

standards for the position. This means that virtually any knowledgeable observer would understand the overall

unacceptable quality of the results.

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

PRODUCTIVITY

Consider the output of work this review period. Compare the amount of work performed with your standard for such a job:

Outstanding	(Exceptional producer)
Superior	(Above average quantity; always does more than their share)
Good	(Regularly turns out a normal or average amount of work)
Marginal	(Volume below average; does enough to get by)
Unsatisfactory	(Excessively slow)
QUALITY OF WOR	<u>.K</u>
Consider accuracy, thor	roughness and content:
Outstanding	(Exceptionally accurate)
Superior	(Only rare errors)
Good	(Few errors; dependable)
Marginal	(Frequent mistakes)
Unsatisfactory	(Careless work)
JOB KNOWLEDGE Consider grasp of pro- normal situations enco-	ocedures and proficiency in all phases of job; overall ability to handle
Outstanding	(Complete knowledge of all details of the job)
Superior	(Performs job without much assistance)
Good	(Adequate job knowledge)
Marginal	(Needs much assistance)
Unsatisfactory	(Limited understanding)
<u>INITIATIVE</u>	
Consider the employee's	self-motivation and drive in planning, organizing and performance:
Outstanding	(Self-starter; seeks responsibility)
Superior	(Willing to do more than most; will not settle for less than an excellent performance)
Good	(Shows occasional initiative)
Marginal	(Does not show effort unless prodded)
Unsatisfactory	(Does less than required)

COMMENTS

1.	Strongest areas of performance:	
2.	Areas of performance that need improvement:	
3.	Other comments:	
	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE:	DA TE: