CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION - APPRAISERS Wisconsin Department of Transportation

RE2127 01/2013

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Instructions: Complete within 30 days after appraisal review acceptance. Save to PDF format *(using dashes, name file: ‘last-first-project ID’)* and send copies email to WisDOT/[Sherry Miner](mailto:sherry.miner@dot.wi.gov), Consultant Svcs Evaluations, and to appraiser being evaluated. Evaluations are used by WisDOT to ensure an appropriate level of competency and quality work product from fee appraisers. Be sure to provide to consultant. Performance conferences will be held, when appropriate, to enable improvements and consistency of work products.  Part I. – General Information | | | | | | |
| Appraiser Name (last, first) | | | | | Company Name | |
| Award Method  Appraisal Master Contract  Full-Service Master Contract (sub-consultant)  Low Bid  Other: | | | | | | |
| Project ID | | | | Master Contract ID | | Work Order No. |
| Number of Appraisals for Each Type | | | | | Contract Details | |
| Short Format Summary | | | | | Total Number of Appraisals | |
| Short Format Surplus | | | | | Contract Amount  $ | |
| Standard Format Abbreviated | | | | | Amendment Amount  $ | |
| Standard Format Before and After (Detailed) | | | | | Project Management Conference Date | |
| Standard Format Before and After Surplus | | | | | Contract Date | |
| Part II. – Region Evaluation | | | | | | |
| Region Evaluation – To be completed by regional staff and forwarded to review appraiser upon delivery of final appraisal report.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | - - EVALUATION/RATING SCALE - - | | | **5** = exceeded MOST expectations | **2** = failed SOME expectations | | **4** = exceeded SOME expectations | **1** = failed MOST expectations | | **3** = met ALL expectations | **0** = failed ALL expectations | | **NA** = not applicable | |   Enter Eval # | | | | | | | |
|  | | A. | Did appraiser cooperate with regional reviewer and other regional staff? | | | | |
|  | | B. | Was appraiser available and did they attend meetings and conferences? | | | | |
|  | | C. | Was Project Data Book (PDB) or Sales Study submitted on time? | | | | |
|  | | D. | Was required format utilized and were all components present? | | | | |
|  | | E. | Were appraisals completed on time and submitted in accordance w/contract delivery schedule? | | | | |
|  | | F. | Were reports accurate with regard to spelling and mathematical calculations? | | | | |
|  | | = | Average Rating (sub-total this section). If “NA” – Don’t include in average calculation. | | | | |
| Region’s Comments (required if any rating is below “3”): | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part III. – Review Appraiser Evaluation | | | | | | |
| Review Appraiser Evaluation – To be completed by review appraiser upon completion of final appraisal review. Review appraiser will return completed form to region for distribution and filing.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | - - EVALUATION/RATING SCALE - - | | | **5** = exceeded MOST expectations | **2** = failed SOME expectations | | **4** = exceeded SOME expectations | **1** = failed MOST expectations | | **3** = met ALL expectations | **0** = failed ALL expectations | | **NA** = not applicable | |   Enter Eval # | | | | | | |
|  | A. | Did appraiser cooperate with regional reviewer? | | | | |
|  | B. | Does scope of work section identify data collected, confirm its accuracy, and indicate conditions not considered? | | | | |
|  | C. | Was appraisal well constructed and were approaches reconciled into a value based on appropriateness, accuracy and quantity? | | | | |
|  | D. | Was number of revisions within acceptable standards? | | | | |
|  | E. | Was quality and thoroughness of Project Data Book within acceptable standards? | | | | |
|  | F. | Were appraisal problems solved in a satisfactory manner without significant instruction from reviewer? | | | | |
|  | G. | Were requests for revisions and/or additional documentation typically returned in a timely manner or within agreed specified time? | | | | |
|  | = | Average Rating (sub-total this section). If “NA” – Don’t include in average calculation. | | | | |
| Review Appraiser’s Comments (required if any rating is below “3”): | | | | | | |
| Part IV. – Recommendation | | | | | | |
| **TOTAL/COMBINED OVERALL AVERAGE PERFORMANCE RATING** (region & reviewer’s opinion)**:** | | | | | | |
| WisDOT recommendation for awarding additional/future contracts | | | | | | |
| - - Region’s Recommendation - -  Yes  Yes, but with reservations (see comments above)  No | | | |  | - - Reviewer’s Recommendation - -  Yes  Yes, but with reservations (see comments above)  No | |
|  | | |  |  |  |
| Regional staff reporting | | | Date | Review appraiser reporting | Date |