

## User's Manual – Consultant Performance Evaluation

### I. Purpose

This manual provides the information necessary for a review to evaluate the quality of a consultant's design work, plan submissions and project management.

### II. Overview of the Consultant Performance Evaluation

#### a. Evaluation Goal

The goal of the consultant performance evaluation is to enhance the quality of construction plans. This is accomplished by identifying those areas in a consultant's design development process that need improvement.

#### b. Evaluation Objectives

The objectives of the Consultant Performance Evaluation are:

1. To provide a uniform rating system that will measure a consultant's conformance with City of Columbus design process, procedures and standards.
2. To provide City of Columbus and consultant management with timely information on the evaluation results of each review conducted.

#### c. Evaluation Method

Design work performed is evaluated using this evaluation.

As part of the Department's review process, the work is evaluated for compliance with each of the following seven performance categories:

- 1) Project Approach
- 2) Project Management and Coordination
- 3) Schedule/Progress
- 4) Plan Development/Quality of Work
- 5) Contract/Budget and Invoicing
- 6) Subconsultant Management
- 7) Constructability

A four-point rating scale is used to describe the consultant's degree of compliance with each performance category.

Each review submission is classified into one or more of the 11 possible professional services review categories (Preliminary Engineering Study, Traffic Operation Studies, Traffic Signal Installation Improvements, Roadway Improvements – Major, Roadway Improvements – Minor (streetscape, sidewalks, ADA ramps, etc.), Roadway Design- Intersection Improvements, Bridge Rehabilitation Design, Electrical/Street Lighting Design, Engineering Surveying, Materials Testing and Right-of-Way Design).

The rating form, "**Consultant Performance Evaluation**", is used by the individual reviewer to record the performance rating for each review.

A set of review questions has been provided as a guide to help determine a score for each category.

Project Approach:

Consultant's ability to resolve technical design problems:

- a) Did consultant provide creative solutions or alternatives?
- b) Did the consultant actively contribute in meeting discussions?
- c) Did the consultant follow through on decisions made, at meetings or other project correspondence?
- d) Were the deliverables complete?
- e) Was the writing style/presentation clear with supporting documentation and/or analysis?
- f) Were all comments adequately addressed and/or incorporated into the report/documents?

Project Management and Coordination

Consultant's responsiveness to Capital Improvement Projects and User Agency design and program criteria:

- a) Did the consultant demonstrate a clear understanding of project expectations?
- b) Was the consultant timely in responding to the City's requests?
- c) Did the consultant accurately follow the scope and other instructions from the City?
- d) Did the consultant keep the City project manager updated on the status of scope, schedule, and budget (potential out of scope items) of the project?
- e) Was the consultant available and accessible when needed?
- f) Did the consultant work well with the City and other stakeholders?

Schedule/Progress:

Consultant's availability to meet important project milestones:

- a) Did fee negotiations occur in efficient manner, meeting goal (timeframe) 90 days City and 120 days federally funded?
- b) Did the consultant submit deliverables always on time or early?
- c) Did the consultant submit deliverables always on time?
- d) Did the consultant submit deliverables usually late?
- e) Did the consultant submit deliverables consistently late?

Plan Development/Quality of Work:

Consultant's ability to submit complete design/study packages within the established project specific schedules and fee:

- a) Did the consultant minimize unnecessary involvement from City staff?
- b) Did the consultant demonstrate understanding of City and other applicable standards?
- c) Was the consultant proactive in identifying potential issues before they became a problem?
- d) Did the consultant provide cost saving ideas and value through the design

- e) Did the consultant work to minimize additional cost to the City when out of scope items or unexpected design issues arose?
- f) Did the consultant provide contract documents in a sufficiently clear and complete way that no addenda or only minor addenda had to be issued
- g) Did the consultant respond to pre-bid questions effectively and quickly?
- h) Was engineer's estimate within 10% of bid amount?

Contract/Budget and Invoicing:

Did consultant demonstrate awareness of the engineering/design budget and communicate concerns?

- a) Did consultant submit invoices in a timely and accurate fashion, including progress reports and subconsultant affidavit form?
- b) Did the consultant provide anticipated value given the scope of work?

Subconsultant Management:

Consultant's ability to effectively manage the subconsultants:

- a) Did the Consultant keep the subconsultants informed of issues?
- b) Did the Consultant effectively use the project subconsultants as informational resources?
- c) Did the Consultant adequately review subconsultant's work prior to submittals for review approval?
- d) Did the Consultant take responsibility for ensuring the quality of work from all subconsultants and adequately coordinate the work in Design.
- e) Did Consultant meet utilization as in original contract proposal?
- f) Did Consultant hold the subconsultant to project schedule?
- g) Did Consultant have control over subconsultant?

Constructability\*:

Consultant's knowledge of constructability issues:

- a) Did the consultant coordinate R/W effectively?
- b) Did the consultant coordinate utilities effectively?
- c) Did consultant consider constructability of project during design including reviewing quantities?
- d) Did the consultant respond appropriately to RFI's during construction?
- e) Did project complete below or above original bid amount?
- f) Where there significant change orders based on plan error?

\*Points from this category are not added to the consultant performance evaluation, as plans should be designed to be constructible. Design consultant could lose points in this category.

**d. Use of the Evaluation Data**

The primary uses of the consultant performance evaluation data are to:

1. Provide consultant with timely information about design and plan preparation deficiencies attributed to work produced by their staff
2. Assist the City selection committee for specific design projects.
3. Monitor changes in the quality of work produced by the consultants.

4. Assist City in focusing review effort on poorly performing consultants.
5. Determine the effectiveness and identify deficiencies in the City's design requirements and review processes.

### III. Using the Evaluation Form

a. The form is located on the Department of Public Service Website under the Design Resources Tab.

b. Header Data

The top of the form should be filled out completely.

1. Project Name:
2. Project CIP 6+6 #
3. Consultant Firm
4. Consultant Project Manager
5. List of Subconsultants:
6. Evaluation Type
7. Date

c. Professional Services

The reviewer will mark the appropriate box to indicate the "Professional Services that are considered as part of the evaluation.

d. Performance Categories and Rating Scale

A four-point rating scale has been established. The reviewer is to mark an "X" in the column that best describes how the submission met requirements. There are four rating columns ranging from four to one. By marking the left-most column, that particular performance category would receive a score of four points, by marking the next column, that performance category would receive three points, by marking the second to the right, that performance category would receive two points. Only one point is received when the right-most column is marked, meaning that the performance category is considered unacceptable to City of Columbus Standards.

Categories are weighted and incorporated into a percentage; the maximum total percentage prior to construction that could be received is 100%.

- Project Approach - 15%
- Project Management and Coordination – 20%
- Schedule/Progress – 20%
- Plan Development/Quality of Work- 25%
- Contract/Budget and Invoicing -10%
- Subconsultant Management – 10%
- Constructability – (Maximum deduction 20% from score prior to construction)

e. Reviewer's Comments

The "Comment" section **must** be used by the reviewer to explain all ratings (problems that were encountered, etc.). This information shall substantiate the rating.

#### f. General Rating Guidance

- Only one evaluation of final plans.
- Only one evaluation for constructability once project is completed.
- The ratings given must be supportable. The comments should be supported by adequate documentation.
- The reviewer should complete and submit the evaluation to their supervisor within two weeks of receiving the Director of Public Service's signature, approval of the study or the recognized construction last day of work.
- The reviewer's supervisor should review all evaluation ratings made by the reviewer to insure uniformity and objectivity and submit to the Section Manager within one week of receiving evaluation from the reviewer.
- The Section Manager will provide the final approval for the evaluation within one week of receiving the evaluation.
- Final evaluation scores will be submitted to the consultant within forty-five (45) days of signature, study approval or the recognized construction last day of work. A scheduled date and time for a thirty minute meeting will accompany the evaluation submitted to the consultant for plans and studies. If score does not change after the construction evaluation a meeting is optional. A meeting after the construction evaluation will be scheduled if score has changed.
- Consultants will be allowed a thirty (30) minute meeting with no more than 2 (two) representatives from their company to discuss evaluation scores.
- After review meeting, if consultants are in disagreement with the evaluation an appeal can be requested.
- Completed evaluation forms should be retained in the project file for at least 12 months in the event a consultant questions a rating appeal.

#### g. Appeal Process

When a consultant's project manager or firm disagrees with the performance evaluation rating there are three opportunities for appeal.

1. The first appeal is to the evaluation approver (supervisor). The first appeal must be made within 15 calendar days of the evaluation meeting. The consultant may contact the evaluation approver if there is concern that a rating was given in error based on statement of fact, (e.g. something was missed). If the evaluation approver determines that a rating was given in error the evaluation approver will return the evaluation to the initial reviewer for a secondary review and additional comments based on the new information provided by consultant.
2. The second appeal is to the Division Administrator. A written appeal must be made within 15 calendar days of receiving the response of the first appeal. An appeal to Division Administrator must be made in writing via email or letter and must provide a detailed argument and documentation justifying reconsideration of the evaluation scoring. Appeals to the Division Administrator must but be copied to the applicable Project Manager and Section Manager.

3. The third appeal is to the Department of Public Service Director. A written appeal must be made within 15 calendar days of receiving the response of the second appeal. An appeal to the Department of Public Service Director must be in writing via email or letter and must provide a detailed argument and documentation justifying reconsideration of the evaluation scoring. All decisions made by the Director are final.