

## OP-B-11-G1 ARCHITECT/ENGINEER EVALUATIONS

### SPECIFIC AUTHORITY

Sections 287.055(3)(d), 1001.74, F. S.

### OBJECTIVE

To establish procedures for the evaluation of architects and engineers while under contract for a project at FSU.

### OVERVIEW

Architects and engineers (A/Es) are rated twice yearly while under contract at FSU. Ratings are maintained on file and these past performance ratings serve as a portion of the score on selections for future FSU projects.

#### A. EVALUATION SCHEDULE

Architects/engineers under contract to FSU are evaluated by the Facilities Design and Construction Office (FDC) on a semiannual basis, in January and July. In order to be rated, a firm must have been under contract for at least two (2) months of the rating period. An evaluation may be conducted at any time when a significant change in performance occurs.

#### B. GENERAL DEVELOPMENT OF RATING

The project manager reviews each firm's performance and assigns points for each category. Individual category ratings are assigned as integers (whole numbers), using the following scale:

4 = Outstanding	2 = Satisfactory (meets expectations)
3 = Above Satisfactory	1 = Less than Satisfactory

A satisfactory score of 2 is the benchmark rating and the level of performance that meets contract requirements.

#### C. EVALUATION FORM (ATTACHMENT 1) INFORMATION

"FIRM" is the name of the firm being evaluated. If it is a joint venture, the name of one party to the joint venture is "FIRM" and the name of the other party to the joint venture is "Joint Venture". "Managing Office:" is the site of the evaluatee's office providing the service, as stated in the architect/engineer agreement. "PROJECT MANAGER:" is the name of the primary contact with the firm for the project.

#### D. BASIC RATING CRITERIA

- Quality of Technical Services*  
Documents the firm's ability to deliver technical services with minimum problems. Such problems may include mistakes in design or analysis, lack of thoroughness, lack of familiarity with codes, ignorance of contract document requirements and, in general, deficiencies resulting from the lack or misapplication of technical skills and/or project specific knowledge that the firm is expected to have or to obtain. If the firm employs consultants, then the weight assigned this item is 5 and the "Consultants" section is completed. If the firm employs no consultants, then the weight assigned to this item is 9 and the "Consultants" section is omitted.
- Timeliness of Service*  
Documents the firm's ability to set realistic schedules for the delivery of its services and the effectiveness of the firm in meeting approved schedules.
- Quality of Technical Documentation*  
Documents clarity, accuracy and general utility of technical documentation produced by the firm., including reports, drawings, specifications, sketches, renderings, promotional materials and various other documented forms intended to communicate information about projects to owners or others. Such documentation may not be in final form; the fundamental issue is how well it accomplishes its intended purpose.
- Cooperation/Concern for FSU Interests*  
Documents the degree to which the firm cooperated with the owner and the extent of the firm's commitment to the protection and advancement of the interests of FSU.
- Administration of Project Paperwork*  
Documents the accuracy, timeliness of submission and thoroughness of paperwork associated with the administration of the project. Such paperwork includes pay requests, additional services requests, status reports, change orders and shop drawing review.
- Part B*  
Should be completed when evaluating the programming phase or design/bidding phase of a project or for evaluating studies. Part B evaluates the overall effectiveness of the firm in meeting study, programming or design objectives. This item specifically includes an appraisal of the firm's effectiveness in coping with budget limitations and scheduling work to be accomplished by others. It is not necessary that the study, program or design be completed during the period.

7. *Part C*

Should be completed when a project is in the construction phase. Part C evaluates the overall effectiveness of the firm in administering and enforcing the contract during construction. This item specifically includes an appraisal of the firm's effectiveness in working with the contractor to bring the project to a timely completion, keeping abreast of progress status, detecting problems, providing direction to the contractor, inspecting the work and following-up on punch list and warranty items.

8. *Combined Part B/Part C Evaluations*

In the event the evaluation period spans Part A and Part B phases, both parts should be rated and the respective weights adjusted by the amount of time during the period occupied by the applicable phases. For example, if during the period covered by a semiannual evaluation, a project is bid and construction begins in the fifth month, the weights for Part B and Part C would be adjusted as follows:

**Part B**

Unadjusted Weight = 5  
Period covered by Part A activities = 4 months  
Period covered by evaluation = 6 months  
Adjusted Weight =  $5 \times 4/6 = 3.33$

**Part C**

Unadjusted Weight = 5  
Period covered by Part B activities = 2 months  
Period covered by evaluation = 6 months  
Adjusted Weight =  $5 \times 2/6 = 1.67$

**E. FINAL RATING**

The 100-point based rating is divided by five (5) to determine the 20-point based rating. This calculation is made because the score used in the past performance category of an architect/engineer selection is based on a 20-point scale. The overall performance descriptor is entered on the form and is assigned as follows:

18 - 20	Outstanding	10 - 14.9	Satisfactory
15 - 17.9	Above Satisfactory	0.0 - 1.9	Less than Satisfactory

**F. RATINGS FOR JOINT VENTURES**

Prepare one evaluation for the joint venture and a copy of the evaluation is sent to each party to the joint venture.

**G. SIGNATURES**

The project manager finalizes the form, secures the approval and signature of the Director of Project Management and Associate Vice President for Facilities.

**H. TRANSMITTAL OF RATING TO FIRM**

The University sends a copy of the final evaluation to the rated firm by certified mail, return receipt requested. The transmittal letter must contain the following statement: *"If you feel that your firm has been rated unfairly, you may appeal this rating by sending written notice stating the basis for your appeal. In order to be considered, such notice must be received by the University within 30 days of receipt of this letter."*

**I. APPEAL OF RATINGS**

If an architect/engineer appeals its rating within the required time, the rating committee will discuss the rating with the firm and attempt to resolve the differences informally. If informal discussions do not result in a resolution, the project manager will notify the firm in writing of the time and place to appear before a review committee. This notification shall be sent certified mail, return receipt requested.

The review committee shall consist of: the University project manager, the Director of Project Management and other individuals, as appropriate.

The review committee discusses the rating and related issues and meets with the appealing firm to hear the basis for the appeal. After reviewing the circumstances surrounding the rating and appeal, the review committee makes a finding. The University notifies the firm of the review committee's finding and sets forth specifically the basis of the finding. The firm will be notified that the finding of the review committee is final unless a formal hearing is requested within fourteen (14) days. The notification is sent certified mail, return receipt requested.

**J. REQUEST FOR HEARING**

If the firm requests a hearing, the matter is referred to the Department of Administrative Hearings to handle as prescribed in Chapter 120, F.S. If the firm does not request a hearing, the finding of the review committee is final.

**K. MAINTENANCE OF RATING DATA BASE**

The FDC maintains a database of ratings. The overall rating for each firm will be updated each time a new rating is received. Ratings will be kept on current record for three (3) years. The overall rating is used as the "Past Performance" score in architect/engineer selections.

The FDC will determine the average rating for firms in the database. This average is used in the selection process for firms which have no rating with the University.

**FORMS**

Evaluation Form



**FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**PROFESSIONAL SERVICES EVALUATION**



Project Number:

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Firm: \_\_\_\_\_

Joint Venture: \_\_\_\_\_

Managing Office: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Manager: \_\_\_\_\_

Check one of the following boxes:

**Semiannual**

**Project Closeout**

**Special** (See Remarks)

**NOTE: DO NOT ATTEMPT TO CHANGE VALUES NOT IN BOXES--THEY ARE EITHER CALCULATED OR FIXED.**

**Part A** (Complete for all evaluations)

Rating  
Value      Weight      Extension

**Quality of Technical Services**

Firm Listed Above: \_\_\_\_\_

X 9 \* =  
\*Weight = 5 if  
consultants are  
used on project.

Consultants:		Rating Value
Firm Name	Specialty	
	Mechanical Eng.	<input style="width: 30px;" type="text"/>
	Electrical Eng.	<input style="width: 30px;" type="text"/>
	Structural Eng.	<input style="width: 30px;" type="text"/>
	Civil Engineering	<input style="width: 30px;" type="text"/>
		<input style="width: 30px;" type="text"/>
		<input style="width: 30px;" type="text"/>
		<input style="width: 30px;" type="text"/>
		<input style="width: 30px;" type="text"/>

Average  
 X 4 =

**Timeliness of Service**  X 4 =

**Quality of Technical Documentation**  X 3 =

**Cooperation/Concern for FSU Interests**  X 2 =

**Administration of Project Paperwork**  X 2 =

**PART B** (Complete when applicable)

**Achievement of Study, Program, or Design Objectives**  X 5 =

**PART C** (Complete when applicable)

**Administration/Enforcement of Contract Documents**  X 5 =

Note: If both Part B and Part C apply during the rating period, enter the number of months Part B applies (must be less than 6) in this box.

Total Weighted Points = \_\_\_\_\_

**Overall Numeric Rating (ONR) =**  
**Overall Performance Rating =**  
ONR ≥ 18 = Outstanding, 18 > ONR ≥ 15 = Above Satisfactory, 15 > ONR ≥ 10 = Satisfactory, 10 > ONR = Less Than Satisfactory

**REMARKS** (Complete for all evaluations)

**Note To Evaluator:** Enter ratings in double bordered boxes using whole numbers from following scale.  
Outstanding = 4      Above Satisfactory = 3  
Satisfactory = 2      Less Than Satisfactory = 1  
Satisfactory is defined as the level of performance that meets contract requirements.

Revised March 2003

For The Florida State University:

Signature/Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_