



Contractor Performance Evaluation

(General Contractors, Job Order Contractors, and major Subcontractors)

Facilities Management ensures that all capital improvement projects are performed in compliance with the Contract Documents and applicable laws and regulations. Facilities Management is responsible to the University and the citizens of Arkansas to oversee the expenditure of public and private funds, and to secure the best possible results for those expenditures. The Contractor Performance Evaluation is intended, therefore, to assess contractor responsibility and performance in support of future projects. The evaluation is standardized in order to yield consistency, objectivity, fairness, and accountability.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the Contractor Performance Evaluation is to provide an official evaluative record, both positive and negative, of a given contract or project. The evaluation will:

- encourage strong working relationships within project teams,
- provide verifiable references for contractors under consideration for public work, and
- provide contractors with a means of enhancing their qualifications and reputation by receiving recognition for high standards of performance.

In addition, the Evaluation will guide University decisions in hiring contractors for public projects by:

- helping the University assess whether a contractor possess all qualifications necessary to complete a given project successfully and on time, and
- communicating contractor strengths and weaknesses to selection committees.

REPORTS

The Facilities Management Director of Design and Construction, the Facilities Management Director of Campus Planning and Capital Programming, or their designated representatives will prepare each Contractor Performance Evaluation. The evaluations will be reviewed by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Facilities (AVCF) and the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration (VCFA), and then sent to the Contractor. Before becoming final, the Contractor may respond, offer comments, and/or dispute the report in part or in full.

Interim evaluations will be conducted on a schedule agreed upon at the start of the project. Interim evaluations will give contractors the opportunity to understand how the University sees the work progressing and to correct any deficiencies as the project continues. Completed interim performance evaluations will be part of the permanent project record. The contractor will have 30 days to respond.

The final evaluation summarizes significant information for the life of the contract. The final performance evaluation will be prepared at final acceptance of the work, at the time of contract termination, or when otherwise appropriate. Final evaluations may be appealed within 30 days of the official notification to the contractor by sending a detailed response to the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration (VCFA). Written decisions will be provided within 30 days of appeal receipt, and these decisions cannot be appealed to a higher level.

The Contractor Performance Evaluation is designed to assess performance of the General Contractor or Job Order Contractor and major Subcontractors. In those areas where subcontractor actions have significantly influenced the outcome, the subcontractor name and actions will be recorded as part of the report.

SCORING

Contractors will be evaluated on how well they performed tasks in six categories. Ratings are on a simple scale from 1 - 5, with a rating of 3 indicating general success. Ratings of 1 - 2 indicate need for improvement and characterize performance levels that result in detriment to the project. Conversely, ratings of 4 - 5 indicate performance beyond expectations and characterize performance levels that result in substantial positive contributions to the project. **An average score of 3, therefore, characterizes the level of performance associated with a reasonably prudent, diligent, and skilled contractor.**

USE

Contractor Performance Evaluations are public documents subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act. Because the reports and evaluations may be used in awarding future contracts and may reflect upon the Contractor's reputation, the University will take care that only accurate, complete, and current information is released.

Contractor Performance Evaluation

☐ Interim ☐ Final

PROJECT	CONTRACTOR				
TEAMWORK / SERVICE FOCUS					
Did the contractor communicate with the architects/engineers in accordance with the contract documents?	1	2	3	4	5
Was the contractor cooperative and accommodating to the owner and design professionals?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the contractor encourage cooperation and collaboration and work in partnership with the project team?	1	2	3	4	5
ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT					
Did the contractor promptly commence the work?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the contractor adequately staff the project and work to meet the owner's schedule? Was the project workforce highly qualified and capable of maintaining an accelerated project schedule?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the contractor employ a capable site superintendent consistently on-site when work was performed?	1	2	3	4	5
Did a person with decision-making authority represent the contractor at pay/progress meetings?	1	2	3	4	5
Were shop drawings submitted on time, and were they complete?	1	2	3	4	5
WORK PERFORMANCE					
Did the contractor submit, follow, and update a written schedule in accordance with the contract documents?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the contractor effectively coordinate and manage the work of its subcontractors?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the contractor provide effective inspection and quality control procedures?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the contractor keep the site clean and free of trash and debris?	1	2	3	4	5
Was the contractor in compliance with current labor standards?	1	2	3	4	5
Were the quality and timeliness of the following items acceptable?					
• punchlist items	1	2	3	4	5
• accurate and complete record documents (as-builts)	1	2	3	4	5
• certificate of operation and training instructions	1	2	3	4	5
• complete operations and maintenance manuals	1	2	3	4	5
• testing and balancing reports	1	2	3	4	5
Did the contractor comply with all warranty provisions and requests for warranty work?	1	2	3	4	5
PROACTIVE PERFORMANCE / DILIGENCE					
Did the contractor actively work to resolve problems?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the contractor suggest solutions and display an initiative to implement solutions?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the contractor share accountability for results?	1	2	3	4	5
Was the contractor responsive to directives from the owner?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the contractor coordinate disruption of facility operations with the owner and user?	1	2	3	4	5
QUALITY OF WORK / COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS					
Did the contractor value the importance of delivering high-quality services and products?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the contractor understand and comply with campus standards?	1	2	3	4	5
Were the materials and workmanship in compliance with the contract documents?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the contractor promptly correct defective work as the project progressed?	1	2	3	4	5
QUALITY OF SAFETY PROGRAM					
Did the contractor follow good safety practices? Did the contractor comply with OSHA requirements?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the contractor meet the environmental requirements of the contract?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the contractor take adequate precautions with any hazardous materials?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the contractor properly report all injuries or damage associated with this project?	1	2	3	4	5

Contractor Performance Evaluation, continued

☐ Interim ☐ Final

PROJECT	CONTRACTOR
---------	------------

COMMENTS

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

PREPARED BY	
DATE	
REVIEWED BY AVCF	
DATE	
REVIEWED BY VCFA	
DATE	
CONTRACTOR	
DATE	

DRAFT



Design and Professional Services Performance Evaluation

(Architects, Engineers, Commissioning Agents, and other Design/Professional Services Providers)

Facilities Management ensures that all capital improvement projects are performed in compliance with the Contract Documents and applicable laws and regulations. Facilities Management is responsible to the University and the citizens of Arkansas to oversee the expenditure of public and private funds, and to secure the best possible results for those expenditures. The Design and Professional Services Performance Evaluation is intended, therefore, to assess a design firm's responsibility and performance in support of future projects. The evaluation is standardized in order to yield consistency, objectivity, fairness, and accountability.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the Design and Professional Services Performance Evaluation is to provide an official evaluative record, both positive and negative, of a given contract or project. The evaluation will:

- encourage strong working relationships within project teams,
- provide verifiable references for design/professional services firms under consideration for public work, and
- provide design/professional services firms with a means of enhancing their qualifications and reputation by receiving recognition for high standards of performance.

In addition, the Evaluation will guide University decisions in hiring design/professional services firms for public projects by:

- helping the University assess whether a design/professional services firm possess all qualifications necessary to complete a given project successfully and on time, and
- communicating design/professional strengths and weaknesses to selection committees.

REPORTS

The Facilities Management Director of Design and Construction, the Facilities Management Director of Campus Planning and Capital Programming, or their designated representatives will prepare each Professional Services Performance Evaluation. The evaluations will be reviewed by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Facilities (AVCF) and the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration (VCFA), and then sent to the design/professional services firm for review. Before becoming final, the design/professional services firm may respond, offer comments, and/or dispute the report in part or in full.

Interim evaluations will be conducted on a schedule agreed upon at the start of the project. Interim evaluations will give design/professional services firms the opportunity to understand how the University sees the work progressing and to correct any deficiencies as the project continues. Completed interim performance evaluations will be part of the permanent project record. The design/professional services firm will have 30 days to respond.

The final evaluation summarizes significant information for the life of the contract. The final performance evaluation will be prepared at final acceptance of the work, at the time of contract termination, or when otherwise appropriate. Final evaluations may be appealed within 30 days of the official notification to the design/professional services firm by sending a detailed response to the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration (VCFA). Written decisions will be provided within 30 days of appeal receipt, and these decisions cannot be appealed to a higher level.

The Professional Services Performance Evaluation is designed to assess performance of primary design professionals. In those areas where consultant actions have significantly influenced the outcome, the consultant name and actions will be recorded as part of the report.

SCORING

Design/Professional Services firms will be evaluated on how well they performed tasks in six categories. Ratings are on a simple scale from 1 - 5, with a rating of 3 indicating general success. Ratings of 1 - 2 indicate need for improvement and characterize performance levels that result in detriment to the project. Conversely, ratings of 4 - 5 indicate performance beyond expectations and characterize performance levels that result in substantial positive contributions to the project. **An average score of 3, therefore, characterizes the level of performance associated with a reasonably prudent, diligent, and skilled design professional.**

USE

Design and Professional Services Performance Evaluations are public documents subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act. Because the reports and evaluations may be used in awarding future contracts and may reflect upon the design professional's reputation, the University will take care that only accurate, complete, and current information is released.

Design and Professional Services Performance Evaluation

☐ Interim ☐ Final

PROJECT	FIRM NAME				
TEAMWORK / SERVICE FOCUS					
Did the designer/professional encourage cooperation and collaboration and work in partnership with the project team?	1	2	3	4	5
Was the designer/professional cooperative with and responsive to the owner and the general contractor?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the designer/professional foster a good working relationship with university personnel?	1	2	3	4	5
ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT					
Did the designer/professional make timely progress through all design phases?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the designer/professional adequately staff the project and work to meet the owner's schedule?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the designer/professional effectively coordinate and manage the work of its consultants?	1	2	3	4	5
Was the designer/professional represented adequately on the jobsite and at progress meetings?	1	2	3	4	5
Were shop drawings and submittals reviewed on time?	1	2	3	4	5
Was the designer/professional actively engaged in the project through substantial completion and project closeout?	1	2	3	4	5
WORK PERFORMANCE					
Did the designer/professional submit and follow a written schedule?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the designer/professional meet the expectations of the building users?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the designer/professional listen and respond to the university's vision for the project?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the designer/professional show leadership and make sound and timely recommendations?	1	2	3	4	5
Were presentations effective, organized, and of high quality? Did these presentations lead to sound decisions?	1	2	3	4	5
Were the quality and timeliness of the following items acceptable?					
• evaluation of the site and building conditions	1	2	3	4	5
• evaluation of program objectives	1	2	3	4	5
• design cost estimates	1	2	3	4	5
Were the completeness and accuracy of the following items acceptable?					
• planning and programming documents	1	2	3	4	5
• schematic design and design development documents	1	2	3	4	5
PROACTIVE PERFORMANCE / DILIGENCE					
Did the designer/professional actively work to resolve problems?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the designer/professional suggest solutions and display an initiative to implement solutions?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the designer/professional share accountability for results?	1	2	3	4	5
Was the designer/professional responsive to directives from the owner?	1	2	3	4	5
Was the design intent realized in the finished building?	1	2	3	4	5
QUALITY OF WORK / COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS					
Does the project satisfy site and building conditions?	1	2	3	4	5
Is the design appropriate, and does it meet program objectives?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the designer/professional understand and comply with campus standards?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the designer/professional advance campus sustainability goals?	1	2	3	4	5
QUALITY OF CONTRACT DOCUMENTS					
Were the completeness and accuracy of the following items acceptable?	1	2	3	4	5
• construction drawings	1	2	3	4	5
• project manual/specifications	1	2	3	4	5
• contract addenda	1	2	3	4	5
Did the designer/professional effectively coordinate the contract documents across all disciplines?	1	2	3	4	5

Design and Professional Services Performance Evaluation, continued

☐ Interim ☐ Final

PROJECT	FIRM NAME
---------	-----------

COMMENTS

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

PREPARED BY	
DATE	
REVIEWED BY AVCF	
DATE	
REVIEWED BY VCFA	
DATE	
DESIGN/PROFESSIONAL	
DATE	



Capital Project Process Performance Evaluation

An evaluation of University personnel and processes by Contractors and Design/Professionals

Facilities Management ensures that all capital improvement projects are performed in compliance with the Contract Documents and applicable laws and regulations. Facilities Management is responsible to the University and the citizens of Arkansas to oversee the expenditure of public and private funds, and to secure the best possible results for those expenditures. The evaluation process is intended, therefore, to assess the effectiveness of the capital project process at the University of Arkansas in support of future projects. The evaluation is standardized in order to yield consistency, objectivity, fairness, and accountability.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the Capital Project Process Performance Evaluation is to provide an official evaluative record, both positive and negative, of a given contract or project. Facilities Management will use these ratings and comments to improve the capital project process at the University of Arkansas.

SCORING

Ratings of 1 - 2 indicate need for improvement and characterize performance levels that result in detriment to the project. Ratings of 4 - 5 indicate performance beyond expectations and characterize performance levels that result in substantial positive contributions to the project. **A rating of 3 characterizes the level of performance you expect from University personnel to assist you in delivering a successful project.**

REPORTS

Contractors and Design/Professionals will be asked to evaluate the University's capital project process using the attached form. The evaluations will be reviewed by the Facilities Management Director of Design and Construction and the Facilities Management Director of Campus Planning and Capital Programming, then sent to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Facilities (AVCF) and the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration (VCFA).

USE

Capital Project Process Performance Evaluations are public documents subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act.

Capital Project Process Performance Evaluation

☐ Interim ☐ Final

PROJECT	
---------	--

TO BE COMPLETED BY CONTRACTOR OR DESIGN/PROFESSIONAL:

Ratings of 1 - 2 indicate need for improvement and characterize performance levels that result in detriment to the project. Ratings of 4 - 5 indicate performance beyond expectations and characterize performance levels that result in substantial positive contributions to the project. **A rating of 3 characterizes the level of performance you expect from University personnel to assist you in delivering a successful project.**

(Circle rating from 1 - 5)

TEAMWORK / COLLABORATION

Did the university present a transparent, understandable, and clearly-delineated communication structure?	1	2	3	4	5
Was it clear how decisions were made on this project and who was responsible for those decisions?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the various parts of the university behave in a collaborative manner?	1	2	3	4	5
Did university personnel understand your goals for this project and work with you to achieve them?	1	2	3	4	5

UNIVERSITY ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURES

Did the university provide clear standards/guidelines at the beginning of the project?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the university consistently apply its standards/guidelines throughout the project?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the university prepare you for the internal review process and effectively coordinate these meetings (i.e. Building & Facilities Committee, Landscape & Grounds Committee, Design Review Board, Executive Committee, Board of Trustees)?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the university inform the team about state inspection requirements?	1	2	3	4	5
Were you given sufficient information about university utility systems and requirements?	1	2	3	4	5

GUIDANCE / EXPECTATIONS

Was the university supportive of excellence and innovation in both design and construction?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the university follow through with its stated commitments to quality and excellence?	1	2	3	4	5
Was the allocated budget realistically matched to the stated needs/desires/aspirations of the university?	1	2	3	4	5
Was the allocated timeline (design and construction) conducive to a well-conceived and well-constructed project?	1	2	3	4	5
Were downloadable resources helpful to you?	1	2	3	4	5
Were drawings and submittals reviewed/comments returned in a timely manner?	1	2	3	4	5

RESPONSIVENESS / COMMUNICATION / DECISIONS

Did the university provide a clear channel for communication throughout the entire process?	1	2	3	4	5
Did a person with decision-making authority represent the university at all important meetings?	1	2	3	4	5
Did university personnel return your calls and emails in a timely manner?	1	2	3	4	5
Did university personnel actively work to resolve problems?	1	2	3	4	5
Did university personnel share accountability for results?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the university deal fairly and consistently with all partners throughout the project?	1	2	3	4	5

ENVIRONMENTAL AND SAFETY PROGRAMS

Did the university consistently work to achieve its stated sustainability goals throughout the project?	1	2	3	4	5
Was the hot works program effective?	1	2	3	4	5
Did university personnel support your efforts in maintaining a safe jobsite?	1	2	3	4	5
Does the university have an effective stormwater management plan?	1	2	3	4	5

CONTRACTS / PAYMENT

Does the university have effective contracts and legal tools?	1	2	3	4	5
Were requests for payment processed in a timely manner?	1	2	3	4	5
Were you able to make a reasonable and fair profit on this job?	1	2	3	4	5

Capital Project Process Performance Evaluation, continued

☐ Interim ☐ Final

PROJECT	
---------	--

COMMENTS / SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

PREPARED BY	
COMPANY NAME	
DATE	
UNIVERSITY REVIEW:	
REVIEWED BY AVCF	
DATE	
REVIEWED BY VCFA	
DATE	

DRAFT