Vendor Performance Evaluation Requirements

The awarded vendor should note that the Contract Administrator will document the contractor's performance by completing a Vendor Performance Evaluation based upon the following:

- For any fixed construction or services contract valued at $30,000 or more upon completion of the contract.

- For any hardware or software implementation contracts valued at $20,000 or more as part of the final acceptance

- For any fixed commodities contract valued at $250,000 or more upon complete delivery of the commodities

- For Master (open-end) Agreements and other continuing contracts by each using agency whose cumulative annual usage of the agreement exceeds $30,000.

- For Work Authorizations valued at $30,000 or more, issued under a Library of Professional Consultant Services or a Library of Environmental Consultant Services, upon project completion

- For contracts where the Office of Economic and Small Business Development (OESBD) has established goals, based on compliance with established goals and requirements.

- The Contract Administrator may also initiate an interim evaluation at any time during the contract period for any contract

The following Vendor Performance Evaluation Templates are provided for informational purposes. The templates included are:

1. Final Construction Evaluation

2. Final Consultant – Architect/Engineer Evaluation

3. Vendor Commodity/Service Evaluation

4. Vendor Service Evaluation

5. Goals Participation

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM
Final Construction Evaluation

CONTRACT INFORMATION		
Contract/RLI/Agreement Number	Project Number/Title	Commission District(s)
Vendor Name		Phone

Award Amount	Change Orders & Amendments	No. of	Total Cost $0.00

Substantial Construction Completion Date		Final Construction Completion Date	

Goal Type	County Established	Vendor Committed	Attained

RECOMMENDED FOR FUTURE USE		
Recommended for future contracts: If other than Yes, provide detailed explanation as attachment. State Condition for Recommendation:	○ YES ○ NO ○ Conditional	Numerical Score: 0.00
Overall Rating:	○ 5-Excellent (4.50 - 5.00) ○ 4-Good (3.20 - 4.49) ○ 3-Fair (2.60 - 3.19) ○ 2-Poor (1.81 - 2.59) ○ 1-Unsatisfactory (1.0 - 1.8)	Goal Evaluation Score: 0.00 Weighted Score: 0.00

COUNTY CONTACT INFORMATION	
Contract Administrator or Delegate Name	Email
Signature	Date

Project Manager Name	Email
Signature	Date

Evaluation Criteria
This evaluation provides an indication of the vendors's ability to implement a practical, accurate, complete and cost conscious project. For each item, please provide a numerical score from 1 to 5, in accordance to the performance rating scale. Select N/A if the criteria does not apply to this evaluation. Reviewer comments must be entered for a rating of 1, 2 or 5. Minimum passing score is 2.60.   **The following scale is used to rank the level of contributions made by the vendor to the project.**   5 - Excellent Performance: Project had no time or cost impacts related to vendor's performance;   4- Good Performance: Project had some minor issues which the vendor aggressively pursued to resolve and there were minor time or cost impacts related to the contractor's performance;   3 - Fair Performance: Project had some issues which the vendor pursued to resolve and that resulted in acceptable time and/or cost impacts;   2 - Poor Performance: Project had several issues which the vendor provided limited assistance to resolve and that resulted in significant time and cost impacts;   1 - Unsatisfactory Performance: Project had multiple, significant issues which the vendor provided no assistance to resolve and that resulted in substantial time and cost impacts.

A) Project Management						Section Score: 0.00
Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory				Excellent	
1. How effectively did the vendor communicate with the Contract Administrator and over County personnel as well as the consultant?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
2. How well did the vendor cooperate with the Contract Administrator, other County personnel and the consultant?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
3. How closely did vendor conform with specifications, drawings and other requirements?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
4. How appropriate was the staff assigned to do the work to ensure a quality product on a timely basis?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
5. How actively did the vendor communicate with subvendors and others involved in project?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
6. How adequate and effective was the vendor's coordination and control of subvendors' work and documentation?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
7. How proactively did the vendor participate in the resolution of disputes?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
8. How timely were the notices of inspection requests?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
9. How well did the vendor control the project by providing recommendations, addressing issues, participating in decision making, and working with government officials and the County?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
10. How clean did the vendor keep the work site on a continuous basis?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

COMMENTS:

B) Business Practices						Section Score: 0.00
Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory				Excellent	
1. How was the vendor's compliance with the United States Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and Broward County's Risk Management Division, Safey and Occupational Health Section requirements? Consider the vendor's established safety program, compliance with standards, safety practices, accident prevention, etc.	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
2. How well did the vendor manage business relationships with subvendors by ensuring that subvendors were fully paind for work that had been completed to specifications? (This information can be verified through subvendor complaints or liens for non payment)	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
3. How well did the vendor manage business relationships with subvendors by ensureing that subvendors were promptly paid?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
4. How well did the vendor follow Broward County procedure in reporting changes of sub vendors?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

COMMENTS:

C) Cost Control — Section Score: 0.00

Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory				Excellent	
1. How actively did the vendor pursue/take aggressive action in obtaining documents such as building permits, Certificate of Occupancy and other required documents on a timely basis?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
2. How actively did the vendor participate in overcoming problems with other vendors, building officials, and/or regulatory agencies?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
3. How valid were the claims for extra costs?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
4. How well did the vendor comply with the prevailing wage rate policy?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
5. How well did the vendor comply with the County's Living Wage rate policy (if applicable)?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

COMMENTS:

D) Timeliness — Section Score: 0.00

Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory				Excellent	
1. How well did the vendor manage delivery of necessary equipment and material for the project?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
2. How timely and accurate were payment requests when submitted?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
3. How well did the vendor meet the schedule of deliverables established at the beginning of the project?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
4. How well did the vendor conform with schedule of work progress in order to meet the planned completion dates for Phase Completion?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
5. How well did the vendor conform with schedule of work progress in order to meet the planned completion dates for Substantial Completion?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
6. How well did the vendor conform with schedule of work progress in order to meet the planned completion dates for Final Completion?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
7. How effectively did the vendor communicate with the Contract Administrator and other County personnel as well as the consultant?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

COMMENTS:

E) Change Order Management — Section Score: 0.00

Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory				Excellent	
1. Did the vendor provide independent estimates of the value of changes?		○ Yes		○ No		◉ N/A
2. How accurate and timely were the preliminary estimates of the value of change orders/amendments provided by the vendor?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
3. How accurate and timely were change orders/amendments processed with the proper documentation?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
4. How fair and timely did the vendor prepare, negotiate and make recommendations to the County regarding change orders/amendments?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
5. How appropriate were the vendor's recommendations for time extensions based on the actual circumstances and reviewed against the contract requirements?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

COMMENTS:

F) Quality of Work — **Section Score: 0.00**

Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory				Excellent	
1. How accessible was the work for inspection?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
2. How close were the equipment and materials to the specifications?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
3. How closely were industry standard construction methods followed?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
4. How responsive and competent were superintendents, supervisors, and workers?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

COMMENTS:

G) Project Closeout — **Section Score: 0.00**

Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory				Excellent	
1. How well did the project meet specified standards when inspected?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
2. How complete and accurate was the documentation provided at the completion of the project, including punch list, warranties, operation, appropriate manuals and Certificate of Occupancy from the appropriate jurisdiction?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
3. How clean did the vendor leave the worksite by completely disposing of debris in a legal manner?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
4. How accurate and timely were the vendor's final project accounting documents sent to Broward County?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

COMMENTS:

RATING OFFICIAL INFORMATION

Name and Title	Office

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM
Final Consultant - Architect/Engineer Evaluation

CONTRACT INFORMATION		
Contract/RLI/Agreement Number	Project Number/Title	Commission District(s)
Vendor Name		Phone

Award Amount	Change Orders & Amendments	No. of	Total Cost $0.00
Substantial Construction Completion Date		Final Construction Completion Date	
Goal Type	County Established	Vendor Committed	Attained

RECOMMENDED FOR FUTURE USE		
Recommended for future contracts: If other than Yes, provide detailed explanation as attachment. State Condition for Recommendation:	○ YES ○ NO ○ Conditional	Goal Evaluation Score: 0.00
Overall Rating:	○ 5-Excellent (4.50 - 5.00) ○ 4-Good (3.20 - 4.49) ○ 3-Fair (2.60 - 3.19) ○ 2-Poor (1.81 - 2.59) ○ 1-Unsatisfactory (1.0 - 1.8)	Goal Evaluation Score: 0.00 Weighted Score: 0.00

COUNTY CONTACT INFORMATION	
Contract Administrator or Delegate Name	Email
Signature	Date

Project Manager Name	Email
Signature	Date

Evaluation Criteria
This evaluation provides an indication of the vendors's ability to implement a practical, accurate, complete and cost conscious project. For each item, please provide a numerical score from 1 to 5, in accordance to the performance rating scale. Select N/A if the criteria does not apply to this evaluation. Reviewer comments must be entered for a rating of 1, 2 or 5. Minimum passing score is 2.60. **The following scale is used to rank the level of contributions made by the vendor to the project.** 5 - Excellent Performance: Project had no time or cost impacts related to vendor's performance; 4- Good Performance: Project had some minor issues which the vendor aggressively pursued to resolve and there were minor time or cost impacts related to the contractor's performance; 3 - Fair Performance: Project had some issues which the vendor pursued to resolve and that resulted in acceptable time and/or cost impacts; 2 - Poor Performance: Project had several issues which the vendor provided limited assistance to resolve and that resulted in significant time and cost impacts; 1 - Unsatisfactory Performance: Project had multiple, significant issues which the vendor provided no assistance to resolve and that resulted in substantial time and cost impacts.

A) Preliminary Design/Engineering Services   Section Score: 0.00

Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory				Excellent	
1. How effective were the vendor's meeting with County to clarify and define the County's requirements for the project?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
2. How knowledgeable was the vendor regarding the jurisdiction of various government authorities involved in the approval process?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
3. How realistic was the schedule and budget for the project as presented by the design team?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
4. How suitable were the design results to the site?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
5. How well did the design meet user objectives and specific program requirements?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
6. How well did the design meet cost limitations?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
7. How clear and detailed were the plans?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
8. How accurate were the plans?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
9. How timely were the submittals of the plans?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
10. How well did the vendor anticipate and address potential construction conflicts with underground/overhead utilities?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
11. How appropriate was the level of completion of the specifications submitted with each design phase?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

COMMENTS:

B) Cost Control   Section Score: 0.00

Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory				Excellent	
1. How helpful was the project duration and the necessary justification which provided by the vendor in allowing the County to evaluate for concurrence?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
2. How actively did the vendor pursue/take aggressive action in obtaining documents such as building permits, Certificate of Occupancy and other required documents on a timely basis?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
3. How effective was the vendor at finding ways to reduce one-time construction costs, long term maintenance, or staffing requirements by specifying alternative materials or designs?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
4. How actively did the vendor participate in overcoming problems with other vendors, building officials, and/or regulatory agencies?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
5. How valid were the claims for extra costs?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

COMMENTS:

C) Timeliness   Section Score: 0.00

Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory				Excellent	
1. How well did the vendor meet the schedule of deliverables established at the beginning of the project?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
2. How well did the vendor conform with schedule of work progress in order to meet the planned completion dates for Phase Completion?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
3. How well did the vendor conform with schedule of work progress in order to meet the planned completion dates for Substantial Completion	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

4. How well did the vendor conform with schedule of work progress in order to meet the planned completion dates for Final Completion	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

COMMENTS:

D) Permitting   Section Score: 0.00

Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory				Excellent	
1. How involved was the vendor in the effort to get permits from appropriate jurisdictions?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
2. How complete were the plans submitted for permitting?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
3. How complete was the initial design which was submitted to the regulatory agencies as reflected by the comments received from the regulatory agencies?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
4. How effectively did the vendor communicate with the County regarding issues that were being resolved by regulatory agencies?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
5. How effectively did the vendor communicate and provide the required notices to the County regarding the status of the permits?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
6. How timely were permit applications submitted so as not to delay the project?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

COMMENTS:

E) Bid Documents   Section Score: 0.00

Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory				Excellent	
1. How carefully did the consultant review all bidding documents for conflicts or **inconsistencies between documents prepared by the County and those prepared by** the design team?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
2. How supportive was the consultant at the pre-bid meeting?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
3. How accurate and timely was the vendor's input to addenda in response to marketplace inquiries?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
4. How complete and clear were the specifications which were distributed to the marketplace as reflected by the number of addenda needed to rectify specification issues or the extention of the bid open date?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
5. How actively did the vendor contribute to the evaluation of selected vendors' responsibility in the areas of research, reference, credit, equipment availability and staff expertise?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
6. How actively did the vendor contribute to the evaluation of contractor bids for realistic price and time, fairness and reasonableness?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

COMMENTS:

F) Construction Administration   Section Score: 0.00

Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory				Excellent	
1. How timely were sealed shop drawings provided to the County?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
2. How frequently did the vendor make site visits to observe the project's construction?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
3. How proactive was the vendor to intervene as necessary if issues were observed during site visits?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
4. How clear and concise were the instructions provided by the vendor to the contractor and how well did they facilitate a professional relationship?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

5. How timely were construction issues related to the vendor's scope of responsibility resolved?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

COMMENTS:

G) Contract Change Management (Amendments)   Section Score: 0.00

Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory			Excellent		
1. Did the vendor provide independent estimates of the value of changes?	○ Yes		○ No			◉ N/A
2. How accurate and timely were the preliminary estimates of the value of change orders/amendments provided by the vendor?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
3. How accurate and timely were change orders/amendments processed with the proper documentation?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
4. How fair and timely did the vendor prepare, negotiate and make recommendations to the County regarding change orders/amendments?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
5. How appropriate were the vendor's recommendations for time extensions based on the actual circumstances and reviewed against the contract requirements?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
6. How well did the vendor follow Broward County procedure in reporting change of sub vendors?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

COMMENTS:

H) Project Closeout   Section Score: 0.00

Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory			Excellent		
1. How well did the project meet specified standards when inspected?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
2. How complete and accurate was the documentation provided at the completion of the project, including punch list, warranties, operation, appropriate manuals and Certificate of Occupancy from the appropriate jurisdiction?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
3. How accurate and timely were the vendor's final project accounting documents sent to Broward County?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

COMMENTS:

RATING OFFICIAL INFORMATION	
Name and Title	Office

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM
Vendor Commodity/Service Evaluation

CONTRACT INFORMATION			
Contract/RLI/Agreement Number	Project Number/Title		Evaluation Period From: To:
Vendor Name			Contract Period From: To:
Project Description/Phases			Contract Type ○ Commodity ○ Commodity/Service
Award Amount	Change Orders & Amendments	No. of	Revised Contract Amount $0.00
FOR SOFTWARE PURCHASES MORE THAN $20,000	Final Acceptance Date	☐ Installation & Setup ☐ Warranty Period ☐ Maintenance Period	
Claims ☐ No Claims	Claims in Process	From Vendor	Against Vendor
	Finalized Claims	From Vendor Date	Against Vendor Date
Goal Type	County Established	Vendor Committed	Attained

RECOMMENDED FOR FUTURE USE		
Recommended for future contracts: If other than Yes, provide detailed explanation as attachment. State Condition for Recommendation:	○ YES ○ NO ○ Conditional	Numerical Score: 0.00
Overall Rating:	○ 5-Excellent (4.50 - 5.00) ○ 4-Good (3.20 - 4.49) ○ 3-Fair (2.60 - 3.19) ○ 2-Poor (1.81 - 2.59) ○ 1-Unsatisfactory (1.0 - 1.8)	Goal Evaluation Score: 0.00 Weighted Score: 0.00

Requesting Agency Representative Name and Title	Email
Signature	Date

Purchasing Unit Representative Name and Title	Email
Signature	Date

This evaluation provides an indication of the vendors's ability to implement a practical, accurate, complete and cost conscious project. For each item, please provide a numerical score from 1 to 5, in accordance to the performance rating scale. Select N/A if the criteria does not apply to this evaluation. Reviewer comments must be entered for a rating of 1, 2 or 5. Minimum passing score is 2.60.

The following scale is used to rank the level of contributions made by the vendor to the project.

5 - Excellent Performance: Project had no time or cost impacts related to vendor's performance;

4- Good Performance: Project had some minor issues which the vendor aggressively pursued to resolve and there were minor time or cost impacts related to the contractor's performance;

3 - Fair Performance: Project had some issues which the vendor pursued to resolve and that resulted in acceptable time and/or cost impacts;

2 - Poor Performance: Project had several issues which the vendor provided limited assistance to resolve and that resulted in significant time and cost impacts;

1 - Unsatisfactory Performance: Project had multiple, significant issues which the vendor provided no assistance to resolve and that resulted in substantial time and cost impacts.

A) Quality   Section Score: 0.00

Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory				Excellent	
1. How responsive was the vendor to notification of an unauthorized substitution?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
2. How close did the delivered product(s) or software perform to expectations?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
3. How accurate and timely were any necessary repairs or reconfigurations?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
4. How timely were necessary parts or software made available?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
5. How appropriate were any vendor recommended repairs or upgrades?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
6. How efficient and timely were product/software installations and training completed?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
7. How complete and timely did the vendor submit warranties, manuals, etc.?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
8. How well did the vendor performance meet agreement expectations?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

COMMENTS:

B) Quantity   Section Score: 0.00

Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory				Excellent	
1. How well did the amount of product shipped match the amount ordered?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
2. How fast were partial deliveries or non-deliveries satisfied?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
3. If there were backorders, how accurate were estimates of delivery times?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
4. How accurate was the weight of the item received as compared to the weight listed on the invoice?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
5. How accurate was the paperwork in the shipment?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
6. How accurate were the licensing estimates for the software installation(s)?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

COMMENTS:

Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory				Excellent	
1. How timely was the complete order received, based on industry standards?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
2. How well was the shipment protected again damage or loss?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
3. How responsive was the vendor to notice of damaged goods?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
4. How proactive was the vendor response to replacing damaged goods?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
5. How cooperative was the vendor in making the delivery at a satisfactory time?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
6. How accurate were the prices quoted to the invoiced price?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
7. How accurate were the documents provide at closeout, e.g. packing slips, invoices, technical manuals, etc. regarding the correct material codes and purchase order numbers?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
8. How accurate was the method of delivery?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
9. How correct was the delivery location?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
10. How visible were the required inspection stamps?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

11. How well did the vendor manage delivery of the product and/or service?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
12. How accurately were close-out procedures followed?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

COMMENTS:

D) Customer Service					**Section Score: 0.00**	
Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory				Excellent	
1. How knowledgeable was the vendor regarding the requested product and/or service?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
2. How timely were requests for information, proposals and quotes answered?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
3. How prompt were County staff communications returned or responded to?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
4. How proactive was the vendor in addressing County staff problems or concerns regarding the product or service?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
5. How courteous/professional was the vendor in dealing with the County, Sub-vendors, County Tenants/Customers?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
6. How sensitive/responsive was the vendor to working around County operational needs?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
7. How consistent and clear were the vendor communications with County staff?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

COMMENTS:

E) Support					**Section Score: 0.00**	
Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory				Excellent	
1. How close was the level of vendor technical expertise to what was needed to support the product or service?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
2. How appropriate was the contact information provided by the vendor for questions?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
3. How well did the vendor respond to additional questions regarding the product or service?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
4. How timely was the vendor response compared to the contract requirements?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
5. How clear was the vendor information regarding the warranty or replacement policy?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
6. How well did the vendor respond to warranty service requests?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
7. How timely were repairs completed?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
8. How well did the vendor coordinate any sub vendors?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
9. How responsive and competent were vendor representatives?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

COMMENTS:

F) Emergency Procurement					**Section Score: 0.00**	
Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory				Excellent	
1. How responsive was the vendor to providing afterhours contact information?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
2. How clear was the vendor regarding the local warehousing and availability of products in the event of an emergency?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
3. How proactive was the vendor in providing emergency support for repair or replacement of a failed or unusable commodity?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
4. How accessible was the vendor before, during and after the emergency?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

5. How willing was the vendor to provide support services ?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
6. How cooperative was the vendor in demonstrating extra effort to meet County staff requirements in the emergency?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

COMMENTS:

RATING OFFICIAL INFORMATION	
Name and Title	Office

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM
Vendor Service Evaluation

CONTRACT INFORMATION			
Contract/RLI/Agreement Number	Project Number/Title		Evaluation Period From: To:
Vendor Name			Contract Period From: To:
Service Description			
Award Amount	Change Orders & Amendments	No. of	Revised Contract Amount $0.00
Claims ☐ No Claims	Claims in Process	From Vendor	Against Vendor
	Finalized Claims	From Vendor Date	Against Vendor Date
Goal Type	County Established	Vendor Committed	Attained

RECOMMENDED FOR FUTURE USE			
Recommended for future contracts: If other than Yes, provide detailed explanation as attachment. State Condition for Recommendation:	○ YES ○ NO ○ Conditional		Numerical Score: 0.00
Overall Rating:	○ 5-Excellent (4.50 - 5.00) ○ 4-Good (3.20 - 4.49) ○ 3-Fair (2.60 - 3.19) ○ 2-Poor (1.81 - 2.59) ○ 1-Unsatisfactory (1.0 - 1.8)		Goal Evaluation Score: 0.00 Weighted Score: 0.00

COUNTY CONTACT INFORMATION	
Requesting Agency Representative Name and Title	Email
Signature	Date

Purchasing Unit Representative Name and Title	Email
Signature	Date

Evaluation Criteria
This evaluation provides an indication of the vendors's ability to implement a practical, accurate, complete and cost conscious project. For each item, please provide a numerical score from 1 to 5, in accordance to the performance rating scale. Select N/A if the criteria does not apply to this evaluation. Reviewer comments must be entered for a rating of 1, 2 or 5. Minimum passing score is 2.60. **The following scale is used to rank the level of contributions made by the vendor to the project.** 5 - Excellent Performance: Project had no time or cost impacts related to vendor's performance; 4- Good Performance: Project had some minor issues which the vendor aggressively pursued to resolve and there were minor time or cost impacts related to the contractor's performance; 3 - Fair Performance: Project had some issues which the vendor pursued to resolve and that resulted in acceptable time and/or cost impacts; 2 - Poor Performance: Project had several issues which the vendor provided limited assistance to resolve and that resulted in significant time and cost impacts; 1 - Unsatisfactory Performance: Project had multiple, significant issues which the vendor provided no assistance to resolve and that resulted in substantial time and cost impacts.

A) Quality — Section Score: 0.00

Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory				Excellent	
1. How close did the vendor conform with specifications, drawings and other requirements?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
2. How accurate and timely were any necessary repairs or reconfigurations?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
3. How appropriate were any vendor recommended repairs or upgrades?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
4. How efficient and timely was the applicable training completed?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
5. How complete and timely did the vendor submit warranties, manuals, etc.?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
6. How well did the vendor performance meet agreement expectations?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

COMMENTS:

B) Quantity — Section Score: 0.00

Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory				Excellent	
1. How accurate were the estimated service hours to the actual hours of service provided?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
2. How accurate were estimated services to those actually needed to complete the project?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

COMMENTS:

C) Delivery — Section Score: 0.00

Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory				Excellent	
1. How timely was the service completed, based on industry standards?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
2. How proactive was the vendor response to replacing damaged goods?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
3. How cooperative was the vendor in appearing at a satisfactory time?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
4. How accurate were the prices quoted to the invoiced price?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
5. How well did the vendor manage delivery of the service?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
6. How accurate were the documents provide at closeout, e.g. packing slips, invoices, technical manuals, etc. regarding the correct material codes and purchase order numbers?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
7. How accurately were close-out procedures followed?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

COMMENTS:

D) Customer Service — Section Score: 0.00

Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory				Excellent	
1. How knowledgeable was the vendor regarding the requested service?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
2. How timely were requests for information, proposals and quotes answered?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
3. How prompt were County staff communications returned or responded to?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
4. How proactive was the vendor in addressing County staff problems or concerns regarding the service?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

5. How courteous/professional was the vendor in dealing with the County, Sub-vendors, County Tenants/Customers?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
6. How sensitive/responsive was the vendor to working around County operational needs?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
7. How consistent and clear were the vendor communications with County staff?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

COMMENTS:

E) Support					Section Score: **0.00**	
Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory				Excellent	
1. How close was the level of vendor technical expertise to what was needed to support the service?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
2. How appropriate was the contact information provided by the vendor for questions?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
3. How well did the vendor respond to additional questions regarding the service?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
4. How timely was the vendor response compared to the contract requirements?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
5. How clear was the vendor information regarding the warranty or replacement policy?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
6. How well did the vendor respond to warranty service requests?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
7. How timely were repairs completed?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
8. How well did the vendor coordinate any sub vendors?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
9. How responsive and competent were vendor representatives?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

F) Emergency Procurement					Section Score: **0.00**	
Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory				Excellent	
1. How responsive was the vendor to providing afterhours contact information?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
2. How clear was the vendor regarding the local services available in the event of an emergency?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
3. How accessible was the vendor before, during and after the emergency?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
4. How willing was the vendor to provide support services ?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
5. How cooperative was the vendor in demonstrating extra effort to meet County staff requirements in the emergency?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

COMMENTS:

G) Living Wage Compliance					Section Score: **0.00**	
Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory				Excellent	
1. How prominent was the Living Wage rate provision poster displayed in workplace?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
2. How timely was the vendor in providing the three language statement with each covered employee in the first paycheck or direct deposit slip and every six months hereafter in accordance with the Living Wage Ordinance?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
3. How complete overall were the vendor's payroll records of the covered employees over the required three year period?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
4. How timely and complete were the required compliance payroll reports submitted?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
5. How proactive was the vendor regarding inserting into any subcontracts the applicable clauses as required by the Living Wage Ordinance?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

6. How proactive was the vendor in ensuring the compliance by any subcontractor with the Living Wage Ordinance as it applies to the subcontract?	◯ 1	◯ 2	◯ 3	◯ 4	◯ 5	⦿ N/A
7. If applicable, how cooperative was the vendor in responding to and resolving any employee complaints regarding alleged violations of Living Wage contract requirements?	◯ 1	◯ 2	◯ 3	◯ 4	◯ 5	⦿ N/A

COMMENTS:

RATING OFFICIAL INFORMATION	
Name and Title	Office

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM
Goals Participation

CONTRACT INFORMATION				
Contract/RLI/Agreement Number Enter this information on the Construction Evaluation Tab	Project Number/Title		Evaluation Period From:　　　　To:	
Vendor Name			Contract Period From:　　　　To:	
Service Description				
Award Amount	Change Orders & Amendments		No. of	Revised Contract Amount
Claims　☐ No Claims	Claims in Process	From Vendor		Against Vendor
	Finalized Claims	From Vendor Date		Against Vendor Date
Goal Type	County Established	Vendor Committed		Attained

RECOMMENDED FOR FUTURE USE		
Recommended for future contracts: If other than Yes, provide detailed explanation as attachment. State Condition for Recommendation:	○ YES ○ NO ○ Conditional	Numerical Score:　　　0.00
Overall Rating:	○ 5-Excellent (4.50 - 5.00) ○ 4-Good (3.20 - 4.49) ○ 3-Fair (2.60 - 3.19) ○ 2-Poor (1.81 - 2.59) ○ 1-Unsatisfactory (1.0 - 1.8)	

COUNTY CONTACT INFORMATION	
Contract Administrator or Delegate Name	Email
Signature	Date

OESBD Representative Name	Email
Signature	Date

Evaluation Criteria
This evaluation provides an indication of the vendors's ability to implement a practical, accurate, complete and cost conscious project. For each item, please provide a numerical score from 1 to 5, in accordance to the performance rating scale. Select N/A if the criteria does not apply to this evaluation. Reviewer comments must be entered for a rating of 1, 2 or 5. Minimum passing score is 2.60. **The following scale is used to rank the level of contributions made by the vendor to the project.** 5 - Excellent Performance: Project had no time or cost impacts related to vendor's performance; 4- Good Performance: Project had some minor issues which the vendor aggressively pursued to resolve and there were minor time or cost impacts related to the contractor's performance; 3 - Fair Performance: Project had some issues which the vendor pursued to resolve and that resulted in acceptable time and/or cost impacts; 2 - Poor Performance: Project had several issues which the vendor provided limited assistance to resolve and that resulted in significant time and cost impacts; 1 - Unsatisfactory Performance: Project had multiple, significant issues which the vendor provided no assistance to resolve and that resulted in substantial time and cost impacts.

A) Contract Goals Evaluation						Section Score: 0.00
Evaluation Question	Unsatisfactory				Excellent	
1. How well did the vendor comply with the County's participation goals?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
2. How timely did the vendor submit the Monthly Performance reports?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
3. How well did the vendor manage business relationships with sub-vendors by ensuring that sub-vendors were fully and promptly paid for work that had been completed to specifications?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
4. How well did the vendor adhere to its participation plan?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
5. If goals were not met, how actively did the vendor pursue options needed to meet the goals?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A
6. How actively did the vendor pursue other opportunities to include Broward County certified small businesses?	○ 1	○ 2	○ 3	○ 4	○ 5	◉ N/A

COMMENTS:

RATING OFFICIAL INFORMATION	
Name and Title	Office