

FACILITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT EVALUATIONS POLICY AND PROCEDURES

PURPOSE

The Institutions of Higher Learning (IHL) now requires evaluations of Professional Architect/Engineer Firms and Contractors to document performance and be able to share with all universities. Design professionals and contractors are held to high standards to prevent excessive budget and time overruns. In order to achieve this, evaluation of performance on design professionals and contractors doing work for Mississippi State University (MSU) is necessary.

POLICY

All Facility Improvement Projects greater than \$250,000 will be assigned a Project Manager at the initiation of the project. The Project Manager shall evaluate Professional Architect/Engineer Firms and Contractors on all facility improvement projects greater than \$250,000 using the Professional Architect/Engineer Evaluation form and Contractor Performance Evaluation form approved by the Institutions of Higher Learning. The forms may be obtained or reviewed from the Facilities Management website at www.fm.msstate.edu/plandescon/. All evaluations shall be submitted to the University Architect for MSU record keeping and forwarding to IHL.

PROCEDURES

The Project Manager will evaluate the Professional Architect/Engineer Firm twice, once within thirty days following the bid opening for the planning phase and once within thirty days of the final acceptance for the construction phase. The completed evaluation shall be submitted to the University Architect.

The Contractor will be evaluated within thirty days of the final acceptance of the project. The completed evaluation shall be submitted to the University Architect.

The University Architect will maintain an evaluation record of architects and contractors who perform work for MSU and forward all evaluations to IHL for their record. Consultation of the University Architect is required prior to selection/award of an Architect/Engineer or contractor.

An Architect/Engineer or a contractor that has a recent history of below average performance at MSU, will not be used without a prior discussion and concurrence of the MSU Counsel, the Executive Director of Facilities and Chief of Staff.

REVIEW

The Chief of Staff is responsible for the review of this operating policy every four years or as needed.

AUTHORIZED BY:

/s/ Michael McGrevey 12/19/06
Chief of Staff **Date**

REVIEWED BY:

/s/ Don Zant 12/13/06
Director, Internal Audit **Date**

/s/ Charles Guest 12/15/06
General Counsel **Date**

APPROVED BY:

/s/ Robert H. Foglesong
President **Date**

NOTE: Upon the President's signature, please route to Director of Internal Audit.

63.02
01/03/07



INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING
Real Estate and Facilities
PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECT/ENGINEER EVALUATION

UNIVERSITY: _____
 PROJECT NUMBER: _____
 PROJECT TITLE: _____
 DATE OF EVALUATION: _____ EVALUATOR/TITLE: _____
 PROFESSIONAL: _____
 CONTRACT SUM: _____

Evaluation Scoring: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2= Less Than Satisfactory
 1= Unacceptable NA = Not Applicable (Requires Comment)

Interim Final

PLANNING PHASE	SCORE
1. Facilities program phase.	
2. Evaluation of existing site and building conditions.	
3. Project satisfies site and building conditions.	
4. Design is appropriate and meets program objectives.	
5. Completeness and accuracy of schematic and design development documents.	
6. Completeness and accuracy of contract documents.	
7. Designers management of consultant's performance.	
8. Timely adherence to schedule (communicates to client).	
9. Accuracy of construction estimate (communicates to client).	
10. Working relationship with using agency.	
AVERAGE SCORE FOR PLANNING PHASE-	

CONSTRUCTION PHASE	SCORE
11. Project Administration, leadership and making sound and timely recommendations.	
12. Observes construction at critical times and regularly attends progress meetings.	
13. Designer's management of consultant's performance.	
14. Completeness and accuracy of Contract Documents - change orders not excessive.	
15. Completeness, timeliness and accuracy of administrative documentation.	
16. Working relationship with Contractor.	
17. Working relationship State Agencies and regulatory officials.	
18. Management of substantial completion phase.	
19. Final inspection and construction closeout.	
20. Designer project closeout.	
AVERAGE SCORE FOR CONSTRUCTION PHASE-	
OVERALL AVERAGE FOR PROJECT-	

COMMENTS: _____



INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING
Real Estate and Facilities
CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

UNIVERSITY: _____
PROJECT NUMBER: _____
PROJECT TITLE: _____
DATE OF EVALUATION: _____ **EVALUATOR/TITLE:** _____
CONTRACTOR: _____
CONTRACT SUM: _____

Evaluation Scoring: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2= Less Than Satisfactory
 1= Unacceptable NA = Not Applicable (Requires Comment)

Interim Final

		SCORE
1. Did the contractor communicate with the A/E in accordance with the contract documents?		
2. Did the contractor promptly commence the work?		
3. Did the contractor employ a capable site superintendent consistently on-site when work was performed?		
4. Did the contractor's on-site personnel demonstrate a customer-friendly attitude to Owner's personnel?		
5. Were requests for information (RFI) from subcontractors effectively managed by the contractor?		
6. Were the quality and timeliness of the submittals and O&M manuals acceptable?		
7. Did the contractor's written and actual schedules meet the project requirements?		
8. Did the contractor adequately staff the project and work to meet the Owner's schedule?		
9. Were material deliveries in accordance with the contractor's schedule?		
10. Did the contractor promptly provide reasonable quotations for changes to the original scope of work or RFP's?		
11. Did the contractor submit proposals that accurately represented the work required?		
12. Did the contractor require accurate and reasonable pricing from subcontractors?		
13. Did the contractor promptly pay the subcontractors and/or suppliers?		
14. Did the contractor protect existing trees, utilities, sidewalks, parking areas as required:		
15. Was the contractor represented at pay/progress meetings by a person with decision-making authority?		
16. Did the contractor effectively coordinate and manage the work of its subcontractors?		
17. Did the contractor clean the work site periodically and at project completion?		
18. Did the contractor promptly correct defective work as the project progressed?		
19. Did the contractor manage progress meetings and produce effective progress reports and minutes?		
20. Were the materials and workmanship in compliance with the contract documents?		
21. Did the contractor comply with site regulations in accordance with the contract documents?		
22. Did the contractor coordinate disruption of facility operations with the user?		
23. Did the contractor provide effective inspection and quality control procedures?		
24. Did the contractor work to actively resolve problems and cooperate with the Owner & Professional?		
25. Did the contractor suggest solutions and display an initiative to implement solutions?		
26. Did the contractor coordinate and cooperate with other contractors and suppliers?		
27. Did the contractor complete all work prior to requesting final inspection?		
28. Did the contractor produce accurate and complete record documents (as-builts)?		
29. Did the contractor provide safety plan and enforce safety on the work site?		
30. Did the contractor promptly clean-up all deficiencies and punch list items?		
31. Did the contractor comply with all warranty provisions and requests for warranty work?		
AVERAGE SCORE-		

COMMENTS:
