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 IHE.

PROCEDURES

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

The University Architect will make 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/Engreef 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:

oeen les inded /s/ Don Zant 12/13/06 **Director, Internal Audit**

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

APPROVED BY:

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

NOTE: Upon the President's lignature, 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:	\	1
Evaluation Scoring:	5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2= Less Tha Salisfa	ctory
Lyanuation Scoring.	1= Unacceptable NA = Not Applicable (Requires Comment)	ctor y
□ Interim □ Final	1 Onacceptable 1471 1400 Applicable (Requires Comment	
	PLANNING PHASE	SCORE
1. Facilities program phase.	I Did Hard I Had	OOOILE
2. Evaluation of existing site and b	uilding conditions	
3. Project satisfies site and building		
4. Design is appropriate and meets		
	chematic and design development documents.	
6. Completeness and accuracy of c	ÿ i	
7. Designers management of consu		
8. Timely adherence to schedule (communicates to client).		
9. Accuracy of construction estima		
10. Working relationship with using		
100 H Oliming Lemonous prison was a	AVERAGE SCORE FOR PLANNING PHASE-	
	CONCEDE TO NUMBER	225
11 D : (All : (CONSTRUCTION PHASE	SCORE
11. Project Administration, leadership and making solution and timely recommendations.		
12. Observes construction at critical times and egularly 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 Cor		
17. Working relationship State 19		
18. Management of substantial of		
19. Final inspection and con true id	on closeout.	
19. Final inspection and con true id	on closeout. AVERAGE SCORE FOR CONSTRUCTION PHASE-	
19. Final inspection and con true id		
19. Final inspection and construction 20. Designer project cuseou .	AVERAGE SCORE FOR CONSTRUCTION PHASE-	
19. Final inspection and con true id	AVERAGE SCORE FOR CONSTRUCTION PHASE-	
19. Final inspection and construction 20. Designer project cuseou .	AVERAGE SCORE FOR CONSTRUCTION PHASE-	
19. Final inspection and construction 20. Designer project cuseou .	AVERAGE SCORE FOR CONSTRUCTION PHASE-	



INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

Real Estate and Facilities
CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

UNIVERSITY:			
PROJECT NUMBER:			
PROJECT TITLE:			
DATE OF EVALUATION:	EVALUATOR/TITLE:		
CONTRACTOR:			
CONTRACT SUM:		7	
		$oldsymbol{eta}$	
Evaluation Scoring:	5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2= Less That Sat	actory	
Evaluation Scoring.	1= Unacceptable NA = Not Applicable (Requires Comment)	nuctor y	
□ Interim □ Final	1 Onacceptable 1421 1400 Applicable (Requires Comment)		
1 mai		SCORE	
1 Did the contractor communicate	with the A/E in accordance with the contract documents?		
2. Did the contractor promptly com			
	able site superintendent consistently on-site when work was performed?	_	
	onnel demonstrate a customer-friendly attitude to Ovin Cs. ersonnel?		
-	RFI) from subcontractors effectively managed by the contractor?		
	of the submittals and O&M manuals acceptable?		
	actual schedules meet the project requirements?		
	aff the project and work to meet the Orne's shedule?		
	dance with the contractor's schedule?		
	ovide reasonable quotations for clarges to the original scope of work or RFP's?		
11. Did the contractor submit propo	osals that accurately represented the work required?		
	rate and reasonable pricing com ubcontractors?		
13. Did the contractor promptly pay	y the subcontractors and/or suppliers?		
	ing trees, utilities, sid walks, parking areas as required:		
	at pay/progress at tings by a person with decision-making authority?		
	oordinate and man ge the work of its subcontractors?		
	rk site per r dically 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 workmansing it compliance with the contract documents? 21. Did the contractor comply with site regulations in accordance with the contract documents?			
		_	
	is ption of facility operations with the user?		
	cive inspection and quality control procedures?		
	vely resolve problems and cooperate with the Owner & Professional?		
	ions and display an initiative to implement solutions?		
	nd cooperate with other contractors and suppliers?		
	work prior to requesting final inspection?		
28. Did the contact or produce accu	urate and complete record documents (as-builts)?		
29. Did the contractor provide safet	ty plan and enforce safety on the work site?		
30 D. the ontractor promptly clea	an-up all deficiencies and punch list items?		
Did the contractor comply with	all warranty provisions and requests for warranty work?		
	AVERAGE SCOR	E-	
COMMENTS:			
,			