

# **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/](http://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. Designer's 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:

**CONTRACT SUM:**

**SCORE**

**COMMENTS:**

---

---

---