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.



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 Satisfa	ctory			
	1= Unacceptable NA = Not Applicable (Requires Comment)				
□ Interim □ Final					
	PLANNING PHASE	SCORE			
1. Facilities program phase.					
2. Evaluation of existing site and but	-				
3. Project satisfies site and building					
4. Design is appropriate and meets p	•				
5. Completeness and accuracy of sch	nematic and design development documents.				
6. Completeness and accuracy of con					
7. Designers management of consult	ant's performance.				
8. Timely adherence to schedule (co	,				
9. Accuracy of construction estimate	e (communicates to client).				
10. Working relationship with using	agency.				
	AVERAGE SCORE FOR PLANNING PHASE-				
CONSTRUCTION PHASE					
11. Project Administration, leadership and making sound and timely recommendations.					
	times and regularly attends progress meetings.				
13. Designer's management of consu					
	ontract Documents - change orders not excessive.				
15. Completeness, timeliness and accuracy of administrative documentation.					
16. Working relationship with Cont					
17. Working relationship State Ager					
18. Management of substantial com	1				
19. Final inspection and construction	closeout.				
20. Designer project closeout.					
	AVERAGE SCORE FOR CONSTRUCTION PHASE-				
	OVERALL AVERAGE FOR PROJECT-				
	-				
COMMENTE.					
COMMENTS:					
COMMENTS:					
COMMENTS:					



INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

Real Estate and Facilities
CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

UNIVERSITY:					
PROJECT NUMBER:					
PROJECT TITLE:					
DATE OF EVALUATION:		EVALUATOR	R/TITLE:		
CONTRACTOR:			· · ·		
CONTRACT SUM:					
Evaluation Scoring:	5 = Excellent	4 = Good	3 = Satisfactory	2= Less Than Satisfa	ctory
g.	1= Unacceptable		able (Requires Comn		
□ Interim □ Final			()	
					SCORE
1. Did the contractor communicate	with the A/E in accord	dance with the con	tract documents?		
2. Did the contractor promptly com					
3. Did the contractor employ a capa		nt consistently on-s	ite when work was ne	erformed?	
4. Did the contractor's on-site perso	-				
5. Were requests for information (R		•			
6. Were the quality and timeliness of	•	•			
7. Did the contractor's written and			•		
8. Did the contractor adequately sta			ner's schedule?		
9. Were material deliveries in accor				e i pena	
10. Did the contractor promptly pro	•			of work or RFP's?	
11. Did the contractor submit propo	•	-	_		
12. Did the contractor require accur	•		itractors?		
13. Did the contractor promptly pay					
14. Did the contractor protect existi	<u> </u>	· • ·	^		
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 di	sruption of facility op	erations with the u	ıser?		
23. Did the contractor provide effect	ctive inspection and qu	uality control proc	edures?		
24. Did the contractor work to activ	ely resolve problems a	and cooperate with	the Owner & Profes	sional?	
25. Did the contractor suggest soluti					
26. Did the contractor coordinate an					
27. Did the contractor complete all					
28. Did the contractor produce accu					
29. Did the contractor provide safet					
30. Did the contractor promptly clea		•			
31. Did the contractor comply with		_			
with tome to the plant with		requests for	mary morns	AVERAGE SCORE-	
L				A VERAGE SCORE-	
COMMENTS:					
COMMENTED.					