

DESIGN PROFESSIONAL EVALUATION GUIDE

PURPOSE: To establish procedures for the evaluation of Architects and Engineers (Design Professionals) while under contract for a University of South Florida (USF) construction project.

I. Evaluation Schedule.

Design Professionals under contract with USF are evaluated (as an [Annual Evaluation](#)) by USF Facilities Management in [September](#) of the years the Design Professionals are under contract with USF. In order to be rated, a firm must have been under contract for at least [ninety \(90\)](#) calendar days of the rating period or completed a phase of contracted service. An evaluation may be conducted at any time (as a [Special Evaluation](#)) when a significant change in performance occurs or a project design or schedule milestone is achieved. **For minor projects, an evaluation shall be completed at the completion of each project; the scores will be maintained as a running average for the duration of the service period.**

II. Design Professional Rating Committee.

The [USF Facilities Management Design & Construction \(FM-DC\)](#) Director or a designee serves as the Chair of the Design Professional Rating Committee (Committee). The Committee membership shall consist of the USF Project Managers, USF Construction Managers and USF Building Code Inspectors. The Committee shall evaluate and recommend ratings for final approval by the [FM-DC](#) Director.

III. General Development of Rating.

The initial rating is provided by the USF Project Manager. The Committee discusses each firm's performance and assigns points for each category. Individual category ratings values are assigned as whole numbers. The total possible score for a firm is **100**.

- 4 = Outstanding
- 3 = Above Satisfactory
- 2 = Satisfactory (meets expectations)
- 1 = Less than Satisfactory

Satisfactory, a score of **2**, is the benchmark rating, and is defined as the level of performance that meets contract requirements.

IV. Professional Services Evaluation Form.

The Professional Services Evaluation Form consists of two sections: the evaluation criteria and data entry page which lists the detailed evaluation categories and scoring; and the signature page which summarizes the overall performance. "Firm" is the name of the firm being evaluated. If a joint venture is providing the services, the name of one party to the joint venture is "Firm" and the name of the other party to the joint venture is "Joint Venture." Each joint venture party shall receive separate evaluations. "Managing Office" is the site of the principle office providing the service, as stated in the design services agreement. "Project Manager" is the name of the primary representative with the firm for the project.

A. Basic Criteria:

1. **Quality of Technical Services.** Documents a firm's ability to deliver technical services with a minimum of problems. Such problems may include mistakes in design or analysis, lack of thoroughness, lack of familiarity with codes, ignorance of contract document requirements, and, in general, deficiencies resulting from the lack or misapplication of technical skills and/or project specific knowledge that the firm is expected to have or to obtain. If the firm employs consultants, then the weight assigned this item is **5** and the "Consultants" section is completed. If the firm employs no consultants, then the weight assigned to this item is **10** and the "Consultants" section is omitted.
2. **Timeliness of Service.** Documents a firm's ability to meet realistic schedules for the delivery of its services.
3. **Quality of Technical Documentation.** Documents the clarity, accuracy, and general utility of technical documentation produced by the firm. This documentation includes reports, drawings, specifications, sketches, renderings, promotional materials, and various other forms of documentation intended to communicate information about the project to the University or others. Such documentation may not be in final form. The fundamental issue is how well does the documentation accomplish its intended purpose.
4. **Cooperation/Concern for University Interests.** Documents the degree to which the firm cooperated with the Owner, and the extent of the firm's commitment to the protection and advancement of the interest of the University.

5. **Administration of Project Paperwork.** Documents the accuracy, timeliness of submission, and thoroughness of paperwork associated with the administration of the project. Such paperwork includes pay requests, additional services requests, status reports, change orders, and shop drawing review.

B. Phases of Service for Evaluation.

The evaluation is cumulative in that each part, once the phase is completed, the last evaluation is not changed and is averaged with each subsequent phase of evaluations.

1. **Part A.** Achievement of Study, Program or Design Objectives

Should be completed when evaluating the programming phase or design/ bidding phase of a project, or for evaluating studies. Part A evaluates the overall effectiveness of the firm in meeting study, programming, or design objectives. This item specifically includes an appraisal of the firm's effectiveness in coping with budget limitations and scheduling work to be accomplished by others. It is not necessary that the study, program, or design be completed during the evaluation period.

2. **Part B.** Administration/Enforcement of Contract Documents

Should be completed when a project is in the construction phase. Part B evaluates the overall effectiveness of the firm in administering and enforcing the contract during construction. This item specifically includes an appraisal of the firm's effectiveness in working with the contractor to bring the project to a timely completion, keeping abreast of progress status, detecting problems, providing direction to the contractor, inspecting the work, and following-up on punch list items.

3. **Part C.** Post Occupancy Services

Should be completed when project has achieved final completion through the end of the basic building warranty phase. This evaluation shall include performance of the Professional in assembling and delivery of project closeout deliverables, addressing warranty issues during warranty phase, and the end of warranty phase inspection and report.

C. Combined Part A/Part B/Part C Evaluations.

In the event the evaluation period spans Part A and Part B phases, both parts should be rated and the respective weights will each be adjusted to 5; if Part C is used alone its weight will be 5 otherwise 1.

D. Final Rating for Future Interview/Selection Process.

The "Total Score" is divided by 5 to determine the 20-point based rating as an input to SUS ratings database. This calculation is used as current firm score in the consultant interview/selection process.

E. Ratings for Joint Ventures.

Identical evaluation is prepared for each party to the joint venture.

F. Ratings for Design/Builder.

The Design/Build firm or a team shall be evaluated separately as Design Professional and Contractor. When Design/Build team is reconstituted for consideration of future project, past individual evaluations scores shall be combined; if at that time either or both parts of the design/build team has no qualifying evaluation on record then an arithmetic average of current evaluations of all Design Professionals and Constructors, as appropriate, will be used in the current rating score.

G. Signatures.

The USF Project Manager completes the form and secures the signature of the USF FM Director to complete the process.

V Administration of the Evaluation Form.

A. Transmittal of Rating to Firm.

The USF FM sends a copy of the completed evaluation form to the rated firm, certified mail, return receipt requested. The transmittal letter must contain the following statement: "If you feel that your firm has been rated unfairly, you may appeal this rating in accordance with [Chapter 120 \(Administrative Procedures Act\), Florida Statutes](#) by sending written notice stating the

basis for your appeal. In order to be considered, such notice must be received by the university within [thirty \(30\)](#) days of receipt of this letter."

B. Appeal of Ratings.

If a Design Professional appeals its rating within the required time, the rating committee will discuss the rating with the firm and attempt to resolve the differences informally. If informal discussions do not result in a resolution, the USF Project Manager will notify the firm in writing of the time and place to appear before the Design Professional Rating Committee. This notification shall be sent certified mail, return receipt requested. The decision of the Committee is final.

V. Maintenance of Rating Data Base.

USF [FM-DC](#) maintains the data base of ratings for firms on contract with the University. The overall rating for each firm will be updated each time a new rating is awarded. The overall rating is used as the "Current Rating" score in the Design Professional selections. For firms with no rating history, an arithmetic average of current evaluations of all firms will be used in the current rating score. The rating for each firm will be mathematically averaged with the final evaluation(s) of previous project(s) performed by the firm. Any evaluation more than [three \(3\)](#) years old at the time of the consultant interview/selection process shall be deleted; if at that time the firm has no qualifying evaluation on record then an arithmetic average of current evaluations of all firms will be used in the current rating score.

FILE: PMG-27A Professional Evaluation Guide.docx