

CONTRACTOR EVALUATION GUIDE

PURPOSE: To establish procedures for the evaluation of Contractor (General Contractor, Construction Management Consultant and Design/Builder) while under contract for a University of South Florida (USF) construction project.

I. Evaluation Schedule.

Contractors under contract with USF are evaluated (as an [Annual Evaluation](#)) by [USF Facilities Management Design & Construction \(FM-DC\) September](#) of the years the Contractors are under contract with USF. In order to be rated, a firm must have been under contract for at least [sixty \(60\)](#) consecutive days of the rating period for major projects; must complete a phase of service or make deliverables for minor projects. In addition, an evaluation may be conducted at any time (as a [Special Evaluation](#)) when a significant change in performance occurs or a project construction 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. Contractor Rating Committee.

The Director of [FM-DC](#) or a designee serves as the Chair of the Contractor Rating Committee (Committee). The Committee membership shall consist of the USF Project Managers (and may include Building Code Inspectors). The Committee shall evaluate and recommend ratings for final approval by the Director of [FM-DC](#).

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. Contractor Evaluation Form.

The Contractor 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. 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. For General Contractor or minor projects evaluations Part A is not a mandatory requirement.

1. Part A. Pre-Construction Phase Services

Should be completed when evaluating the pre-construction phase of a project, or for evaluating cost reports and other studies or reports. Part A evaluates the overall effectiveness of the firm in meeting budget and site logistics objectives, and the quality of the reports and studies. This item specifically includes an appraisal of the firm's effectiveness in coping with budget limitations and proposed schedule work. It is not necessary that all pre-construction phase services be completed during the evaluation period.

2. Part B. Construction Phase Services

Should be completed when a project is in the construction phase. Part B evaluates the overall effectiveness of the firm in bidding, administering and enforcing the trade contracts during construction. This item specifically includes an appraisal of the firm's effectiveness in working with the design professionals, USF agencies, trade contractors and vendors to bring the project to a timely completion, keeping abreast of progress status, detecting problems, providing direction to the subcontractors.

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

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

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

In the event the evaluation period spans Part A, Part B and Part C phases in any combination, all applicable parts should be rated and the respective weights will each be adjusted to **10**; if Part A & C or B & C are used, weight is adjusted to **20**; if Part A & B are used, weight adjusted to **12.5**; if only Part A, B or C is used alone, weight adjusted to **25**. If Part A and/or Part B are used, the weight for Part C = **5**; If only Part C is used, weight = **25**. Put it simply, each Part weighs equally no matter what combination of Part A, B and C are scored.

C 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.

D. 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 Professional and Contractor, 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 Director of **FM-DC** to complete the process.

V. Administration of the Evaluation Form.

A. Transmittal of Rating to Firm.

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

VI. Maintenance of Rating Data Base.

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 architect/engineer 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.