Policy

University Policy FP-03.03-06/14

Policy Title: Architect and Engineer Evaluations

Originator: Dr. James Barnett, Associate Vice President

Responsible Office: Facilities, Development, and Operations

Reason for Policy/Purpose:

This policy establishes procedures for the evaluation of architects and engineers while under contract for a University of West Florida Board of Trustees construction project. These procedures are intended to provide a structure for evaluations required by Florida Board of Governors Regulation 14.020 and to set forth appeal rights in connection therewith.

Procedures:

Evaluation Schedule:

Architects/Engineers under contract with The University of West Florida Board of Trustees shall be evaluated by the University on an annual basis. In order to be rated, a firm must have been under contract for at least two months of the rating period. An evaluation may be conducted at any time when a significant change in performance occurs.

General Development of Rating:

The Evaluation Team, as established by the University, will discuss each firm's performance and assign points for each category. Individual category rating values should be assigned as whole numbers:

4 = Outstanding

3 = Above Satisfactory

2 = Satisfactory (meets expectation)

1 = Less than Satisfactory

Professional Services Evaluation Form (Attachment 1). "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." "Managing Office" is the site of the firm's office providing the service, as stated in the architect/engineer agreement. "Project Manager" is the name of the primary representative with the firm for the project.

Rating Criteria for Categories:

A. Quality of Technical Services documents the 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 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 9, and the "Consultants" section is omitted.

B. Timeliness of Service documents the firm's ability to meet realistic schedules for the delivery of its services.

C. Quality of Technical Documentation documents the clarity, accuracy, and general utility of technical documentation produced by the firm. This documentation includes reports describing the firm's personnel and expertise, drawings, specifications, sketches, renderings, promotional materials, and various other forms of documentation intended to communicate information about the project to the Owner or others. Such documentation is not required to be in final form. The fundamental issue is how well the documentation accomplished its intended purpose.

D. Cooperation/Concern for SUS 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.

E. 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 drawings review.

Part A is completed when evaluating the programming phase or design/bidding phase of a project, or for evaluating studies, or when applicable. 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 the budget limitations and scheduling work to be accomplished by others. It is not necessary that the study, program, or design be completed during the period.

Part B is completed when a project is in the construction phase or when applicable. 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 the progress status, detecting problems, providing direction to the contractor, inspecting the work, and following – up on punch list and warranty items.

Combined Part A and Part B 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 2.5.

Final Rating:

The "Total Weighted Points" amount is divided by 5 to determine the 20 – point based rating. This calculation is made because the score used in the past performances category of an architect/engineer selection is based on a 20 – point scale. The overall performance descriptor is entered on the form, and is assigned as follows:

18 – 20	Outstanding
15 – 17.9	Above Satisfactory
10 – 14.9	Satisfactory
0 – 9.9	Less than Satisfactory

Ratings for Joint Ventures:

One evaluation should be prepared for the joint venture, and a copy of the evaluation will be sent to each party to the joint venture.

Signature:

The completed evaluation will be signed by the director of the Department of Facilities Planning, Maintenance and Construction or his or her designee.

Transmittal of Rating to Firm:

The University shall provide 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 by sending written notice stating the basis for your appeal. In order to be considered, such notice must be received by the university within 30 days of receipt of this letter."**

Appeal of Ratings:

In accordance with BOG Regulation 14.020, any rating may be appealed to the President of the University or designee within thirty days, and such appeals will be handled in the manner set forth in BOG Regulation 14.022(2), for appeals of disqualification of contractors. As provided therein, a hearing may be requested within fourteen (14) days of receipt of notice of the President's decision. If such a request is not timely filed, the President will make a final ruling on the matter in its original form. If a

request for hearing is made, the matter will be handled in accordance with university procedures for a quasi-judicial hearing.

Quasi- Judicial Hearing:

Appellate review of the final order shall be in accordance with the requirements of Rule 9.190 (b) (3), Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.

Archive of Rating Data Base:

The University of West Florida Department of Facilities Planning, Maintenance and Construction maintains the database of ratings. The overall rating for each firm will be updated each time a new rating is received. Ratings will be kept on current record for three (3) years. The overall rating is used as the "Past Performance" score in architect/engineer selections.

Change Justification:

This amendment is adopted to reflect changes in applicable regulations of the Florida Board of Governors and to reflect departmental and divisional name changes.

Authority and Related Documents:

Florida Board of Governors Regulations 14.020 and 14.022; and Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure 9.190 (b)(3).

APPROVED: Dr. Judith A. Bense, President **Date:** 6/30/14

History: Revision replaces and renumbers FDO 02.01-05/09 June 2014; amended May 2009, adopted September 2002.