



Arizona Department of Transportation
Intermodal Transportation Division
206 South Seventeenth Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

Janice K. Brewer
Governor

Floyd Roehrich, Jr.
State Engineer

John S. Halikowski
Director

June 28, 2010

INFORMATION BULLETIN NO. 10-02

TO: ADOT Project Managers
Resident Engineers
Consultant Engineering Firms

FROM: Engineering Consultants Section (ECS)

SUBJECT: REVISED CONSULTANT EVALUATION GUIDELINES

The Consultant Evaluation program for ECS contracts has been revised and will become effective for new contracts with a Notice to Proceed date after July 1, 2010. A series of training sessions have been implemented by ECS over the past few months to familiarize ADOT PMs and Consultants with program guidelines and how to complete evaluations in the electronic Contact Management System (eCMS).

Attached for your information is a copy of the guidelines for the program. Please review them carefully to familiarize yourself with changes to the process, which include how results of evaluations will be used, procedures and timelines for completing evaluations.

Any questions regarding this bulletin should be directed to the Engineering Consultants Section at (602) 712-7525.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "V. Lattibeaudiere", is written over a horizontal line.

Vivien Lattibeaudiere, Ph.D.
Director
Engineering Consultant Section

**Arizona Department of Transportation
ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS SECTION (ECS)**

CONSULTANT EVALUATION PROGRAM GUIDELINES

Introduction & Purpose

The Consultant Evaluation Program is a program administered by ECS as a means for ADOT to monitor and evaluate the quality of work performed on engineering consultant contracts. A positive approach to the program assures that project schedule, cost and quality of design and construction are attainable. This assures that potential problems which may impact other projects or the 5-Year Construction Program are identified and resolved in a timely manner.

All engineering consultant contracts shall be evaluated annually based on the Notice to Proceed (NTP) anniversary date by the ADOT staff assigned to the contract, including the ADOT PM, other Technical groups, ECS staff, etc., in accordance with applicable contract provisions. In addition to annual evaluations, a final consultant evaluation must be conducted at the end of all engineering consultant contracts.

Implementation Timeline

This evaluation program will be effective for all ECS contracts with a Notice to Proceed (NTP) date of July 1, 2010, or later. Annual evaluation using this program will be conducted on contracts which were NTPed before July 1, 2010, but the results will not affect consultant selection.

Uses for Consultant Evaluation

Consultant Evaluations will be used for the following purposes:

1. To identify consultant performance strengths and weaknesses, as well as help identify, document and resolve performance issues, as needed.
2. As one factor or criterion in the selection process for subsequent contracts. Final evaluations for contracts executed after **July 1, 2010** will be used as part of the selection process. Up to 5 points may be deducted from a consultant's score during the selection process for **final** evaluation ratings of less than 3 (average performance) on performance factors of evaluation for projects a firm has completed for ADOT over a three year time period.

Evaluation history to be used for selection will include evaluation scores encompassing the most current three-year period at any given time. The three-year evaluation history will be maintained for firm contracts executed after July 1, 2010. For example, a firm's evaluation history in FY 2013 would include scores from FY 2011 through FY 2013, in FY 2014, the evaluation history would include FY 2012 through FY 2014.

ECS will deduct points from the scores of submitted Statements of Qualifications (SOQ) for each firm based on performance rating as follows:

Performance rating of 1 or 2 on 1-2 evaluation factors	-1 Point
Performance rating of 1 or 2 on 3-4 evaluation factors	-2 Point
Performance rating of 1 or 2 on 5-6 evaluation factors	-3 Point
Performance rating of 1 or 2 on 7-8 evaluation factors	-4 Point
Performance rating of 1 or 2 on 9 or more evaluation factors	-5 Point

3. As documentation to justify disqualification of a prime consultant or subconsultant from submitting Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) proposals. In order for ECS to take action that could lead to consultant disqualification from submitting SOQs, the ADOT PM or staff shall complete a Consultant Evaluation by initiating the process through the ECS Contract Specialist. When an evaluation form is used to document issues which could lead to consultant disqualification from submitting SOQ proposals (as outlined in Section 2.02 of the ECS Rules and Procedures), the ECS Specialist will select "Other" as the Evaluation type in eCMS.

4. As documentation to justify the declaration of a breach of contract for a consultant's failure to fulfill terms of the contract or to address problems identified by ADOT in the performance of the contract. In order for ECS to take action that could lead ADOT to declare a breach of contract, the ADOT PM or staff must complete a Consultant Evaluation by initiating the process through the ECS Contract Specialist. When an evaluation form is used to document issues which could lead to a breach of contract being declared (as outlined in Section 4.17 of the ECS Rules and Procedures), the ECS Specialist will select "Other" as the Evaluation type in eCMS.

Procedure

ECS Contract Specialist will initiate the completion of consultant evaluation forms for contracts annually on their NTP anniversary date.

Since evaluations will be used as a factor in the consultant selection process, it is important for ADOT PMs, Resident Engineers or other applicable staff to complete evaluations in a timely manner.

Please adhere to the following general guidelines in completing the consultant evaluation electronically in eCMS.

1. All consultant evaluations, annual, final or otherwise shall be initiated by the ECS Specialist. ADOT PMs, who wish to conduct a consultant evaluation outside of the normal annual or final cycle, should contact the ECS Specialist to initiate the evaluation process.
2. Section I (Items 1-4) of the evaluation form shall be completed by ECS staff in eCMS and forwarded to the ADOT PM through automatic email notification.
3. The ADOT PM shall confer with other ADOT Project Team members involved in the contract and complete Section II of the evaluation form (Items 5-11) in eCMS. The ADOT PM shall forward the fully completed evaluation to the consultant electronically through eCMS within 14 calendar days from the receipt of notification from the ECS Specialist.

If the ADOT PM is a Supplemental Services (SS) consultant, the PM portion of the evaluation must be completed in eCMS by the SS consultant's Supervisor or Manager.

4. Section II, Item 12 (Post-Design) will be forwarded to the ADOT Resident Engineer (RE) by the ADOT PM for completion, as applicable. The ADOT RE shall confer with the ADOT PM and other ADOT project team members involved in the project and shall complete the Section II, Item 12 within 5 calendar days.
5. When totally completed, the ADOT PM shall discuss the evaluation with the consultant (telephonically or in-person) and "publish" it to the consultant through eCMS. The consultant shall complete Section III by indicating the firm's agreement or disagreement with the ratings, type comments and "publish" the evaluation back to ADOT through eCMS within 10 calendar days, with the goal of completing the entire evaluation process within 30 calendar days.

ADOT PMs should encourage consultants to share the results of the subconsultant portion of the evaluation with their subconsultants.

General Guidelines

1. Each individual line item in the evaluation constitutes a performance factor.
2. ECS will assign negative points based on individual factor scores, not on an overall composite score.
3. Each individual performance factor and category on the form will be treated equally.
4. General comments are highly recommended to support scores in each major performance category.
5. Documentation and specific comments **must** be included to justify any performance factor receiving a score of 2 or less.

6. The ADOT PM, ECS and other applicable ADOT staff are encouraged to take appropriate steps to resolve performance issues with consultants, as they arise, in a timely manner, and to document these issues in the eCMS Evaluation tab for that particular contract. This information will be used as a means of documenting issues for future evaluation ratings.
7. If performance issues arise, ADOT PMs and ECS Contract Managers should expeditiously inform consultants in writing that they are performing unsatisfactorily (using the Issues Resolution form located in eCMS) and provide them the opportunity to take corrective action to cure the deficiency before they are formally evaluated. The following steps must be taken if there are performance issues with a consultant, which could potentially lead to an evaluation score of less than 3 (average):
 - a) If communicating to resolve the matter with the consultant informally does not resolve the issue, the ADOT PM, ECS Contract Specialist, Manager or other appropriate ADOT employee shall notify the consultant, in writing, of the deficient performance, identify required solutions and establish a deadline to resolve issues. The Consultant Performance Issues Resolution Form in eCMS should be completed by the appropriate ADOT staff and forwarded to the consultant for further action, as needed.
 - b) If the consultant does not respond within ten (10) business days or other timeframe specified on the form and/or the matter is still unresolved after the deadline set for the cure, it is appropriate for the ADOT staff to rate the consultant a 2 or less on the applicable evaluation criteria on the consultant evaluation form.
8. Consultants should take the initiative to expeditiously contact the ADOT PM or ECS, if they are experiencing difficulties which could result in a score of less than 3 on a performance factor. The consultant should identify any problems, state proposed resolutions and specify dates the firm expects to resolve issues.
9. Subconsultant performance will affect the scores of the prime consultant as it relates to performance factors in item #9, "Utilization of Key Subconsultants." Therefore, it is important for prime consultants to closely oversee the work of their subconsultants.
10. Subconsultant scores on Item #10 of the evaluation will not affect the scores of prime consultants. ECS will maintain an evaluation history on subconsultants.
11. If a prime consultant or subconsultant receives 10 or more scores of 2 or less on evaluations, within a two-year time period, these firms may be evaluated as candidates for disqualification from submitting SOQs by ECS, and may not be eligible for work as a prime consultant or subconsultant on ECS contracts for a minimum of one year. A list of consultants that are prequalified and disqualified from submitting SOQs will be posted on the ECS website. Individual consultant evaluation scores will not be posted.
12. New consultants with no ADOT contracts or evaluation history will be evaluated according to the criteria outlined in the SOQ Package, and will not be evaluated based on past performance.
13. Consultants' ratings will not be adversely affected if ADOT reduces the scope of work, or in some way delayed or impacted the ability of the consultant to reasonably meet a performance factor.
14. There is no formal escalation process for consultant evaluation issues at this time. However, if a consultant believes that the firm has been unfairly rated in an evaluation, the firm can indicate its points of disagreement on the evaluation form itself or submit a letter to ECS, which will be included as an official part of the evaluation file and may be evaluated by ECS as a mitigating factor.

**Arizona Department Of Transportation
ENGINEERING CONSULTANT EVALUATION FORM**

Consultant Firm Name		Date	
Consultant Project Manager		ADOT Project Manager	
Contract No.		ADOT Section	
Contract Start Date		Original Budget	
Contract Expiration Date		Revised Budget	
Project Location & Description			

Section II: Items 5 - 12 shall be completed by the ADOT PM and Project Team for Pre-Design/Design to evaluate the Prime Consultant's project performance. General comments are required to support scores in each major category. Specific comments must be written to justify any item receiving a score of 2 or less.

5. COOPERATION AND COMMUNICATION	1	2	3	4	5	NA
5.1 How did the Consultant respond to written and verbal requests?						

Score Definition for Question: 5.1

N/A Not Applicable

- 01 Poor correspondence, communications and response to requests; often does not return calls
- 02 Correspondence, communications and response to requests is prompt less than half of the time
- 03 Correspondence, communications and response to requests is adequate.
- 04 Correspondence and communications prompt most of the time (90%); addressed most requests
- 05 Promptly responded to correspondents and all verbal request from ADOT, public, and/or other constituencies

Comments:

	1	2	3	4	5	NA
5.2 What kind of rapport and working relationship did the Consultant have with stakeholders?						

Score Definition for Question: 5.2

N/A Not Applicable

- 01 Poor rapport with ADOT, public and/or other constituencies
- 02 Below average rapport and working relationship with ADOT, public and/or other constituencies
- 03 Good rapport and working relationship with ADOT, public and/or other constituencies
- 04 Very good rapport and working relationship with ADOT, public and/or other constituencies
- 05 Excellent rapport and working relationship with ADOT, public and/or other constituencies

Comments:

	1	2	3	4	5	NA
5.3 How well prepared, cooperative, flexible, open to suggestions was the Consultant's team?						

Score Definition for Question: 5.3

N/A Not Applicable

- 01 Team often uncooperative, unprepared and resists changes
- 02 Team sometimes uncooperative, unprepared and less open to suggestions
- 03 Team cooperative, prepared and willing to change when necessary
- 04 Team cooperative, generally prepared and open to suggestions
- 05 Team very cooperative, well prepared, flexible and very open to suggestions

Comments:

	1	2	3	4	5	NA
5.4 How effective was the Consultant in resolving disputes?						

Score Definition for Question: 5.4

N/A Not Applicable

01 Major disputes occurred that needed to be resolved through informal or formal dispute resolution

02 Multiple time consuming disputes to resolve; some resolved at the second dispute resolution level

03 Average number of disputes that were handled at the Team or Project Manager level

04 Very minor disputes that were resolved well at the Team or Project Manager level

05 Little or no disputes

Comments:

6. TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE	1	2	3	4	5	NA
6.1 How well did the Consultant meet the project requirements (e.g., scope, schedule, budget, other terms of agreement, etc.)?						

Score Definition for Question: 6.1

N/A Not Applicable

01 Significant variation from scope of work and terms of agreement

02 Scope of work and terms of agreement followed with major changes

03 Scope of work and terms of agreement followed with some changes

04 Scope of work and terms of agreement followed with minor changes

05 Scope of work and terms of agreement followed very well with no changes required

Comments:

	1	2	3	4	5	NA
6.2 How was their technical competency (e.g., documentation, ideas, technical assumptions, strategy, reports, etc.)?						

Score Definition for Question: 6.2

N/A Not Applicable

01 Consistently lack of documentation and justification of strategy, designs and/or reports

02 Periodically lacks documentation and justification of many strategies, designs and/or reports

03 Adequately documented and justified technical assumptions for strategy, design and/or reports

04 Well documented and justified technical assumptions for strategy, design and/or reports

05 Very innovative ideas; creative solutions with excellent documentation and justified technical assumptions for

Comments:

	1	2	3	4	5	NA
6.3 What was the quality of their work (i.e., did they follow ADOT engineering or industry specs, standards, etc.)?						

Score Definition for Question: 6.3

N/A Not Applicable

01 Work not according to ADOT, engineering or industry specifications /standards; revisions always required

02 Work often not according to ADOT, engineering or industry specifications/standards; revisions frequently required

03 Work meets ADOT, engineering or industry specifications/standards; some revisions required

04 Work often meets or exceeds ADOT, engineering or industry specifications/standards; very few revisions

05 Work exceeds ADOT, engineering or industry specifications/standards;no revisions required

Comments:

7. DELIVERABLES	1	2	3	4	5	NA
7.1 Were deliverables submitted as expected (i.e., error free and complete and properly documented)?						

Score Definition for Question: 7.1

N/A Not Applicable

01 Deliverables repeatedly submitted with multiple problems

02 Review comments resolved during second/third round of review

03 Review comments resolved during first round of review

04 Minor corrections required for some deliverables

05 All deliverables submitted were error-free, complete and properly documented

Comments:

	1	2	3	4	5	NA
7.2 Were deliverables and schedules on time?						

Score Definition for Question: 7.2

N/A Not Applicable

01 Consistently late with deliverables and schedule

02 Sometimes late with deliverables and schedule

03 Generally on time with deliverables and schedule

04 Always on time with deliverables and schedule

05 Always on time with deliverables and schedule; sometimes early

Comments:

	1	2	3	4	5	NA
7.3 Did negotiations adhere to ADOT guidelines (e.g., fees, schedule, etc.)?						

Score Definition for Question: 7.3

N/A Not Applicable

01 Contract negotiations did not meet ADOT guidelines on fee; well beyond negotiation schedule

02 Contract negotiations did not meet many of ADOT guidelines on fee; moderately beyond negotiation schedule

03 Contract negotiations generally met ADOT guidelines on fee; slightly beyond negotiation schedule

04 Contract negotiations adhered to ADOT guidelines on fee; met negotiation schedule

05 Contract negotiations well within ADOT guidelines on fee; ahead of negotiation schedule

Comments:

	1	2	3	4	5	NA
7.4 Were deliverables within and/or under the budget?						

Score Definition for Question: 7.4

N/A Not Applicable

01 Consistently over budget

02 Often over budget

03 Usually within budget

04 Always within budget

05 Always within budget; sometimes under budget

Comments:

8. CONSULTANT PROJECT MANAGER/TEAM	1	2	3	4	5	NA
8.1 Was the Consultant Project Manager's leadership professional; did they create a cohesive team?						

Score Definition for Question: 8.1

N/A Not Applicable

01 Ineffective team lacking cohesiveness

02 Below average leadership and team interactions

03 Adequate leadership and team interactions

04 Good leadership; strong team

05 Excellent leadership; very professional cohesive team

Comments:

	1	2	3	4	5	NA
8.2 Did the Consultant Project Manager anticipate and resolve issues and were they prepared for contingencies, coordination and delegation?						

Score Definition for Question: 8.2

N/A Not Applicable

01 Many unresolved issues; unorganized; duplication of effort; lack coordination and delegation efforts.

02 Resolved issues slowly and usually ineffectively; frequently unprepared for contingencies; inconsistent coordination and delegation efforts.

03 Adequately resolved issues and learned from mistakes; adequately prepared for contingencies; adequate coordination and delegation efforts

04 Resolved issues well; prepared for most contingencies; effective coordination and delegation efforts.

05 Took the initiative; regularly anticipated and resolved issues very well; very prepared for contingencies; excellent coordination and delegation efforts.

Comments:

	1	2	3	4	5	NA
8.3 Was the focus on the big picture and task completion?						

Score Definition for Question: 8.3

N/A Not Applicable

01 Frequent mistakes; consistently reactive rather than proactive

02 Focused mostly on problem resolution than big picture and task completion

03 Focused mostly on task completion rather than the big picture

04 Good Focus on big picture and task completion

05 Excellent focus on big picture and task completion

Comments:

	1	2	3	4	5	NA
8.4 Did the Consultant Project Manager manage the Subconsultants milestones/tasks/schedule effectively throughout project?						

Score Definition for Question: 8.4

N/A Not Applicable

01 Schedule & Quantities not managed - no milestones met & many quantity overruns

02 Schedule & Quantities not effectively managed - 75% milestones not met & many quantity overruns

03 Schedule & Quantities managed (50%) of the time - half of milestones not met & some quantity overruns

04 Schedule & Quantities managed (75%) of the time - 25% of milestones not meet & few quantity overruns

05 Schedule & Quantities managed all the time - all milestones met & no quantity overruns

Comments:

	1	2	3	4	5	NA
8.5 Did the Consultant Project Manager manage the Subconsultants progress reports/invoices/payments throughout project?						

Score Definition for Question: 8.5

N/A Not Applicable

01 Contract documents consistently incomplete and late

02 Contract documents frequently incomplete and often submitted late

03 Contract documents adequately complete with minor changes and usually submitted on time

04 Contract documents complete and submitted on time

05 Contract documents always complete and always on time; sometimes early

Comments:

9. UTILIZATION OF KEY SUBCONSULTANTS	1	2	3	4	5	NA
9.1 Did the Prime Consultant assign tasks to the Subconsultants as proposed in the contract?						

Score Definition for Question: 9.1

N/A Not Applicable

01 Did not assign Subconsultant tasks as proposed in contract without any justification

02 Assigned less than 50% Subconsultant tasks as proposed in contract with or without a plausible explanation

03 Assigned less than 75% sub consultant tasks as proposed in contract with plausible explanation

04 Assigned 75% subconsultant tasks as proposed in contract

05 Assigned 100% subconsultant tasks as proposed in contract

Comments:

	1	2	3	4	5	NA
9.2 Prime Did the Consultant meet DBE goals?						

Score Definition for Question: 9.2

N/A Not Applicable

01 Did not meet goals and no efforts was made to achieve goals; no justification on file.

02 Did not meet goals, but performed diligent search for DB firms

03 Met at least 75% of DBE goals

04 Met DBE goals

05 Exceeded DBE goals

Comments:

	1	2	3	4	5	NA
9.3 Did the Prime Consultant on a monthly basis report the DBE participation as detailed in the contract?						

Score Definition for Question: 9.3

N/A Not Applicable

01 Did not report DBE participation monthly as required

02 Reported DBE monthly participation less than 75% of the time

03 Reported DBE monthly participation 80% of the time

04 Reported DBE participation 90% of the time.

05 Reported DBE participation 100% of the time

Comments:

	1	2	3	4	5	NA
9.4 Did the Consultant monitor and manage the performance of the Subconsultant?						

Score Definition for Question: 9.4

N/A Not Applicable

01 Unacceptable (Intervention Required)

02 Below Expectations (Intervention Required)

03 Meets Expectations

04 Exceeds Expectations

05 Exceptional & Consistent

Comments:

10. SUBCONSULTANTS					
Type in the name of the firm for each Subconsultant below, then check one box for the firm's Overall Project Evaluation Score.	1	2	3	4	5
10.1					
10.2					
10.3					
10.4					
10.5					
10.6					
10.7					
10.8					

Score Definition for Question: 10

01 Unacceptable (Intervention Required)

02 Below Expectation (Intervention Required)

03 Meets Expectations

04 Exceeds Expectations

05 Exceptional & Consistent

Comments:

11. OTHER (List and provide a general score for any discipline-specific criteria).	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: