

Design & Construction Division Professional Performance Evaluation

Purpose of Professional Performance Evaluation

An important part of the mission of Penn State Office of Physical Plant (OPP) is to provide quality and cost effective services. OPP depends on contracted design professionals and consultants to support this mission. In order to meet customer expectations and our commitment to continuous quality improvement, OPP must develop partnerships with professionals and consultants to improve the overall performance with design and construction projects. The Professional Performance Evaluation (Evaluation) is one tool to facilitate improved performance.

The intent of the Evaluation is to improve the delivery and quality of projects, to promote better working relationships between OPP and consultants, and to provide useful information required for the future selection of consultants.

While the official Evaluation is not completed until the end of the project, interim communication throughout the project about performance is encouraged between OPP stakeholders and the design professionals and consultants using the evaluation as a guide.

Evaluation Process

1. The Project Leader will schedule a meeting of an Evaluation Committee (EC) consisting of appropriate stakeholders to perform the Evaluation after the close-out portion of the project. PL to make every effort to evaluate consultants on all projects. Parties participating in the EC shall include, at a minimum, the Project Leader and Construction Services Representative, if applicable.
2. The Project Leader will forward the completed Evaluation to the Design and Construction IT Project Coordinator who will attach the performance evaluation to the professional and consultant(s) entry in the master database for future reference. The PL is to share the evaluation with the professional to ensure areas for improvement are discussed. PL to also share the summary of the evaluation with the PM/PC group at a monthly meeting.
3. Firms receiving an unsatisfactory mark (score below 50) will be considered for removal from the 1-T agreement listing (if applicable) and may also be removed from the master listing of firms that receive RFQs for future projects.
4. The final removal decision will be made by the Director, Design and Construction, considering the Evaluation (which is project specific) and additional factors such as other project experiences, contractual relationships, prior consequence precedence, and other influences and will formulate a recommendation with justification. The Director will forward the recommendation regarding removal with all supporting information to the Associate Vice President for Office of Physical Plant (AVP).
5. After review by the AVP, further discussion (if warranted), and agreement on appropriate consequences, the Director will notify the firm of the final decision. Consequences other than the specified guidelines may be considered.
6. Professional Performance Evaluations will be retained indefinitely for reference purposes. They will be available to all through the master vendor listing.

Guidelines for Reviewers

The following definitions are being furnished as a guide for assisting evaluators in determining an appropriate rating for firms.

For each category the EC is to establish a single value between 0 and 100. The EC is not restricted to using the numerical values shown but can establish a rating between the points shown. For example, if you feel the professional performed somewhere between Average and Very Good you can establish a rating of **60**.

The final score is based on a weighted average established on the summary form. Firms with a score of **49** or less will be considered for removal from 1-T agreement listing or the master database of firms who receive RFQs on future projects.

Definitions of Rating Levels:

1. Unacceptable (0) The company's performance indicates very little or no effort extended to satisfy the minimum requirements.
2. Poor (25) The company made an effort but the result was not the desired outcome. The firm did not meet an acceptable level of performance.
3. Average (50) The company's performance was acceptable but did not, in any way, exceed the expectations.
4. Very Good (75) The company's performance exceeded expectations and produced the desired result. The company stands out from other companies in regards to performance.
5. Excellent (100) The company consistently exceeded expectations and always provided an exceptional result.