

DRAFT

**Consultant/WSDOT
Performance
Evaluation
Report
Manual**

August 8, 2007



Washington State
Department of Transportation

Foreword

The *Consultant/WSDOT Performance Evaluation Report Manual* is prepared to give Project Office, Region, and other personnel of the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) a working reference of uniform standards and procedures for the preparation and processing of the Consultant Performance Report. The Consultant Performance Evaluation Report Manual also provides the Consultants uniform standards and procedures for evaluating WSDOT performance.

The Report is an important part of the feedback process to the Consultant and WSDOT about performance on WSDOT contracts. It also is the primary means for developing communication standards and establishing expectations for performance at the onset of the project. Therefore, performance expectations must be addressed during the project scope and negotiations phase.

As an administration tool, it provides a forum to communicate performance being observed allowing time to make corrections if necessary. Frequent and timely feedback can help prevent small issues from developing into larger long-term issues. This real time communication is a fundamental principle of our philosophy of administration.

	Page
Foreword	i
<hr/>	
Introduction	
References	
Definitions	
Instructions	
<hr/>	
Performance Evaluation Consultant Services	
Section I — Consultant Data and Contract Data	
Section II — Criteria and Sub-criteria Rating Elements	
Section III — Narrative Comments	
Section IV — Authentication and Review	
<hr/>	
Consultant Evaluation of WSDOT	
Section I — Contract Data	
Section II — Criteria and Sub-criteria	
Section III — Narrative Comments and Opportunities for Improvement	
Section IV — Submittal	
<hr/>	
Appeal of Performance Report	
<hr/>	
Conditional Qualification	
<hr/>	
Public Disclosure of Performance Reports	
<hr/>	
Appendixes	
Appendix A — Sample Report, Performance Evaluation Consultant Services	
Appendix B — Sample Report, Consultant’s Evaluation of WSDOT	
Appendix C — Sample Cover Letter	

This manual has been prepared to guide Consultants, Project Office, Region, and other personnel through the preparation of the Consultant and WSDOT performance reports. These reports are an important part of the feedback process. It also is the primary means for developing communication standards and establishing expectations for performance at the onset of the project. Therefore, performance expectations must be addressed during the project scope and negotiations phase.

The completions of the performance reports by WSDOT are mandatory for all consultant contracts/agreements. The performance reports are also required by Individual WSDOT Offices when they administer a single or multiple task orders using on-call consultant list that equals or exceeds \$50,000.

The completions of the performance reports for WSDOT performance by Consultants are optional but strongly encouraged.

The rater is cautioned that this report is not a comparison of Consultants or WSDOT offices, but an evaluation of the performance of a specific Consultant or WSDOT office on a specific project. It records whether the Consultant or WSDOT did or did not meet the typical performance standards set in the contract.

Diligence and objectivity in the preparation of this report is imperative to ensure that the report is an effective tool for measuring, recording and communicating performance. The performance feedback must be submitted in a timely fashion and at the appropriate intervals in order to be an effective tool.

References

??????????????

??????????????

Definitions

Rating Scale:

1. Performance Evaluation of Consultant Services

Above Standard

Consultant helps define work direction with timely questions and recommendations. Consultant requires little monitoring, relative to size and complexity of work and demonstrates proactive project management. Performance often exceeds requirements or expectations in at least some work elements, such as fully

incorporating review comments into plans the first time. Consultant always responds well to feedback.

Work product quality often exceeds expectations. Agency coordination and public involvement are timely and well done. Overall work is under budget and/or ahead of schedule. Quality leadership principles and sound engineering judgment are used. Evaluation of alternatives and trial solutions is often innovative.

Standard

Consultant almost always follows direction. Consultant requires routine monitoring relative to size and complexity of work. Performance on average meets requirements and expectations in all work elements, such as fully incorporating review comments into plans although needing several iterations. Consultant generally accepts feedback well.

Work product quality routinely meets expectations, given minor revisions and monitoring. Agency coordination and public involvement are adequate. Work is generally completed on time and on budget. Good engineering practices and management are used. Evaluation of alternatives and trial solutions is adequate.

Below Standard

Consultant often does not follow direction, may require close monitoring relative to size and complexity of work. Performance fails to meet requirements or expectations in at least one work element, such as not fully addressing review comments. Consultant may not accept feedback well.

Work product may have errors or omissions. Consultant may require a high degree of monitoring to complete work. Consultant needs a plan for improvement, to be selected for additional projects.

2. Performance Evaluations of Client (WSDOT)

Above Standard

Client consistently provides clear work direction and timely responses to questions and recommendations. Client consistently provides appropriate level of monitoring, relative to size and complexity of work. Client offers feedback that is always constructive and tactful.

Decisions are consistently made in a timely manner. Client responds promptly and fully to requests for data or other information, such as providing timely, fully consolidated review comments. Quality leadership principles and sound engineering judgment are used. Client facilitation of agency coordination and public involvement is timely and proactive. Management style and culture reflect a genuine trust of consultants as valued partners.

Standard

Client typically provides clear work direction and timely response to questions and recommendations. Client provides routine monitoring, generally appropriate to size

and complexity of work. Client offers feedback that is generally constructive and tactful.

Decisions are usually made in a timely manner. Client responds adequately to requests for data or other information, such as fully resolving conflicting review comments although needing several reviews. Good engineering practices and management are used. Client facilitation of agency coordination and public involvement is generally timely and adequate. Management style and culture reflect a general trust and acceptance of consultants as service providers, if not partners.

Below Standard

Client often does not provide clear work direction or timely response to questions and recommendations. Client monitoring may be inadequate or not appropriate to size and complexity of work. Client may offer feedback that is not constructive or tactful.

Decisions may not be made in a timely manner. Client response to requests for data or other information may be tardy or inadequate, such as not resolving or consolidating review comments. Client facilitation of agency coordination and public involvement may be late or inadequate. Management style and culture may reflect a lack of trust and acceptance of consultants.

3. **Corrective Action Plan:** When the average rating for any criteria receives a below standard rating, the consultant is required to develop a corrective action plan to address the below standard rating and submit to the Consultant Liaison. The corrective action plan must address the deficiency and what measures lead to the rating, what steps it will take, or has already taken, to resolve the deficiency and improve performance, and how it will monitor on future contracts.
4. **Pass:** Rating used by the Project Manager and Consultant Liaison to indicate that the consultant has met the performance expectation of the consultant services contract and is recommended to continue receiving contracts from WSDOT.
5. **Fail:** Rating used by the Project Manager and Consultant Liaison to indicate that the consultant has not met the performance expectation of the consultant services contract and is not recommended to continue receiving contracts from WSDOT until additional action is taken. This is usually in the form of a corrective action plan.

Instructions

Types of Performance Reports

The below reports apply to both WSDOT and Consultants as they evaluate performance:

A. Final Report

A final report must be prepared immediately following the project completion or when a contract is terminated. The Report shall be

completed within 30 days after receipt of the final Consultant invoice. Final contract payment can not be made until the report is complete and sent to the Regional Administrator. The final report evaluates performance for the duration of the project even though interim reports have been prepared.

Interim reports, prepared during the life of the project, will be considered in preparing the final report. An overall summary of the total - performance, considering interim reports and current data, shall be included.

Evaluation of WSDOT performance by the Consultant is optional but strongly encouraged at project completion.

B. Interim Report

The frequency of interim reports should be set during the initial project scoping/negotiation phase. Best management practices necessitate that the best performance feedback happens as the project progresses for both positive and corrective action. Communication on performance as it occurs will allow for the final evaluation to reflect an accurate performance assessment throughout the project life cycle. Prepare as follows:

1. The first interim report shall be prepared within 6 months of consultant's notice of selection and after the completion of negotiation of the agreement.
2. At a minimum, annually on the anniversary of the work starting date for all projects exceeding one year's duration.
3. When the current Project Engineer or Consultant Manager will no longer be involved with the project, providing the project has been in progress for more than 25% of the assigned scope duration.
4. Include all work either from the start of the project, or from the date of the last interim report to the beginning of a subsequent interim report, or to the project completion date.
5. When a consultant's or WSDOT's total overall work has become less-than-standard. A corrective action plan may be necessary to ensure the required project performance is reestablished.
6. At the agreed upon interval set during the contract scoping/negotiation phase.

An interim report should not cover a period of more than one year.

D. Special Report

Prepared when a nonscheduled evaluation is needed, when a report is needed to facilitate a counseling session, or at the request of the consultant or WSDOT. Such a report will not be referenced in the final report.

Performance Evaluation Consultant Services

The Performance Evaluation Consultant Services, DOT Form _____, consists of the following sections.

- Section I consists of Consultant and Contract Data
- Section II consists of Criteria and Sub-criteria elements used to establish a baseline to measure performance against.
- Section III consists of Narrative Comments
- Section IV — Authentication and Review

Each section is described in detail below.

Section I — Consultant and Contract Data

1. Company Name — Enter the complete name, address, and phone number of the firm shown on the contract.
2. Evaluation Type — Check “Final,” “Interim,” or Enter “Special.”
3. Project Title and Agreement Number
4. Check the Type of Work, Enter Date the Agreement was approved and check the Type of Agreement.
5. Enter the Original Agreement Value, Value of Agreement Modifications, and Total amount of Agreement.
6. Enter the Completion Date including time extensions, actual Completion Date, and Actual Total Costs Paid.
7. Enter type and extent of Subcontracting

Section II — Criteria and Sub-criteria

The performance evaluation report must provide an accurate, detailed account of the consultant’s typical performance over the life of the project. Six criteria areas are established to rate performance against. Each of the criteria areas are further broken down into sub-criteria areas that will be rated in accordance with the rating system for consultant services found under the *Definition* section of this manual. During the project scope and negotiation phase, and prior to the start of work on the project, it is expected that both parties will review the six performance criteria areas and the associated sub-criteria. Additional sub-criteria can be added in order to establish specific performance expectations to meet the specific contract requirements.

The score for each criteria area will be an average of the sub-criteria items. The total performance score for the evaluation will be an average of the six

criteria area. It is required that all pages of the evaluation form be completed and submitted to the Consultant Services office.

The descriptions of each criterion below are intended to provide additional detail as to what constitutes “standard” performance for each area. “Above standard” performance exceeds the definitions listed below, and “below standard” fails to meet the standard listed.

Criteria area includes:

1. **Negotiations:** The Consultant used the Project Management negotiation procedures and demonstrated an understanding of the scope of work and the levels of effort required. Independent estimates show this relationship and help facilitate discussions in reaching agreement on level of effort, scope of work, and product expectations. The negotiations were open, honest, relevant, cordial, and business like.
2. **Cost and Budget:** The Consultant consistently reviews and evaluates the budget and communicates how the costs equate to the level of effort and scope of work. Communication occurs whenever it appears the project costs will overrun, or are overrun what was negotiated and provides how they plan to bring them back in line with the original agreement. The consultant provides recommendations and alternatives for discussion when changes are necessary.
3. **Schedule:** The schedule matches includes all items involved in the scope of work. The schedule is realistic with an orderly progression that shows completion of the project on time and allows for the appropriate review periods at the appropriate time. The schedule is maintained and progress is measured and this is communicated regularly. Schedule updates and changes are clear, reasonable, and are submitted timely for discussion and approval.
4. **Technical Quality:** The products delivered meet the standards agreed to in the scope of work, established by WSDOT, or the industry standard. Professional documents have had the appropriate review and are appropriately signed and/or stamped by the Consultant. The documents are complete when submitted for interim reviews, or final submittals.
5. **Communications:** Communication with the project manager is regularly scheduled or whenever an issue or change has occurred. The communications are open, providing all of the information relevant to understanding the issues or items to be discussed. Alternatives or recommendations are made, if appropriate, with explanations of the effects to scope, schedule and budget. Communications, either written, or oral are clear and concise.

6. **Management:** The consultant manager stays involved and contains the background and experience to lead the project. The manager insures the workforce has the appropriate skills for the work involved. The manger reviews documents, budgets, costs, schedule, and deliverables for appropriateness and takes corrective action when needed. The consultant manager communicates often and openly with owner.

Section II — Narrative Comments

The Narrative Comment section is divided into three areas, an overall comment for each criteria on page one of the report, comments after each sub-criteria area, and corrective action comments. The rater must be cautious to assure that standard and above standard performance is considered in determining typical performance on the same basis as below standard performance. The narrative should be prepared from project records which must be referenced in the comments. If more space is needed, use additional sheets. The rater should enter data as follows in this section:

1. **Criteria General Comment** – A brief summary statement which describes how and why the average rating was given. Page one of the evaluation form provides a quick snap shout as to the overall performance. If the reviewer requires more detailed information, narrative comments under the sub-criteria section will provide the information.
2. **Sub-criteria Comments** – The narrative comments provided under the sub-criteria section provide specific detailed information regarding assigned rating. The statements must be keyed to the section by identifying the rating element, e.g. 3-B “Prompt Response to Review Comments”. Adequate documentation must be cited to backup all rating remarks so that justification may be located readily for an appeal, litigation, investigation, or for any other need. All ratings must be justified by stating several, rather than a single example, and examples of such performance that apply over the duration of the project. Comments must be based upon fact rather than on unsubstantiated opinion. (See Appendix A, Sample Report)

References to documentation should be made as follows:

Daily Report of Conversation/Progress dated 1/16/07; Ltr 10/11/06, DOT J.D. Smith (letter dated October 11, 2006, Department of Transportation, signed by J.D. Smith); Contract Change #1 dated 11/11/06.

Above standard ratings also require justification. This is necessary to avoid accusations by other consultants that the rater has engaged in favoritism. In some instances, consultants have been rated at the very

top of the scale with no remarks or backup justification. Above standard ratings that are not adequately justified and documented will be revised to a maximum “standard” rating upon Headquarters review.

The Regional Administrator will be advised of such changes and copies of the revised report will be distributed to the consultant and to the region. If a consultant’s performance has been above standard, it should not be difficult to find something to be stated that would substantiate the above standard rating. Be sure to state facts rather than opinions.

3. **Corrective Action Comments and Plan**– When the average rating for any criteria receives a below standard rating, the rater must check the “yes” corrective action is required box. The rater shall provide a description of the below standard item(s) requiring correction in the comment box provided. The comment statement should contain the necessary detail for the consultant to understand the deficiency and why a below standard rating was received.

The consultant is required to develop a corrective action plan to address the below standard rating and submit to the Consultant Liaison. The corrective action plan will be reviewed with the Consultant Services Office. The corrective action plan must address the deficiency and what measures lead to the rating, what steps it will take, or has already taken, to resolve the deficiency and improve performance, and how it will monitor on future contracts. Before the consultant can receive additional contracts, the Consultant Services Office and Consultant Liaison must agree that the corrective action plan will or has addressed the deficiency. A letter will be provided to the consultant stating approval of the corrective action plan.

Section IV — Authentication and Review

This section records the review and verification of the accuracy and completeness of the report by the rater, the consultant liaison, and the executive reviewer. It also gives assurance that the report has been reviewed for objectivity in its preparation and for the elimination of the influences of personalities. The report will be prepared, reviewed, and endorsed as follows:

1. Project Manager

Prepare a draft of the Consultant Performance Report based on data in project records for the type of performance report, final, interim, or special. Schedule a face to face review of the draft report with the consultant. The review should be open, honest, and courteous discussions concerning the six rating areas. The consultant should be encouraged to call any performance considered to be exemplary to the

project manager's attention, so that it may be verified, recorded, and if appropriate, entered in the report. After the review, the Project Manager will finalize the report, sign, recommend a "pass" or "fail" for the contract, and forward it to the Consultant Liaison. (For an explanation and purpose of a "pass" "fail" mark, see the *Definitions* sections of the manual.

2. Consultant Liaison
 - a. Review the report for objectivity, correctness, and documentation. Documentation will be of utmost importance in the event of an appeal or litigation. The Consultant Liaison must sign the document and recommend a "pass" or "fail" for the contract.
 - b. Provide a copy of the report to the consultant with an appropriate cover letter. (See Appendix C, Sample Cover Letter.) The report may be delivered in person, or by certified mail with return receipt.
 - c. Inform the consultant that an appeal of the rating to the Consultant Liaison may be made in writing within twenty (20) calendar days from the receipt of the report. Appeals received after twenty days have elapsed will not be considered.
3. Regional Administrator — Review the consultant performance report after the twenty day appeal period.
 - a. The Regional Administrator may modify the rating, if appropriate, on the form and/or on additional sheets. The Regional Administrator will advise the consultant of any changes that have been made.
 - b. Performance reports, when completed at region level, will be submitted to the Consultant Services Office. Refer to the additional instructions attached to the Performance Evaluation Consultant Services **DOT form _____**.
4. Consultant Services Office-
 - a. Establish an internal performance review panel to review all consultant performance reports. The review will focus on objectivity, correctness, fairness, and overall consistency of the reports.
 - b. Provide necessary feedback to the Consultant Liaison and Project Manager regarding the report.

Consultant Evaluation of WSDOT

The Consultant Evaluation of WSDOT, DOT Form _____, consists of the following sections.

- Section I consists of Contract Data
- Section II consists of Criteria and Sub-criteria elements used to establish a baseline to measure performance against.
- Section III consists of Narrative Comments and Opportunities for Improvement
- Section IV consists of the Submittal of the evaluation form to the Consultant Services Office.

Each section is described in detail below.

Section I —Contract Data

1. Agreement Number and Project Title.
2. Evaluation Type — Check “Final,” or “Interim”
3. Check the Type of Work
4. Enter the Original Agreement Value
5. Consultant Name
6. WSDOT Project Lead
7. Region

Section II — Criteria and Sub-criteria

The performance evaluation report must provide an accurate, detailed account of WSDOT’s typical performance over the life of the project. Three criteria areas are established to rate performance against. Each of the criteria areas are further broken down into sub-criteria areas that will be rated in accordance with the rating system for WSDOT found under the *Definition* section of this manual. During the project scope and negotiation phase, and prior to the start of work on the project, it is expected that both parties will review the three performance criteria areas and the associated sub-criteria. Additional sub-criteria can be added in order to establish specific performance expectations to meet the contract requirements.

Criteria areas include:

1. Contract Agreement and Specifications
2. Management and Administration
3. Review and Technical Quality

Section III — Narrative Comments and Opportunities for Improvement

The Narrative Comment and Opportunity for Improvement section should be prepared from project records which must be referenced in the comments. If more space is needed, use additional sheets. The rater must be cautious to assure that good and outstanding performance is considered in determining typical performance on the same basis as below standard performance. The rater should enter data as follows in this section:

1. **Narrative Comments and Opportunity for Improvement** – The narrative comments provided under the sub-criteria section provide specific detailed information. Explain all ratings used in the sub-criteria section. The statements must be keyed to the section by identifying the rating element, e.g. A-2 “Completeness”. Adequate documentation should be cited to backup all remarks.

All ratings used must be justified by stating several, rather than a single example, and examples of such performance that apply over the duration of the project. Comments must be based upon fact rather than on unsubstantiated opinion. (See Appendix B, Sample Report)

2. **Improvement Plan**– The Consultant Services Office shall keep the performance evaluation reports confidential. The Consultant Services Office shall compile and combine the comments and ratings from the various performance evaluation reports by region and provide a report to each region on an annual basis for educational and improvement purposes. A report can be prepared and shared with the regions more frequently if there are indications of areas that may need more immediate attention. This will be done in a manner that maintains the confidentiality of the individual performance evaluation reports.

The regions are required to review the report and if appropriate develop an improvement and implementation plan to address the issues identified. A copy of the improvement and implementation plan shall be provided to the Consultant Services Office.

Section IV — Submittal

Performance reports when completed by the consultant, shall be submit directly to the Consultant Services Office. The Consultant can directly share a copy of the performance report with the WSDOT project team if they so elect. Refer to the instructions attached to the Consultant Evaluation of WSDOT, **DOT Form _____**.

Appeal of Performance Report

1. A consultant may appeal in writing the rating received on a performance report to the Regional Administrator within twenty (20) calendar days of its receipt. An appeal must state the specific basis for the appeal.
2. The Regional Administrator shall cause the appeal to be investigated to determine whether the facts substantiate the consultants' basis for the appeal. If the basis for appeal is justified, the report may be modified by striking those portions of the originally prepared report, and modifying the relevant element and changing the narrative as appropriate on separate sheets. The Regional Administrator's response to the consultant shall be made by certified mail, return receipt requested, within twenty (20) days of the receipt of the appeal. Forward a copy of the appeal and response including copies of all data used to substantiate any action taken with regard to the consultant's appeal to the Consultant Services Office.
3. A performance report shall be considered preliminary until all reviews and appeals have been accomplished and the report reviewed by the internal review panel. The panel will then approve the report as final.
4. Performance reports are to be kept on file by the Consultant Services Office for a period of 3 years from the date of the completion.

Conditional Qualification

Conditional qualification of a consultant may be affected when the overall - performance of that consultant has become “below standard”, and upon - recommendation of the Regional Administrator to the Secretary. A consultant placed in conditional status may be restricted in receiving additional contracts for highway projects or other sanctions may be placed in effect.

A consultant may be placed in Conditional Qualification status under the following conditions:

1. When an overall total performance rating of “below standard” has been given on a final performance report.
2. When a firm’s performance is reported as below standard in either “schedule”, “technical quality” or “cost/budget” on an interim report for a current project, and the Region Administrator has requested the Director of Environmental and Engineering Programs to place the firm in conditional status. The Director of Environmental and Engineering Programs will advise the consultant firm of its having been placed in conditional status and the consequences of being placed in such status. The consultant will be advised of the preparation of interim performance reports while in that status.

Interim Performance Reports will be prepared at thirty-day (30) calendar intervals to record a consultant’s performance while in conditional qualification status. If overall performance has been brought to standard after two consecutive 30-day interim reports have been prepared, no further interim reports need be prepared unless specifically requested by the consultant or other circumstances require their preparation. In the event the consultant requests completion of an interim report the date of the report shall be the date of the consultant’s request.

Public Disclosure of Performance Reports

Consultant performance reports shall be considered a preliminary draft until all reviews and appeals, have been accomplished and the report has been reviewed by the internal review panel. Once the report is finalized in this manner, the report, appeals, correspondence and other related data may be subject to public disclosure. Performance reports and related data will be released to individuals, other than the rated consultant, only by the Public Disclosure Office at Headquarters.

Appendix A



Consultant Name		Evaluation Type <input type="checkbox"/> Interim <input type="checkbox"/> Final <input type="checkbox"/> Special	
Consultant Address		Project Title	
		Agreement Number	
Type of Work <input type="checkbox"/> Study <input type="checkbox"/> Design <input type="checkbox"/> R/W <input type="checkbox"/> PS&E <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify Below):		Type of Agreement <input type="checkbox"/> Lump Sum <input type="checkbox"/> Hourly Rate <input type="checkbox"/> Cost Plus Fixed Fee <input type="checkbox"/> Other	
		Date Agreement Approved	
Amount of Original Agreement \$	Total Amount Modifications \$	Total Amount Agreement \$	
Completion Date Including Extensions	Actual Completion Date	Actual Total Paid \$	
Type and Extent of Subcontracting			

Performance Rating Scale (From Average Score Below)				
		3	2	1
		Above Standard	Standard	Below Standard
Criteria	Comment			Score
1. Negotiations				
2. Cost / Budget				
3. Schedule				
4. Technical Quality				
5. Communications				
6. Management				
Corrective Action Required <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Comments		Total Score		
		Average Score (Total Score / Number of criteria rated)		

Rated By (Project Manager Name and Title)	Project Manager Signature Recommendation: <input type="checkbox"/> Pass <input type="checkbox"/> Fail	Date
Rated By (Area Consultant Liaison Name and Title)	Area Consultant Liaison Signature Recommendation: <input type="checkbox"/> Pass <input type="checkbox"/> Fail	Date
Executive Review (Name and Title)	Executive Signature	Date

Performance Evaluation Instructions

The Performance Evaluation Form should be reviewed and discussed with the Consultant prior to and during contract negotiations. Review the expectations for each criteria area and add additional sub-criteria as necessary to establish performance expectations. Performance expectations must be in place prior to the start of the work. For more detail on how to complete the evaluation form, see the Consultant/WSDOT Performance Evaluation Manual. Scores from the evaluations factor into “Past Performance” ratings, which are used to help determine selection of future consultants.

RATING SCALE

The following Rating System shall be used:

Above Standard

Consultant helps define work direction with timely questions and recommendations. Consultant requires little monitoring, relative to size and complexity of work. Performance often exceeds requirements or expectations in at least some work elements, such as fully incorporating review comments into plans the first time. Consultant always responds well to feedback.

Work product quality may often exceed expectations. Agency coordination and public involvement are timely and well done. Overall work may be under budget and/or ahead of schedule. Quality leadership principles and sound engineering judgment are used. Evaluation of alternatives and trial solutions is often innovative.

Standard

Consultant almost always follows direction. Consultant requires routine monitoring relative to size and complexity of work. Performance typically meets requirements and expectations in all work elements, such as fully incorporating review comments into plans although needing several iterations. Consultant generally accepts feedback well.

Work product quality routinely meets expectations, given minor revisions and monitoring. Agency coordination and public involvement are adequate. Work is generally completed on time and on budget. Good engineering practices and management are used. Evaluation of alternatives and trial solutions is adequate.

Below Standard

Consultant may not follow direction at times, especially without close monitoring. Consultant may require close monitoring relative to size and complexity of work. Performance likely fails to meet requirements or expectations in at least one work element, such as not fully addressing review comments. Consultant may not accept feedback well.

Work product may have errors or omissions. Consultant may require a high degree of monitoring to complete work. Consultant needs a plan for improvement, to be selected for additional projects.



Consultant Name	Evaluation Type <input type="checkbox"/> Interim <input type="checkbox"/> Final <input type="checkbox"/> Special
Consultant Address	Project Title
	Agreement Number
Performance Rating Scale (From Average Scores)	
<u>3</u> Above Standard	<u>2</u> Standard
	<u>1</u> Below Standard

Negotiation and Cost / Budget Criteria

1. Negotiations	
Sub-Criteria	Score
A. Adhered to WSDOT guidelines on fee.	
B. Met negotiation schedule.	
C. Open and honest communications.	
D. Prepared to negotiate	
E.	
F.	
Total Score	
Average Score (Total Score / Number of sub-criteria rated)	
Comments	

2. Cost / Budget	
Sub-Criteria	Score
A. Finished within budget, including all supplements.	
B. Preparation of initial negotiation cost estimate	
C. Reasonable direct, non-salary expenses; resources estimated properly.	
D.	
E.	
F.	
Total Score	
Average Score (Total Score / Number of sub-criteria rated)	
Comments	

Schedule and Technical Quality Criteria

Consultant Name	Agreement Number
-----------------	------------------

3. Schedule	
Sub-Criteria	Score
A. Achieved schedule (Including all supplements).	
B. Prompt response to review comments.	
C. Adapted to schedule revisions by WSDOT.	
D. Notified WSDOT early regarding schedule "impactors."	
E.	
F.	
Total Score	
Average Score (Total Score / Number of sub-criteria rated)	
Comments:	

4. Technical Quality	
Sub-Criteria	Score
A. Work products meet professional standards of practice / Submittals are complete.	
B. Performed appropriate quality control.	
C. Responds to review comments in subsequent submission.	
D. Sought opportunities to incorporate innovative solutions.	
E. Delivered electronic files as defined in Contract Agreement.	
F. Implemented procedures to control design and construction costs.	
G.	
H.	
Total Score	
Average Score (Total Score / Number of sub-criteria rated)	
Comments:	

Communication and Management Criteria

Consultant Name	Agreement Number
-----------------	------------------

5. Communications	
Sub-Criteria	Score
A. Produced clear, concise oral and written communication.	
B. Demonstrates an understanding of oral and written instructions.	
C. Communicated at intervals appropriate for the work.	
D. Respects and uses lines of communications.	
E. Documents project design decisions.	
F. Returns phone calls and emails promptly.	
G.	
Total Score	
Average Score (Total Score / Number of sub-criteria rated)	
Comments:	

6. Management	
Sub-Criteria	Score
A. Provided effective cost control measures / ideas.	
B. Submitted appropriate and accurate progress reports.	
C. Accurate and timely invoicing.	
D. Conducted meetings effectively.	
E. Managed project scope effectively	
F. Coordinated with WSDOT effectively.	
G. Responsive	
H. Managed subconsultants effectively.	
I.	
J.	
Total Score	
Average Score (Total Score / Number of sub-criteria rated)	
Comments:	

Appendix B

Agreement Number	Project Title	Evaluation Type <input type="checkbox"/> Interim <input type="checkbox"/> Final
Type of Work <input type="checkbox"/> Study <input type="checkbox"/> Design <input type="checkbox"/> PS&E <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)		Original Contract Amount
Consultant Name	WSDOT Project Lead	Region

A. Contract Agreement and Specifications	Below Standard (1)	Standard (2)	Above Standard (3)
1. Accuracy.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Completeness.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Clarity.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Organization.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Negotiations.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Timely Execution of the Contract and Supplements.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Comments and Examples			
10. Opportunities for Improving Future Contract Agreements and Specifications			
11. Opportunities for Improving Future Negotiations			

B. Management and Administration	Below Standard (1)	Standard (2)	Above Standard (3)
1. Coordination and Cooperation.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Anticipation of Problems.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Timely Decision-Making and Approvals.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Availability of WSDOT Project Lead.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Willingness to Resolve Difficult Issues.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Clear and Timely Communications with Defined Expectations...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Timeliness of Progress Payments.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Considered part of the Team	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Comments and Examples			
14. Opportunities for Improvement			

C. Review and Technical Quality

Below Standard (1) Standard (2) Above Standard (3)

- | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Effectiveness of Review Comments..... | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Timeliness of Review(s)..... | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Objectivity and Fairness of Review..... | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Performed Appropriate Quality Control Early | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Knowledge of Subject Matter..... | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

9. Comments and Opportunities for Improvement

Signature of Consultant Representative

Date

DRAFT Consultant Evaluation Report of WSDOT

Instructions for Use

1. The Consultant will send this evaluation form to the WSDOT Consultant Services Manager upon completion of the project. The Consultant will complete the form and return the original and canary copy to the Consultant Services Manager.
2. The Consultant shall complete the ratings by placing an X in the applicable box (Above Standard, Standard, Below Standard) for the various elements and provide any necessary supporting comments. The following performance rating system shall be used:

Above Standard

Client consistently provides clear work direction and timely responses to questions and recommendations. Client consistently provides appropriate level of monitoring, relative to size and complexity of work. Client offers feedback that is always constructive and tactful.

Decisions are consistently made in a timely manner. Client responds promptly and fully to requests for data or other information, such as providing timely, fully consolidated review comments. Quality leadership principles and sound engineering judgment are used. Client facilitation of agency coordination and public involvement is timely and proactive. Management style and culture reflect a genuine trust of consultants as valued partners.

Standard

Client typically provides clear work direction and timely response to questions and recommendations. Client provides routine monitoring, generally appropriate to size and complexity of work. Client offers feedback that is generally constructive and tactful.

Decisions are usually made in a timely manner. Client responds adequately to requests for data or other information, such as fully resolving conflicting review comments although needing several reviews. Good engineering practices and management are used. Client facilitation of agency coordination and public involvement is generally timely and adequate. Management style and culture reflect a general trust and acceptance of consultants as service providers, if not partners.

Below Standard

Client often does not provide clear work direction or timely response to questions and recommendations. Client monitoring may be inadequate or not appropriate to size and complexity of work. Client may offer feedback that is not constructive or tactful.

Decisions may not be made in a timely manner. Client response to requests for data or other information may be tardy or inadequate, such as not resolving or consolidating review comments. Client facilitation of agency coordination and public involvement may be late or inadequate. Management style and culture may reflect a lack of trust and acceptance of consultants.

3. The Consultant shall mail the original and canary copy of the completed form to:

CONSULTANT SERVICES OFFICE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
PO Box 47323
Olympia, WA 98504-7323

Appendix C