TITLE: ARCHITECT/ENGINEER RATINGS

OBJECTIVE AND PURPOSE: To establish procedures for the evaluation of architects and engineers while under contract for continuing services for minor projects and major construction projects. Evaluation ratings are to be completed on a semiannual basis, in January and July. The firm must be under contract for a minimum of two months prior to being rated. An evaluation may be conducted at any time when a significant change in performance occurs.

RESPONSIBILITY ACTION

SENIOR PROJECT MANAGER  ♦ Distributes evaluation forms to all Project Managers (including Engineering & Utilities) for major and minor projects (Attachment “A”).

PROJECT MANAGERS  ♦ Completes evaluation form for each architect or engineer they have worked with during the evaluation period on major or minor projects, as per evaluation instructions (Attachment “B”). If an A/E firm is working on multiple major projects, a separate A/E evaluation form is to be completed for each project.
♦ Prepares supporting documentation for their evaluation to be discussed at a scheduled minor projects meeting.

FP DIRECTOR  ♦ Conducts minor project meeting to determine a single, final rating for each A/E firm providing minor project services during the evaluation period.
♦ Reviews all major project evaluation forms for consistency of rating among PM’s based on director’s overall comprehensive perspective.
♦ Finalize evaluation forms and transmits both major and minor evaluation forms to the office of the University Architect & VP for Facilities (UAVP) for review.

UNIVERSITY. ARCHITECT & VP FOR FACILITIES  ♦ Review all ratings for University wide consistency.
♦ Forward approved ratings to Senior Administrative Assistant for logging into main database and A/E evaluation book.

UAVP ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT  ♦ Record all ratings and maintain rating database.
♦ Transmit approved A/E ratings to Facilities Planning for further processing.

FP DIRECTOR  ♦ Signs final A/E rating forms.
♦ Mail the completed evaluation form to the rated firm, certified mail, return receipt requested.
♦ Provide a complete set of all A/E rating forms to UAVP office.
♦ Track 30 day time frame for appeal process by rated firms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issued By: Richman/ Dashtaki</th>
<th>Date Issued: 8/2008</th>
<th>Date Revised:</th>
<th>Effective Date: 8/2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Assistant V.P.</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES EVALUATION

University: Florida Atlantic University
Date: 
Project Title: Semiannual
Firm: Special
Joint Venture: (See Remarks)
Managing Office: Coral Gables, FL 33134
Project Manager: Javier F. Salman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASIC CRITERIA</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Technical Services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>9 *</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm Name</th>
<th>Specialty</th>
<th>Rating Value</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Eng.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Eng.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Eng.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = X 4 = 0

Timeliness of Service | X | 4 = 0.0
Quality of Technical Documentation | X | 3 = 0.0
Cooperation/Concern for SUS Interests | X | 2 = 0.0
Administration of Project Paperwork | X | 2 = 0.0

PART A (Completed when applicable)
Achievement of Study, Program, or Design Objectives | X | 5 ** =

PART B (Completed when applicable)
Administration/Enforcement of Contract Documents | X | 5 ** = 0.0

**Note: If both Part A and Part B are used, the weight for each part will be 2.5 instead of 5.

Total Weighted Points = Numeric Rating (Total Weighted Points/5) =

Overall performance during the rating period is evaluated as

REMARKS (Completed for all evaluations)
A design feature of the buried chilled water lines project was needlessly costly.

Note: Individual category rating values are assigned as whole numbers using the following scale.
Outstanding = 4 Above Satisfactory = 3
Satisfactory = 2 Less Than Satisfactory = 1

For The University:
Director: Robert Richman
Project Manager:

For The University:
Professional Services Evaluation Form Instructions

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 to 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, 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 may not be in final form. The fundamental issue is how well does the documentation accomplish 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 SUS.

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 drawing review.

**Part A.** Should be completed when evaluating the programming phase or design/bidding phase of a project or for evaluating studies. 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 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.** Should be completed when a project is in the construction phase. 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 progress status, detecting problems, providing direction to the contractor, inspecting the work, and following-up on punch list and warranty items.

**Combined Part A/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 performance 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 |
| 0.0 – 9.9 | Less than Satisfactory |

**Ratings for Joint Ventures.** Once evaluation is prepared for the joint venture, and a copy of the evaluation is sent to each party to the joint venture.

**ATTACHMENT “B”**