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Executive Summary

Background
MnDOT and ACEC/MN identified the need to revise the Professional/Technical Contract Evaluation process due to a number of factors (e.g.: lack of valuable information, subjectivity, lack of consistency, timing of evaluations, etc.). A collaborative working team was formed with the main goal to develop tools and processes for performance evaluations that benefit MnDOT and the Consultant Community.

Goals
As stated above, the main goal was to develop tools and processes for performance evaluations that benefit MnDOT and the consultant community. In addition, three more goals were identified to improve on the existing evaluation process. Goals:

- Develop tools and processes for performance evaluations that benefit MnDOT and the Consultant Community.
- Transparency and Consistency should be included in the evaluation process.
- Define expectations of both sides up front. Establish and define criteria by which the consultant and MnDOT will be measured/evaluated.
- Include the Department of Administration’s evaluation requirements and incorporate into the process.

Working Team Approach
Over the last year, the working team has been developing a number of items centered around the goals mentioned above. The team’s approach and subsequent tasks were:

- Researched what other states are using for evaluations.
- Determined what should be included in Minnesota’s evaluation. Included global criteria for each contract evaluation no matter what the work type (master evaluation form). Developed contract-specific criteria that will be evaluated for different work types (work-type templates).
- Defined the scoring system to minimize subjectivity and promote consistency.
- Included the ability to give positive feedback, not just areas for improvement.
- Included the Department of Administration’s questions in the evaluations.
- Incorporated risk management of the contract.
- Began process of automating evaluations.
- Developed a process for interim evaluations.
- Developed method for scoring (weighted scores).
- Developed the process for improvement and dispute resolution.
- Developed the process for how the evaluations affect the prequalification process.
- Developed the overall process for evaluations.
Working Team Outcomes

- New process for performance evaluations (including interim and final).
- New performance evaluation Master Template that includes global criteria for each contract evaluation no matter what the work type (master evaluation form).
- Contract/work specific criteria for different work types (work-type templates). All templates include the Department of Administration’s questions/requirements.
- Scoring system to minimize subjectivity and promote consistency.
- Content and process to enable Consultant Agreement Reporting & Tracking (CART) database consultant to load and create process automated evaluations.
- Process for improvement and dispute resolution.
- Process for how the evaluations affect the prequalification process.

Timeline and Next Steps for Performance Evaluations

The following outlines the anticipated timeline and next steps for the new performance evaluations and process:

- April & May 2013: Share the Final Report with MnDOT and the Consultant Community
- April - June 2013: MnDOT working with CART database consultant on automated system for performance evaluations. All content for evaluations was turned over to CART database consultant in April 2013 and work has begun on new system.
- June – July 2013: Testing on new automated performance evaluation system. This will be performed by MnDOT and Consultant Community.
- July – August 2013: Provide training to MnDOT and Consultant Community on new system.

Recommendations

Not all of the issues with the consultant evaluations could be addressed with this working team. Therefore, the working team developed some recommendations to be implemented at a future date:

- Include a post-construction evaluation to review lessons learned (e.g.: Was the design constructible? What can be improved?). This would ultimately improve the performance of all involved in the project.
- Institute the idea/philosophy that consultant contract evaluation is only one element of the overall evaluation of project performance. Projects should be evaluated throughout the Planning – Design – Construction – Operations cycle.
- Automate the evaluations for ease of use for both the consultants and MnDOT.
- Develop and provide training to MnDOT and ACEC/MN about the new performance evaluation process.
Performance Evaluation Review/Evaluation Process Outline

1. Describe project types requiring a performance review/evaluation
   a. All Professional/Technical Services contracts over $25,000
   b. Excludes Interagency Contracts

2. Who/what requires the review?
   a. State Statute 16c.08, subdivision 4
   b. Department of Administration

3. Who desires a review and requirements
   a. MnDOT
      i. Before a contract is executed, MnDOT Project Manager will work with MnDOT Contract Administrator (in conjunction with Consultant Project Manager) to establish which Performance Evaluation template and schedule will be utilized for evaluation(s).
      ii. Final acceptance of deliverables and final invoice approval triggers performance evaluation
      iii. Interim evaluations are required for contracts longer than 2 years (to be completed at least every year) and may be initiated at the direction and discretion of the MnDOT Project Manager for any contract. Interim evaluations will utilize the same criteria as the final evaluation and will be used as a project management tool to monitor and track performance. Interim evaluations will be documented in Consultant Services Consultant Agreement Reporting & Tracking (CART) database, but will not count toward Consultant’s score for reporting purposes or final evaluation score.
      iv. All evaluations are stored with Consultant Services CART database
      v. Transparency
         • MnDOT will have access to view all evaluations
         • Consultants will have access to their own evaluations (Non-MnDOT will require data practices request to view evaluations of other consultants)

4. Describe the review process
   a. MnDOT’s new Evaluation Software (ES) initiates the Consultant Review and MnDOT Review following MnDOT Project Manager (PM) approval of final invoice. A link to an electronic evaluation is anticipated to be pushed out to both PM’s. *(Note the closeout process, final audit and final invoice payment cannot be completed until the evaluation process is completed.)*
   b. MnDOT review of Consultant
      i. MnDOT PM completes the evaluation and submits to ES.
      ii. ES sends the evaluation to MnDOT Contract Administrator (CA) to review for consistency and compliance with policies. CA coordinates with MnDOT PM if changes are necessary. CA resubmits revised evaluation to ES.
iii. ES sends the evaluation to the Consultant PM for review. Consultant PM has 5 business
days to “accept” or “contest” the evaluation. If after 5 business days, there is no action,
the evaluation will default to “accept.”
iv. Accepted evaluation is posted to CART, unless Consultant rating is 10 or below, or the
evaluation is contested.
v. Contested evaluations: Consultant may challenge ratings by requesting a meeting. If the
MnDOT PM and Consultant PM cannot resolve the scoring differences, then the issue is
escalated to MnDOT PM and Consultant PM’s respective supervisors. When resolved,
final evaluation is submitted to ES and posted to CART.
vi. Accepted evaluation ratings of 10 or below: ES sends evaluations with ratings of 10 or
below to Assistant Consultant Services Director for review and comment. Final
evaluation is submitted to ES and posted to CART.
vii. For final evaluation ratings of 10 or below, Consultant PM must submit a performance
improvement plan to the MnDOT PM. This plan and its content are at the discretion,
direction and approval of the MnDOT PM. Improvement plan is saved in MnDOT
official contract file.

c. Consultant review of MnDOT (Concurrent with MnDOT review of Consultant)
   i. Consultant PM completes the evaluation and submits to ES.
   ii. ES sends the evaluation to the MnDOT PM for review. MnDOT PM has 5 business
days to “accept” or “contest” the evaluation. If after 5 business days, there is no action, the
evaluation will default to “accept.”
   iii. Accepted evaluation is posted to CART, unless MnDOT rating is 2.5 or below, or the
evaluation is contested.
   iv. Contested evaluations: MnDOT may challenge ratings by requesting a meeting. If the
MnDOT PM and Consultant PM cannot resolve the scoring differences, then the issue is
escalated to MnDOT PM and Consultant PM’s respective supervisors. When resolved,
final evaluation is submitted to ES and posted to CART.
   v. Accepted evaluation ratings of 2.5 or below: ES sends evaluations with ratings of 2.5 or
below to Assistant Consultant Services Director for review and comment. Final
evaluation is sent to ES and posted to CART.
   vi. For final evaluation ratings of 2.5 or below, MnDOT PM must submit a performance
improvement plan to the MnDOT PM Supervisor. This plan and its content are at the
discretion, direction and approval of the MnDOT PM Supervisor. Improvement plan is
saved in MnDOT official contract file.

d. ES sends the final evaluations to:
   i. MnDOT PM
   ii. Consultant PM
   iii. Consultant Firm Designee
Use of Performance Evaluations in Prequalification Program & Dispute Resolution

Guidelines

• Consultant “competency” based on data collected through performance evaluations will be considered for remaining prequalified in the applicable work types.
• A minimum of three consecutive final evaluations within the same work type must be completed to form the basis of prequalification decisions.
• If, after the minimum number of final evaluations are completed, the average of three consecutive scores is 10 or below, the consultant is required to prepare a performance improvement plan including actions such as mentoring and training. Performance improvement plans will be reviewed and accepted by the Prequalification Work Type Owner Committee.
• If on the next project measured performance does not elevate above previously measured performance in that particular work type or evaluation criteria the consultant will be suspended from the prequalified list for that work type.
• If measured performance averaged over the next three projects does not exceed the threshold stated above in that particular work type or evaluation criteria the consultant will be suspended from the prequalified list for that work type.
• At MnDOT’s sole discretion and in an extreme case of poor performance on a particular project, MnDOT may suspend a consultant immediately from the prequalified list for that work type.
• These guidelines apply to the prime consultant only. Sub consultants are the responsibility of the prime consultant and as such their performance is evaluated as a member of the consultant team.
• Reinstatement is at MnDOT’s discretion and will include, but not be limited to, MnDOT’s acceptance of a performance improvement plan and submittal by consultant of replacement personnel for prequalification consideration.

Dispute Resolution

The following guidelines for dispute resolution are applicable to performance evaluations for a specific project and/or prequalification decisions based on evaluations. The goal will always be to resolve any disagreements at the project manager level whenever possible. If unable to do so, a dispute resolution “ladder” as described below would then be used to elevate the dispute:

• If following the completion and discussion of a performance evaluation, the MnDOT and/or consultant project managers do not concur with the results, written notification to the other party must be made within ten business days.
• If a dispute cannot be resolved at the project manager/district level it will be elevated to the consultant services unit in Central Office.
• If a dispute cannot be resolved within the Central Office consultant services unit it will be elevated to the Division Director and/or Contract Management.
• Final decisions are at the discretion of MnDOT.
APPENDICES
Approach to Performance Evaluation Process Improvement
MnDOT/ACEC
White Paper
(used throughout working team duration to inform and update stakeholders)
April 16, 2013

BACKGROUND
Strategy 6D: Improve the processes for project performance evaluation (from original MnDOT-ACEC/MN Consultant Contract Collaboration Project)
MnDOT and ACEC/MN have identified the need to revise the Professional/Technical Contract Evaluation process due to a number of factors (e.g.: lack of valuable information, subjectivity, lack of consistency, timing of evaluations, etc.). A workgroup has been formed and consists of 5 MnDOT (1 as facilitator) and 4 ACEC representatives. MnDOT and ACEC each have 1 co-chair on the workgroup. This workgroup’s main goal is to develop tools and processes for performance evaluations that benefit MnDOT and the Consultant Community.

This white paper is a living document, updated after every meeting, and will include the final recommendations of the workgroup, concluding at that time.

DISCUSSION
As stated above, the main goal is to develop tools and processes for performance evaluations that benefit MnDOT and the consultant community. In addition, three more goals have been identified with supporting criteria to improve on the existing evaluation process.

❖ Develop tools and processes for performance evaluations that benefit MnDOT and the Consultant Community
  • Provide specific useful feedback
  • Improve mechanics of feedback process
  • Utilize existing processes to the extent possible
  • Develop user friendly tool
  • Provide a tool to assist in all levels of consultant selection
  • Clarify how MnDOT and consultants can use data to improve
  • Develop a flexible process that can be adapted to different types of work including size/complexity, etc.
  • Evaluate firms based on scope/contract requirements— but find a way to address individuals
  • Develop some form of 360 degree evaluation or lay the groundwork for future inclusion
  • Require check-ins at basic intervals but include flexibility for MnDOT and/or the consultant to add more
  • Develop communication framework/tool as part of this process (ladder of communication for firms and MnDOT)
  • Develop or recommend training to accompany the new process
  • Ensure consistency between work types
  • Develop criteria definitions to identify what each score actually means
  • Require comments be added for extreme scores
  • Incorporate contractor plan evaluations in the process (from Strategy 6D)
  • Allow MnDOT the ability to eliminate “poor performers”

❖ Transparency and Consistency should be included in the evaluation process
• Incorporate more than just a back and forth paper evaluation – success of project is dependent on the collaboration and communication of MnDOT and the consultant
• Remove individual bias’s from the evaluation process

❖ Define expectations of both sides up front. Establish and define criteria by which the consultant and MnDOT will be measured/evaluated
  • Integrate the performance evaluation process with overall project performance/success
  • Provide recommendations for construction and post-construction component
  • Deal with issues proactively as they occur
  • Encourage effective and timely communications amongst all members

❖ Include the Department of Administration’s evaluation requirements and incorporate into the process

These goals were identified during the first two meetings along with the goal to present the workgroup’s findings at the MnDOT/ACEC Transportation Conference in March of 2013.

APPROACH
Over the last year, the workgroup has been developing a number of items centered around the goals mentioned above. The workgroup’s approach and subsequent tasks have been:

1. Research what other states are using for evaluations.
2. Determine what should be included in Minnesota’s evaluation. Include global criteria for each contract evaluation no matter what the work type (master evaluation form). Develop contract-specific criteria that will be evaluated for different work types (work-type templates).
3. Define the scoring system to minimize subjectivity and promote consistency.
4. Include the ability to give positive feedback, not just areas for improvement.
5. Include the Department of Administration’s questions in the evaluations.
6. Incorporate risk management of the contract.
7. Automate evaluations if at all possible.
8. Have at least one interim review prior to final check-in point (may be more reviews depending on the contract).
10. Develop the process for improvement and dispute resolution.
11. Develop the process for how the evaluations affect the prequalification process.
12. Develop the overall process for evaluations.

RECOMMENDATIONS
Not all of the issues with the consultant evaluations can be addressed with this workgroup. Therefore, the workgroup has developed some recommendations to be implemented at a future date.

1. Include a post-construction evaluation to review lessons learned (e.g.: Was the design constructible? What can be improved?) and ultimately improve the performance of all involved in the project.
2. Automate the evaluations for ease of use for both the consultants and MnDOT.
3. Develop and provide training to MnDOT and ACEC/MN about the new performance evaluation process.

4. Utilize the following philosophy in future improvements to the performance evaluation process.

Consultant contract evaluation is one element of the overall evaluation of project performance.

Projects have four primary process improvement evaluation points which continuously interact in a typical improvement cycle. Operational needs lead to planning for design and construction improvements which in turn lead back to operational efficiencies. Project evaluations should be continuous and provide feedback to the other modes.

Consultant contracts directly connect to one element of the project cycle. Contract evaluations should be timely and address the respective contract requirements. Feedback from the contract should be given to the prior project cycle element. As an example feedback from a construction contract should be given to the design element of the project. Furthermore, feedback from the next cycle element should be provided to the contract at a later date. The example would be construction feedback given to a design contract.

MnDOT should also be evaluated as part of the consultant contract. MnDOT generally works in partnership with consultants to deliver the scope of a contract and should be evaluated in the overall performance of the contract.
Master Evaluation Template
(Content)

Interim and Final Evaluation: Assumptions
- A score of 3 in each of the criteria is assumed to meet the requirements of the contract
- If the evaluation criteria does not apply to your project, check the "NA" box
- Comments are encouraged and required in some locations
- PM's from Consultant and MnDOT need to define the expectations of the project prior to starting work

Interim and Final Evaluation: Definitions
Project Managers can use this definitions/assumptions page to customize their evaluations. If evaluation criteria don't apply to the project, don't include in the evaluation or check 'NA'.

Categories

Project Management (consulting firm)
This category evaluates the consulting firm with respect to project knowledge, communication, project administration, issue resolution, leadership, and budget. This category assumes that the consulting firm is the entire team working on the contract, including sub consultants.
- Project Knowledge - What was the overall understanding of issues/constraints on the project? Did the team's understanding of the issues/constraints allow them to meet contract requirements?
- Communication - Did the written/verbal communication meet project needs? How appropriate was the communication methods and level of formality? Were communication policies observed? How often?
- Project Administration (includes subs) - Were typical administrative tasks accurate and timely? Was coordination maintained adequately to meet contract requirements? Were contract issues addressed in a timely manner?
- Issue Resolution - Were project issues addressed collaboratively in a timely manner? Did they meet the needs of the project?
- Leadership - Did the consultant team provide appropriate leadership and direction to the project? Were contract requirements met? Was the project a success?
- Budget - How was/is the consultant team's budget management?

Project Development
This category evaluates the consulting team with respect to resources, flexibility, schedule, project approach, and public involvement/stakeholder coordination. This category assumes that the consulting firm is the entire team working on the contract, including sub consultants.
- Resources - Were staff qualified to perform their assigned roles/responsibilities? How well? Was the staff well equipped? Did the performance meet contract requirements?
- Flexibility Did the consultant team adapt to changes in the project and scope of work? How well did they adapt? Was the contract accommodated?
- Schedule - Did the consultant team meet the schedule requirements in the contract?
• Project Approach - Was the work plan applicable/appropriate for the project constraints and contract requirements? Were the project constraints mitigated appropriately? Was risk managed appropriately? How well were all of the above done?

• Public Involvement/Stakeholder Coordination - Were the stakeholders listened to? Did the stakeholders needs get addressed and incorporated into the work? Did the consultant team collaborate with other disciplines? Were efforts productive? Were contract requirements met?

**Deliverables**

This category evaluates the consulting team with respect to preliminary engineering, QMP, layout/plan quality, reports/special provisions, calculations, final design, project deliverables. This category assumes that the consulting firm is the entire team working on the contract, including sub consultants.

• Preliminary Engineering - for projects with type studies, preliminary plans, early layouts, etc. Were alternatives/deliverables provided that met contract requirements?

• QMP - Was the QMP submitted according to contract requirements? Was the QMP thorough, accurate, and used appropriately? Did the QMP require any iteration? How did the consultant team respond to quality issues?

• Layout/Plan Quality - Was the layout/plans professional and conformed to standards? Were the contract requirements met? Were there markups on the submittal, and if so, how many? Were the appropriate details shown? Were economy and constructability taken into account?

• Reports/Special Provisions - Were the reports/special provisions professional, easy to understand, accurate, and complete? Were they organized and logical? Were the contract requirements met?

• Calculations - Were the calculations thorough, accurate, easy to read, and clear? Were applicable codes/standards used? Were design criteria referenced?

• Final Design - Was the design thorough and accurate? Were the applicable codes/standards used? Was engineering judgment used appropriately? Was the design appropriate for the situation? Was the design constructible and economical? Did the design manage risk?

**Consultant – PM and Key Personnel**

This category evaluates the consultant's key personnel on project knowledge, communication, project administration, issue resolution, leadership, and flexibility. This category is customizable to add additional key personnel to evaluate depending on key personnel required in the consultant selection.

• Project Knowledge - What was the understanding of project issues/constraints? What was the level of understanding? Were contract requirements met?

• Communication - Did the written/verbal communication meet project needs? How appropriate were the communication methods and level of formality? Were communication policies observed?

• Project Administration - Were typical administrative tasks accurate and timely? Was coordination maintained adequately to meet contract requirements? Were the contract issues addressed in a timely manner?

• Issue Resolution - Were project issues addressed collaboratively in a timely manner? Did they meet the needs of the project?

• Leadership - Did the consultant team provide appropriate leadership and direction to the project? Were contract requirements met? Was the project a success?
• Flexibility - Did the PM adapt to changes in the project and scope of work? Was the contract accommodated?

MnDOT - Agency
This category evaluates MnDOT with respect to deliverables, project knowledge, communication, project administration, issue resolution, leadership, and flexibility.
• Deliverables - Were the MnDOT deliverables delivered in a timely manner? Were they complete, thorough, and clear?
• Project Knowledge - What was the understanding of project issues/constraints? What was the level of understanding? What level of collaboration was achieved?
• Communication - Did the written/verbal communication meet project needs? How appropriate was the communication methods and level of formality? Were communication policies observed?
• Project Administration - Were typical administrative tasks processed quickly? Was coordination maintained to help Consultant meet contract requirements? Were contract issues addressed in a timely manner?
• Issue Resolution - Were project issues addressed collaboratively in a timely manner? Did they meet the needs of the project?
• Leadership - Did MnDOT provide the appropriate level of leadership and direction to the project? Was the project a success?
• Flexibility - Did MnDOT adapt to changes in the project and scope of work? Was the contract accommodated?

Each rating area will provide opportunity for comments. Interim evaluations will require comments and explanation for amendments.
### Interim Master Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Management (consulting firm)</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quickly and fully understands project; demonstrates exceptional leadership in identifying issues and constraints</td>
<td>Exceeds expectations in understanding of project issues and constraints</td>
<td>Achieves a solid understanding of project issues and constraints to meet the contract requirements</td>
<td>Some understanding of project issues and constraints, however not enough to meet contract requirements</td>
<td>Minimal understanding of project issues and constraints; contract requirements not met</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written and verbal communication is exceptional, professional, timely, clear, and easy to understand; communications methods and level of formality are appropriate; maintains outstanding level of collaboration with MnDOT; project communication polices are almost always observed</td>
<td>Written and verbal communication exceeds the needs of the project; communication methods and level of formality are appropriate; maintains good level of collaboration with MnDOT; project communication polices are always observed</td>
<td>Written and verbal communication meets the needs of the project; communication methods and level of formality are appropriate; maintains appropriate level of collaboration with MnDOT; project communication polices are usually observed</td>
<td>Some written and verbal communication meets the needs of the project; occasionally, methods and tone are inappropriate; required greater than normal level of guidance by MnDOT; project communication polices are not observed consistently</td>
<td>Written and verbal communication isn’t meeting the needs of the project, are ill-timed, confusing, and/or misleading; methods and tone are inappropriate; requires extraordinary level of guidance by MnDOT; project communication polices are not observed</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invoicing, supplemental agreements, cost/schedule updates, sub consultant management, etc. are exceptional and require virtually no discussion; coordination is maintained at a high level; contract issues are anticipated and dealt with before they become an issue</td>
<td>Invoicing, supplemental agreements, cost/schedule updates, sub consultant management, etc. are accurate and timely exceeding expectations; coordination is maintained at a greater than normal level; contract issues are addressed collaboratively and in a timely fashion</td>
<td>Invoicing, supplemental agreements, cost/schedule updates, sub consultant management, etc. are accurate and timely; coordination is maintained to meet contract requirements; contract issues are addressed collaboratively and in a timely fashion</td>
<td>Some invoicing, supplemental agreements, cost/schedule updates, sub consultant management, etc. are accurate and timely; coordination is maintained at a lower than normal level; contract issues are addressed as they arise</td>
<td>Invoicing, supplemental agreements, cost/schedule updates, billing preparation, sub consultant management, etc. are inaccurate and delayed; coordination is not maintained; contract issues aren’t addressed timely enough resulting in delays</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue Resolution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project issues are identified and addressed innovatively, collaboratively, in a timely fashion and far exceeds the needs of the project with major benefits to all stakeholders</td>
<td>Project issues are identified and addressed collaboratively, and in a timely fashion, exceeding the expectations of the project</td>
<td>Project issues are identified and addressed collaboratively, in a timely fashion, and meet the needs of the project</td>
<td>Some project issues are identified and addressed collaboratively or in a timely fashion with some needs of the project being met</td>
<td>Project issues are not identified and addressed or are addressed too late</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Consultant team provides exceptional leadership and direction to the project; contract requirements are met and exceeds expectations; project is an overwhelming success to date</td>
<td>Consultant team exceeds expectations in leadership and direction to the project; contract requirements are met; project is a success to date</td>
<td>Consultant team provides appropriate leadership and direction to the project; contract requirements are met; project is a success to date</td>
<td>Consultant team provides unacceptable leadership and direction to the project; contract requirements are not met; project is not successful to date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Consultant consistently reviews the budget and communicates issues to MnDOT; outstanding budget management; recommendations/alternatives are provided when changes are necessary; demonstrates careful and precise planning regarding the budget and requires little oversight by MnDOT</td>
<td>Consultant consistently reviews the budget and communicates issues to MnDOT; good budget management; recommendations/alternatives are provided when changes are necessary</td>
<td>Consultant reviews the budget and communicates issues to MnDOT; adequate budget management</td>
<td>Consultant is not consistently reviewing the budget and communicating issues to MnDOT; lack of budget management at times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Comments: Explain any amendments to the contract. Include amendment number, description of work, and reason for adding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Staff (including sub consultants if applicable) are exceptionally well-qualified to perform roles and responsibilities assigned; are well equipped; performance meets contract requirements and exceeds expectations</td>
<td>Staff (including sub consultants if applicable) are well-qualified to perform roles and responsibilities assigned; are well equipped; performance meets contract requirements</td>
<td>Staff (including sub consultants) are qualified to perform roles and responsibilities assigned; are well equipped; performance meets contract requirements</td>
<td>Staff (including sub consultants if applicable) lacks experience to perform roles and responsibilities assigned; have insufficient equipment; performance is not meeting contract requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Consultant team shows exceptional leadership in adapting to changes in the project and scope of work, far exceeds expectations, within reasonable accommodation of the contract to date</td>
<td>Consultant team is willing and adapts to changes in the project and scope of work within reasonable accommodation of the contract to date</td>
<td>Consultant team adapts to some changes in the project and scope of work</td>
<td>Consultant team adapts to changes in the project and scope of work, far exceeds expectations, within reasonable accommodation of the contract to date</td>
<td>Consultant team is not willing or capable of adapting to changes in the project and scope of work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Consultant team meets the schedule requirements in the contract to date or turned in deliverables early, far exceeds expectations</td>
<td>Consultant team meets the schedule requirements in the contract to date; exceeds expectations</td>
<td>Consultant team meets the schedule requirements in the contract to date for some items, but not others</td>
<td>Consultant team is routinely late turning in deliverables, not meeting the schedule requirements in the contract to date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Approach</td>
<td>Work plan is streamlined and innovative in how project constraints and contract requirements are addressed; project constraints mitigated well to date; project risk has been reduced and managed well</td>
<td>Work plan exceeds expectations in how project constraints and contract requirements are addressed; project constraints mitigated to date; risk has been managed appropriately</td>
<td>Expectations are met in most areas of the work plan, however some project constraints and contract requirements are not addressed; some risk has been managed appropriately</td>
<td>Work plan unrelated/inappropriate to project constraints and contract requirements; project constraints are not addressed; no management of risk to date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Involvement/Stakeholder Coordination</td>
<td>Extraordinary approach in dealing with stakeholders' needs; makes extra effort to work with other disciplines involved in developing the project; efforts yield outstanding results; meets contract requirements</td>
<td>Listens to stakeholders' needs and translates them into the work; makes extra effort to work with other disciplines involved in developing the project; productive efforts; meets contract requirements</td>
<td>Some stakeholders are listened to, others are not; inconsistent collaboration with other disciplines involved in developing the project; some contract requirements are being met</td>
<td>Neglects stakeholders concerns either with no contact or not incorporating concerns into project; no contact with other disciplines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverables</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>Provides thorough and innovative alternatives/deliverables that provides for excellent discussion and streamlines the decision-making process</td>
<td>Provides alternatives/deliverables that exceeds expectations that has made the decision-making process easier</td>
<td>Provides alternatives/deliverables that meets contract requirements</td>
<td>Provides alternatives/deliverables that meets some contract requirements</td>
<td>Alternatives/Deliverables do not provide for project objectives and provides for undesirable situations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMP</td>
<td>QMP is above expectations; is revised appropriately when necessary; no quality issues to date; roles/responsibilities are clear; is thorough, accurate, applicable to the project, and followed appropriately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout/Plan Quality</td>
<td>Layout/Plans contains outstanding quality; virtually error-free; innovative; clear and easy to read; shows appropriate details; is balance in economy and constructability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports/Special Provisions</td>
<td>Reports/Special provisions are above and beyond contract requirements; is easily understood by all audiences; is presented in a way that is well organized, logical; addresses aspects that weren't expected or known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculations</td>
<td>Calculations are well above expectations, well presented, streamlined, thorough, accurate, uses applicable codes/standards, easy to read, descriptive and well references design criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| QMP is revised appropriately when necessary, quality issues are addressed immediately after discovery; requires no iterations with MnDOT; is thorough, accurate, applicable to the project, and followed appropriately |
| QMP is thorough, accurate, applicable to the project, and followed appropriately; requires some iterations with MnDOT |
| QMP requires multiple iterations with MnDOT; is applicable to the project and sometimes followed |
| QMP is poorly written, incomplete, not used or inapplicable to the project |

| Layout/Plans are professional, well developed and conforms to standards; complete; accurate; meets contract requirements; minor or no mark ups on the submittal; shows appropriate details; is balance in economy and constructability |
| Layout/Plans requires multiple iterations to conform to standards and meet contract requirements; many mark ups on the submittal; shows details; is balance in some aspects of economy and constructability |
| Plans contain many errors and submittal package was incomplete; doesn't show details; no balance in economy and constructability |

| Reports/Special provisions exceeds contract requirements; is professional; easily understood; all information is accurately included and presented in a way that is well organized and logical |
| Reports/Special provisions are professional; easily understood; all information is accurately included and presented in a way that is well organized and logical; meets contract requirements |
| Reports/Special provisions requires multiple iterations to meet contract requirements; some information is missing |
| Reports/Special Provisions are incomplete and inaccurate; is not organized or presented in a logical manner |

<p>| Calculations are above expectations, thorough, accurate, uses applicable codes/standards, easy to read, descriptive and well references design criteria |
| Calculations are thorough, accurate, easy to read, uses applicable codes/standards, descriptive, and well references design criteria |
| Calculations requires multiple iterations between the consultant and MnDOT to be thorough, accurate, use applicable codes/standards, easy to read, descriptive, and well reference design criteria |
| Calculations are incomplete, sloppy, and hard to follow with no references to design criteria |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Design</th>
<th>Design is well above expectations, innovative, optimized, and reduces risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design is above expectations, thorough, accurate; appropriate for the situation; constructible, economical, and managed risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design is thorough, accurate; appropriate for the situation; constructible, economical, and manages risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design meets contract requirements, but requires a lot of guidance from MnDOT to achieve the appropriate constructible design for the situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design is incomplete, inaccurate; expensive, inappropriate for the situation, may result in many field design changes, and increased risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable (customizable)</th>
<th>Deliverable is above and beyond contract requirements; is easily understood by all audiences; is presented in a way that is well organized, logical; addresses aspects that weren't expected or known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable exceeds contract requirements; is professional; easily understood; all information is accurately included and presented in a way that is well organized and logical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable is professional; easily understood; all information is accurately included and presented in a way that is well organized and logical; meets contract requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable requires multiple iterations to meet contract requirements; some information is missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable is incomplete and inaccurate; is not organized or presented in a logical manner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable (customizable)</th>
<th>Deliverable is above and beyond contract requirements; is easily understood by all audiences; is presented in a way that is well organized, logical; addresses aspects that weren't expected or known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable exceeds contract requirements; is professional; easily understood; all information is accurately included and presented in a way that is well organized and logical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable is professional; easily understood; all information is accurately included and presented in a way that is well organized and logical; meets contract requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable requires multiple iterations to meet contract requirements; some information is missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable is incomplete and inaccurate; is not organized or presented in a logical manner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant – PM &amp; Key Personnel (Customizable)</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Knowledge</td>
<td>Quickly and fully understands project; demonstrates exceptional leadership in identifying issues and constraints</td>
<td>Exceeds expectations in understanding of project issues and constraints</td>
<td>Achieves a solid understanding of project issues and constraints to meet the contract requirements</td>
<td>Some understanding of project issues and constraints, however not enough to meet contract requirements; requires greater than normal level of guidance by MnDOT</td>
<td>Minimal understanding of project issues and constraints is not achieved; requires extraordinary level of guidance by MnDOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Written and verbal communication is exceptional, professional, timely, clear, and easily understood; communications methods and level of formality are appropriate; project communication policies are always observed</td>
<td>Written and verbal communication exceeds the needs of the project; communication methods and level of formality are appropriate; project communication policies are always observed</td>
<td>Written and verbal communication meets the needs of the project; communication methods and level of formality are appropriate; project communication policies are always observed</td>
<td>Some written and verbal communication meets the needs of the project; occasionally, methods and tone are inappropriate; project communication policies are not observed consistently</td>
<td>Written and verbal communication does not meet the needs of the project, are ill-timed, confusing, and/or misleading; methods and tone are inappropriate; project communication policies are not observed consistently</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Administration</td>
<td>Invoicing, supplemental agreements, cost/schedule updates, etc. are exceptional and requires virtually no discussion; coordination is maintained at a high level; contract issues are anticipated and dealt with before they become an issue</td>
<td>Invoicing, supplemental agreements, cost/schedule updates, etc. are accurate and timely exceeding expectations; coordination is maintained at a greater than normal level; contract issues are addressed collaboratively and in a timely fashion</td>
<td>Invoicing, supplemental agreements, cost/schedule updates, etc. are accurate and timely; coordination is maintained to meet contract requirements; contract issues are addressed collaboratively and in a timely fashion</td>
<td>Some invoicing, supplemental agreements, cost/schedule updates, etc. are accurate and timely; coordination is maintained at a lower than normal level; contract issues are addressed as they arise</td>
<td>Invoicing, supplemental agreements, cost/schedule updates, billing preparation, etc. are inaccurate and delayed; coordination is not maintained; contract issues aren't addressed timely enough resulting in delays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Resolution</td>
<td>Project issues are addressed innovatively, collaboratively, in a timely fashion and far exceeds the needs of the project with major benefits to all stakeholders</td>
<td>Project issues are addressed collaboratively, and in a timely fashion, exceeds the expectations of the project</td>
<td>Project issues are addressed collaboratively, in a timely fashion, and meets the needs of the project</td>
<td>Some project issues are addressed collaboratively or in a timely fashion with some needs of the project met</td>
<td>Project issues are not addressed or are addressed too late</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Key Personnel provides exceptional leadership and direction to the project; contract requirements are met and exceeds expectations; project is an overwhelming success to date</td>
<td>Key Personnel exceeds expectations in leadership and direction to the project; contract requirements are met; project is a success to date</td>
<td>Key Personnel provides appropriate leadership and direction to the project; contract requirements are met; project is a success to date</td>
<td>Key Personnel provided some leadership and direction to the project; some contract requirements are met; project will be completed</td>
<td>Key Personnel provides unacceptable leadership and direction to the project; contract requirements are not met; project is not a success to date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Key Personnel shows exceptional leadership in adapting to changes in the project and scope of work, far exceeds expectations, with reasonable accommodation of the contract</td>
<td>Key Personnel is willing and adapts to changes in the project and scope of work with reasonable accommodation of the contract</td>
<td>Key Personnel adapts to some changes in the project and scope of work with reasonable accommodation of the contract</td>
<td>Key Personnel adapts to changes in the project and scope of work, far exceeds expectations, with reasonable accommodation of the contract</td>
<td>Key Personnel is not willing or capable of adapting to changes in the project and scope of work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnDOT - Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverables</td>
<td>Are delivered in a timely manner; are complete, thorough, and clear; MnDOT has gone out of their way to provide as much information as possible</td>
<td>Are delivered in a timely manner; are complete, thorough, and clear</td>
<td>Some written and verbal communication meets the needs of the project; occasionally, methods and tone are inappropriate; project communication policies are not observed consistently</td>
<td>Written and verbal communication does not meet the needs of the project, are ill-timed, confusing, and/or misleading; methods and tone are inappropriate; project communication policies are not observed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Knowledge</td>
<td>Fully understands project; demonstrates exceptional leadership in identifying issues and constraints; maintains outstanding level of collaboration with Consultant</td>
<td>Exceeds expectations in understanding of project issues and constraints; maintains appropriate level of collaboration with Consultant</td>
<td>Has a solid understanding of project issues and constraints to meet the contract requirements; maintains appropriate level of collaboration with Consultant</td>
<td>Minimal understanding of project issues and constraints; no collaboration with Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Written and verbal communication is exceptional, professional, timely, clear, and easily understood; communication methods and level of formality are appropriate; project communication policies are always observed</td>
<td>Written and verbal communication exceeds the needs of the project; communication methods and level of formality are appropriate; project communication policies are always observed</td>
<td>Written and verbal communication meets the needs of the project; communication methods and level of formality are appropriate; project communication policies are observed</td>
<td>Some written and verbal communication meets the needs of the project; occasionally, methods and tone are inappropriate; project communication policies are not observed consistently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Administration</th>
<th>Invoicing, supplemental agreements, cost/schedule updates, etc. are processed exceptionally fast and require virtually no discussion; coordination is maintained at a high level to help the Consultant meet contract requirements; contract issues are anticipated and dealt with before they become an issue</th>
<th>Invoicing, supplemental agreements, cost/schedule updates, etc. are processed quickly exceeding expectations; coordination is maintained at a greater than normal level to help Consultant meet contract requirements; contract issues are addressed collaboratively and in a timely fashion</th>
<th>Some invoicing, supplemental agreements, cost/schedule updates, etc. are accurate and timely; coordination is maintained at a lower than normal level; contract issues are addressed as they arise</th>
<th>Invoicing, supplemental agreements, cost/schedule updates, billing preparation, etc. are inaccurate and delayed; coordination is not maintained; contract issues aren't addressed timely enough resulting in delays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue Resolution</td>
<td>Project issues are addressed innovatively, collaboratively, in a timely fashion and far exceeds the needs of the project with major benefits to all stakeholders</td>
<td>Project issues are addressed collaboratively, in a timely fashion, exceeding the expectations of the project</td>
<td>Project issues are addressed collaboratively, in a timely fashion, and meet the needs of the project</td>
<td>Project issues are not addressed or are addressed too late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>MnDOT provides exceptional leadership and direction to the project; project is an overwhelming success to date</td>
<td>MnDOT exceeds expectations in leadership and direction to the project; project is a success to date</td>
<td>MnDOT provides appropriate leadership and direction to the project; project is a success to date</td>
<td>MnDOT provides unacceptable leadership and direction to the project; project is not a success to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>MnDOT shows exceptional leadership in adapting to changes in the project and scope of work, far exceeds expectations, with reasonable accommodation of the contract</td>
<td>MnDOT is willing and adapts to changes in the project and scope of work with reasonable accommodation of the contract</td>
<td>MnDOT adapts to some changes in the project and scope of work</td>
<td>MnDOT is not willing or capable of adapting to changes in the project and scope of work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# End of Contract Master Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quickly and fully understood project; demonstrated exceptional leadership in identifying issues and constraints</td>
<td>Exceeded expectations in understanding of project issues and constraints</td>
<td>Achieved a solid understanding of project issues and constraints to meet the contract requirements</td>
<td>Some understanding of project issues and constraints, however not enough to meet contract requirements</td>
<td>Minimal understanding of project issues and constraints; contract requirements not met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written and verbal communication was exceptional, professional, timely, clear, and easily understood; communications methods and level of formality were appropriate; maintained outstanding level of collaboration with MnDOT; project communication policies were always observed</td>
<td>Written and verbal communication exceeded the needs of the project; communication methods and level of formality were appropriate; maintained good level of collaboration with MnDOT; project communication policies were almost always observed</td>
<td>Written and verbal communication met the needs of the project; communication methods and level of formality were appropriate; maintained appropriate level of collaboration with MnDOT; project communication policies were usually observed</td>
<td>Some written and verbal communication did meet the needs of the project; occasionally, methods and tone were inappropriate; required greater than normal level of guidance by MnDOT; project communication policies were not observed consistently</td>
<td>Written and verbal communication did not meet the needs of the project, were ill-timed, confusing, and/or misleading; methods and tone were inappropriate; required extraordinary level of guidance by MnDOT; project communication policies were not observed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invoicing, supplemental agreements, cost/schedule updates, sub consultant management, etc. were exceptional and required virtually no discussion; coordination was maintained at a high level; contract issues were anticipated and dealt with before they became an issue</td>
<td>Invoicing, supplemental agreements, cost/schedule updates, sub consultant management, etc. were accurate and timely; exceeded expectations; coordination was maintained at a greater than normal level; contract issues were addressed collaboratively and in a timely fashion</td>
<td>Invoicing, supplemental agreements, cost/schedule updates, sub consultant management, etc. were accurate and timely; coordination was maintained to meet contract requirements; contract issues were addressed collaboratively and in a timely fashion</td>
<td>Some invoicing, supplemental agreements, cost/schedule updates, sub consultant management, etc. were accurate and timely; coordination was maintained at a lower than normal level; contract issues were addressed as they arose</td>
<td>Invoicing, supplemental agreements, cost/schedule updates, billing preparation, sub consultant management, etc. were inaccurate and delayed; coordination was not maintained; contract issues weren't addressed timely enough resulting in delays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Resolution</td>
<td>Project issues were identified and addressed innovatively, collaboratively, in a timely fashion and far exceeded the needs of the project with major benefits to all stakeholders</td>
<td>Project issues were identified and addressed collaboratively, and in a timely fashion; exceeded the expectations of the project</td>
<td>Project issues were identified and addressed collaboratively, in a timely fashion, and met the needs of the project</td>
<td>Some project issues were identified and addressed collaboratively or in a timely fashion with some needs of the project met</td>
<td>Project issues were not identified and addressed or were addressed too late</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Consultant team provided exceptional leadership and direction to the project; contract requirements were met and exceeded expectations; project was an overwhelming success</td>
<td>Consultant team exceeded expectations in leadership and direction to the project; contract requirements were met; project was a success</td>
<td>Consultant team provided appropriate leadership and direction to the project; contract requirements were met; project was a success</td>
<td>Consultant team provided some leadership and direction to the project; some contract requirements were met; project was completed</td>
<td>Consultant team provided unacceptable leadership and direction to the project; contract requirements were not met; project was not successful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Management</td>
<td>Consultant consistently reviewed the budget and communicated issues to MnDOT; outstanding budget management; recommendations/alternatives were provided when changes were necessary; demonstrated careful and precise planning regarding the budget and required little oversight by MnDOT</td>
<td>Consultant consistently reviewed the budget and communicated issues to MnDOT; good budget management; recommendations/alternatives were provided when changes were necessary</td>
<td>Consultant reviewed the budget and communicated issues to MnDOT; adequate budget management</td>
<td>Consultant did not consistently review the budget and communicate issues to MnDOT; lack of budget management at times</td>
<td>Consultant did not review the budget and communicate issues to MnDOT; no budget management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Staff (including sub consultants if applicable) were exceptionally well-qualified to perform roles and responsibilities assigned; well equipped; performance met contract requirements and exceeded expectations</td>
<td>Staff (including sub consultants if applicable) were well-qualified to perform roles and responsibilities assigned; well equipped; performance met contract requirements</td>
<td>Staff (including sub consultants if applicable) were qualified to perform roles and responsibilities assigned; well equipped; performance met contract requirements</td>
<td>Some staff (including sub consultants if applicable) were not qualified to perform roles and responsibilities assigned; some equipment provided; performance met some contract requirements</td>
<td>Staff (including sub consultants if applicable) inexperienced to perform roles and responsibilities assigned; insufficient equipment provided; performance did not meet contract requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Consultant team showed exceptional leadership in adapting to changes in the project and scope of work; far exceeded expectations, within reasonable accommodation of the contract</td>
<td>Consultant team was willing and adapted to changes in the project and scope of work within reasonable accommodation of the contract</td>
<td>Consultant team adapted to some changes in the project and scope of work</td>
<td>Consultant team was not willing or capable of adapting to changes in the project and scope of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Consultant team met the schedule requirements in the contract or turned in deliverables early; far exceeded expectations</td>
<td>Consultant team met the schedule requirements in the contract; exceeded expectations</td>
<td>Consultant team met the schedule requirements in the contract for some items, but not others</td>
<td>Consultant team was routinely late turning in deliverables not meeting the schedule requirements in the contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Approach</td>
<td>Work plan was streamlined and innovative in how project constraints and contract requirements were addressed; project constraints mitigated well; project risk reduced and managed well</td>
<td>Work plan exceeded expectations in how project constraints and contract requirements were addressed; project constraints mitigated; risk managed appropriately</td>
<td>Expectations were met in most areas of the work plan, however some project constraints and contract requirements were not addressed; some risk managed appropriately</td>
<td>Work plan unrelated/inappropriate to project constraints and contract requirements; project constraints not addressed; no management of risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Involvement/Stakeholder Coordination</td>
<td>Extraordinary approach in dealing with stakeholders' needs; made extra effort to work with other disciplines involved in developing the project; efforts yielded outstanding results; met contract requirements</td>
<td>Listened to stakeholders' needs and translated them into the work; made extra effort to work with other disciplines involved in developing the project; productive efforts; met contract requirements</td>
<td>Some stakeholders were listened to, others were not; inconsistent collaboration with other disciplines involved in developing the project; some contract requirements met</td>
<td>Neglected stakeholders concerns either with no contact or not incorporating concerns into project; no contact with other disciplines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverables</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>Provided thorough and innovative alternatives/deliverables that provided for excellent discussion and streamlined the decision-making process</td>
<td>Provided alternatives/deliverables that exceeded expectations that made the decision-making process easier</td>
<td>Provided alternatives/deliverables that met contract requirements</td>
<td>Provided alternatives/deliverables that met some contract requirements</td>
<td>Alternatives/Deliverables did not provide for project objectives and provided for undesirable situations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMP</td>
<td>QMP went above expectations; was revised appropriately when necessary; no quality issues arose; roles/responsibilities were clear; was thorough, accurate, applicable to the project, and followed appropriately.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMP</td>
<td>QMP was revised appropriately when necessary, quality issues were addressed immediately after discovery; required no iterations with MnDOT; was thorough, accurate, applicable to the project, and followed appropriately; required some iterations with MnDOT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMP</td>
<td>QMP was thorough, accurate, applicable to the project, and followed appropriately; required some iterations with MnDOT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMP</td>
<td>QMP required multiple iterations with MnDOT; was applicable to the project and sometimes followed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMP</td>
<td>QMP was poorly written, incomplete, not used or inapplicable to the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout/Plan Quality</td>
<td>Layout/Plans contained outstanding quality; virtually error-free; innovative; clear and easy to read; showed appropriate details; balanced economy and constructability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout/Plan Quality</td>
<td>Layout/Plans were professional, well developed and conformed to standards; complete; accurate; met contract requirements; minor or no mark ups on the submittal; showed appropriate details; balanced economy and constructability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout/Plan Quality</td>
<td>Layout/Plans required multiple iterations to conform to standards and meet contract requirements; many mark ups on the submittal; showed details; some aspects of economy and constructability balanced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout/Plan Quality</td>
<td>Plans contained many errors and submittal package was incomplete; appropriate details not shown; economy and constructability not balanced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports/Special Provisions</td>
<td>Reports/Special provisions went above and beyond contract requirements; was easily understood by all audiences; was presented in a way that was well organized, logical, addressed aspects that weren't expected or known.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports/Special Provisions</td>
<td>Reports/Special provisions exceeded contract requirements; were professional; easily understood; all information was accurately included and presented in a way that was well organized and logical.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports/Special Provisions</td>
<td>Reports/Special provisions were professional; easily understood; all information was accurately included and presented in a way that was well organized and logical.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports/Special Provisions</td>
<td>Reports/Special provisions were multiple iterations to meet contract requirements; some information was missing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports/Special Provisions</td>
<td>Reports/Special Provisions were incomplete and inaccurate; not organized or presented in a logical manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculations</td>
<td>Calculations went well above expectations, were well presented, streamlined, thorough, accurate, used applicable codes/standards, easy to read, descriptive and well referenced to design criteria.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculations</td>
<td>Calculations went above expectations, were thorough, accurate, used applicable codes/standards, easy to read, descriptive and well referenced to design criteria.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculations</td>
<td>Calculations were thorough, accurate, easy to read, used applicable codes/standards, descriptive, and well referenced to design criteria.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculations</td>
<td>Calculations required multiple iterations between the consultant and MnDOT to be thorough, accurate, use applicable codes/standards, easy to read, descriptive, and well referenced to design criteria.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculations</td>
<td>Calculations were incomplete, sloppy, and hard to follow with no references to design criteria.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design</td>
<td>Design went well above expectations, was innovative, optimized, and reduced risk</td>
<td>Design went above expectations, was thorough, accurate; appropriate for the situation; constructible, economical, and managed risk</td>
<td>Design was thorough, accurate; appropriate for the situation; constructible, economical, and managed risk</td>
<td>Design met contract requirements, but required a lot of guidance from MnDOT to achieve the appropriate constructible design for the situation</td>
<td>Design was incomplete, inaccurate; design was expensive, inappropriate for the situation, resulted in many field design changes, and increased risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable (customizable)</td>
<td>Deliverable went above and beyond contract requirements; was easily understood by all audiences; was presented in a way that was well organized, logical, addressed aspects that weren't expected or known</td>
<td>Deliverable exceeded contract requirements; were professional; easily understood; all information was accurately included and presented in a way that was well organized and logical</td>
<td>Deliverable was professional; easily understood; all information was accurately included and presented in a way that was well organized and logical; met contract requirements</td>
<td>Deliverable required multiple iterations to meet contract requirements; some information was missing</td>
<td>Deliverable was incomplete and inaccurate; not organized or presented in a logical manner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable (customizable)</td>
<td>Deliverable went above and beyond contract requirements; was easily understood by all audiences; was presented in a way that was well organized, logical, addressed aspects that weren't expected or known</td>
<td>Deliverable exceeded contract requirements; were professional; easily understood; all information was accurately included and presented in a way that was well organized and logical</td>
<td>Deliverable was professional; easily understood; all information was accurately included and presented in a way that was well organized and logical; met contract requirements</td>
<td>Deliverable required multiple iterations to meet contract requirements; some information was missing</td>
<td>Deliverable was incomplete and inaccurate; not organized or presented in a logical manner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Consultant - PM &amp; Key Personnel (Customizable) | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| Project Knowledge | Quickly and fully understood project; demonstrated exceptional leadership in identifying issues and constraints | Exceeded expectations in understanding of project issues and constraints | Achieved a solid understanding of project issues and constraints to meet the contract requirements | Some understanding of project issues and constraints, however not enough to meet contract requirements; required greater than normal level of guidance by MnDOT | Minimal understanding of project issues and constraints not achieved; required extraordinary level of guidance by MnDOT |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Written and verbal communication was exceptional, professional, timely, clear, and easily understood; communications methods and level of formality were appropriate; project communication policies were always observed</th>
<th>Written and verbal communication exceeded the needs of the project; communication methods and level of formality were appropriate; project communication policies were observed</th>
<th>Written and verbal communication met the needs of the project; communication methods and level of formality were appropriate; project communication policies were observed</th>
<th>Some written and verbal communication did meet the needs of the project; occasionally, methods and tone were inappropriate; project communication policies were not observed consistently</th>
<th>Written and verbal communication did not meet the needs of the project; were ill-timed, confusing, and/or misleading; methods and tone were inappropriate; project communication policies were not observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Administration</td>
<td>Invoicing, supplemental agreements, cost/schedule updates, etc. were exceptional and required virtually no discussion; coordination was maintained at a high level; contract issues were anticipated and dealt with before they became an issue</td>
<td>Invoicing, supplemental agreements, cost/schedule updates, etc. were accurate and timely; exceeded expectations; coordination was maintained at a greater than normal level; contract issues were addressed collaboratively and in a timely fashion</td>
<td>Invoicing, supplemental agreements, cost/schedule updates, etc. were accurate and timely; coordination was maintained to meet contract requirements; contract issues were addressed collaboratively and in a timely fashion</td>
<td>Some invoicing, supplemental agreements, cost/schedule updates, etc. were accurate and timely; coordination was maintained at a lower than normal level; contract issues were addressed as they arose</td>
<td>Invoicing, supplemental agreements, cost/schedule updates, billing preparation, etc. were inaccurate and delayed; coordination was not maintained; contract issues weren't addressed timely enough resulting in delays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Resolution</td>
<td>Project issues were addressed innovatively, collaboratively, in a timely fashion and far exceeded the needs of the project with major benefits to all stakeholders</td>
<td>Project issues were addressed collaboratively, and in a timely fashion; exceeded the expectations of the project</td>
<td>Project issues were addressed collaboratively, and in a timely fashion, and met the needs of the project</td>
<td>Some project issues were addressed collaboratively or in a timely fashion with some needs of the project met</td>
<td>Project issues were not addressed or were addressed too late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Key Personnel provided exceptional leadership and direction to the project; contract requirements were met and exceeded expectations; project was an overwhelming success</td>
<td>Key Personnel exceeded expectations in leadership and direction to the project; contract requirements were met; project was a success</td>
<td>Key Personnel provided appropriate leadership and direction to the project; contract requirements were met; project was a success</td>
<td>Key Personnel provided some leadership and direction to the project; some contract requirements were met; project was completed</td>
<td>Key Personnel provided unacceptable leadership and direction to the project; contract requirements were not met; project was not successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Key Personnel showed exceptional leadership in adapting to changes in the project and scope of work; far exceeded expectations, with reasonable accommodation of the contract</td>
<td>Key Personnel was willing and adapted to changes in the project and scope of work with reasonable accommodation of the contract</td>
<td>Key Personnel adapted to changes in the project and scope of work with reasonable accommodation of the contract</td>
<td>Key Personnel adapted to some changes in the project and scope of work</td>
<td>Key Personnel was not willing or capable of adapting to changes in the project and scope of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnDOT - Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Were delivered in a timely manner; were complete, thorough, and clear; MnDOT went out of their way to provide as much information as possible</td>
<td>Were delivered in a timely manner; were complete, thorough, and clear</td>
<td>Were delivered in a timely manner; were complete, thorough, and clear</td>
<td>Were delivered late or never delivered; were incomplete, pieced together, unclear</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Knowledge</td>
<td>Fully understood project; demonstrated exceptional leadership in identifying issues and constraints; maintained outstanding level of collaboration with Consultant</td>
<td>Exceeded expectations in understanding of project issues and constraints; maintained appropriate level of collaboration with Consultant</td>
<td>Had a solid understanding of project issues and constraints to meet the contract requirements; maintained appropriate level of collaboration with Consultant</td>
<td>Some understanding of project issues and constraints, however not enough to meet contract requirements; very little collaboration with Consultant</td>
<td>Minimal understanding of project issues and constraints not achieved; no collaboration with Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Written and verbal communication was exceptional, professional, timely, clear, and easily understood; communications methods and level of formality were appropriate; project communication polices were always observed</td>
<td>Written and verbal communication exceeded the needs of the project; communication methods and level of formality were appropriate; project communication polices were observed</td>
<td>Written and verbal communication met the needs of the project; communication methods and level of formality were appropriate; project communication polices were observed</td>
<td>Some written and verbal communication did meet the needs of the project; occasionally, methods and tone were inappropriate; project communication polices were not observed consistently</td>
<td>Written and verbal communication did not meet the needs of the project; were ill-timed, confusing, and/or misleading; methods and tone were inappropriate; project communication polices were not observed consistently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Administration</td>
<td>Invoicing, supplemental agreements, cost/schedule updates, etc. were processed exceptionally fast and required virtually no discussion; coordination was maintained at a high level to help the Consultant meet contract requirements; contract issues were anticipated and dealt with before they became an issue</td>
<td>Invoicing, supplemental agreements, cost/schedule updates, etc. were processed quickly; exceeded expectations; coordination was maintained at a greater than normal level to help Consultant meet contract requirements; contract issues were addressed collaboratively and in a timely fashion</td>
<td>Invoicing, supplemental agreements, cost/schedule updates, etc. were processed quickly; were accuracy and timely; coordination was maintained at a lower than normal level; contract issues were addressed as they arose</td>
<td>Invoicing, supplemental agreements, cost/schedule updates, billing preparation, etc. were inaccurate and delayed; coordination was not maintained; contract issues were not addressed timely enough resulting in delays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Resolution</td>
<td>Project issues were addressed innovatively, collaboratively, in a timely fashion and far exceeded the needs of the project with major benefits to all stakeholders</td>
<td>Project issues were addressed collaboratively, in a timely fashion; exceeded the expectations of the project</td>
<td>Some project issues were addressed collaboratively or in a timely fashion with some needs of the project met</td>
<td>Project issues were not addressed or were addressed too late</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>MnDOT provided exceptional leadership and direction to the project; project was an overwhelming success</td>
<td>MnDOT exceeded expectations in leadership and direction to the project; project was a success</td>
<td>MnDOT provided some leadership and direction to the project; project was completed</td>
<td>MnDOT provided unacceptable leadership and direction to the project; project was not successful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>MnDOT showed exceptional leadership in adapting to changes in the project and scope of work; far exceeded expectations, with reasonable accommodation of the contract</td>
<td>MnDOT was willing and adapted to changes in the project and scope of work with reasonable accommodation of the contract</td>
<td>MnDOT adapted to some changes in the project and scope of work</td>
<td>MnDOT was not willing or capable of adapting to changes in the project and scope of work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work Area Templates

General Template
This is meant to cover everything that is not roadway, planning, bridge, environmental, or construction. It is basically a little more streamlined than the Master Evaluation template.

Project Management - Consulting Firm
- Project Knowledge
- Communication
- Issue Resolution
- Leadership
- Budget Management

Project Development
- Resources
- Flexibility
- Schedule
- Project Approach

Deliverables
- QMP
- Reports/Services

Consultant – Project Manager and Key Personnel
- Project Knowledge
- Communication
- Project Administration
- Issue Resolution
- Leadership
- Flexibility

MnDOT
- Project Knowledge
- Communication
- Issue Resolution
- Leadership
- Flexibility

Bridge Template
This is the summary of what to include in the bridge template (assumed final design scope of work).

Project Management – Consulting Firm
- Project Knowledge
- Communication
- Issue Resolution
- Leadership
- Budget Management

Project Development
- Resources
- Flexibility
- Schedule
- Project Approach

Deliverables
- QMP
- Layout/Plan Quality
- Reports/Special Provisions
- Calculations
- Final Design

Consultant – Project Manager and Key Personnel
- Project Knowledge
- Communication
- Project Administration
- Issue Resolution

MnDOT
- Deliverables
- Project Knowledge
- Communication
- Project Administration
- Issue Resolution
- Leadership
- Flexibility
Construction Oversight Template

Project Management – Consulting Firm

- Project Knowledge
- Communication
- Project Administration
- Issue Resolution
- Leadership
- Budget

Project Development

- Resources
- Flexibility
- Schedule
- Project Approach

Deliverables (Switch out this entire section with Construction Oversight Services (customizable))

- Design Reviews
- Roadway Construction Inspection
- Bridge Construction Inspection
- Temporary Construction Items
  - Traffic Control
  - Temporary Drainage
- Specialty Construction Inspection (customizable)
  - Lighting
  - ITS
  - Landscaping
  - Painting
- Materials Testing, Inspection and Certification
- Bituminous and/or Concrete Plant Inspection
- Environmental Compliance Oversight
- Office Manager / Contract Administration
- Contractor CPM Schedule Review
- Risk Assessments
- Feedback and Lessons Learned

Consultant Project Manager and Key Personnel

- Project Knowledge
- Communication
- Project Administration
- Issue Resolution
- Leadership
- Flexibility

MnDOT

- Deliverables
- Project Knowledge
- Communication
- Project Administration
- Issue Resolution
- Leadership
- Flexibility
Planning Template

Project Management – Consulting Firm
- Project Knowledge
- Communication
- Project Administration
- Issue Resolution
- Leadership
- Budget

Project Development
- Resources
- Flexibility
- Schedule
- Project Approach
- Public Involvement

Deliverables (customized)
- Data Collection/Background Information
- Needs Reports
- Concept Plans
- Innovation Solutions
- Stakeholder Involvement

Consultant Project Manager and Key Personnel
- Project Knowledge
- Communication
- Project Administration
- Issue Resolution
- Leadership
- Flexibility

MnDOT
- Deliverables
- Project Knowledge
- Communication
- Project Administration
- Issue Resolution
- Leadership
- Flexibility

Road Design Template

Project Management – Consulting Firm
- Project Knowledge
- Communication
- Issue Resolution
- Leadership
- Budget Management

Project Development
- Resources
- Flexibility
- Schedule
- Project Approach

Deliverables
- Preliminary Engineering
- QMP
- Layout/Plan Quality
- Reports/Special Provisions
- Final Design

Consultant – Project Manager and Key Personnel
- Project Knowledge
- Communication
- Project Administration
- Issue Resolution
- Leadership
- Flexibility

MnDOT
- Deliverables
- Project Knowledge
- Communication
- Project Administration
- Issue Resolution
- Leadership
- Flexibility
Environmental Stewardship and Cultural Resources Template

Project Management - Consulting Firm
- Project Knowledge
- Communication

Project Development
- Schedule
- Flexibility

Deliverables
- Deliverables Reports/Special Provisions
- Customized Deliverable

Consultant Project Manager and Key Personnel
- Project Knowledge
- Communication
- Leadership
- Flexibility

MnDOT
- Deliverables
- Project Knowledge
- Communication
- Leadership
- Flexibility
Working Team Meeting Minutes

Working Team Meeting
4/30/12
10a-12
MnDOT

Action Items from 3/27:

Consultants will reach out to other firm members for eval system examples
Brad will have Library do a search for other state eval examples
Amber will bring DB materials to next meeting

Working Team
Performance Evaluations
4/30/12

1. Chair Discussion
   Glenn and Amber

2. Establish Plan

What is ultimate time line?

Report at next year’s consultant conference – what do we report? Recommendations or ultimate product?

Who needs to review – who do we need to get buy in from?
PMS, MnDOT and ACEC leadership, DOA

Problem statement – Goal
Measuring performance
Improve performance
Quality

What are weaknesses of current process?
What is our goal?

What is the consultant post-project process or evaluation of project? It varies from firm to firm.

Two Reach out points – what are issues with current process? Goals for next process and recommendations.
Goals:
• Develop tools and processes that help both sides
  o Specific useful feedback
  o Improve mechanics of feedback process
  o User friendly tool
  o Provide tool to assist in future selections – what is MnDOT doing with the data? Pre-Qual status? Direct and competitive selections. How industry will use in pursuits of future work – how does MnDOT and consultants use data to improve – shelf life of information. How do we use that data – how does that impact what is collected and evaluated? Capture data that can be used by both parties for future use.
  o Develop a flexible process that can be adapted to different types of work or size/complexity, etc.

• Transparency and Consistency in evaluation process
  o Incorporate more than just a back and forth paper evaluation – success of project is MnDOT and consultant – evaluation tool should be a communication tool

• Define expectations of both sides – up front – establish and define criteria by which consultant and MnDOT will be measured/evaluated
  o Integrate performance evaluation process with overall project performance/success – goes both ways.
  o Post construction component

• Continue DOA requirement

Timeline Goal: Unveil New Evaluation Process at 2013 Annual Conference in March so final recommendations by December 2012

Reach out to broader group to ask what issues are there with current process?

Do we need to include a rating? Score?
Utilize tools or processes that are already in place – ie Val’s group – plan quality

Process improvements
• Selection
• Evaluation
• PM training process
• Minimum ability/level
• Contracting Process
• Training for Evaluation Process
• Understand how New Process feeds other aspects
• Recommendation that MnDOT evaluate at the very end of project
• Feedback at bidding stage, construction and post construction
• Get root cause of issues
• Some type of formal FDC (field design change) process of recommendations
**ACTION ITEMS:**
- Committee should review materials from other States and Amber
- Brad will check on SWIFT issues – what are restrictions and capabilities?
- ACEC members will reach out to transportation committee for feedback on current process and what needs to be addressed
- Brad will schedule next meeting – tentative 6/1 at 10am
- Glenn, Amber and Rick will develop a draft schedule/timeline and have something ready for next meeting
- Brad will check on any other initiatives out there – Jeff and Val
- Brad will send out notes

---

**Working Team**
**Performance Evaluations**
6/1/12

1. **Previous Action Items**

   - Enough background data from other states to use and eventually will be able to pull for our approach. Members are encouraged to look through data and come up with some “best practices”.
   - SWIFT issues and capabilities are not known but the direction will be to keep going and SWIFT is not an obstacle at this point. There are no restrictions regarding SWIFT at this point.
   - Feedback from other ACEC members (see action below)
   - Draft schedules – Handouts (Rick and Glenn)
   - Need a quick “white paper” that describes some background and what our goal is and why we are doing this.
   - Need to develop a framework for “deliverables” for this group
   - Discussion of how we are approaching this...consultant evaluation...MnDOT evaluation...or using as a tool to evaluate project even when there are no consultants.
   - Discussion on what we are doing with the data eventually...what are repercussions of “bad” evaluations for consultants AND MnDOT? Perhaps use as a tool for improving teams, etc. rather than punishment...so many variables...
   - How do we use past performance in selection?
   - Flaw in current system is that we use firms and the evaluations should be about individuals
   - Should be some accountability to evaluations
   - Could this process roll into PQ process?
   - Discussion on interim evaluations and/or informal check ins...communication tool
   - Val and Jeff do not have any initiatives but are interested in our product as a project management tool

- **Main Ideas from discussion:**
  - Need interim evaluations/check-ins
  - Evaluate firms based on scope/contract requirements– but find a way to address individuals
  - Need to have some form of 360 degree evaluation
Scalable evaluations as far as frequency of interim check-ins – time/money – require basic intervals but include flexibility for people to add more check-ins

Communication framework/tool as part of this process (ladder of communication for firms and MnDOT)

How do we use evaluations in future selections and PQ status?

Training component

User friendly to promote buy-in

Consistency between work types

Criteria – what does each score actually mean?

Comments need to be required for extremes

2. Discuss categories of types of projects and potentially form sub committees for each type
   Glenn- should be a different evaluation based on project type. Suggest going through examples with basic project types that should be evaluated...action item

3. Round Robin
   • Mark suggested weaving in a construction component – quality of plans after the fact
   • Terry echoed Mark’s – some kind of plan rating
   • Glenn suggested a “project” rating some kind of system – system for lessons learned project improvement component for both sides
   • Amber – Glenn will have next agenda for meeting

4. Action Items
   ❖ (Glenn) ACEC members: Have ACEC TC get some feedback from other firms in ACEC as to what is working with evaluations now and what they would like to see in the future...keep all in the loop and allow for input
   ❖ All team members review other state information!
   ❖ Go through examples and come to next meeting with suggestions for basic project types that should be evaluated.
   ❖ Combine schedule (Rick, Amber and Glenn)
   ❖ Draft white paper (Brad) – send out before next meeting
   ❖ Next meeting 6/28 12:30-3 (Glenn will do next agenda)

June 28 2012

1. Previous Action Items update:
   Don’t need additional information from ACEC. Have check in point within the schedule

2. Revised schedule update
   Combined schedules. Based off of the white paper draft from Brad. Changes in end of September “X” was review by MnDOT staff. Thought that both MnDOT and ACEC could review at the same time. Meet in November to make changes. December present to Division Directors. Pilot test in January. Get some reaction.

3. Draft white paper
   Need the introduction of why we are doing this.
   Paragraph instead of bullets.
Some of the items are above our current scope – make paragraph for future recommendations. Our group could assist with the future recommendations, but not by March 2013.

4. Potential Working Group Types
Determined that we want to work through draft process first – then break it into working groups
Could use Texas example of high level categories

5. State Processes
WisDOT – Human Relations questions – liked questions, but not ratings (unless it was only used for an interim review)
Area for suggestions for improvement, allows for face to face review. Comments at the end.
Liked the evaluation criteria at the end – gave directions for the evaluator
Kentucky – Defined ratings, no subjectivity.
Texas – primary work type – don’t like rating. 1st page has the apparent option to animate
Arizona – liked the original $ and final $ (MnDOT’s evaluation has that)
Liked the ones that had the ability to comment
Illinois – rating reviewed by another staff member
Florida – format was too wordy – not easy to get through. Showed multiple reviews during the project
Missouri – liked the comments and the status update. Like the summary at the end.
? – liked that they tied it into the prequal process

6. Other
Evals are public: http://www.mmd.admin.state.mn.us/PTEvals/ptevalreviewmain.asp
Performance - Should we include Key Personnel on the evaluation form so that the people are recognized instead of just the firm?
Transparent with people involved – may be training component for how that is addressed with the review.
Invoice payment prompt for review? Ratings based off of 30/60/90% review? For short projects, maybe just one review.
Need to have interim review that is done prior to final – check in point.

7. New Action Items:

1. Glenn - Flow Chart to show where the evals fall into the project as a whole.
2. Amber - Find out if there are any other review processes prior to the pre-letting review (besides CO review).
3. Mark - Find out how often Wisconsin has face to face reviews.
4. Brad - Ask Admin if they are firm on their questions or if there is guidance on the evaluation questions - evaluate the contractor’s quality, etc. No guidance provided – useless. Contradictions between Admin question answers and scores below.
5. Brad – How many contracts are written for each of the 18 work types?
6. All - Create basic primary and secondary list of work types in conjunction with the prequal list (similar to Texas).
7. All - What criteria would you evaluate – all projects get X (i.e. quality management, etc). For those secondary list of work types – what you would evaluate? Send out prior to next meeting if possible
8. Amber to send out meeting notes - Next meeting – Monday, July 23 8:30 to 10:30 am

Working Team
Performance Evaluations
7-23-12 Agenda - Notes

1. Flow Chart – Glenn
Glenn – Chart focuses on Project - intent is to show evaluation of project through each stage...maybe do not use the term enterprise – maybe eventually use a circular. Do not want to lose sight of this. (circles are input). Also need to focus on positive, not just what went wrong. This would be a recommendation for this process. This team will focus more on “Sheila’s Chart.”

Sheila – how are we going to accomplish improvement? Focus on improving consultant and MnDOT. Focuses on contract.

2. Other review processes – Amber

Pre-letting is only area that has reviews. Consultants might like to see these – they are public. Amber will send out form so people can see what they are doing.

3. Frequency of Wisconsin face-to-face reviews – Mark M.

This happens occasionally at the request of either party. Not routine.

This group is interested in creating a culture where these meetings would not just be when there are problems.

4. Admin information required or can we change? – Brad

Admin performance data cannot be altered. We must continue to do this. There is not guidance provided from Admin on eval. These questions will still be there. We will keep this and have it be separate entities.

5. How many contracts are written for each of the 18 work types? – Brad

Handout – number of contracts for all work types in CART database. How do we take this list and group work together?

6. Discuss basic primary and secondary work types

Do we include risk as a factor in what criteria is used? We need to make this as prescriptive as possible. We need to provide the information so the user does not have to make all the decisions.

Maybe a core list of ratings criteria/questions and then a list to pick from...

Need to be mindful on how this information is going to be used – feeding lessons learned to future PMs and future projects.

7. Discuss what primary criteria would be evaluated
8. Global (primary) items would be more project related—consultant and MnDOT should be evaluated. Contract specific (secondary) criteria—certain items must be evaluated. 
Global – primary is evaluated for EVERY contract
Specific – questions for specific contract
This group needs to create process for contract evaluation and then provide recommendation for further project evaluation.
**Amber will pull together a Master Form and the next meeting we will go through and start to customize.

9. Discuss what secondary criteria would be evaluated

Managing risk – how do we address this? Can we roll this up to ask how well was risk managed for a specific contract.

10. Revised White Paper

This will be a “live” document that will be updated constantly and utilized as the final report along with flow charts, etc.

Preliminary recommendations need to be added.

11. Round Robin

12. Action Items for next meeting
Brad – pull Rating Source pilot project – Brad will email to group
Amber – Put together a mock-up of a Master Eval Form.
Amber will update white paper.***GROUP – give Amber feedback when she sends out.
Glenn will update flow chart – make it circular

Performance Evaluation Working Team

Notes

8/22/12

1. Review meeting minutes
2. Rating Sources Pilot – not much value to gather. Will look at scoring benchmarks.
3. Master Evaluation Form –
   Should we make it more specific to type of contract we are rating? Then how would that look?
   • Weighted?
   • Average?
   • Want to have a scalable standard – a number that can be understood at a glance
   • Maybe change Project Development to Project “Execution”
• Put Development section into Project Management
• Keep preliminary engineering as defined – talks about innovation – into deliverables
• Change plan quality to layout/plan quality
• Project constraints to project management
• Managing the work plan and managing risk…Amber will try to fit it in.
• Under Key Personnel: What do we combine? Need to evaluate the PM for consultant and MnDOT specifically.
• Overall Value – feels redundant…weave into other sections – take out

• 3 is base point – average - met

Amber already talked to Bridge Administrators about trying this on a few contracts.

As an additional item for the evaluation – a place for the PM to give an overview of the project…sum up the project – what type of job, what were the constraints? More of a cover sheet similar to Texas.

*****ACTION ITEMS:

***Amber will use her sheet as a base and will make consensus changes from discussion today. She will send out a new sheet to all.

***Rick will extend his work through rest of sheet

***Keri will look at a streamlined version for smaller contracts.

***Glenn will take lead at looking at math – possible weighting, etc. – will work with Mark M. and Sheila

***WHOLE GROUP needs to look at master sheet so we can finalize Master at next meeting

4. White Paper – Amber will send out a update draft for comment and ACEC will share with members

5. Circular Char – handout
   Right now we are focusing on consultant eval…we need to discuss how we evaluate MnDOT
   Is there a way to have a total eval that combines and has a 50/50 aspect?
   How do we address the issue if project is not going well – interim evals
   Could have CS be an independent party and moderate or you could have MnDOT scorers and mediate/moderate.
   Should the dual eval be non-personal for MnDOT?

6. On schedule with draft process – would like to submit for review by ACEC and MnDOT in September.
   ***Brad will set up next meeting – WED 9/26
Performance Evaluation Working Team

Notes

10/16/12

Missing: Mark Maves, Rick Brown and Mark Dierling.

7. Amber went through the Master Evaluation form briefly. Amendment info is just so everything is in one place.

8. Weighted score info. Yellow are the main categories. Rate between 1 and 5. 20 points Consultant; 5 points MnDOT. Averaged numbers. Weighting was easy – equal rate so each add up to 100. Test Case was just to make sure formula was set up correctly. Then changed weighted score on a couple of examples to see what it did to the score. Could set all the same as a default and then allow the PM to change (would have to be significant change in order to see the difference in the score).
   - This may be used on larger contracts and not necessarily on all.
   - If you change the rating, the Consultant and MnDOT need to set down right away and discuss so that expectations are set right up front.
   - How does this correlate with the proposal weights and scoring? They may not be the same and may not tie at all since this is for the performance and not necessarily the selection process.
   - Would you allow different project types to have different default weightings?
   - Consistency/lack of consistency between different project managers is an issue.
   - Need a baseline on which to compare the score to.
   - How will score be used? Prequal, selection for other projects, etc.? Currently used as documentation if there is an issue or not, selection committee members are free to look at them if they want to. We can make recommendations on how they should be used.

9. Bridge office wants to use the new master evaluation on the Cayuga project (just the bridge design). Approaching it as a group. Consultant will also do the MnDOT one as well. Redid definition page. 3 categories for the consultant, 1 category for MnDOT. Pick list of these items, you do not need to rate every single one of them. These items will be selected from the MnDOT project manager with help from Consultant Services contract administrator. Picks should be turned in with requisition of the contract. Budget one – had a hard time figuring out score of 5. Every month it is important for the PM to document upcoming expenditures. Managing the budget versus contract amount. Budget Management approach is more liked. Expectation of formal change in contract – needs to be tightened up. Meeting to do evaluations on Monday, Oct 22.

10. Went over Mater Evaluation categories and determined that several could be moved within categories.
   - Need to have a “generic deliverable” for projects that do not have the deliverables listed.
   - Change it back to four main categories.
   - Subconsultants should be included – perhaps under firm Project Administration and Resources or create a separate category. Firms are teaming up more and more (subconsultants have a greater percentage of the job than previous years). The subconsultants would have to be on the rating form for tracking/search purposes.
How are firm and PM ratings differentiated? Topic heading with definitions – evaluate key personnel or just PM? Potentially list key personnel positions – “PM and Task Leads” as example. Joint discussion on which positions should be listed between MnDOT and Consultant. Positions not by name. Could take the top 4 items (Project Knowledge, Communication, Project Administration, and Issue Resolution) and rate each key personnel on those items with the max score staying the same – or allow PM to make the decision on which of the items under Key Personnel - PM. Agency instead of MnDOT.

- If score less than 3, Corrective Action Report or some action taken.
- Lessons learned or room for improvement.
- Internal reviewer of ratings for consistency on both sides?
- Formal sign-offs?
- Technical support ratings – how to get them involved/merge the two?

Action items:

1. Recommendation on how the evaluations are used and placed into the White Paper – Marks and Rick.
2. Ideas on how to rate Budget Management; more thought needed on this topic – all
3. Research language for Budget Management for a starting point – Brad
4. Evaluation of subconsultants needs to be looked at and provide feedback – could go into our recommendations. Legally contract is with the Prime; not subconsultants.
6. Amber to make corrections to Master Evaluation.
7. Glenn to make changes to Weighted score.
8. Present to ACEC/MnDOT prior to November meeting (Transportation committee meeting is Nov 15)? Get comments from Rick, Mark and Mark
9. Amber to talk to Jim Cownie about signatures.
10. Brad to schedule next meeting – tentatively 11/20 from 1 to 3.

Action Items from December Meeting:

* Brad will make changes to Pre-qualification / Dispute Resolution Document and then will email to group for comment – then Amber will update white paper

* Sheila will take a look at Planning criteria

* Amber will work on Budget Management criteria

* EVERYONE: review templates and provide comments before next meeting

ACEC/MN MnDOT Working Team

Performance Evaluations
Meeting Minutes

Missing: Terry

1. Review 12-19-12 meeting minutes

No comments on last meeting minutes

2. Action Item: Changes to Pre-qualification / Dispute Resolution Document – Brad

Brad added bullets to Dispute Resolution. Draft language. Brad had heard from Terry: Terry wondered if it was too one-sided; what do the Consultants think? Consultants felt with 360 eval communication would be there. Feel this is more for the prequalification program. Prequal list should be indicating that they are performing well. Will remain draft until thresholds are set for ratings.

3. Action Item: Review Planning criteria - Sheila

Project Management – planners thought that budget, leadership and communication were highest. Thought leadership and administration could be combined. Planners thought that it was a comprehensive review.

4. Action Item: Budget Management Criteria – Amber and All

If estimation of fees is an issue, should it be its own issue? Trying to combine right now and it’s not working. Lower end ratings easy to turn cause and effect around. It could have been improperly estimated, but the consultant did an excellent job managing that budget and communicating with MnDOT on issues with the budget. Perhaps the estimating portion should just be removed. Amendment wouldn’t have been approved without MnDOT agreeing to the reasonable cause. If there are issues with the estimate, PM should be providing comments. Amber to modify estimate language from eval criteria. Both Consultant and MnDOT agree on scope and cost is the base assumption for this category.

5. Action Item: Review Templates – All

May need to better define leadership. Proactive/work independent was the intent for leadership. Added bullets for additional deliverables. Templates should be provided – as few as possible. Also need a generic template. Add a general deliverable. Brad - IT gave estimation for automating this evaluation form. Consultant can do it and estimate is acceptable. The less customization needed by the end user, the better. Customizations would have to go to system administrator.

PMs should take the time to identify what Consultant would be rated on. Resources are limited. Currently one page with one template. Could you do it up front as an exhibit to the contract – yes, however, it will take a culture change.
MnDOT PM would have to choose the template and tell Contract Administration which ones do not apply. Our group needs to determine how many templates and what is on the templates.

IT can customize a wizard to allow a preview of the report prior to submittal.

General template should be brief, could base template criteria off of contract value.

6. Environmental Criteria – Keri

Intent for a minimum criteria evaluation was to have two ratings under each of the five headings.

7. Draft Process Statement – Brad and Glenn

8. White paper Revisions – Amber and Terry

Discussion of Terry’s comments:

1. Do we include the plan quality review within our evaluation? Currently completely separate process and only used to generate data. Does it work time wise to tie together?

2. Have we addressed evaluation of individuals? Team captured in other areas with project. Beyond PM, considered team.

3. Dispute Resolution: Develop ladder part of this? Yes.

4. Training accomplished? No, but plan to.

5. Recommendation for construction feedback? Just recommendation from our working team.

6. Risk management incorporation? Could easily be added as a criteria.

For any of the above or more, provide comments to Amber.

9. Check-in with team progress and schedule – Glenn

10. MnDOT ACEC/MN Conference Presentations - Brad

Chairs presenting on March 5. Summary presentation almost of white paper. Have 15 to 20 minutes in general session. Agenda set for general session. If need more time than general session, they can add a breakout session which would be an additional 45 minutes. That would be the only 4th breakout session for the entire day. Or could present at a breakfast in June.

Instead of presentation, could just give time for feedback for breakout session.

Provide process one pager on when this will be implemented and other handouts.
11. Amber discussion regarding eval for Cayuga. Four engineers did evals using the new evaluation. Meeting this afternoon with them to get feedback. A couple of the engineers took initiative and are proposing a different format for the eval. Amber provided handouts of their proposal. Does not address consistency, other functional areas, no eval for MnDOT, no eval for Key Personnel. Does not address the goals that this evaluation committee had developed. Does tell us that people want simple and that they are recognizing the necessity for scoring criteria.

12. Round Robin

13. Action Items for next meeting

1. Set threshold for bullet 3, Use of performance evaluations in prequal program.

2. Amber – modify estimate language from Budget evaluation criteria.

3. All - Finish Templates prior to ACEC meeting

4. Brad - Talk to Chris Roy regarding plan quality rating and timing

14. Next Meeting

February 19, 1 to 3

Working Team
Performance Evaluations
02-19-13 Meeting Minutes
Shelia, Rick, Mark M, Terry, Amber, Keri, Brad, Glenn

1. Pre-Qual/Dispute Resolution Document – all; Need to set thresholds
   Average 3 projects at 10 and below, then subject to removal from prequal.

2nd bullet – change to a minimum of three consecutive final evaluations must be completed to form the basis of prequalification decisions.

3rd bullet – If, after the minimum number of final evaluations are completed, the average of three consecutive scores is 10 and below, the consultant....

2. Budget Management criteria – Amber
   Amber revised – got away from notion of overrun/under-run as bad. Could change to proactive instead of consistently.
   2 - Only reviewed when prompted by MnDOT.  4 – Consistent and proactive. Do we want to add scope of work in text? Implied

3. Review Templates - all
   Are we good with what we have?
   Environmental – Keri
   Bridge – Amber
   General – Mark M.
   Highways – Sheila and Rick
Planning and Construction Oversight – Glenn and Terry

What about MnDOT Consultant Project Administrator rating? Likely already caught with discussions between Project Administrator and PM.

Brad wants to get content to IT people on templates so that they can start populating database. Content by April, Testing end June/July, Live August.

Could hide majority of text – only see it if roll over major headings. Would like to see entire ratings for each category. It would give summary before final submittal. Example from bridge to help guide some of the answers for evaluations. Could use it as an office tool.

4. Process Document – Brad and Glenn
Total score of 25 (5 points for MnDOT). If 3 is average, they would get 12 points. Propose if consultants score a 8 10 and below for an individual contract, that would trigger the review process/address prequal. See what happens. Proposing also that interim reviews are for project management tool and does not apply to final score.

4a – a portion of the final invoice is sometimes paid. It doesn’t go to audit until final evaluation is completed. Close-out process going through LEAN event in March to try to speed process up.

MnDOT should also have an improvement process on our 5 points.

Could do a trial time (transition time) in which “penalty box” is not enforced and see how it goes.

Training with managing consultants and MnDOT project managers may be necessary/required. Training for both MnDOT and consultants in the same room. Culture change.

Add 4e. Improvement process for PM (documented in data base somehow).

Expectations up front – need to add to the document.

5. Tasks left to complete – Amber
Weighted Rating Spreadsheet – part of software
Prequal/Dispute Resolution Document
Others?

6. Revised White Paper and Presentation – Amber
Presentation outline. Need to get feedback.
ACEC – transportation committee – mass distribution up to you.
MnDOT – consultant contract team (Jon, Amr, Dawn, Chris R, Val, Brad). Think we should get some buy-in with a cross-section group of people; then deploy out.

10 to 15 minutes to present.
Major talking points:
Why doing this?
Benefits to all.
5 major categories, automated
Scoring
Timeframe and feedback
7. Round Robin
8. Action Items for next meeting
1. Change Use of Performance Evaluations in prequal program – Brad
2. Change Performance Review/Evaluation process – Brad
3. Add Criteria to process to set criteria up front. – Brad
4. Presentation – Glenn and Amber
5. Amber – double check master eval form is ready to go
6. Next meeting – April 16 10:30 – 12:30

ACEC/MN MnDOT Working Team

Performance Evaluations

MnDOT CO Conference Room 604

Tuesday April 16, 2013

11:00 AM – 1:00 PM

Agenda

Attendees: Terry, Shelia, Brad, Mark M, Amber, Keri, Glenn

1. Review 2-19-13 meeting minutes

2. Feedback from MnDOT ACEC Conference presentation

Did not hear much for feedback. Glad 360 review. White paper looks great. Wondering if Consultant and MnDOT will be honest with the evaluation. When do training, it should help with the issue of honesty and constructive criticism. It should force/encourage people to be more proactive.

Evolved into discussion about Task Force Members...
Future training for PMs that manage consultants. Having consultants be involved with this training. Have a few PMs go and see what consultants do, how they put together a proposal, etc.

Also, training for kick-off meetings and their importance. Issue resolution contacts.
Brad meeting on Friday to discuss PM training and hopes to incorporate the evaluation training into that training. Hope to have a 1 ½ day training. This is a high priority for MnDOT to get the PMs trained. Need to understand role of MnDOT, role of consultant, and teambuilding to make projects successful.

3. **Action Item**: Changes to Use of Performance Evaluations in prequal program – Brad
   It is ready to be final.

4. **Action Item**: Changes to Performance Review/Evaluation process – Brad
   Brad met with consultant to do automated system. Process was helpful to them. Question regarding 4e. It is an extra step that is really not necessary? If reviews are not acceptable to either party, they can go to f. Extra step = extra time. Concern on MnDOT’s side vs Consultant’s side.

   When you do an evaluation with staff, you sit down and talk with them. Could you change the text to “Receive” instead of “Accept”.

   Consultant has not received evals in the past – gone to wrong person or upper level management didn’t share it with the PM. With a receive notification, you would know that it is done.

   Could you put a deadline on the acceptance part and if no comments, it auto accepts after a certain time?

   4e forces a dialogue. Doesn’t have to happen with every project, but is important.

   Email – info with this is your eval; if you have issues, this is what you do. Hit “Receive” or if you don’t hit anything, it auto accepts after 5 days.

   After b and c, eval should go to the PM. 5 days after that, it goes to CART.

5. **Action Item**: Add Criteria to process to set criteria up front. – Brad
   3.a.1. language added

6. **Action Item**: Master evaluation form – Amber
   Sent to Brad last month for consultant to automate. Done.

7. **Action Item**: Work Area Templates – Amber
   Needs the list for all of the work areas. Believes that there were 5 or 6.

8. **Action Item**: White Paper Revisions – Amber
Last revision was April 16 (Amber needs to send out)

9. Check-in with team progress and schedule – Glenn
   Next steps – final report package. After final, send to ACEC and Division Directors. Then, it will be final.
   Anticipate testing in June/July. Anticipate involving us with the testing.

10. Action Items for next meeting – Are we done?????
   1. Brad to fix process and email out to everyone.
   2. All – email lists for templates to Amber and Cc: Glenn and Brad (do this ASAP)
   3. Brad – put together final report – take white paper and all of the attachments as exhibits. Will put
      together an executive summary. Will also add “Next steps timeline”. Send out to all for comment.
   4. Amber – send out last white paper revision.

11. Next Meeting if necessary
   Anticipate that another meeting will be necessary after testing (sometime June/July – date to be determined).
Performance Evaluation Improvements

MnDOT – ACEC/MN Annual Conference
March 5, 2013
Amber Blanchard, MnDOT
Glenn Schreiner, ACEC/MN

Current Process

How many of you like MnDOT’s current P/T contract performance evaluation?
Current Process

How many of you don’t like MnDOT’s current P/T contract performance evaluation?
Performance Evaluation Improvements

- **Purpose:** Improve the processes for evaluating project performance

- **Benefits:**
  - Refined process that will give useful, consistent feedback
  - Offer chance to express concerns
  - Automated (ease of use)

Performance Evaluation Improvements

- **White Paper**
  - **Goals:**
    - Develop tools and processes for performance evaluations that benefit MnDOT and the Consultant Community
    - Transparency and Consistency should be included in the evaluation process
    - Include the Department of Administration’s evaluation requirements and incorporate into the process
Performance Evaluation Improvements

- Goals (Cont.)
  - Define expectations of both sides up front. Establish and define criteria by which the consultant and MnDOT will be measured/evaluated

Key points:
- MnDOT and Consultant PM review performance metrics before the project begins
- Consultant will also be reviewing MnDOT Performance

Contract Rating includes sum of Consultant and MnDOT Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnDOT</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>A+B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consultant Rating Based on Four Categories

- Project Management
- Project Development
- Deliverables
- PM (Key Personnel)

Each Category has Criteria scored from 1 to 5

1 - Low (Does not meet expectations)
3 - Meets Expectations
5 - High (Exceeds Expectations)
# Average Criteria Scores for Category Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Resolution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Sum Category Scores for Consultant Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Meet Expectations</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Development</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverables</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM (Key Personnel)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Rating</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MnDOT Rating Based on Seven Criteria

- Deliverables
- Project Knowledge
- Communication
- Administration
- Issue Resolution
- Leadership
- Flexibility

Average Criteria Scores for MnDOT Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliverables</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Resolution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MnDOT Rating</strong></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sum Consultant and MnDOT Ratings for Contract Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Rating</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnDOT Rating</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Rating</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consequences of Consistent Poor Ratings

- Ratings of 10 or less require Improvement Plans
- Non compliance with improvement plan could affect prequalification for a work type.
Performance Evaluation Improvements

- Draft process reviewed with both MnDOT and ACEC/MN
- New evaluation software testing and training in June 2013
- Start using new evaluation software in July 2013

Performance Evaluation Improvements

- **Purpose:** Improve the processes for evaluating project performance

- **Benefits:**
  - Refined process that will give useful, consistent feedback
  - Offer chance to express concerns
  - Automated (ease of use)
### Example/Sample of Evaluation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Case</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Aver</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Default Weight</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
<th>Default Weight</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Management</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Administration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Resolution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Development</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Approach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Involvement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverables</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout/Plan Quality</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports/Special Provisions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable (Custom)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable (Custom)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PM (Key Personnel)</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Administration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Resolution</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultant Rating:</strong></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnDOT</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverables</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Administration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Resolution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23.57</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Contract Rating: | 5.0 | 15.0 | 25.0 | 16.2 | 16.2 | 16.2 | 15.8 |

June 1, 2013