

**OKLAHOMA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

EC No.
J/P No.

Provider:	Rating Dates	
	Task Order Phase:	Preconstruction Phase:
Project Description:	Construction Phase:	Other (Specify in Remarks Section):
	Rating Key (see instructions) (E) Exceeds Standards (M) Meets Standards (I) Needs Improvement (NA) Not Applicable	

EVALUATION FACTORS	Task Order Phase	Preconstruction Phase			Construction Phase
		NEPA	Bridge	Roadway	
A. Knowledge of Department Processes					
B. Cooperation with the Department, Public, Other Agencies					
C. Adequacy of Personnel, Supervision, and Management					
D. Timely Submission of Work					
E. Overall Quality and Accuracy of Work					
F. Accuracy of Billing Records	NA				
G. Control of Work (Construction Management Contracts Only)	NA	NA	NA	NA	
H. Contractor Coordination (Construction Management Contracts Only)	NA	NA	NA	NA	
I. Ability to Maintain Construction Schedule (Construction Management Contracts Only)	NA	NA	NA	NA	
J. Timely Submission of Annual FAR Audit					
Rater: Project Manager / Project Engineer					
Reviewer: Division Manager / Division Engineer					
Director of Operations / Director of Engineering					

Remarks

**OKLAHOMA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
Evaluation Factors**

Knowledge of Department Processes

Exceeds Standards	Provider displays thorough understanding of Department processes, policies and procedures. Project reports, plans, and calculations are prepared consistent with Department standards, in acceptable format, and with minimal errors. Timely submission of deliverables indicates a thorough understanding of Department scheduling processes and priorities.
Meets Standards	Provider displays general understanding of Department processes, policies and procedures. Project deliverables are prepared consistent with Department standards and contain few errors. Identified errors do not impact Department's project delivery date or project budget.
Needs Improvement	Provider is unfamiliar with, or fails to follow, Department processes, policies and procedures. Requires repeated instruction in preparation of normal documentation, correspondence, or reports. Deliverables contain numerous errors which negatively impacting either project delivery date or project budget.

Cooperation with the Department, the Public, and other Agencies

Exceeds Standards	Provider displays willingness to embrace Team concept in the development of the project. Readily accessible to Department Staff and responsive to Department requests. Responds in a timely manner and with professional demeanor to all public requests for information. Develops and maintains positive working relationships with Federal / State Agencies involved in the project. All written and verbal communication delivered in a professional manner.
Meets Standards	Provider works well with Department personnel in prosecution of the project. Generally responsive to Department requests for information. Occasional Department involvement required in coordination and delivery of information to the public and other agencies. Written and verbal communication was generally adequate.
Needs Improvement	Provider was generally unresponsive to Department requests for information. Interaction with the public and other agencies was generally ineffective or unprofessional. Written and verbal communication was generally late or did not provide the requested information.

Adequacy of Personnel, Supervision, and Management

Exceeds Standards	Provider staff was competent and knowledgeable of all applicable guidelines, standards, and regulations required completing the tasks. Level of staffing was adequate for the assigned work and product delivery dates were met and occasionally exceeded. Management involvement was timely and decisions were made at the appropriate level.
Meets Standards	Provider staff displayed a general understanding of the expertise required to perform the assigned tasks. Staffing level was generally adequate to meet milestone deadlines. Management involvement was generally timely and few delays were experienced.
Needs Improvement	Provider staff is generally unfamiliar with applicable guidelines, standards, and regulations required for task completion. Staffing level was inadequate for the level of work to be performed, resulting in delays in achieving milestone dates and adversely impacting the project delivery schedule. Management involvement was insufficient to meet the requirements of project delivery.

Timely Submission of Work

Exceeds Standards	Provider submitted work in a timely manner, contributing to a smooth work flow and meeting or exceeding milestone dates. Displayed awareness of issues impacting project delivery schedule, and was an active participant in the decision making process. Department approvals were obtained in a timely manner. Submitted work was consistently free of errors and met or exceeded Department standards for quality.
Meets Standards	Provider work was submitted in adherence with the project schedule. Department approvals were obtained prior to submission deadlines. Submitted work contained minimal errors and did not adversely impact project delivery date or project budget.
Needs Improvement	Provider work was incomplete and consistently did not meet milestone dates. Work contained a sufficient amount of errors to impact project delivery date or project budget. Provider ignored or was unaware of Department approval requirements. Submitted work required continuous review by Department staff.

Overall Quality and Accuracy of Work

Exceeds Standards	Provider work was technically accurate, complete, and submitted in a manner consistent with Department requirements. Work displayed a complete understanding of the project scope and was consistent with the contract document and Department standards for that type work. Work was submitted with adherence to the contract milestone dates and displayed professional competence with regard to content. Few errors were discovered and those errors did not impact either the project delivery date or project budget.
Meets Standards	Provider work was generally complete and accurate. Work was consistent with the project scope and the contract document. Errors were minimal and were addressed in a timely manner by the Provider. Errors did not affect the project delivery date or project budget.
Needs Improvement	Provider work was submitted incomplete and reflected a lack of technical competency in the disciplines required to perform the work. Quantity or significance of errors necessitated Department involvement and correction. The work was inconsistent with the project scope or the contract requirements. The quantity or significance of the errors adversely impacted the project delivery date or the project budget.

Accuracy of Billing Records

Exceeds Standards	Provider provided Department with mathematically correct and itemized breakdown of billing charges in accordance with approved accounting requirements. Salaries, fixed fees, and other rates were consistent with the contract cost proposal. Requests for clarification or supporting documentation were addressed completely and in a timely manner.
Meets Standards	Provider billing requests were generally correct and with minimal errors. Salaries, fixed fees, and other rates were consistent with the contract cost proposal. Requests for clarification and supporting documentation were addressed in a timely manner.
Needs Improvement	Provider billing requests were consistently vague or inaccurate. Numerous errors required continuous research by Department staff and resulted in increased claim processing time. Billed fees were inconsistent with the contract cost proposal. Supporting documentation was absent or insufficient to support the billing claim.

Control of Work

Exceeds Standards	Provider effectively and accurately administered the construction contract. Provider representatives were very knowledgeable of Department processes, policies and procedures. Time and diaries were accurate and completed daily. Materials documentation was accurate and timely. Progressive claims were accurate and submitted in a timely manner. Department staff was kept current on project schedule and issues related to construction of the project. Field issues were handled at the appropriate level. The Provider was pro-active in identifying potential problems, and provided solutions to construction issues before the issues became critical.
Meets Standards	Provider effectively administered the construction contract. Provider representatives were generally knowledgeable of Department processes, policies and procedures. Time and diaries were completed with few errors. Materials documentation was accurate. Progressive claims were generally accurate and submitted in a timely manner. Department staff was generally kept informed of issues related to construction of the project. Field issues were handled at the appropriate level, with occasional guidance from the Field Division. Potential problems were generally identified early enough to be addressed by the Field Division
Needs Improvement	Provider experienced frequent problems in administering the construction contract. Provider representatives were occasionally unaware of Department processes, policies and procedures. Construction documentation was incomplete or inaccurate. Progressive claims were frequently inaccurate or submitted late. Department staff was frequently not informed of pending issues, and the Provider was not proactive in identifying potential problems. Field Division personnel frequently were called to the project site to assist the Provider in dealing with construction issues.

Contractor Coordination

Exceeds Standards	Provider displayed ability to effectively coordinate with the construction contractor. Correspondence generated by the Provider was accurate, timely, and displayed a thorough understanding of Department policies, processes, and procedures. Construction meetings were timely and proactively addressed potential construction issues. Construction issues were handled at the appropriate level and Field Division input was secured at the appropriate time in with the appropriate documentation.
Meets Standards	Provider generally displayed ability to coordinate with the construction contractor. Correspondence generated by the Provider was generally accurate and timely. The Provider displayed a general understanding of Department policies, processes, and procedures. Construction meetings were timely and proactively addressed potential construction issues. Construction issues were generally handled at the appropriate level and at the appropriate time. Field Division input was occasionally necessary to facilitate communication between the Provider and construction contractor.
Needs Improvement	Provider displayed an inability to effectively coordinate with the construction contractor. Provider displayed a general lack of understanding of Department policies, processes, and procedures. Construction issues generally required involvement by the Field Division.

Ability to Maintain Construction Schedule

Exceeds Standards	Provider effectively maintained the project schedule. Correspondence and documentation was accurate and timely and displayed thorough understanding of issues that could impact project delivery. Provider was proactive in identifying issues that could impact the delivery schedule, and provided possible solutions to potential problems before impacting the delivery schedule. Provider displayed thorough understanding of construction issues and provided timely input to the contractor to help maintain the construction schedule. Coordinated at appropriate times with the Field Division to ensure decisions on construction issues would not impact the delivery date.
Meets Standards	Provider effectively maintained the project schedule. Correspondence and documentation was displayed a general understanding of issues that could impact project delivery. Provider was generally proactive in identifying issues that could impact the delivery schedule; occasional involvement by the Field Division was necessary to ensure the project delivery date was maintained. Provider displayed a basic understanding of construction issues and provided input to the contractor to help maintain the construction schedule.
Needs Improvement	Provider was unable to maintain the project schedule. Correspondence and documentation was displayed a general lack of understanding of issues that could impact project delivery. Field Division involvement was frequently necessary to ensure the project delivery date was maintained. Provider displayed a lack of basic understanding of construction issues.

Timely Submission of Annual FAR Audit

Meets Standards	Provider submitted annual FAR audit in a timely manner. Submitted work was consistently free of errors and met or exceeded Department standards for quality.
Needs Improvement	Provider annual FAR audit was not submitted in a timely manner and/or was incomplete and consistently did not meet Department standards for quality. Provider ignored or was unaware of Department approval requirements.