



How

- Form should be reviewed and discussed with the Consultant prior to contract negotiations. Establish performance expectations.
- Performance evaluation ratings include a reflection of sub-consultants used by the prime consultant.
- Evaluation may include additional criteria, noted as 7. "Other Criteria (As Agreed)", as mutually agreed to by both parties in advance of performing contract work(e.g. public involvement or volume of work
- Provide justification for performance ratings above or below "Meets Std." Include examples.
- The evaluator and the consultant should understand and discuss at the beginning of the work and during the evaluation process that a "Meets Standard" score should be interpreted as a positive score. It simply means that the product was delivered as expected and that it meets the requirement of the work. As a reference, a "Meets Standard" score would indicate that the product was similar to what WSDOT would expect from a typical design team from WSDOT.

When

Final Evaluation

- Complete and distribute a performance evaluation at the point of termination of the agreement. Distribute the form as specified at bottom of form.

Interim Evaluation

- Interim evaluations should be performed as follows:
 1. At phase transitions
 2. When project management changes occur
 3. Provide consultant with constructive feedback in order to correct poor performance
 4. Annually if none of the other conditions occur Distribute as specified at the bottom of the form.
- Distribute as specified at the bottom of the form.

Subconsultant Evaluation

- For sub-consultants with significant project participation (more than \$100,000) an evaluation is recommended. Ensure coordination and review with the prime consultant prior to distribution.
- Performance evaluation ratings include a reflection of sub-consultants used by the prime consultant.
- Distribute as specified at the bottom of the form,including prime consultant and sub-consultant.

Why

- Meaningful evaluations provide consultants with constructive feedback to improve performance and meet WSDOT expectations. Scores from these evaluations factor into "Past Performance" ratings, which are used to help determine selection of future consultants. In addition, poor ratings may lead to being disqualified to perform WSDOT work and elimination from pre-qualification status.



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

Performance Rating Scale (From Average Score Below)

<u> </u> S Superior	<u> </u> AR Above Std.	<u> </u> MR Meets Std.	<u> </u> BR Below Std.	<u> </u> P Poor
----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------------

Standard Criteria	Comments (Justify Above & Below Ratings)	Rating
1. Negotiations Cooperative and responsive Adhered to WSDOT guidelines on fee. Met negotiation schedule. Open and honest communications. Willingness to negotiate in good faith		
2. Cost / Budget Finished within agreed budget, including all supplements Appropriate level of effort (Cost commensurate with work) Reasonable direct, non-salary expenses (Approx. xx% -yy%)		
3. Schedule Complete within agreement schedule including supplements. Achieved schedule (Including all supplements). Prompt response to review comments Adapted to changes by WSDOT Notified WSDOT early regarding schedule issues		
4. Technical Quality Work products meet WSDOT design policy & standards Performed appropriate quality control and assurance Responds to review comments in subsequent submission Pursued innovative design solutions Delivered "compatible" electronic files Implemented principles of practical design		

<p>5. Communications Clear and concise communication (Oral, written, drawings). Demonstrates an understanding of oral and written instructions Communicated at intervals appropriate for continual progress</p>		
<p>6. Management Provided creative cost control measures Submitted appropriate, periodic, accurate progress reports Accurate and timely invoicing Conducted meetings efficiently Limited the number of consultant-initiated contract modifications / supplements Collaborated effectively with WSDOT Responsive Managed subconsultants effectively</p>		
<p>7. Other Criteria (As agreed)</p>		
<p>Overall Rating</p>		

<p>Rated By (Project Manager Name and Title)</p>	<p>Project Manager Signature</p>	<p>Date</p>
<p>Rated By (Area Consultant Liaison Name and Title)</p>	<p>Area Consultant Liaison Signature</p>	<p>Date</p>
<p>Executive Review (Name and Title)</p>	<p>Executive Signature</p>	<p>Date</p>