

University of Illinois
Architecture, Engineering, Land Surveying
QUALIFICATIONS BASED SELECTION POLICY

The professional services selection process is governed by the State of Illinois Architectural, Engineering, and Land Surveying Qualifications Based Selection (QBS) Act. This Act requires state agencies to publicly announce all requirements for architectural, engineering, and land-surveying services, to procure these services on the basis of demonstrated competence and qualifications, to negotiate contracts at fair and reasonable prices, evaluate the performance of firms, and authorize the Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulation (IDFPR) to enforce the provisions of this Act. To view this Act or any of the forms and documents referenced in this policy, please go to the University Office of Capital Programs & Real Estate Services (UOCP&RES) website page, https://www.uocpres.uillinois.edu/policies/for_design_professionals or https://www.uocpres.uillinois.edu/contracts_forms/for_design_professionals, respectively.

***Modification:** Neither this policy nor its process may be modified without the prior written approval of the University Office of Capital Programs & Real Estate Services (UOCP&RES).*

Process Selection as Follows:

I. EVALUATION COMMITTEE AND CRITERIA

A. Identify Evaluation Committee. The Professional Services Evaluation Committee (“Committee”) shall be comprised of three to eight individuals and will include, at a minimum, representatives of the Campus Construction Unit (“CCU”) and a representative for the client. The Committee shall be chaired by a representative of the CCU. The University Office of Capital Programs & Real Estate Services (UOCP&RES) and the Office of Procurement Diversity (OPD) shall each be represented on the Committee for projects that require approval by the Board of Trustees (BOT). UOCP&RES may have a representative on the Committee for projects that require the approval of the Assistant Vice President – Capital Programs and Utility Services (AVP) at the discretion of the AVP. UOCP&RES may have a representative on the Committee for other projects at the discretion of the AVP. Depending on the nature of the project, a representative of the Physical Plant may also be included on the Committee. Each Committee member shall receive one vote. For Master Plan projects, the Committee shall be chaired by a representative of UOCP&RES. A sample checklist for the Committee Chair is attached.

1. The Vice Chancellor for Administration at UIC, the Executive Director of Facilities and Services at Urbana, or the Associate Chancellor of Administrative Affairs at UIS shall approve all representatives to serve on the Committee. Committee members must attend all Committee meetings to vote. Changes to the Committee shall be approved by the CCU.

2. *For CDB managed projects, the Committee Chair shall offer CDB representation on the Committee.*

3. *Questions from vendors shall be answered by the Committee Chair or the designee.*

B. Develop Selection Criteria. Specific qualifications-based criteria shall be developed for each project. The criteria may include the firm's familiarity with building type, the experience of assigned individuals, the size of the organization, its ability to perform the work in a timely fashion, and any other project-specific criteria deemed appropriate and allowed under the Act and Regulations (e.g. the prior experience of the proposed project staff with similar projects).

1. *All prime professional service consultants must be pre-qualified with the CDB at the time of their submittal of statement of qualifications. The firms on the team that are not responsible for contract documents are not required to be licensed in the State of Illinois, such as specialty design firms and programming firms.*

2. *On CDB managed projects, all University recommended firms and their subconsultants shall be pre-qualified by CDB prior to the CDB's selection approval consideration.*

3. *The Business Enterprise for Minorities, Females and Persons with Disabilities Act (30 ILCS 575 et. Seq.) allows selection criteria for the initial evaluation to include a criterion to give points for a team's Minority Business Enterprise (MBE), Women Business Enterprise (WBE), and/or Business Owned by A Person with A Disability (PBE) status. Points should be awarded based on the level of MBE/WBE/PBE participation of the consultant and their subconsultants combined. To receive points for MBE/WBE/PBE participation, the firm must be certified by Illinois Commission on Equity and Inclusion (CEI). MBE/WBE/PBE points may be filled out based on the initial evaluation table prior to the initial evaluation form being distributed to the selection Committee.*

4. *A selection criterion shall be included that gives points to a firm with Veteran Owned Small Business (VOSB) or Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business (SDVOB) status as certified by CEI.*

5. *Initial evaluation criteria must be the same as the criteria listed in the advertisement for professional services.*

C. Committee Charge. The Committee shall perform the tasks as described in the policy and submit to the appropriate CCU, a preliminary ranking of, in order of qualification, the top three firms considered as best meeting the selection criteria for the project. For projects that require the approval of the Board or the approval of the AVP, the final ranking and selection will be made by the AVP after consultation with the Committee. The AVP must provide a written explanation to be maintained in the project file if the recommendation of the Committee is not followed.

II. INITIAL EVALUATION OF FIRMS

- A. Advertisement.** After project-specific initial evaluation criteria have been identified, an advertisement for professional services shall be prepared by the CCU and forwarded to the University Office for Capital Programs & Real Estate Services (UOCP&RES) for posting on the Illinois Procurement Bulletin/Public Institutions of Higher Education web site.

Advertisement Policies and Requirements:

- 1. The advertisement shall be posted for a minimum of 15 days.*
- 2. The advertisement shall state the initial evaluation criteria and give information regarding the submittal and selection process.*
- 3. All advertisements shall be prepared on the Public Notice of Construction Related Professional Services form via Upside Contract system. (see attached sample)*
- 4. Project approval must be current prior to submitting advertisement request.*
- 5. If a request must be re-advertised, canceled or modified, UOCP&RES shall be contacted.*

- B. Submittal Of Statements Of Qualifications.** Firms shall submit statements of qualifications as prescribed in the advertisement. The official submittal is the electronic copy submitted in PRZM. *If PRZM does not receive the submittals properly, the Committee Chair must notify the AITS Help Desk to correct the problem.*

- C. Review Of Submittals.** The Committee Chair or a delegate shall determine which submittals meet the minimum qualifications requested in the advertisement. The Committee shall review all submittals which meet the minimum qualifications requested in the advertisement. A sample Initial Evaluation-Minimum Qualifications for evaluating submittals is attached.

Committee Chair shall review the Professional Services Consultant's (PSC) prior performance evaluation records for the past 3 years of any submitted firm that has had prior experience with the University. Committee Chair should check the Vendor Evaluation Module within the Vendor Services Application (VSA) for the stored performance evaluations. If a past substantial completion performance evaluation indicates an average composite score less than 3, the firm must be disqualified.

- D. Verify Board of Elections Registration of Prime Firm.** Committee Chair shall verify that all submitted firms are currently registered with the Board of Elections by checking the on-line registry. Any firm that is not registered must be disqualified.

E. Initial Evaluation. Prior to reviewing submittals, each selection committee member shall complete the Procurement Participation Form located in the PSC Selection Process (PSP). If any member is unwilling or unable to complete this Agreement, that committee member shall be removed from the selection committee by the committee chair in PSP and PRZM. After completion of the Procurement Participation Form, each member of the Committee acting independently shall rank the firms on the Initial Evaluation form via PSP. Estimates of costs or proposals in terms of dollars, hours required, percentage of construction cost or any other measure of compensation shall not be considered. Composite scoring is required to be completed **prior** to the Committee discussing a recommendation. The Committee is expected to arrive at a consensus for a list of three to five firms (“initially selected”). If consensus cannot be reached, a majority vote shall decide. There may be circumstances where it is appropriate for the Committee to recommend more or fewer firms.

F. Reference Phone Calls. After consultation with the Committee regarding issues and concerns, the Committee Chair must make reference calls on all initially selected firms. The same questions must be asked of each selected firm. The results of the reference calls shall be recorded by the Committee Chair and made available to all members of the Committee for their use. If a reference call results in information that may influence the Committee’s decision to initially select a firm, the Committee Chair shall call another meeting to discuss. If the Committee decides to invite another firm to the discussion meeting, the Committee shall invite the firm ranked next highest in the initial evaluation.

III. INITIAL SELECTION RECOMMENDATION

A. Determination Of Need To Hold Discussion Meetings. The Committee shall determine if it is in the best interest of the University to have discussion meetings with the initially selected firms. If the Committee determines that a discussion meeting is in the best interest of the University, the Committee must meet with all initially selected firms.

Reasons for not meeting with the initially selected firms must be set forth in writing and may include that a particular firm is obviously best qualified for a specific project. If the Committee determines a discussion meeting is unnecessary, they will conclude their evaluation responsibilities for the project by ranking the top three firms in priority order and filing a written executive summary of their recommendation.

1. The Committee’s recommendation for initially selected firms shall be submitted electronically for approval by the appropriate CCU on the Approval Form for Firms to Be Invited to Discussion Meeting along with the Initial Evaluation forms and the Composite Evaluation form. For projects that must be approved by the Board or the AVP, the Campus’s recommendation shall be sent electronically to the AVP for evaluation and for a final decision using the Approval Form for Firms to Be Invited to Discussion Meeting form (see attached sample). If the CCU or AVP does not follow the recommendation of the Committee, a written explanation must be provided.

2. *If an out-of-state firm is recommended by the Committee to be initially selected, the recommendation shall be approved by the AVP before the initial selection process is declared complete and prior to any firms being notified.*
3. *Firms ranked without discussion meetings shall be approved by the AVP prior to proceeding with recommendation using the Sample Letter for Discussion Meeting Waiver.*
4. *On Capital Development Board (CDB) managed projects, three or more firms for projects with fees anticipated to be larger than \$300,000 must have a discussion meeting.*

B. Develop Discussion Meeting Questions. The Committee must consider the final selection criteria and the relative importance of each for the discussion meeting. A sample discussion meeting evaluation form is attached. The Committee must compile a list of questions or topics relevant to the project that are to be asked at the meeting and submit those to the team prior to the meeting.

C. Notify Firms Of Discussion Meeting. The firms to attend a discussion meeting are notified by the Committee Chair. The discussion meeting questions developed by the Committee shall be included in this notification along with the meeting time, place, and agenda, as well as other information that the Committee deems important using the Sample Letter for Selected Team for a Discussion Meeting form. The Committee Chair shall notify firms not selected for discussion meeting using the Sample Letter for the Team Not Selected for a Discussion Meeting.

D. Meet With Initially Selected Firms. If the Committee meets with the initially selected firms, the meeting agenda and process shall be uniform in an effort to conduct fair and equal evaluations. If a team wishes to make changes to the personnel or substitute a consultant from the information submitted, the firm must submit the request in writing to the Committee Chair 48 hours prior to a discussion meeting with an explanation why the change is necessary. The firm may be disqualified from consideration at the discretion of the Committee. A firm may, however, add a consultant to a team in addition to the consultants listed in the submittals at the discretion of the firm at any time and shall notify the Committee Chair upon doing so. Professional cost/fees shall not be discussed or requested.

E. Recommend And Rank Firms. After the discussion meetings, each Committee member must evaluate the firms based on the discussion meeting questions on the electronic Discussion Meeting Evaluation form. Individual evaluation scoring forms must be completed prior to the Committees discussion and ranking of the firms. Composite scoring is required to be completed **prior** to the Committee discussing a recommendation. The Committee shall conclude with ranking of the firms in priority order. The evaluation Committee shall strive for a consensus recommendation. In the absence of consensus, the Committee shall conduct a confidential vote in accordance with its own procedure, and determine a ranking by majority vote. The Committee Chair shall preside over all

deliberations, and shall have an equal voice and vote. The electronic Discussion Meeting Evaluation form shall also be used to provide a composite evaluation of all of the individual Committee members' evaluations.

The Committee Chair shall prepare a written executive summary electronically using the Approval Form to Negotiate with Recommended Professional Services Consultant From Discussion Meeting which lists all Committee members, and the results of the Committee as a whole or the majority rating of the firms including any strengths or weaknesses of the top three firms. Submittal will also include the Discussion Meeting Evaluation forms including the Composite Discussion Meeting Evaluation. The summary will also include the consultant and subconsultants' location, the MBE/WBE/PBE status and the VOSB/SDVOSB status of the consultant and subconsultants, and the estimated percentage of work for the consultant and subconsultants. Estimates of costs or proposals in terms of dollars, hours required, percentage of construction cost or any other measure of compensation may not be considered or included in the summary.

- F. Notify Firms.** The Committee Chair shall electronically forward the Approval Form to Negotiate with Recommended Professional Services Consultant From Discussion Meeting of the Committee's rankings for review and comment by the Vice Chancellor for Administration at UIC, the Executive Director of Facilities and Services at Urbana, or the Associate Chancellor of Administrative Affairs at UIS. Once the Campus has approved, the executive summary will be sent electronically to UOCP&RES for review by the AVP for projects that must be approved by the Board or approved by the AVP. After acceptance, the selected firm shall be notified by the Committee Chair using the Sample Letter for Firm Selected from Discussion Meeting. Firms not selected shall be notified that they were not chosen for further consideration using the Firms Not Selected from Discussion Meeting letter (see sample letter). If a firm requests comments on the discussion meeting, they shall be given by the Committee Chair.

IV.FINAL SELECTION APPROVAL

NOTE: If the project is a Capital Development Board (CDB) managed project, the University's Board of Trustees or their delegated designees need to approve the selection and forward it to CDB through UOCP&RES for final approval, fee negotiations, and contracting.

- A. University of Illinois Contract Negotiation** (if not a CDB managed project). The representative of the campus construction unit (or a representative of UOCP&RES for master plan projects) shall negotiate a scope of services, a list of deliverables, and a fee with the top ranked firm. If acceptable scope, deliverables, and fee cannot be negotiated, further negotiations with this firm shall be terminated. The second ranked firm shall be contacted and negotiations begin with that firm. This process shall be continued until a contract is successfully negotiated. If the Committee Chair is unable to negotiate a contract with any of the top three firms, the procurement shall be cancelled and the process may be restarted beginning with re-advertising for services.

The negotiated fee shall comply with the University's Scope and Fee Policy. (see https://www.uocpres.uillinois.edu/policies/for_design_professionals)

- B. Professional Services Approval Request.** The Committee Chair shall prepare and electronically circulate the Professional Services Approval Request Form. Should a Board item be required, the CCU shall prepare a draft Board item and forward to the UOCP&RES.

The Committee's recommendation will be submitted electronically for approval on the Professional Services Approval Request. The recommendation will be submitted electronically for evaluation and a final decision to the Vice Chancellor for Administration at UIC, the Executive Director of Facilities and Services at Urbana, or the Associate Chancellor of Administrative Affairs at UIS. For projects that must be approved by the Board or the AVP, the Campus's recommendation will be sent electronically to the AVP for evaluation and for a final decision.

1. *Once the Campus and the University approve the selection, a request for approval describing the reason for the proposed contract award decision will be made by the UOCP&RES to the State CPO or SPO. The State CPO or SPO may, as authorized in the Procurement Code, participate in the procurement prior to the request for approval.*

All professional services employment requiring Qualifications Based Selection shall be reported to UOCP&RES on the Required Procurement Posting Information form.

Pursuant to 30/ILCS 50-39, until the time of contract, communications between the campus construction units (and/or any other state employees involved in the discussions) and the firm shall be reported according to the requirements of the law.

- C. Performance Evaluation.** The CCU shall evaluate the performance of a PSC firm upon the completion of a contract.

All firms selected and contracted under the QBS Act, shall be formally evaluated per the PSC Evaluation Process.

Required Evaluations: (Use Consultant Evaluation Required form)

- *Standard¹ Contract:* at Substantial Completion
- *Conceptualization² Contract:* at the end of the contract.
- *Retainer Contract:* at the end of the contract, prior to renewal

Additional evaluations may be completed at the discretion of each Project Manager. The following listed evaluations are considered optional and are intended to be used as a tool to provide feedback to the PSC at different phases in the project.

Optional Evaluations: (Use Consultant Evaluation Optional form)

¹ Standard contracts are those that use the PSA standard form and the PSA short form.

² Conceptualization contracts include feasibility studies and master plans.

- *Standard Contract:* at the end of Preconstruction phase
- *Standard Contract:* at the end of each Design phase (SD, DD, and CD).
- *Standard Contract:* at the end of the Post-Construction phase

The results of the evaluation shall be given to the firm evaluated and each firm shall have an opportunity to respond in writing. All evaluations and responses from the firms shall be kept on file, and not made available to persons or firms outside the University. The QBS Act specifically exempts these evaluations and responses from the Freedom of Information Act. Any requests for information on PSC performance should be reviewed with Office of University Counsel.

An additional copy of the evaluation shall be stored electronically with access by designated people at all three campuses. The evaluations and PSC responses may be used in the PSC Selection Process for future projects. Information about the Professional Services Consultant Evaluation Summary and Electronic Storage Process is attached.

D. Project File Requirements. For all QBS Professional Services Consultant selection, the campus shall have a project file that contains:

1. A copy of the advertisement. (Upside Contract System)
2. All submitted booklets/letters of interest in response to the advertisement. (PRZM)
3. Initial Evaluation forms for each Committee member. (PSC Selection Process)
4. Initial Evaluation composite form. (PSC Selection Process)
5. Approval Form for Firms to Be Invited to Discussion Meeting. (PSC Selection Process)
6. Signed copies of the letters sent to the firms to be invited to discussion meeting and not to be invited to discussion meeting.
7. Discussion Meeting Evaluation forms for each Committee member. (PSC Selection Process)
8. Discussion Meeting Composite Evaluation form. (PSC Selection Process)
9. Approval Form to Negotiate with Recommended Professional Services Consultant From Discussion Meeting. (PSC Selection Process)
10. Signed copies of the letters sent to the firms not selected from the discussion meetings and the firm recommended to be selected.
11. Professional Services Approval Request form. (PSC Selection Process)
12. Signed approval form by the State's CPO or SPO. (The e-mail from UOCP&RES stating the PPB has waived the 30-day review period is acceptable since PPB will not review until the CPO or SPO approves.)
13. A copy of the posting for the award of the contract.
14. Professional Services Consultant's evaluations (VSA)

E. Reporting. The UOCP&RES will produce a semi-annual review of Qualifications Based Selections.

QBS Services Selection

COMMITTEE CHAIR CHECKLIST

| | TASK | Completion Date |
|-----|--|------------------------|
| 1. | Verify project approvals have been completed | |
| 2. | Form the Evaluation Committee with input from the planner/project manager | |
| 3. | Review program statement with client for verification (knowledge transfer). Share statement with selection committee (optional) | |
| 4. | Prepare Initial Evaluation Criteria with input from evaluation committee | |
| 5. | Determine Project Classification and Type with the planner/project manager based on the Scope and Fee Negotiation Policy | |
| 6. | Prepare PSC advertisement and file attachments (program) via Upside Contract Management System and submit to UOCP&RES for review and posting to IPHEC website | |
| 7. | Within PRZM: Create project (required for electronic PSC submittals to be uploaded); Complete AE Solicitation worksheet; After the solicitation is closed, add the committee members to the team management | |
| 8. | Enter any additional evaluation criteria that were listed on the advertisement via PSP | |
| 9. | Prescreen submittals received to verify minimum qualifications are met via PSP | |
| 10. | Check BOE on-line registry for all submitted firms | |
| 11. | Check prior performance evaluations on firms that have done work with the University of Illinois previously via VSA/CAPS | |
| 12. | Verify MBE, WBE, WMBE, PBE, and VOSB/SDVOSB certification, determine points based on policy (part of prescreening), and add the points to Initial Evaluation Minimum Qualifications prior to sending it to committee via PSP | |
| | | |
| 13. | Each selection committee member shall complete the Procurement Participation Form located in the PSP. If any member is unwilling or unable to complete this Agreement, that committee member shall be removed from the selection committee by the committee chair in PSP and PRZM. | |
| 14. | Distribute PSC submittals along with Initial Evaluation Form for review prior to initial evaluation meeting. Individual initial evaluation form must be submitted via PSP | |
| 15. | Schedule Initial Evaluation meeting, compile composite scores via PSP, and facilitate a consensus for firms to be invited to a discussion meeting | |
| 16. | Develop questions for Discussion Meeting with committee members | |
| 17. | Check references for all firms to be invited | |
| 18. | Submit Approval Form for Firms to Be Invited to Discussion Meeting via PSP | |
| 19. | Notify selected firms and schedule meetings via phone and letter. Include Discussion Meeting Questions | |
| 20. | Notify unsuccessful firms via letter | |

QBS Services Selection

COMMITTEE CHAIR CHECKLIST

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 21. | Schedule final evaluation committee meeting (to be after discussion meeting) to decide a recommendation | |
| 22. | Enter Discussion Meeting questions and distribute Discussion Meeting Evaluation Form via PSP. Individual Discussion Meeting Evaluation Form must be submitted via PSP | |
| 23. | Act as chair during Discussion Meetings with introductions and brief overview of process | |
| 24. | Compile composite scores via PSP and facilitate final evaluation committee meeting to determine a recommendation in rank order | |
| 25. | Submit Approval Form to Negotiate with Recommended Professional Services Consultant from Discussion Meeting via PSP | |
| 26. | Notify successful firm of selection and request proposal | |
| 27. | Review proposal and determine fee range with campus unit | |
| 28. | Negotiate with approved firm (contract, scope, schedule and fee) | |
| 29. | Submit Professional Services Approval Request via PSP | |
| 30. | Send negotiated contract to PSC for signatures with letter indicating not to begin work until they receive a fully executed contract | |
| 31. | Prepare Board item for next meeting and approval (if applicable) | |
| 32. | Notify unsuccessful interviewed firms via letter | |
| 33. | Submit award to UOCP&RES for publishing to IPHEC website/submit to PPB | |
| 34. | Start contract routing for University signatures | |
| 35. | Issue fully executed agreement to PSC | |
| 36. | PSC starts work | |
| 37. | Negotiate potential contract Amendments | |
| 38. | Negotiate any contract disputes | |
| 39. | Perform performance evaluations as required | |

FOR CDB PROJECTS ONLY

University of Illinois at Campus

QBS #PSSproject number

Request for Professional Services Qualifications

(QBS): Project Title

First published month date, year

Project Description

The Capital Development Board and the University of Illinois are seeking professional services for the above referenced project.

Description of project/scope of work.

The Capital Development Board will hire the consulting team.

Please see the attached file(s) for more information.

Project Location:

Project Area: GSF:

Project Area: NASF:

Project Budget: \$

Construction Budget: \$

Project Fee Classification: Classification and Type

Links to related agreement, policies, statutory requirements, documents and software training can be found at: www.uocpres.uillinois.edu/architects/

A) Minimum Qualifications:

Only those firms which meet the following qualifications will be considered for selection:

1. Prequalified with the State of Illinois Capital Development Board. (Processing may take up to 30 days)
2. Registered to practice as a Professional Design Firm with the Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulation as applicable (At time of discussion meeting)
3. Professional staff licensed or registered to practice as an Architect, Engineer, or Landscape Architect in the State of Illinois.
4. Certifications & Statutory Requirements and Financial Disclosures & Conflicts of Interest
5. Registered with the State Board of Elections at time of proposal as required by 30 ILCS 500/20-160
6. For a prime firm that has prior experience with the University of Illinois, a minimum average score of 3 on performance evaluations over the last three years.

B) Professional Services Consultant Submittal:

To be considered for selection, firms shall submit the following items as shown in section order:

SECTION 1:

- A letter of interest with brief statements addressing each of the evaluation criteria.

SECTION 2:

- Completed sections from the CDB SF 255 that contain the following information:
 - Name, address, telephone number of prime firm
 - Contact person from prime firm and e-mail address
 - Approximate distance from prime firm to project site
 - Percentage of work to be performed by prime firm
 - Percentage of work to be performed by each subconsultant, role each subconsultant will play in the project and if the prime firm has worked with the subconsultant previously
 - CMS certified status MBE/WBE/PBE/VOSB/SDVOSB of prime firm and each subconsultant
 - Total number of professionals to be assigned to this project

SECTION 3:

- Relevant project experience on completed projects within the last seven (7) years, limited to eight (8) projects for the prime firm and four (4) for each subconsultant

SECTION 4:

- A list of team personnel with each team member's name, project assignment, associated firm, individual professional license(s) or certification(s) and confirmation if licensed or certified in Illinois
- Individual resumes for each team member

SECTION 5:

- MBE/WBE/WMBE/PBE/VOSB/SDVOSB information for professional services consultant and subconsultant(s). Only firms certified with the Illinois Department of Central Management Services (CMS) are acceptable. A current and valid print version of the vendor's CMS Business Enterprise Program (BEP) Vendor Directory results is the printed proof of the CMS certification for each identified MBE/WBE/WMBE/PBE/VOSB/SDVOSB vendor. This document includes the vendor name, address, ethnicity, county, contact information, and certification renewal date and expiration date. Certification must be current and valid at the time of proposal.

The IL CMS BEP Vendor Directories can be found at

<https://cms.diversitycompliance.com/>

SECTION 6:

- A copy of the prime firm's CDB prequalification letter.

SECTION 7:

- Completed and signed Certifications and Statutory Requirements form.
- Completed and signed Financial Disclosures and Conflicts of Interest form(s).

Note: In lieu of submitting these forms in each proposal and in PRZM, the proposer may submit a single, completed and signed copy of the forms in a sealed envelope with the required hard copies of the proposal to the contact person listed in this advertisement.

C) Submittal Information:

1. Qualifications and supporting materials will be accepted at the address below

until 4:00 PM, prevailing time on
Weekday, Month Date, Year:

Unit
Unit Address

City, State, Zip Code

Attention: Responsible individual, e-mail address, and phone number

2. Firms shall submit number (#) packets, organized and tabbed as indicated above, in hard copy format to the address noted above.
3. The electronic copy of the packet, organized and tabbed as indicated above, shall be submitted in pdf format, using the URL <https://przm.apps.uillinois.edu/przm/ocpweb.nsf/projectsuiuc> to complete and submit the information. **The electronic copy shall be submitted using the web at the URL listed and will not be accepted via email.**

****NOTE TO CAMPUSES - PLEASE NOTE THAT THE URL address needs to be changed to reflect if the project is a UIUC, UIS, or UIC project and then delete this box. (ie:**

<https://przm.apps.uillinois.edu/przm/ocpweb.nsf/projectsuiuc>

<https://przm.apps.uillinois.edu/przm/ocpweb.nsf/projectsuic>

<https://przm.apps.uillinois.edu/przm/ocpweb.nsf/projectsuis>

4. The electronic submittal is the official submittal of record. Firms shall be disqualified if an electronic submittal is not received. Firms shall notify contact person above of any technical problems PRIOR to the time/date the submittal is due.

D) Agreement and Statutory Compliance:

Compliance with all statutory certifications and provisions is required. Statutory certifications and provisions include but are not limited to:

1. Vendors must register with the State of Illinois's Board of Elections as required by 30 ILCS 500/20-160. Vendors must be registered at the time of Proposal.
2. All vendors are required to comply with applicable provisions of the Illinois Procurement Code (30 ILCS 500/1 et seq.).
3. Vendor must register with the Secretary of State of Illinois and be in "Good Standing" where "Good Standing" is defined as having complied with all obligations of the State of Illinois to conduct business within the State, the vendor's registration with the Secretary of State is current and "Active", and the vendor is not subject to any form of sanction, suspension, or disciplinary censure by the State. "Active" status MUST be in place at the time of contract.

E) Computer System Requirements:

1. Utilization of AutoCAD compatible system.

F) Evaluation Criteria

Selection will be consistent with the Architectural, Engineering, and Land Surveying Qualifications Based Selection Act (30 ILCS 535/1). The following project-related criteria will be used to evaluate the firms requesting consideration for selection:

1. Confirmation of commitment of firm, proposed staff and consultants to perform this work.
2. Prior experience of the proposed project staff in the design and construction of similar projects.
3. Expertise and success in construction cost estimating.
4. MBE/WBE/PBE participation of Professional Service Consultant(s) and subconsultants with a goal of 20% of the total value of the professional services agreement, including but not limited to, basic services, supplemental services and reimbursables. Illinois Department of Central Management Services (CMS) Business Enterprise Program certification is the basis for determination of diversity status. Utilization of WMBE certified vendors must designate full participation as either a MBE or WBE when split goals are identified for purposes of meeting diversity goals. WMBE value may not be

split between MBE and WBE.

5. VOSB/SDVOSB participation of Professional Service Consultant and subconsultants with a goal of 3% of the total value of the professional services agreement, including but not limited to, basic services, supplemental services and reimbursables. Illinois Department of Central Management Services (CMS) Veteran Business Program certification is the basis for determination of VOSB/SDVOSB status.
6. Additional criteria to be determined by individual campus.

G) Presentation Process at Discussion Meeting

Vendor(s) may be requested to present their responses to pre-distributed questions or topics for discussion relevant to the project. Questions or topics for discussion will be sent to the vendor(s) when the vendor is notified of the discussion meeting.

The University of Illinois encourages diversity among its vendors, including the participation of firms and consultants owned by minorities, females and persons with disabilities. The University strives to meet voluntary contract goals established in the Business Enterprise for Minorities, Females, and Persons with Disabilities Act (30 ILCS 575 et seq.) as well as subsequent adoption by the Business Enterprise Council. The University reserves the right to set separate contract goals on specific prime contracts with subcontracting possibilities based on the type of work or services or subcontractor availability.

Projected percentage of work for Consultant and Subconsultants stated in the CDB SF 255 form will be the expected minimum percentage goal(s) utilized in final executed contract documents should the firm be selected.

For additional information on Processes, Policies and Tools for Professional Services Consultants contracting with the University of Illinois, see www.uocpres.uillinois.edu/architects/

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the agreement or policies, please call the contact person listed prior to the submittal due date.

PROTEST REVIEW OFFICE: Vendors may send a written protest to the Chief Procurement Office following the requirements of the Higher Education Standard Procurement Rules. (44 Ill. Adm. Code 4.5550)

For protests related to the solicitation, including specifications, the Protest Review Officer must receive the protest no later than 14 days after the solicitation or related addendum was posted to the Bulletin.

For protests related to awards or rejection of individual responses, the protest must be received by close of business no later than 14 days after the protesting party knows or should have known of the facts giving rise to the protest, or posting to the Bulletin, whichever is earlier.

Protests must be sent to:

Chief Procurement Office
Attn: Protest Review Office
401 S. Spring Street
Suite 515 Stratton Office Building
Springfield, IL 62706
Email: eec.legalstaff@illinois.gov
Facsimile: (217) 558-1399
Illinois Relay: (800) 526-0844

The preferred method for receipt of protests is electronic via email. If sent electronically, protests do not need to be sent via regular postal mail.

Highlighted areas in gray on the electronic boilerplate are for input by the Campus Construction Units.

Boilerplate approved as of 01/23; any changes to boilerplate language must be pre-approved by the University Office of Capital Programs and Real Estate Services.

Consultant Selection Procedure Update
CEI BEP/VBP Certification Initial Selection Points
 January 2023

The following tables for awarding points will be used for the two possible respondent scenarios:

Both MBE/WBE/PBE & VOSB/SDVOSB Participation Goals Met (Table 1) and Either MBE/WBE/PBE or VOSB/SDVOSB Participation Goals are NOT Met (Table 2)

TABLE 1 – Both MBE/WBE/PBE (30%) & VOSB/SDVOSB (3%) Participation Goals Met

Point Allocation for Initial Evaluation for MBE/WBE/PBE & VOSB/SDVOSB Participation

| No. of Individual QBS Criteria | Total MBE/WBE/PBE & VOSB/SDVOSB % Participation in QBS Submittal | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|-------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| | 0% | 1-16% | 17-32% | 33-49% | 50-66% | 67-100% |
| 4 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 5 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 7 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 9 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 10 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 11 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 12 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 13 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 14 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 15 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 16 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 8 | 9 | 10 |

Assumptions/Guidelines

- 1) Members of teams identified as a MBE/WBE/PBE or VOSB/SDVOSB must have CEI BEP certification to be considered a MBE/WBE/PBE or VOSB/SDVOSB at the time of submittal.
- 2) The participation expressed as a voluntary goal is to be obtained from the State of Illinois CDB 330 form from the subject QBS submittal.
- 3) Each individual QBS criteria has a maximum value of 10 points; criteria shall not be weighted.

TABLE 2 – Either MBE/WBE/PBE (30%) or VOSB/SDVOSB (3%) Participation Goals NOT Met

Point Allocation for Initial Evaluation for MBE/WBE/PBE & VOSB/SDVOSB Participation

| No. of Individual QBS Criteria | Total MBE/WBE/PBE & VOSB/SDVOSB % Participation in QBS Submittal | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|-------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| | 0% | 1-16% | 17-32% | 33-49% | 50-66% | 67-100% |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 8 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 9 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 10 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 11 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 12 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 13 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 14 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 15 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 16 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 |

Assumptions/Guidelines

- 1) Members of teams identified as a MBE/WBE/PBE or VOSB/SDVOSB must have CEI BEP certification to be considered a MBE/WBE/PBE or VOSB/SDVOSB at the time of submittal.
- 2) The participation expressed as a voluntary goal is to be obtained from the State of Illinois CDB 330 form from the subject QBS submittal.
- 3) Each individual QBS criteria has a maximum value of 10 points; criteria shall not be weighted.

Initial Evaluation - Minimum Qualifications

PROJECT NAME

Project Number: AXXXXX

Date: 09/02/2020

| Firms | PSC1 | PSC2 | PSC3 | PSC4 | PSC5 | PSC6 |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1. Prequalified with the State of Illinois Capital Development Board. Copy of CDB prequalification letter included? (Prime Only) | -- v |
| 2. Registered to practice as a Professional Design Firm with the Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulation as applicable (At time of discussion meeting) | -- v |
| 3. Professional staff licensed or registered to practice as an Architect, Engineer, or Landscape Architect in the State of Illinois. | -- v |
| 4. Certifications and Statutory Requirements and Financial Disclosures and Conflicts of Interest. | -- v |
| 5. Registered with the State Board of Elections at time of proposal as required by 30 ILCS 500/20-160. | -- v |
| 6. For a prime firm that has prior experience with the University of Illinois, a minimum average score of 3 on performance evaluations over the last three years. | -- v |

Approval Form For Firms To Be Invited To Discussion Meeting (Interview)

PROJECT NAME

Project Number: AXXXXX
 Date: 09/02/2020
 Retainer Selection: No
 Committee Chair: CPM Training
 Committee Members: CLI Training; ONM Training

FIRMS RECOMMENDED FOR INVITATION

| Firms | Subconsultants | Services Provided | CMS Diversity | % | Primary Firm has an office in Illinois |
|-------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|----|--|
| PSC1 | | | --- | 0% | --- |
| PSC2 | | | --- | 0% | --- |
| PSC3 | | | --- | 0% | --- |
| PSC4 | | | --- | 0% | --- |
| --- | | | --- | 0% | --- |
| --- | | | --- | 0% | --- |
| --- | | | --- | 0% | --- |
| --- | | | --- | 0% | --- |
| --- | | | --- | 0% | --- |
| --- | | | --- | 0% | --- |

| Firms | CMS Diversity Percentages |
|-------|---------------------------|
| PSC1 | |
| PSC2 | |
| PSC3 | |
| PSC4 | |
| --- | |
| --- | |

[Update Total](#)

Reference Calls Complete?:

Recommendation Supported By Documentation:

ATTACHMENTS

Attach File: No file selected.

Current Attachments:

APPROVAL SECTION

Senior Associate Vice President for Business and Finance approval required?: No

Committee Chair:

INITIAL EVALUATION - INDIVIDUAL

[CLI Training](#)
[CPM Training](#)
[ONM Training](#)

INITIAL EVALUATION - COMPOSITE

[CPM Training](#)

COMMENTS

Comments:

SAMPLE LETTER FOR DISCUSSION MEETING WAIVER

DATE

Mr. Mike Bass
Senior Associate Vice President of Business
and Finance & Deputy Comptroller
Suite 340 Illini Union Bookstore MC-309

Re: PROJECT

Dear Mr. Bass,

In accordance with the provisions within the *University of Illinois, Capital Professional Services Qualifications-Based Selection Policy*, a waiver of the discussion meetings is possible for the following reasons:

- A. Familiarity by the campus construction unit of the short listed firms.
- B. One of the short listed firms is obviously most qualified for a specific project.
- C. Qualifications, workload distribution and BEP certified vendor criteria position this firm to be at the highest ranking.

The evaluation committee has met on the above referenced project and makes the following recommendations in ranking order:

1. [FIRM NAME]
2. [FIRM NAME]
3. [FIRM NAME]

The committee feels that [FIRM NAME] meets criteria [LETTER DESIGNATION FROM ABOVE] as specified in the policy. The evaluation committee's evaluation finds [JUSTIFICATION].

Accordingly, your approval is requested to accept [FIRM NAME, CITY, STATE] as the recommended consultant without discussion meeting.

Sincerely,

Campus Construction Unit Director

SAMPLE LETTER – SELECTED TEAM FOR DISCUSSION MEETING

DATE

CONTACT
FIRM
ADDRESS

RE: Project

Dear MR./MS.:

Your team has been selected by the University to attend a discussion meeting for the professional architectural and engineering services required for this unique project.

A standard scope of services for the architect/engineer will be developed by the University for this project and will form the basis of the fee proposal.

Enclosed is the anticipated scope of the project. If there are other issues or aspects of the project that you feel should be included, we will be prepared to discuss those during the meeting.

In considering teams to be employed for this project, prior experience in the design and construction of similar projects, particularly the firm experience in developing feasibility studies for similar facilities is critical. Excellence in the architectural design of renovating existing facilities, including those demonstrating historical considerations is essential. A commitment to the project from a principal within the firm, and an organization of sufficient capacity to undertake such a project to meet the schedule developed by the University is also essential.

A meeting regarding this project has been scheduled at the UIC,UIUC,UIS campus in ROOM # of the BUILDING,DATE. Your meeting will begin at TIME.

The process will take approximately one hour and the focus of the meeting will be the responses to the questions prepared by the selection committee and given to the consultant. Key members of the team should be present at the meeting (e.g., principal-in-charge, project manager). The methodology and anticipated schedule for the project will also be discussed.

The agenda for the meeting is suggested to be as follows:

- Introduction and opening remarks University of Illinois (5 minutes)
- Consultant's responses to the prepared questions (45 minutes)
- Closing remarks by consultant (5 minutes)
- Closing remarks by University of Illinois (5 minutes)

The evaluation committee is comprised of individuals who will be involved during the entire course of the project and are as follows:

INSERT EVALUATION COMMITTEE

At the completion of the meetings, the committee will evaluate each firm based upon specific criteria that will assist in selecting an architect/engineer for this project. At that time, the firm selected will be requested to submit a fee proposal for the professionals services desired based on the negotiated scope of services agreed upon.

Should you wish to obtain any drawings or tour the **SITE** prior to your meeting please contact **CONTACT NAME AND PHONE**.

Pre Meeting and Site Visit ***(Optional) DATE, TIME, PLACE.***

By responding to the advertisement, the firm is assumed to comply with all statutory certifications and provisions and to accept the standard terms and conditions of the University of Illinois' standard Professional Services Agreement, Errors and Omissions Policy and Scope and Fee Negotiation Policy.

We look forward to meeting with your firm to discuss this project. If you have any questions or wish to discuss this project further, please call this office.

Sincerely,

Name
Chairperson of Evaluation Committee

c: Evaluation Committee

**SAMPLE LETTER – NOT SELECTED TEAM TO ATTEND A
DISCUSSION MEETING**

DATE

FIRM
ADDRESS

RE: PROJECT TITLE

Dear Mr. :

While the committee was impressed with your qualifications, your firm was not one of the firms recommended to be interviewed.

We thank you and the members of your firm for the time spent putting together the brochure that you provided us.

Thank you for your interest in the University of Illinois.

Sincerely,

Name
Chairperson Evaluation Committee

Copies: Evaluation Team

Discussion Meeting (Interview) Evaluation - Individual

Project Name

Project Number: AXXXXX
 Date: 07/15/2015
 Evaluator: CPM Training

| Firms | PSC1 | | PSC2 | | PSC3 | |
|-----------------------------------|------|----------|------|----------|------|----------|
| Subconsultants | | | | | | |
| Questions | # | Comments | # | Comments | # | Comments |
| 1. Discussion meeting Questions 1 | 0 ▾ | | 0 ▾ | | 0 ▾ | |
| 2. Discussion meeting Questions 2 | 0 ▾ | | 0 ▾ | | 0 ▾ | |
| 3. Discussion meeting Questions 3 | 0 ▾ | | 0 ▾ | | 0 ▾ | |
| Total | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |

RANK

1st:2nd:3rd:

COMMENTS

Comments (optional)

STATUS

Status: Pending
 Complete

Save Cancel

PROJECT NAME

Project Number: AXXXXX
 Date: 09/02/2020
 Retainer Selection: No
 Committee Chair: CPM Training
 Committee Members: CLI Training; ONM Training

BASED ON DISCUSSION MEETING (INTERVIEW) EVALUATION COMPOSITE

| Committee Final Recommendation in Priority Order | Preliminary Ranking Order | Preliminary Raw Composite Score |
|--|---------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1st: PSC1 | 1st: PSC1 | 1st: PSC1 |
| 2nd: PSC2 | 2nd: PSC2 | 2nd: PSC2 |
| 3rd: PSC3 | 3rd: PSC3 | 3rd: PSC3 |
| 4th: PSC4 | 4th: PSC4 | 4th: PSC4 |

Recommended Firm:

Recommendation Supported By Documentation: No

Reason For Recommendation Comments:

| Firms | Subconsultants | Services Provided | CMS Diversity | % | Primary Firm has an office in Illinois |
|-------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|------|--|
| PSC1 | | | No | 100% | Yes |
| PSC2 | | | WBE | 100% | Yes |
| PSC3 | | | MBE | 100% | Yes |
| PSC4 | | | PBE | 100% | Yes |

| Firms | CMS Diversity Percentages |
|-------|---------------------------|
| PSC1 | |
| PSC2 | Total: 100% - WBE: 100% |
| PSC3 | Total: 100% - MBE: 100% |
| PSC4 | Total: 100% - PBE: 100% |

ATTACHMENTS

Attach File: No file selected.

Current Attachments:

APPROVAL SECTION

Senior Associate Vice President for Business and Finance approval required?: No
 Committee Chair:

| INITIAL EVALUATION INDIVIDUAL | INITIAL EVALUATION COMPOSITE | DISCUSSION MEETING (INTERVIEW) EVALUATION INDIVIDUAL | DISCUSSION MEETING (INTERVIEW) EVALUATION COMPOSITE |
|--|------------------------------|--|---|
| CLI Training CPM Training ONM Training | CPM Training | CPM Training ONM Training CLI Training | CPM Training |

COMMENTS

Comments (optional):

SAMPLE LETTER FOR FIRM SELECTED FROM DISCUSSION MEETING

Date

CONTACT PERSON

FIRM NAME

FIRM ADDRESS

RE: PROJECT NAME

Dear Mr./Mrs. NAME,

The evaluation committee for the PROJECT TITLE has recommended to the Board of Trustees that your firm be employed for PROJECT TITLE.

The committee was impressed with your firm's qualifications and your firm best met all of the specific criteria developed by the University. We look forward to working with your firm on this project.

Should you have any questions, please call.

Sincerely,

NAME

Chairperson of the Evaluation Committee

C: Evaluation Committee

**SAMPLE LETTER FOR FIRMS NOT SELECTED FROM
DISCUSSION MEETING**

DATE

FIRM
ADDRESS

RE: PROJECT TITLE

Dear Mr./Ms:

The evaluation committee for the PROJECT TITLE has recommended that the University of Illinois Board of Trustees be requested to employ FIRM SELECTED for the PROJECT TITLE. While the committee was impressed with your qualifications, the firm selected met all of the specific criteria developed by the University.

Thank you and the members of your firm for the time spent with the evaluation committee and in preparing for the discussion meeting.

Thank you for your interest in the University of Illinois.

Sincerely,

NAME
Chairperson of the Evaluation Committee

C: Evaluation Committee

Professional Services Approval Request

Project Name

Project Number: **AXXXXX**
 Date: **07/15/2015**
 Firm: **PSC1**
 Firm Address:
 Firm City:
 Firm State:
 Firm Zip Code:

Estimated Construction Budget From
 FCPWeb:

PHASES INCLUDED ON PSA

| | | Basic Service Fee |
|------------------------------|--------|-------------------|
| Programs Definition: | \$0.00 | |
| Conceptual: | \$0.00 | |
| Schematic Design: | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Design Development: | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Construction Documents: | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Bid: | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Construction: | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| On-site Observation: | \$0.00 | |
| Warranty: | \$0.00 | |
| Reimbursables: | \$0.00 | |
| Interiors: | \$0.00 | |
| Others: | \$0.00 | |
| Total: | | |
| Base Fee Compensation Range: | | |

Basic Services Fee Is Within Range Of The University's Scope/Fee Policy?

Reason:

ATTACHMENTS

Attach File:

Current Attachments:

APPROVAL SECTION

Senior Associate Vice President for Business and Finance approval required?:
 Board of Trustees approval required?:
 Committee Chair:

COMMENTS

Comments (optional):

Document History

REQUIRED PROCUREMENT POSTING INFORMATION

EXAMPLE

PROJECT NAME

NOTICE OF CONTRACT FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

Notice is hereby given of a professional services agreement between the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois and **Professional Services Consultant's name, City, State** for the **project name (Project #)** in the amount of \$.

Other firms considered:

List Firms by Name and City, State

NOTE:

To be submitted along with this form for posting to the Illinois Higher Education Procurement Bulletin:

- Form A or Form B
- Attachment C from PSA (or dates)

**University of Illinois
PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CONSULTANTS (PSC) EVALUATION
CONSTRUCTION PHASE (Completed at the end of Substantial Completion)**

Project Name:
Project Location:
Evaluator Name:

Date:
UI Project #:
CDB Project #:
Firm Name:
Key Team Members:

| QUANTITATIVE MEASUREMENTS: | | |
|---|--|--------------|
| 1 | Original Total Construction Contract Amount: | |
| 2 | Number of Change Orders Issued: | |
| 3 | Total Dollar Value of Change Orders (CO): | |
| 4 | Percentage of CO to Total Contract Amount: | #DIV/0! |
| 5 | Total Dollar Value of CO's with justification code of PSC Error: | |
| 6 | Total Dollar Value of CO's with justification code of PSC Omissions: | |
| 7 | Policy Limit for total errors and omissions (3% of total original contract amount): | \$0 |
| 8 | Policy limit for Omissions (30% of total omissions): | \$0 |
| 9 | Total PSC Responsibility (negative number indicates none): | \$0 |
| SCORING LEGEND: | | |
| (5) Excellent; (4) Good; (3) Satisfactory; (2) Less than Satisfactory; (1) Unacceptable; (0) Not applicable | | |
| QUALITATIVE MEASUREMENTS: ("To what level...") | | Score |
| TECHNOLOGY (the impact of these items on construction): | | |
| 10 | was a field investigation completed in a thorough fashion to minimize unknowns during construction? | |
| 11 | were the construction documents complete, coordinated with all disciplines and constructible? (quality of the documents) | |
| 12 | were the number of RFI's and Change Orders consistent with the project scope and complexity? | |
| 13 | did the document issued for construction clearly define the scope of work for each contractor/assigned subcontractor? | |
| CONSTRUCTION ADMINISTRATION/OBSERVATION: | | |
| 14 | did the PSC provide a timely response to construction documentation, i.e. Requests for Information (RFI's), Request for Proposal/Change Orders (RFP's/CO's), etc.? | |
| 15 | did the PSC provide and accurately review construction documentation, i.e. Requests for Information (RFI's), Request for Proposal/Change Orders (RFP's/CO's), etc. prior to approval? | |
| 16 | did the PSC provide timely documentation of meetings and decisions? | |
| 17 | did the PSC complete submittal review in a timely manner? | |
| 18 | did the PSC review the contractor's pay requests and supporting documentation in a timely manner? | |
| 19 | did the PSC issue site inspection reports in the time frame established by contract? | |
| 20 | did the PSC work to resolve conflict in a timely manner? | |
| 21 | did the PSC provide a complete punch list? | |
| 22 | did the PSC follow-through with all closeout requirements for the project? | |
| PROJECT TEAM: | | |
| 23 | did the PSC use the same personnel on the project that were submitted on the State of Illinois CDB 330 form? If not, was the change communicated to and accepted by the Owner and beneficial to the project? | |
| 24 | did the PSC and consultants communicate and coordinate with the contractors? | |
| 25 | did the PSC and consultants communicate and coordinate with each other? | |

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|------------|
| 26 | did the PSC communicate effectively with the Owner? | |
| TOTAL SCORE: | | 0 |
| AVERAGE SCORE: | | 0.0 |

| | |
|----|---|
| 27 | COMMENTS: (Required for scores of less than 3) |
| | |

| |
|-------------------------|
| RECOMMENDATIONS: |
|-------------------------|

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 28 | Would you recommend contracting with this PSC for future projects? | |
| (Y) Yes; (N) No; (C) Conditional, would use PSC again but with limitations listed below | | |

| | |
|----|---------------------|
| 29 | LIMITATIONS: |
| | |

**University of Illinois
PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CONSULTANTS (PSC) EVALUATION
CONCEPTUALIZATION (Feasibility, Master Plans, etc.) PHASE**

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| Project Name: | | Date: | |
| Project Location: | | UI Project #: | |
| Evaluator Name: | | CDB Project #: | |
| | | Firm Name: | |
| | | Key Team Members: | |

| QUANTITATIVE MEASUREMENTS: | | |
|---|---|--------------|
| 1 | Completion date per PSA Attachment C or as amended: | |
| 2 | Actual completion date: | |
| 3 | Schedule Variance (Planned minus Actual in days) | 0 |
| SCORING LEGEND: (5) Excellent; (4) Good; (3) Satisfactory; (2) Less than Satisfactory; (1) Unacceptable; (0) Not applicable | | |
| QUALITATIVE MEASUREMENTS: ("To what level...") | | Score |
| 4 | did the PSC develop a detailed program that identified spaces, primary users, required adjacencies, site requirements, etc.? | |
| 5 | did the PSC identify special requirements related to code, historical issues, site constraints, environmental issues, etc.? | |
| 6 | was a field investigation completed in a thorough fashion? | |
| 7 | was the existing building and systems analyzed with regards to reuse? | |
| 8 | did the aesthetics of the design concepts meet the program requirements and Owner expectations? | |
| 9 | did the functionality of the design concepts meet the program requirements and Owner expectations? | |
| 10 | did the PSC propose concepts for site and building that met University design guidelines? | |
| 11 | did the PSC propose concepts for site and building that agreed with the campus master plan? | |
| 12 | did the PSC communicate effectively with the Owner? | |
| TOTAL SCORE: | | 0 |
| AVERAGE SCORE: | | 0.0 |
| 13 | COMMENTS: (Required for scores of less than 3) | |
| | | |
| RECOMMENDATIONS: | | |
| 14 | Would you recommend contracting with this PSC for future projects? (Y) Yes; (N) No; (C) Conditional, would use PSC again but with limitations listed below | |
| 15 | LIMITATIONS: | |
| | | |

**University of Illinois
PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CONSULTANTS (PSC) EVALUATION
RETAINER CONTRACT
(Completed at the end of the retainer contract)**

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------|--|
| Project Name: | | Date: | |
| Project Location: | | UI Project #: | |
| | | CDB Project #: | |
| Evaluator Name: | | Firm Name: | |
| | | Key Team Members | |

SCORING LEGEND:

(5) Excellent; (4) Good; (3) Satisfactory; (2) Less than Satisfactory; (1) Unacceptable; (0) Not applicable

| QUALITATIVE MEASUREMENTS: ("To what level...") | | Score |
|---|---|--------------|
| DESIGN/TECHNOLOGY: | | |
| 1 | were all applicable codes and UI guidelines typically followed? | |
| 2 | were field investigations typically completed in a thorough fashion to minimize unknowns during construction? | |
| 3 | were comments and revisions from the University typically incorporated into the design in a timely manner? | |
| 4 | did the constructed project aesthetics typically meet the expectations of the University and client group? | |
| 5 | did the constructed project functionality typically meet the expectations of the University and client group? | |
| 6 | were the construction documents typically complete, coordinated with all disciplines and constructible? (quality of the documents) | |
| 7 | were the number of Addenda, RFI's and Change Orders typically consistent with the project scope and complexity? | |
| SCHEDULE/BUDGET: | | |
| 8 | were the scheduled due dates typically met by the PSC? | |
| 9 | did the PSC issue timely construction documentation, i.e., Addenda, response to Requests for Information (RFI's), Request for Proposal/Change Orders (RFP's/CO's), etc.? | |
| 10 | did the PSC verify that the projects were being constructed to meet the construction documents and provide feedback on any deviations? | |
| 11 | did the PSC work to resolve conflict in a timely manner? | |
| 12 | did the PSC follow-through with all closeout requirements for the projects? | |
| PROJECT TEAM: | | |
| 13 | did the PSC use the same personnel and consultants on the projects that were submitted on the State of Illinois CDB 330 form? If not, was the change communicated to the Owner and beneficial to the project? | |
| 14 | did the PSC and consultants communicate and coordinate with the each other? | |
| 15 | did the PSC and consultants communicate and coordinate with the contractors? | |
| 16 | did the PSC communicate effectively with the Owner? | |
| 17 | when questions or problems were encountered, did the PSC respond proactively? | |
| TOTAL SCORE: | | 0 |
| AVERAGE SCORE: | | 0.0 |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| 18 | COMMENTS: (Required for scores of less than 3) | |
| | | |
| RECOMMENDATIONS: | | |
| | | |
| 19 | Would you recommend contracting with this PSC for future projects? | |
| (Y) Yes; (N) No; (C) Conditional, would use PSC again but with limitations listed below: | | |
| 20 | LIMITATIONS: | |
| | | |

Summary of PSC Evaluations

PSC Name:

PSC Location:

Print Date: 9/9/2020 10:28

| Phase/Contract Type | Average Score* |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Pre-Construction | 0.0 |
| Construction | 0.0 |
| Conceptualization | 0.0 |
| Retainer | 0.0 |
| Schematic Design | 0.0 |
| Design Development | 0.0 |
| Construction Documents | 0.0 |
| Post Construction | 0.0 |
| Total Average | 0.0 |

* Scoring system of 1 to 5 with 5 being the highest score available.

(5) Excellent; (4) Good; (3) Satisfactory; (2) Less than Satisfactory; (1) Unacceptable; (0) Not applicable

University of Illinois
PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CONSULTANTS (PSC) EVALUATION
PRECONSTRUCTION PHASE (Completed at the end of Bidding and Award Phase) (optional)

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| Project Name: | | Date: | |
| Project Location: | | UI Project #: | |
| | | CDB Project #: | |
| Evaluator Name: | | Firm Name: | |
| | | Key Team Members: | |

| QUANTITATIVE MEASUREMENTS: | | |
|---|--|------------|
| 1 | Issue for Bid date per PSA Attachment C or as amended: | |
| 2 | Actual Issue for Bid date: | |
| 3 | Schedule Variance (Planned minus Actual in days) | 0 |
| 4 | Budget for Construction: | |
| 5 | Final PSC Construction Cost Estimate (Base Bid): | |
| 6 | Budget Cost Variance (Budget minus PSC Cost Estimate): | \$0 |
| 7 | Final PSC Construction Cost Estimate (Base Bid + Accepted Alternates): | |
| 8 | Construction Award Amount: | |
| 9 | Cost Variance (PSC Cost Estimate minus Actual): | \$0 |
| SCORING LEGEND: (5) Excellent; (4) Good; (3) Satisfactory; (2) Less than Satisfactory; (1) Unacceptable; (0) Not applicable | | |
| QUALITATIVE MEASUREMENTS: ("To what level...") | | |
| DESIGN/TECHNOLOGY: | | |
| 10 | did the aesthetics of the design meet the program requirements provided by the University? | |
| 11 | did the functionality of the design meet the program requirements provided by the University? | |
| 12 | did the PSC complete the documentation required for sustainable/energy efficient design accurately? (i.e. energy analysis, LEED documentation) | |
| 13 | were all applicable laws and code requirements incorporated into the design? | |
| 14 | was a field investigation completed in a thorough fashion to minimize unknowns during design? | |
| 15 | were the University standards and guidelines followed? | |
| 16 | were comments and revisions from the University incorporated into the design? | |
| 17 | were the design submittals complete? | |
| SCHEDULE: | | |
| 18 | did the design submittals meet the scheduled due dates in PSA Attachment C or as amended? | |
| 19 | did the PSC issue required addenda in a timely manner? | |
| PROJECT TEAM: | | |
| 20 | did the PSC use the same key personnel on the project that were submitted on the State of Illinois CDB 330 form? If not, was the change communicated to and accepted by the Owner and beneficial to the project? | |
| 21 | did the PSC and consultants communicate and coordinate effectively? | |
| 22 | did the PSC communicate effectively with the Owner? | |
| 23 | when questions or problems were encountered, did the PSC respond proactively? | |
| TOTAL SCORE: | | 0 |
| AVERAGE SCORE: | | 0.0 |

| | |
|--|--|
| 24 | COMMENTS: (Required for scores of less than 3) |
| | |
| | |
| 25 | Would you recommend contracting with this PSC for future projects? |
| | Y |
| (Y) Yes; (N) No; (C) Conditional, would use PSC again but with limitations listed below: | |
| 26 | LIMITATIONS: |
| | |

University of Illinois
PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CONSULTANTS (PSC) EVALUATION
DESIGN PHASE (OPTIONAL)
(Completed at the end of Phase Indicated)

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-----------------------|--|
| Project Name: | | Date: | |
| Project Location: | | UI Project #: | |
| | | CDB Project #: | |
| Evaluator Name: | | Firm Name: | |
| | | Team Members: | |

| QUANTITATIVE MEASUREMENTS: | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|-----|
| 1 | Issue for SD Review date per PSA Attachment C or as amended: | |
| 2 | Actual Issue for SD Review date: | |
| 3 | SD Schedule Variance (Planned minus Actual in days) | 0 |
| 4 | SD PSC Cost Estimate: | |
| 5 | Owner Budget for Construction: | |
| 6 | SD Cost Variance (Budget minus PSC Estimate): | \$0 |
| 7 | Issue for DD Review date per PSA Attachment C or as amended: | |
| 8 | Actual Issue for DD Review date: | |
| 9 | DD Schedule Variance (Planned minus Actual in days) | 0 |
| 10 | DD PSC Cost Estimate: | |
| 11 | Owner Budget for Construction: | |
| 12 | DD Cost Variance (Budget minus PSC Estimate): | \$0 |
| 13 | Issue for 95% CD Review date per PSA Attachment C or as amended: | |
| 14 | Actual Issue for 95% CD Review date: | |
| 15 | CD Schedule Variance (Planned minus Actual in days) | 0 |
| 16 | CD PSC Cost Estimate: | |
| 17 | Owner Budget for Construction: | |
| 18 | CD Cost Variance (Budget minus PSC Estimate): | \$0 |

SCORING LEGEND:
(5) Excellent; (4) Good; (3) Satisfactory; (2) Less than Satisfactory; (1) Unacceptable; (0) Not applicable

| QUALITATIVE MEASUREMENTS: ("To what level...") | | Score | | |
|---|--|--------------|----|----|
| DESIGN/TECHNOLOGY: | | SD | DD | CD |
| 19 | did the aesthetics of the design meet the program requirements provided by the University? | | | |
| 20 | did the functionality of the design meet the program requirements provided by the University? | | | |
| 21 | did the PSC complete the documentation required for sustainable/energy efficient design accurately? (i.e. energy analysis, LEED documentation) | | | |
| 22 | were all applicable laws and code requirements incorporated into the design? | | | |
| 23 | was a field investigation completed in a thorough fashion to minimize unknowns during design? | | | |
| 24 | were the University standards and guidelines followed? | | | |
| 25 | were comments and revisions from the University incorporated into the design? | | | |
| 26 | were the design submittals complete? | | | |

| SCHEDULE/BUDGET: | | | | |
|---|--|------------|------------|------------|
| 27 | did the design submittals meet the scheduled due dates in PSA Attachment C or as amended? | | | |
| 28 | were the PSC cost estimates aligned with the available budget? | | | |
| 29 | did the PSC issue required addenda in a timely manner? | | | |
| PROJECT TEAM: | | | | |
| 30 | did the PSC use the same key personnel on the project that were submitted on the State of Illinois CDB 330 form? If not, was the change communicated to and accepted by the Owner and beneficial to the project? | | | |
| 31 | did the PSC and consultants communicate and coordinate effectively? | | | |
| 32 | did the PSC communicate effectively with the Owner? | | | |
| TOTAL SCORE: | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| AVERAGE SCORE: | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 33 COMMENTS: (Required for scores of less than 3) | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 34 Would you recommend contracting with this PSC for future projects? (Y) Yes; (N) No; (C) Conditional, would use PSC again but with limitations listed below | | | | |
| 35 LIMITATIONS: | | | | |
| | | | | |

**University of Illinois
PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CONSULTANTS (PSC) EVALUATION
POST CONSTRUCTION PHASE (Optional)**

Project Name:
Project Location:

Evaluator Name:

Date:
UI Project #:
CDB Project #:
Firm Name:
Key Team
Members:

SCORING LEGEND:

(5) Excellent; (4) Good; (3) Satisfactory; (2) Less than Satisfactory; (1) Unacceptable; (0) Not applicable

| QUALITATIVE MEASUREMENTS: ("To what level...") | | Score |
|---|---|--------------|
| 1 | did the PSC help resolve problems during the post construction phase in a timely manner? | |
| 2 | did the PSC verify completion of punch list items by Contractors? | |
| 3 | did the PSC complete documentation as required in PSA for warranty issues in a timely manner? | |
| 4 | did the PSC communicate effectively with the Owner? | |
| 5 | did the PSC communicate effectively with the Contractor? | |
| TOTAL SCORE: | | 0 |
| AVERAGE SCORE: | | 0.0 |

| | |
|----------|---|
| 6 | COMMENTS: (Required for scores of less than 3) |
| | |

RECOMMENDATIONS:

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| 7 | Would you recommend contracting with this PSC for future projects? | |
| (Y) Yes; (N) No; (C) Conditional, would use PSC again but with limitations listed below: | | |

| | |
|----------|---------------------|
| 8 | LIMITATIONS: |
| | |

PSC Evaluations – Electronic Storage Process

1. PSC Evaluation Storage
 - a. The Vendor Evaluation Module within the Vendor Services Application is the repository for all vendor evaluations.
2. Completed PSC Evaluations (by Campus Units):
 - a. Print or save the completed evaluation to pdf format. The naming convention is [ProjectNumber]-[#].pdf. The # will start at 1 and increase as additional evaluations or responses are added to the folder.
 - b. If printed, the evaluation will need to be scanned to create an electronic version.
 - c. Input the summary evaluation data into the Vendor Evaluation Module and attach the completed evaluation form.
3. Responses from PSC firms.
 - a. If a response from the PSC is received, the original is filed in the project file and a copy is scanned and filed electronically with the evaluations for that project. The file naming convention is [ProjectNumber]-[#]R.pdf. The number should match the evaluation that the PSC is responding to and the R is to indicate that this is a response from the PSC.
 - b. Responses may be uploaded into the Vendor Evaluation Module for the applicable evaluation.