The University of Illinois (“University”) undertakes, both in funding and management, capital projects at each of its three campuses. The University often determines that specific construction projects may benefit from the utilization of certain professional and artistic services. This policy sets forth the process and procedures related to securing these services.

PROFESSIONAL AND ARTISTIC SERVICES SELECTION

The selection of professional and artistic services shall be undertaken in accordance with the Illinois Procurement Code, 30 ILCS 500 Procurement of Professional & Artistic Services, The Joint Committee on Administrative Rules section 4.2035 (Competitive Selection procedures for Professional and Artistic Services), and section 3005(g) Construction and Construction and Construction Related Professional Services.

The process is a multi-step selection process to receive submissions to determine the best qualified proposers followed by discussions based on the criteria set forth in the solicitation to ultimately negotiate a contract to perform the required services. Refer to Professional and Artistic Services RFP Reference Documents for pertinent forms.

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 and Real Estate Services (“UOCP&RES”) shall have a representative on the Committee for projects that require approval by the Board of Trustees (“Board”). 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) is 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 Administrative Services 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 designee.

**B. Develop Selection Criteria.** Specific qualifications-based criteria shall be developed by the Committee Chair and reviewed by the Committee for each project. At a minimum, criteria shall include the evaluation of the firm’s plan for performing the required services, evaluation of the firm’s past performance of similar work, evaluation of the firm’s ability to perform the services as reflected by technical training and education, general experience, specific experience in providing the required services and the qualifications and abilities of personnel proposed to be assigned to perform the services, and evaluation of the firm’s personnel, equipment, and facilities to perform the services currently available or demonstrated to be made available at the time of contracting.

Additional criteria shall directly relate to the proposed scope of services and as allowed under the Act and Regulations. To demonstrate relevant experience, firms submitting for the project shall include examples of deliverables they have provided for previous projects that show the typical standard of professional care they produce for their clients. Submittals should also include examples of previous deliverables they produced during the construction phase of similar projects. Examples may include but are not limited to: schedule analysis during construction, progress meeting minutes, copies of monthly reports, daily progress reports, cash flow reports, and procurement logs. The document submittals should provide a good indication of attention to detail that these firms have typically given on previous projects.

1. On CDB managed projects, all University recommended firms and their subconsultants shall be pre-qualified as required by CDB prior to the CDB’s selection approval consideration.

2. The Business Enterprise for Minorities, Woman 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 Business Enterprise Program (BEP) Certified Vendors that are certified by the Illinois Commission on Equity and Inclusion. BEP certified vendors include a team’s Minority Business Enterprise (MBE), Woman Business Enterprise (WBE) or Persons with Disabilities Enterprise (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 BEP participation goals, the firm must be certified by 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.
3. 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.

4. Initial selection criteria must be the same as the criteria listed in the advertised request 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, more than one most qualified firm considered as best meeting the selection criteria for the project. For projects that require the approval of the Board or 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. When project-specific selection criteria have been identified, an advertisement for a RFP for professional services shall be prepared by the CCU and forwarded to UOCP&RES for posting on the Illinois Procurement Bulletin/Public Institutions of Higher Education web site.

   Advertisement Policy and Requirements:

   1. The advertisement shall be posted for a minimum of 15 days.

   2. The advertisement shall state the initial evaluation criteria, the discussion meeting evaluation criteria, and give information regarding the submittal and selection process. The criteria are to be listed in priority order.

   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. Proposals shall include pricing proposals in a separate envelope.

   6. Proposals shall be opened publicly.

   7. If a request must be re-advertised, canceled or modified, contact UOCP&RES.

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.
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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 the submittals meeting the minimum qualifications requested in the advertisement. Pricing proposals shall not be reviewed until after ranking the best qualified proposers after the discussion meetings. 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’s discussing a recommendation. The Committee is expected to arrive at a consensus for a list of more than one firm. If consensus cannot be reached, a majority vote shall decide. There may be circumstances where it is appropriate for a 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. 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 a discussion meeting 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 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.**

B. **Develop Discussion Meeting Questions.** The Committee shall review the list of questions or topics relevant to the project listed in the advertisement. A sample discussion meeting evaluation form is attached. The questions or topics developed by the Committee and listed in the advertisement are to be asked at the meeting and submit those to the team prior to the meeting.

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

The questions or topics used to evaluate the firms selected for a discussion meeting are to be listed in priority order. The Committee shall assign point values for each question, topic or criteria prior to the discussion meetings. A minimum value for each criteria shall be 100 points.

D. **Meet With Initially Selected Firms.** If the Committee meets with the initially selected firms, the meeting agenda and the process shall be uniform in an effort to conduct fair
and equal evaluations. If a team wishes to make changes to 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 at the meeting.

E. **Recommend and Rank Firms.** After the discussion meeting, 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 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 majority rating of the firms including strengths or weakness of the top 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)

1. After the firms are ranked and approved, the Committee Chair shall open the sealed price proposals and tabulate. If the low price is submitted by the best qualified vendor, the award may be made to the vendor. If the price of the best qualified vendor is not the lowest, but it does not exceed $100,000, the SPO may award to that vendor. If the price of the best qualified vendor exceeds $100,000, the SPO must state why a vendor other than the low priced vendor was selected and that determination shall be published in the Bulletin.

2. The Committee Chair shall negotiate a scope of services consistent with the advertisement for professional 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 firms, the procurement shall be cancelled, and the process may be restarted beginning with re-advertising for services.

B. Professional Service 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 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.

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 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 Professional and Artistic Services Selections 
policy, shall be formally evaluated per the PSC Evaluation Process

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 firm at different phases in the project.

Optional Evaluations: (Use Consultant Evaluation Optional form)
• 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 
evaluations and responses are exempt from the Freedom of Information Act. Any 
requests for information on firm’s 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 Professional and Artistic Services Selections, the 
CCU 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 COP or SPO (The e mail from UOCP&RES stating that 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. Copies of the Professional Services Consultant’s evaluations. (VSA)

E. Review. The UOCP&RES will produce a semi-annual review of Professional and Artistic Services Selections at each campus.