

## **University of Illinois**

### **PROFESSIONAL and ARTISTIC SERVICES REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS SELECTION POLICY Including Construction Management Services and Landscape Architecture Services**

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.*

- 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.

Professional and Artistic Services Selection

**COMMITTEE CHAIR CHECKLIST**

|     | <b>TASK</b>   | <b>Completion Date</b> |
|-----|---|------------------------|
| 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 and Discussion Meeting Questions with input from evaluation committee   |                        |
| 5.  | Determine Project Classification and Type with the planner/project manager based on the Scope and Fee Negotiation Policy (if applicable)  |                        |
| 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.  | Publically open submittals (except price) as stated in the advertisement  |                        |
| 9.  | Enter any additional evaluation criteria and discussion meeting questions that were listed on the advertisement via PSP   |                        |
| 10. | Prescreen submittals received to verify minimum qualifications are met via PSP  |                        |
| 11. | Check BOE on-line registry for all submitted firms  |                        |
| 12. | Check prior performance evaluations on firms that have done work with the University of Illinois previously via VSA/CAPS  |                        |
| 13. | 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  |                        |
| 14. | Check prior performance evaluations on firms that have done work with the University of Illinois previously via VSA/CAPS  |                        |
| 15. | Each selection committee member shall complete the Confidentiality Agreement 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. |                        |
| 16. | Distribute PSC submittals along with Initial Evaluation Form for review prior to initial evaluation meeting. Individual initial evaluation form must be submitted via PSP   |                        |
| 17. | Schedule Initial Evaluation meeting, compile composite scores via PSP, and facilitate a consensus for firms to be invited to a discussion meeting   |                        |
| 18. | Confirm discussion meeting questions that were listed on the advertisement with committee members   |                        |
| 19. | Check references for all firms to be invited  |                        |
| 20. | Submit Approval Form for Firms to Be Invited to Discussion Meeting via PSP  |                        |

Professional and Artistic Services Selection

**COMMITTEE CHAIR CHECKLIST**

|     |   |  |
|-----|---|--|
| 21. | Notify selected firms and schedule meetings via phone and letter. Include Discussion Meeting Questions  |  |
| 22. | Notify unsuccessful firms via letter  |  |
| 23. | Schedule final evaluation committee meeting (to be after discussion meeting) to decide a recommendation   |  |
| 24. | Enter Discussion Meeting questions and distribute Discussion Meeting Evaluation Form via PSP. Individual Discussion Meeting Evaluation Form must be submitted via PSP   |  |
| 25. | Act as chair during Discussion Meetings with introductions and brief overview of process  |  |
| 26. | Compile composite scores via PSP and facilitate final evaluation committee meeting to determine a recommendation in rank order  |  |
| 27. | Open, tabulate, and upload the sealed pricing proposals to Approval Form to Negotiate with Recommended Professional Services Consultant from Discussion Meeting via PSP |  |
| 28. | Submit Approval Form to Negotiate with Recommended Professional Services Consultant from Discussion Meeting via PSP   |  |
| 29. | Notify successful firm of selection and request proposal  |  |
| 30. | Review proposal and determine fee range with campus unit (If Applicable)  |  |
| 31. | Negotiate with approved firm (contract, scope, schedule and fee)  |  |
| 32. | Submit Professional Services Approval Request via PSP; justify if lowest fee was not submitted by selected firm and notify UOCP&RES                                     |  |
| 33. | Send negotiated contract to PSC for signatures with letter indicating not to begin work until they receive a fully executed contract.                                   |  |
| 34. | Prepare Board item for next meeting and approval (if applicable)  |  |
| 35. | Notify unsuccessful interviewed firms via letter  |  |
| 36. | Submit award to UOCP&RES for publishing to IPHEC website/submit to PPB  |  |
| 37. | Start contract routing for University signatures  |  |
| 38. | Issue fully executed agreement to PSC   |  |
| 39. | PSC starts work   |  |
| 40. | Negotiate potential contract Amendments   |  |
| 41. | Negotiate any contract disputes   |  |
| 42. | Perform performance evaluations as required   |  |

**Request for Proposal: **Project Name****

**Consultant Profession ("Consultant") Selection**

**First published: **Date****

Sealed proposals will be accepted at the address below until 4:00 PM prevailing time on:  
**DATE**

**Proposal**

The Proposal shall be submitted in separate parts clearly marked as follows:

**Part A: General Information (# copies)**

**Part B: Previous Project Experience (# copies)**

**Part C: Project Scope of Services and Organization (# copies)**

**Part D: Sealed Compensation Proposal (# copies)**

Send all proposals to:

The Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois

c/o **Unit**

**Street**

**City, State, Zip Code**

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

**Submission and Opening of Qualification Statement:**

Each firm will be required to submit their proposals by the deadline referenced above. Proposal parts A, B and C combined (# copies) submitted electronically within the Technical Response tab and separate Sealed Compensation Proposal Part D (# copies) submitted electronically within the Pricing for Electronic Submittal of Proposals tab. Immediately following the deadline date and time, all proposals will be publicly opened in **Room, Street Address, City, State, Zip code**. The electronically submitted Compensation Proposal Part D will be locked from viewing until after the selection committee ranks the best qualified proposers.

The electronic copy of the proposal (Parts A, B and C) shall be submitted in pdf format, using the following URL and within the Technical Response tab to complete and submit the information:

**Specific Campus PRZM URL address**

**The electronic copy shall be submitted using the web at the URL listed and will not be accepted via e-mail.** The electronic submittal is the official submittal of record. Firm 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. The electronic copy of Compensation Proposal Part D shall be submitted in pdf format using the same URL and within the Pricing for Electronic Submittal of Proposals tab.

**Description of Project:**

**Text (including a project schedule)**

**Project Location:**

**Note:** The project will be administered using the University's web-based project management system.

Minimum user requirements are as follows:

- Internet Browser
- Valid e-mail account
- Computer-Aided Drawing (CAD) viewer

### **Outline of Consultant Services:**

Consultant services required under this contract may include, but is not limited to, the following:

#### **Description of Services**

### **Minimum Qualifications:**

The University of Illinois encourages firms to submit proposals for providing Consultant services. Only those firms that meet the following qualifications will be considered for the short list discussion selection:

1. Prequalified with the State of Illinois Capital Development Board as applicable (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 (IDFPR) as applicable (At time of discussion meeting)
3. Professional staff licensed or registered to practice as an Architect, Engineer, or Land Surveyor in the State of Illinois
4. Form A or Form B Certifications and Disclosures is included with the submittal. Failure to submit either Form A or Form B Certifications and Disclosures will result in rejection of submittal. The Form A and Form B Certifications and Disclosures can be found at [https://www.uocpres.uillinois.edu/contracts\\_\\_\\_forms/for\\_design\\_professionals](https://www.uocpres.uillinois.edu/contracts___forms/for_design_professionals).
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 (3) years
7. 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.
8. Acceptance of the terms and conditions of the University of Illinois' provisions in:
  - Standard Professional Agreement
  - Errors and Omissions Policy
  - Scope and Fee Policy
9. All vendors are required to comply with applicable provisions of the Illinois Procurement Code (30 ILCS 500/1 et seq).

### **Evaluation Criteria:**

The following project-related criteria will be used to evaluate the firms requesting consideration for selection and is listed in order of importance:

1. MBE/WBE/WMBE/PBE participation of Consultant(s) and subconsultants with a goal of 30% of the total value of the professional services agreement, including but not limited to,

basic services, supplemental services and reimbursables. Illinois Commission on Equity and Inclusion (CEI) Business Enterprise Program certification is the basis for determination of diversity status. Utilization of WMBE certified vendors must designate full participation as either an MBE or WBE when split goals are identified for purposes of meeting diversity goals. WMBE value may not be split between MBE and WBE.

2. VOSB/SDVOSB participation of 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 Commission on Equity and Inclusion (CEI) Veteran Business Program certification is the basis for determination of VOSB/SDVOSB status. A firm cannot be designated as more than one business enterprise between criteria #1 and #2.

3. The plan for performing the required services

4. Ability to perform the services as reflected by the technical training and education, general experience, specific experience in providing the required services and abilities of personnel proposed to be assigned to perform the services

5. A record of past performance of similar work

6. The personnel, equipment, and facilities to perform the services currently available or demonstrated to be made available at the time of contracting

7. Other specific requirements as described by the Campus Construction Unit (CCU)

**The Proposal should be organized as follows:**

**Part A – General Information:**

Tab 1: Introduction letter

Tab 2: General description of firm, philosophy, accomplishments, value

Tab 3: General description of project understanding and challenges

Tab 4: Provide relevant project experience including complete project descriptions and Minority, Women, and Persons with Disabilities Business Enterprises (MBE/WBE/WMBE/PBE) and Veteran Owned Small Business Enterprise and Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business Enterprise (VOSB/SDVOSB) participation for comparable projects.

Tab 5: Client references (minimum of 3 required – including name, title, address, telephone number, related project and date, reference's participation in project)

Tab 6: Contractor references (minimum of 5 required – including name, title, address, telephone number, related project and date, reference's participation in project)

Tab 7: PSC (AE) references (minimum of 5 required – including name, title, address, telephone number, related project and date, reference's participation in project)

Tab 8: A Form A or Form B Certifications and Disclosures is included with the submittal. Failure to submit either Form A or Form B Certifications and Disclosures will result in rejection of submittal. The Form A and Form B Certifications and Disclosures can be found at [https://www.uocpres.uillinois.edu/contracts\\_\\_\\_forms/for\\_design\\_professionals](https://www.uocpres.uillinois.edu/contracts___forms/for_design_professionals). By submitting a signed proposal, the consultant also certifies compliance with the additional certifications below:

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.

University of Illinois Supplemental Certifications

a. Vendor is required under 30 ILCS 500/20-65 to maintain, for a period of three (3) years after the later of the date of completion of this Contract or the date of final payment under the Contract, all books and records relating to the performance of the Contract and necessary to support amounts charged to the Owner under the Contract. The Contract and all books and records related to the Contract shall be available for review and audit by the Owner and the Illinois Auditor General. If this Contract is funded from contract/grant funds provided by the U.S. Government, the Contract, books, and records shall be available for review and audit by the Comptroller General of the U.S. and/or the Inspector General of the federal sponsoring agency. The Vendor agrees to cooperate fully with any audit and to provide full access to all relevant materials. Failure to maintain the required books and records shall establish a presumption in favor of the Owner for the recovery of any funds paid by the Owner under this Contract for which adequate books and records are not available.

b. Vendor certifies that it has not retained a person or entity to attempt to influence the outcome of a procurement decision for compensation contingent in whole or in part upon the decision or procurement. Vendor further certifies that it has not and will not, pursuant to this subcontract or otherwise, bill or otherwise cause the State of Illinois to pay for any of the lobbyist's costs, fees, compensation, reimbursement or other remuneration (30 ILCS 500/50-38).

c. This applies only if procuring Owner receives Medicare or Medicaid funding. Vendor certifies that neither it nor any of its directors, officers, employees, agents or subvendors who may provide services pursuant to this Contract (collectively "Agents") is presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible or otherwise excluded from transactions with the U.S. Government or by any federal government agency. Vendor shall provide University immediate written notice if Vendor learns that this certification was erroneous when made or if Vendor or any of its Agents hereafter becomes debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible or otherwise excluded from transactions with the U.S. Government or by any Federal agency.

d. Vendor further certifies that neither it nor any of its Agents is presently subject to an investigation or proceeding to exclude it as a provider under Medicare or Medicaid or under any other federal or state health care program or under any third party insurance program, nor is currently excluded or debarred from submitting claims to Medicare or Medicaid or to any other federal or state health care program or to any third party insurer.

e. The following certification is applicable for professional services consultants and subconsultants only. Vendor shall comply with the Copeland "Anti Kickback" Act, as codified in 18 USC 874 (2010), and comply with the payment provisions and obligations detailed by the Office of the Secretary of Labor in 29 CFR, Part 3 (2010).

f. The following certification is applicable for professional services consultants and subvendors and this applies only if procuring Owner receives Medicare or Medicaid funding. Vendor agrees to make available, upon written request, to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, this contract and any books, documents and records necessary to verify the costs of services rendered under this agreement. Vendor further agrees to make said contract and any books, documents and necessary records available until the expiration of four years after the completion of the agreement. In the event Vendor subcontracts any and all of its duties under this contract to another party and said subcontract has a value or cost

of \$10,000 or more over a twelve (12) month period, Vendor agrees that the subcontract shall contain a clause requiring the subvendor to make available, upon written request, to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Comptroller General of the United States or any of their duly authorized representatives, the subcontract and any books, documents and records of the subvendor that are necessary to verify the nature of the costs under the subcontract. Vendor agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the Owner in the event that any of its Medicare reimbursement is denied or disallowed due to the failure of Vendor or any of its subvendors to comply with the requirements of this provision. Such indemnity shall include but not be limited to the amount of reimbursement denied or disallowed, plus any interest, penalties and fees.

g. The following certification is applicable for contractors and subcontractors only. Pursuant to the Prevailing Wage Act, Vendor shall pay a wage of no less than the general prevailing hourly rate as paid for work of a similar character in the locality in which the work is performed, to all laborers, workers and mechanics, pursuant to definitions, guidelines and procedures set forth in 820 ILCS 130/0.01 et. seq. (2010).

h. The vendor shall submit monthly to Owner a certified copy of the records required under section 130/5(a)(1) of the Act. The certified payroll shall include records of all laborers, mechanics, and other workers employed by the vendor, including assigned subcontractors, for services performed. The records shall include each worker's name, address, telephone number when available, social security number, classification or classifications, hourly wages paid in each pay period, number of hours worked each day, and the starting and ending times of each work day. The certified payroll shall be accompanied by a statement signed by the vendor and statements signed by each subcontractor where appropriate which aver that: (1) such records are true and accurate, (2) the hourly rate paid to each worker is not less than the general prevailing rate of hourly wages required under the Act; and (3) the vendor acknowledges that filing a certified payroll that he or she knows to be false is a Class B misdemeanor.

i. Pursuant to the Veterans Preference Act, Vendor shall give preference to veterans of the United States military and naval service in appointments and employment upon public works by, or for the use of, the State or its political subdivisions, pursuant to the guidelines in 330 ILCS 55/0.01 et. seq. (2010)

j. The following certification is applicable for contractors only. Affidavit to Maintain a Primary Place of Employment in Illinois. By his/her signature, the officer of Vendor signing these certifications makes the following affirmation on behalf of Vendor as required by 30 ILCS 500/30-22(8): If awarded a Contract, Vendor will maintain an Illinois office as the primary place of employment for persons employed in the construction authorized by the Contract throughout the term of the Contract.

**Tab 9: Provide copies from selected projects demonstrating the firm's typical practice of the following deliverables:**

- **Descriptions provided by Campus Construction Unit**

**Tab 10: MBE/WBE/WMBE/PBE/VOSB/SDVOSB information for Consultant and subconsultant(s).** Only firms certified with the Illinois Commission on Equity and Inclusion (CEI) are acceptable. A current and valid print version of the vendor's CEI Business Enterprise Program (BEP) Vendor Directory results is printed proof of the CEI 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 the proposal.

The IL CEI BEP Vendor Directories can be found at <https://ceibep.diversitysoftware.com/>

Tab 11: 5 year audited financial statement

Tab 12: Additional Information on all sub-consultants as appropriate.

## **Part B – Previous Project Experience:**

Firms shall submit descriptions of the last 3-5 facilities that most clearly match the scope of this project where the firm provided phase services.

Information should include the following:

- Project description
- Scope
- Unique characteristics
- Unique challenges
- Specific accomplishments
- Project location
- PSC firm, project manager, project designer
- Urban or suburban setting
- Site constraints
- Size/GSF/NSF
- Number of stories
- Schedules
  - Original
  - Actual
  - Schedule proposals should include activities from beginning to end of construction and include the following activities: Construction, Substantial Completion, Occupancy, and Final Completion.
- Project budget
- Construction budget
- Cost estimating
  - Cost/GSF @ original estimate
  - Cost/GSF @ time of bid
  - Cost/GSF @ final completion
- Cost of all changes
- Final construction cost
- Number of change orders
- Percentage of changes due to changes in project scope
- Construction delivery method (GC, CM, other)
- Number of requests for information (RFIs)
- Firm's project staff, including principal, project manager
- Firm's primary consultants (if any)
- Owner/Client contact information
- PSC contact information

In addition to the above project specific information, the firm shall include a description of the deliverables that the firm provides at the end of the following phase(s) of the project:

- List Phases

## **Part C: Project Scope of Services and Organization**

### **Section A:**

Tab 1: Project organization during each phase

Tab 2: Detailed description of Consultant services including CCU adds text. Process and proposal include all typical tasks such as CCU adds text to be executed in accordance with Illinois Procurement Law and University Policy.

### **Section B: Staffing**

Tab 1: Comprehensive staffing matrix. Matrix shall include the names of all planned staff and indicate project hours for each month through the duration of the project for each staff member. Include all subconsultant(s), MBE/WBE/WMBE/PBE firm(s), and VOSB/SDVOSB certified by the Illinois Commission on Equity and Inclusion (CEI) Business Enterprise Program (BEP) and define the degree of work to which they will be used. Include a print version of MBE/WBE/WMBE/PBE vendor's and VOSB vendor's CEI BEP Vendor Directory results.

NOTE: MBE/WBE/WMBE/PBE goals and VOSB/SDVOSB goals are separate and distinct from workforce projections. The MBE/WBE/WMBE/PBE goal for this proposal is 30% of the Consultant's contract value. Provide in this tab MBE/WBE/WMBE/PBE participation as a % of total price, NOT the \$ value. The VOSB/SDVOSB goal for this proposal is 3% of the Consultant's contract value. Provide in this tab VOSB/SDVOSB participation as a % of total price, NOT the \$ value.

Tab 2: Resumes of staff that will be actively involved in the project-by-project phase including relevant project experience.

### **Section C: Consultant Agreement**

Tab 1: Firm shall evaluate the proposed Consultant Agreement accompanying this RFP in Attachment A and specifically respond to the University regarding acceptance of the proposed Agreement. Firm shall indicate any sections that Firm cannot accept as written with justification.

## **Part D - The Sealed Compensation Proposal should be organized as follows:**

Note: The sealed compensation proposal shall be clearly identified and submitted within the Pricing for Electronic Submittal of Proposals tab and not mentioned anywhere else in the proposal package.

Tab 1: Staffing Matrix – Using the staffing matrix submitted in Part C above, assign the respective rates and indicate the total extended cost for each assigned individual.

Tab 2: Prepare a matrix indicating Consultant monthly total cost over the project duration that will be incurred. Include specific values of MBE/WBE/WMBE/PBE and VOSB/SDVOSB subconsultant's participation by month and for total project.

Tab 3: Compensation Proposal Summary – Itemize the total project compensation using the Fees Proposal Template shown in Attachment B. **Construction Manager shall provide Builders Risk insurance for this project.**

## **Proposals review process for Parts A, B, C and D:**

Using the evaluation criteria stated in this RFP, the University will review and rank the qualifications of the firms who submit and render a decision regarding which Consulting firms

(more than 1) will move to a discussion phase. After discussions are completed, pricing proposals from all initial proposers will be opened and tabulated. Pricing negotiations will begin with the highest ranked firm(s) from discussions to ultimately award a single contract.

Proposers should note this RFP will be an expedited process and the selected firms that will move on to the discussion phase will be allowed approximately 10 days to respond and be prepared for more detailed discussions.

The University may determine that the discussion phase is not necessary and select based on the initial evaluation.

**Discussion process:**

Firms may be requested to participate in a discussion meeting.

Firms that are selected to move to the discussion phase will be evaluated based on the following criteria listed in order of importance:

1. Response to questions shown in Attachment C. (If any additional questions are added to the questions shown in Attachment C based on proposal review, the revised questions will be sent to the vendor prior to the discussion meeting.)
2. Consultant's interaction with each other and the University.
3. Quality and content of discussion.

These discussion evaluation criteria will be used to score each selected firm to determine final rankings. Subsequent contract negotiations between the highest ranked firm and the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois will be undertaken to ultimately reach an executed contract.

**Post-Performance Review:**

After final completion of services, but before final payment, the University will conduct a post-performance review of the Consultant services provided and this review will be made part of the procurement file.

**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 will be the expected minimum percentage goal(s) utilized in final executed contract documents should the firm be selected.**

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](mailto: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.

Boilerplate approved as of 01/2022; any changes to boilerplate language must be pre-approved by the University Office of Capital Programs and Real Estate Services.

**Request for Proposal  
Attachment A – Consultant Agreement**

**See “SampleConsultantProfessionAgreement.pdf”  
attachment to IPHEC posting RFPnumber**

# **Request for Proposal**

## **Attachment B – Compensation Proposal Summary**

Consultant proposed fee shall include:

1. Text provided by CCU

## **Request for Proposal**

### **Attachment C – Discussion questions to be answered**

1. Text provided by CCU
2. Additional questions may be added based on proposal review

## PROJECT NAME

Date: 01/23/2019

[illegible]



Consultant Selection Procedure Update  
**Diverse Business 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 &amp; 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.

PROJECT TITLE: \_\_\_\_\_

EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS: \_\_\_\_\_

## **APPROVAL FORM FOR FIRMS TO BE INVITED TO DISCUSSION MEETING**

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

SUBMITTED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

FIRMS RECOMMENDED FOR INVITATION: (include firm's team composition and each member's percentage of work, MBE/WBE/PBE and VOSB/SDVOSB status, prime location and brief statement of strength and weakness of each recommended firm.

RECOMMENDATION SUPPORTED BY DOCUMENTATION: \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

APPROVED:

☐ Senior Assoc. VP of Business & Finance

Signature/Date: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Director of Campus Construction Unit

Signature/Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Attached: Initial individual and composite evaluation matrices

## **APPROVAL FORM TO NEGOTIATE WITH RECOMMENDED PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONSULTANT FROM DISCUSSION MEETING**

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

SUBMITTED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE(S) OF DISCUSSION MEETING: \_\_\_\_\_

FIRMS AT DISCUSSION MEETINGS listed in descending order of rank: (include firm's team composition and each member's percentage of work (if different from initial selection), MBE/WBE/PBE and VOSB/SDVOSB status (if different from initial selection), location, and a brief statement weakness and strength of each recommended firm

RECOMMENDED FIRM: \_\_\_\_\_

RECOMMENDATION SUPPORTED BY DOCUMENTATION: \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: \_\_\_\_\_

APPROVED:

[ ] Senior Assoc. VP of Business & Finance

Signature/Date: \_\_\_\_\_

[ ] Director of Campus Construction Unit

Signature/Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## PROFESSIONAL SERVICES APPROVAL REQUEST

(Not required for Retainer Professional Services Selections)

University Project No. \_\_\_\_\_ CDB Project No. \_\_\_\_\_

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FIRM NAME/ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

BASIC SERVICES FEE IS WITHIN RANGE OF THE UNIVERSITY'S SCOPE/FEE POLICY? \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION BUDGET FROM FCPWeb: \_\_\_\_\_

### PHASES INCLUDED ON PSA:

|                        |           |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Program Definition     | \$        |
| Schematic Design       | \$        |
| Design Development     | \$        |
| Construction Documents | \$        |
| Bid                    | \$        |
| Construction           | \$        |
| On-site Observation    | \$        |
| Warranty               | \$        |
| Reimbursables          | \$        |
| Interiors              | \$        |
| Other                  | \$        |
| <b>Total</b>           | <b>\$</b> |

*Note: For CDB managed projects, the fees are negotiated by CDB at a later date.*

### Professional Services Approval (signature according to current delegated authority level)

[ ] BOT (via University Office of  
Capital Programs and Real Estate Services)

PM Initials: \_\_\_\_ BOT Date: \_\_\_\_\_

[ ] Senior Assoc. VP of Business & Finance

Signature/Date: \_\_\_\_\_

[ ] Director of Campus Construction Unit

Signature/Date: \_\_\_\_\_

All professional services employment requiring QBS shall be reported as specified to the University Office of Capital Programs and Real Estate Services.

# REQUIRED PROCUREMENT POSTING INFORMATION

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 dated date for the project name (Project #) in the amount of \$.

### NOTE:

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

- Certification and Statutory Requirements form
- Financial Disclosures and Conflict of Interest form
- Initial Evaluation Documentation
- Interview Evaluation Documentation
- COI determination from PPB (if applicable)
- Attachment C from PSA

## 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 RFP 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

Consultant Discussion Meeting Matrix

Project Name: xxx

Project No. xxx

INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION

Date

#6

| Score:1-5    # 1 = Worst   # 5 = Best |   | Consultant Name  |  | Consultant Name  |          | Consultant Name  |   | Consultant Name  |  |   |          |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|----------|--|---|--|--|---|----------|
| Q U E S T I O N S                     |   | Subconsultant #1<br>Subconsultant #2<br>Subconsultant #3 |  | Subconsultant #1<br>Subconsultant #2<br>Subconsultant #3 |          | Subconsultant #1<br>Subconsultant #2<br>Subconsultant #3 |   | Subconsultant #1<br>Subconsultant #2<br>Subconsultant #3 |  |   |          |
|                                       | # | Comments   |  | #  | Comments |  | # | Comments   |  | # | Comments |
| 1                                     |   |  |  |  |          |  |   |  |  |   |          |
| 2                                     |   |  |  |  |          |  |   |  |  |   |          |
| 3                                     |   |  |  |  |          |  |   |  |  |   |          |
| 4                                     |   |  |  |  |          |  |   |  |  |   |          |
| 5                                     |   |  |  |  |          |  |   |  |  |   |          |
| 6                                     |   |  |  |  |          |  |   |  |  |   |          |
| 7                                     |   |  |  |  |          |  |   |  |  |   |          |
| 8                                     |   |  |  |  |          |  |   |  |  |   |          |
| 9                                     |   |  |  |  |          |  |   |  |  |   |          |
| 10                                    |   |  |  |  |          |  |   |  |  |   |          |
| T O T A L                             |   | 0  |  | 0  |          | 0  |   | 0  |  | 0 |          |

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Consultant Discussion Meeting Matrix

Project Name: xxx

Project No. xxx

Date

#6

|                                  |  | Consultant Name  |          | Consultant Name  |          | Consultant Name  |          | Consultant Name  |          |
|----------------------------------|--|--|----------|--|----------|--|----------|--|----------|
| Score:1-5 # 1 = Worst # 5 = Best |  | Subconsultant #1<br>Subconsultant #2<br>Subconsultant #3 |          | Subconsultant #1<br>Subconsultant #2<br>Subconsultant #3 |          | Subconsultant #1<br>Subconsultant #2<br>Subconsultant #3 |          | Subconsultant #1<br>Subconsultant #2<br>Subconsultant #3 |          |
| Q U E S T I O N S                |  | #  | Comments | #  | Comments | #  | Comments | #  | Comments |
| 1                                |  |  |          |  |          |  |          |  |          |
| 2                                |  |  |          |  |          |  |          |  |          |
| 3                                |  |  |          |  |          |  |          |  |          |
| 4                                |  |  |          |  |          |  |          |  |          |
| 5                                |  |  |          |  |          |  |          |  |          |
| 6                                |  |  |          |  |          |  |          |  |          |
| 7                                |  |  |          |  |          |  |          |  |          |
| 8                                |  |  |          |  |          |  |          |  |          |
| 9                                |  |  |          |  |          |  |          |  |          |
| 10                               |  |  |          |  |          |  |          |  |          |
| TOTAL                            |  | 0  |          | 0  |          | 0  |          | 0  |          |

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_



Consultant Discussion Meeting Matrix

Project Name: xxx

Project No. xxx

Date

#6

| Score:1-5    # 1 = Worst   # 5 = Best |   | Consultant Name  |  | Consultant Name  |          | Consultant Name  |   | Consultant Name  |  |   |          |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|----------|--|---|--|--|---|----------|
| Q U E S T I O N S                     |   | Subconsultant #1<br>Subconsultant #2<br>Subconsultant #3 |  | Subconsultant #1<br>Subconsultant #2<br>Subconsultant #3 |          | Subconsultant #1<br>Subconsultant #2<br>Subconsultant #3 |   | Subconsultant #1<br>Subconsultant #2<br>Subconsultant #3 |  |   |          |
|                                       | # | Comments   |  | #  | Comments |  | # | Comments   |  | # | Comments |
| 1                                     |   |  |  |  |          |  |   |  |  |   |          |
| 2                                     |   |  |  |  |          |  |   |  |  |   |          |
| 3                                     |   |  |  |  |          |  |   |  |  |   |          |
| 4                                     |   |  |  |  |          |  |   |  |  |   |          |
| 5                                     |   |  |  |  |          |  |   |  |  |   |          |
| 6                                     |   |  |  |  |          |  |   |  |  |   |          |
| 7                                     |   |  |  |  |          |  |   |  |  |   |          |
| 8                                     |   |  |  |  |          |  |   |  |  |   |          |
| 9                                     |   |  |  |  |          |  |   |  |  |   |          |
| 10                                    |   |  |  |  |          |  |   |  |  |   |          |
| T O T A L                             |   | 0  |  | 0  |          | 0  |   | 0  |  | 0 |          |

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Consultant Discussion Meeting Matrix

Project Name: xxx

Project No. xxx

Date

#6

| Score:1-5 # 1 = Worst # 5 = Best |  | Consultant Name  |          | Consultant Name  |          | Consultant Name  |          | Consultant Name  |          |
|----------------------------------|--|--|----------|--|----------|--|----------|--|----------|
| Q U E S T I O N S                |  | Subconsultant #1<br>Subconsultant #2<br>Subconsultant #3 |          | Subconsultant #1<br>Subconsultant #2<br>Subconsultant #3 |          | Subconsultant #1<br>Subconsultant #2<br>Subconsultant #3 |          | Subconsultant #1<br>Subconsultant #2<br>Subconsultant #3 |          |
|                                  |  | #  | Comments | #  | Comments | #  | Comments | #  | Comments |
| 1                                |  |  |          |  |          |  |          |  |          |
| 2                                |  |  |          |  |          |  |          |  |          |
| 3                                |  |  |          |  |          |  |          |  |          |
| 4                                |  |  |          |  |          |  |          |  |          |
| 5                                |  |  |          |  |          |  |          |  |          |
| 6                                |  |  |          |  |          |  |          |  |          |
| 7                                |  |  |          |  |          |  |          |  |          |
| 8                                |  |  |          |  |          |  |          |  |          |
| 9                                |  |  |          |  |          |  |          |  |          |
| 10                               |  |  |          |  |          |  |          |  |          |
| TOTAL                            |  | 0  |          | 0  |          | 0  |          | 0  |          |

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Consultant Discussion Meeting Matrix

Project Name: xxx

Project No. xxx

COMPOSITE EVALUATION

Date

#6

|                                       | Consultant Name  |          | Consultant Name  |          | Consultant Name  |          | Consultant Name  |          |
|---------------------------------------|--|----------|--|----------|--|----------|--|----------|
| Score:1-5    # 1 = Worst   # 5 = Best | Subconsultant #1<br>Subconsultant #2<br>Subconsultant #3 |          | Subconsultant #1<br>Subconsultant #2<br>Subconsultant #3 |          | Subconsultant #1<br>Subconsultant #2<br>Subconsultant #3 |          | Subconsultant #1<br>Subconsultant #2<br>Subconsultant #3 |          |
| Q U E S T I O N S                     | #  | Comments | #  | Comments | #  | Comments | #  | Comments |
| 1                                     | 0  |          | 0  |          | 0  |          | 0  |          |
| 2                                     | 0  |          | 0  |          | 0  |          | 0  |          |
| 3                                     | 0  |          | 0  |          | 0  |          | 0  |          |
| 4                                     | 0  |          | 0  |          | 0  |          | 0  |          |
| 5                                     | 0  |          | 0  |          | 0  |          | 0  |          |
| 6                                     | 0  |          | 0  |          | 0  |          | 0  |          |
| 7                                     | 0  |          | 0  |          | 0  |          | 0  |          |
| 8                                     | 0  |          | 0  |          | 0  |          | 0  |          |
| 9                                     | 0  |          | 0  |          | 0  |          | 0  |          |
| 10                                    | 0  |          | 0  |          | 0  |          | 0  |          |
| TOTAL                                 | 0  |          | 0  |          | 0  |          | 0  |          |

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

# 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

PROJECT TITLE: \_\_\_\_\_

EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS: \_\_\_\_\_

## **APPROVAL FORM FOR FIRMS TO BE INVITED TO DISCUSSION MEETING**

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

SUBMITTED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

FIRMS RECOMMENDED FOR INVITATION: (include firm's team composition and each member's percentage of work, MBE/WBE/PBE and VOSB/SDVOSB status, prime location and brief statement of strength and weakness of each recommended firm.

RECOMMENDATION SUPPORTED BY DOCUMENTATION: \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

APPROVED:

[ ] Senior Assoc. VP of Business & Finance

Signature/Date: \_\_\_\_\_

[ ] Director of Campus Construction Unit

Signature/Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Attached: Initial individual and composite evaluation matrices

## **APPROVAL FORM TO NEGOTIATE WITH RECOMMENDED PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONSULTANT FROM DISCUSSION MEETING**

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

SUBMITTED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE(S) OF DISCUSSION MEETING: \_\_\_\_\_

FIRMS AT DISCUSSION MEETINGS listed in descending order of rank: (include firm's team composition and each member's percentage of work (if different from initial selection), MBE/FBE/PBE and VOSB/SDVOSB status (if different from initial selection), location, and a brief statement weakness and strength of each recommended firm

RECOMMENDED FIRM: \_\_\_\_\_

RECOMMENDATION SUPPORTED BY DOCUMENTATION: \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: \_\_\_\_\_

APPROVED:

[ ] Senior Assoc. VP of Business & Finance

Signature/Date: \_\_\_\_\_

[ ] Director of Campus Construction Unit

Signature/Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## PROFESSIONAL SERVICES APPROVAL REQUEST

(Not required for Retainer Professional Services Selections)

University Project No. \_\_\_\_\_ CDB Project No. \_\_\_\_\_

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FIRM NAME/ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

BASIC SERVICES FEE IS WITHIN RANGE OF THE UNIVERSITY'S SCOPE/FEE POLICY? \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION BUDGET FROM FCPWeb: \_\_\_\_\_

### PHASES INCLUDED ON PSA:

|                        |           |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Program Definition     | \$        |
| Schematic Design       | \$        |
| Design Development     | \$        |
| Construction Documents | \$        |
| Bid                    | \$        |
| Construction           | \$        |
| On-site Observation    | \$        |
| Warranty               | \$        |
| Reimbursables          | \$        |
| Interiors              | \$        |
| Other                  | \$        |
| <b>Total</b>           | <b>\$</b> |

*Note: For CDB managed projects, the fees are negotiated by CDB at a later date.*

### Professional Services Approval (signature according to current delegated authority level)

[ ] BOT (via University Office of  
Capital Programs and Real Estate Services)

PM Initials: \_\_\_\_ BOT Date: \_\_\_\_\_

[ ] Senior Assoc. VP of Business & Finance

Signature/Date: \_\_\_\_\_

[ ] Director of Campus Construction Unit

Signature/Date: \_\_\_\_\_



All professional services employment requiring QBS shall be reported as specified to the University Office of Capital Programs and Real Estate Services.

## REQUIRED PROCUREMENT POSTING INFORMATION

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 dated date for the project name (Project #) in the amount of \$.

#### NOTE:

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

- Certification and Statutory Requirements form
- Financial Disclosures and Conflict of Interest form
- Initial Evaluation Documentation
- Interview Evaluation Documentation
- COI determination from PPB (if applicable)
- Attachment C from PSA

## **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 interview committee and in preparing for the interview.

Thank you for your interest in the University of Illinois.

Sincerely,

NAME  
Chairperson of the Evaluation Committee

C: Evaluation Committee

PROJECT TITLE: \_\_\_\_\_  
 EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS: \_\_\_\_\_

## APPROVAL FORM FOR FIRMS TO BE INVITED TO DISCUSSION MEETING

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

SUBMITTED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

FIRMS RECOMMENDED FOR INVITATION: (include firm's team composition and each member's percentage of work, MBE/WBE/PBE and VOSB/SDVOSB status, prime location and brief statement of strength and weakness of each recommended firm.

RECOMMENDATION SUPPORTED BY DOCUMENTATION: \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: \_\_\_\_\_

APPROVED: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Senior Assoc. VP of Business & Finance

Signature/Date: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Director of Campus Construction Unit

Signature/Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Attached: Initial individual and composite evaluation matrices

## APPROVAL FORM TO NEGOTIATE WITH RECOMMENDED PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONSULTANT FROM DISCUSSION MEETING

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

SUBMITTED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE(S) OF DISCUSSION MEETING: \_\_\_\_\_

FIRMS AT DISCUSSION MEETINGS listed in descending order of rank: (include firm's team composition and each member's percentage of work (if different from initial selection), MBE/WBE/PBE and VOSB/SDVOSB status (if different from initial selection), location, and a brief statement weakness and strength of each recommended firm

RECOMMENDED FIRM: \_\_\_\_\_

RECOMMENDATION SUPPORTED BY DOCUMENTATION: \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: \_\_\_\_\_

APPROVED: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Senior Assoc. VP of Business & Finance

Signature/Date: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Director of Campus Construction Unit

Signature/Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## PROFESSIONAL SERVICES APPROVAL REQUEST

(Not required for Retainer Professional Services Selections)

University Project No. \_\_\_\_\_ CDB Project No. \_\_\_\_\_

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FIRM NAME/ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

BASIC SERVICES FEE IS WITHIN RANGE OF THE UNIVERSITY'S SCOPE/FEE POLICY? \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION BUDGET FROM FCPWeb: \_\_\_\_\_

PHASES INCLUDED ON PSA:

|                        |           |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Program Definition     | \$        |
| Schematic Design       | \$        |
| Design Development     | \$        |
| Construction Documents | \$        |
| Bid                    | \$        |
| Construction           | \$        |
| On-site Observation    | \$        |
| Warranty               | \$        |
| Reimbursables          | \$        |
| Interiors              | \$        |
| Other                  | \$        |
| <b>Total</b>           | <b>\$</b> |

*Note: For CDB managed projects, the fees are negotiated by CDB at a later date.*

**Professional Services Approval (signature according to current delegated authority level)**

[ ] BOT (via University Office of  
Capital Programs and Real Estate Services)

[ ] Senior Assoc. VP of Business & Finance

[ ] Director of Campus Construction Unit

PM Initials: \_\_\_\_\_ BOT Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature/Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature/Date: \_\_\_\_\_

All professional services employment requiring QBS shall be reported as specified to the University Office of Capital Programs and Real Estate Services.

## REQUIRED PROCUREMENT POSTING INFORMATION

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 dated date for the project name (Project #) in the amount of \$.

**NOTE:**

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

- Certification and Statutory Requirements form
- Financial Disclosures and Conflict of Interest form
- Initial Evaluation Documentation
- Interview Evaluation Documentation
- COI determination from PPB (if applicable)
- Attachment C from PSA

PROJECT TITLE: \_\_\_\_\_  
 EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS: \_\_\_\_\_

## APPROVAL FORM FOR FIRMS TO BE INVITED TO DISCUSSION MEETING

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_  
 SUBMITTED BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
 FIRMS RECOMMENDED FOR INVITATION: (include firm's team composition and each member's percentage of work, MBE/WBE/PBE and VOSB/SDVOSB status, prime location and brief statement of strength and weakness of each recommended firm.  
 RECOMMENDATION SUPPORTED BY DOCUMENTATION: \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No  
 REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

APPROVED:  
☐ Senior Assoc. VP of Business & Finance Signature/Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
☐ Director of Campus Construction Unit Signature/Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Attached: Initial individual and composite evaluation matrices

## APPROVAL FORM TO NEGOTIATE WITH RECOMMENDED PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONSULTANT FROM DISCUSSION MEETING

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_  
 SUBMITTED BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
 DATE(S) OF DISCUSSION MEETING: \_\_\_\_\_  
 FIRMS AT DISCUSSION MEETINGS listed in descending order of rank: (include firm's team composition and each member's percentage of work (if different from initial selection), MBE/WBE/PBE and VOSB/SDVOSB status (if different from initial selection), location, and a brief statement weakness and strength of each recommended firm  
 RECOMMENDED FIRM: \_\_\_\_\_  
 RECOMMENDATION SUPPORTED BY DOCUMENTATION: \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No  
 REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION: \_\_\_\_\_

APPROVED:  
☐ Senior Assoc. VP of Business & Finance Signature/Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
☐ Director of Campus Construction Unit Signature/Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

## PROFESSIONAL SERVICES APPROVAL REQUEST

(Not required for Retainer Professional Services Selections)

University Project No. \_\_\_\_\_ CDB Project No. \_\_\_\_\_  
 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FIRM NAME/ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

BASIC SERVICES FEE IS WITHIN RANGE OF THE UNIVERSITY'S SCOPE/FEE POLICY? \_\_\_\_ Yes  
\_\_\_\_ No

ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION BUDGET FROM FCPWeb: \_\_\_\_\_

PHASES INCLUDED ON PSA:

|                        |           |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Program Definition     | \$        |
| Schematic Design       | \$        |
| Design Development     | \$        |
| Construction Documents | \$        |
| Bid                    | \$        |
| Construction           | \$        |
| On-site Observation    | \$        |
| Warranty               | \$        |
| Reimbursables          | \$        |
| Interiors              | \$        |
| Other                  | \$        |
| <b>Total</b>           | <b>\$</b> |

*Note: For CDB managed projects, the fees are negotiated by CDB at a later date.*

**Professional Services Approval (signature according to current delegated authority level)**

☐ BOT (via University Office of  
Capital Programs and Real Estate Services)  
☐ Senior Assoc. VP of Business & Finance

PM Initials: \_\_\_\_\_ BOT Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature/Date: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Director of Campus Construction Unit

Signature/Date: \_\_\_\_\_

All professional services employment requiring QBS shall be reported as specified to the University Office of Capital Programs and Real Estate Services.

## REQUIRED PROCUREMENT POSTING INFORMATION

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 dated date for the project name (Project #) in the amount of \$.

#### NOTE:

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

- Certification and Statutory Requirements form
- Financial Disclosures and Conflict of Interest form
- Initial Evaluation Documentation
- Interview Evaluation Documentation
- COI determination from PPB (if applicable)
- Attachment C from PSA

## Professional Service Consultants (PSC) Evaluation Process Overview

### Summary

The University has a policy and process to help ensure that each Professional Services Consultant is evaluated during and/or at the end of each contract.

In addition, each evaluation should be made available to the PSC firm being evaluated who may provide a written response to the evaluation. *The evaluation and response shall not be made available to any other person or firm and is exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act.*

### Process

1. Based on the type of contract, select the form(s) appropriate for the project type:
  - A. **Required** forms to be completed by policy and/or law:
    - 1). Standard contract: Construction Phase Evaluation at Substantial Completion. Standard contracts are those that use the PSA standard contract or PSA short form contract.
    - 2). Conceptualization contract: Conceptualization Phase (including feasibility and master plans) Evaluation at the completion of the contract.
    - 3). Retainer contract: Retainer Evaluation at the completion of the contract prior to possible renewal.
  - B. Optional forms to be completed as deemed necessary by the Project Manager:
    - 1). Standard contract: Design Phase Evaluation used at the end of SD, DD and/or CD.
    - 2). Standard contract: Pre Construction Phase Evaluation at the end of Bid and Award phase
    - 3). Standard contract: Post Construction Phase Evaluation used at the end of the warranty phase.
2. Based on size and complexity of the project, determine who will complete evaluations:
  - A. **Required** by policy:
    - 1). Project Manager. The Project Manager should determine if other project team members are needed to evaluate the PSC's performance. If others are requested to evaluate the PSC, the Project Manager should review those evaluations prior to completing his or her own. The Project Manager's evaluation will be sent to the PSC and should reflect the entire team's view of the project.
  - B. Optional – others who have had direct contact with the PSC or involvement in the design process as determined needed by the Project Manager, for example:
    - 1). Director.
    - 2). Plan reviewers/in-house professional staff.
    - 3). Client/future occupants of the facility.
    - 4). Planners.



3. Complete evaluation form either in Excel or print out and complete manually. The Excel form(s) will tabulate scores automatically. It is recommended that the form be filled out in Excel.
  - A. The quantitative measurements are numbers that are available in FCPWeb should be completed first. There are notes indicating where the values can be obtained within the evaluation form. The numbers should be obtained from these sources only to maintain consistency.
  - B. The quantitative measurements should be completed only by the Project Manager. These numbers should be filled in prior to sending the evaluations to other team member for completion.
4. Provide a copy of the completed evaluation form to the following:
  - A. Campus project file.
  - B. PSC firm being evaluated (*required* by statute).
    - 1). Only the evaluation form completed by the Project Manager should be sent to the PSC. The Project Manager should review and incorporate other team member evaluations into his or her evaluation.
    - 2). If the optional Design Evaluation form is being used, a meeting with the PSC would be an opportunity to review the evaluation and discuss performance issues. This could be helpful to improve the overall project.
  - C. PSC Evaluation Storage online. See the attached document for instructions on electronic file storage. Documents are stored electronically at UOCP&RES.
5. Complete the PSC Summary sheet located within the electronic file folder for each PSC firm, see attached document.
6. By statute, the PSC firm has an opportunity to provide a written response to the evaluation comments. If a response is received, a copy should be provided to:
  - A. Campus project file.
  - B. PSC Evaluation Storage online. The response from the PSC firm should be scanned and filed electronically. See the attached document for instructions on electronic file storage.
7. For each evaluation type, **the evaluation process shall be completed within 30 days of the end of the phase.** For example, the Pre-Construction phase evaluations shall be completed, filed and sent to the PSC being evaluated with 30 days of the project bid date.

**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:**

| <b>QUANTITATIVE MEASUREMENTS:</b>   |  |              |
|---|--|--------------|
| 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 (1% 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          |
| <b>SCORING LEGEND:</b><br>(5) Excellent; (4) Good; (3) Satisfactory; (2) Less than Satisfactory; (1) Unacceptable; (0) Not applicable |  |              |
| <b>QUALITATIVE MEASUREMENTS: ("To what level...")</b>   |  | <b>Score</b> |
| <b>TECHNOLOGY (the impact of these items on construction):</b>  |  |              |
| 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?  |              |
| <b>CONSTRUCTION ADMINISTRATION/OBSERVATION:</b>   |  |              |
| 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?   |              |
| <b>PROJECT TEAM:</b>  |  |              |
| 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?   |              |

## #14a

|    |   |            |
|----|---|------------|
| 25 | did the PSC and consultants communicate and coordinate with each other? |            |
| 26 | did the PSC communicate effectively with the Owner?                     |            |
|    | <b>TOTAL SCORE:</b>   | <b>0</b>   |
|    | <b>AVERAGE SCORE:</b>   | <b>0.0</b> |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| 27  | <b>COMMENTS: (Required for scores of less than 3)</b>              |  |
|   |  |  |
| <b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>   |  |  |
|   |  |  |
| 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  | <b>LIMITATIONS:</b>  |  |
|   |  |  |

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

**Project Name:**  
**Project Location:**

**Evaluator Name:**

**Date:**  
**UI Project #:**  
**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          |
| <b>SCORING LEGEND:</b><br>(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?  |            |
| <b>TOTAL SCORE:</b>   |  | <b>0</b>   |
| <b>AVERAGE SCORE:</b>   |  | <b>0.0</b> |
| <b>13 COMMENTS: (Required for scores of less than 3)</b><br><div style="height: 80px; border: 1px solid black;"></div>  |  |            |
| <b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>   |  |            |
| <b>14</b> Would you recommend contracting with this PSC for future projects?<br>(Y) Yes; (N) No; (C) Conditional, would use PSC again but with limitations listed below |  |            |
| <b>15 LIMITATIONS:</b><br><div style="height: 80px; border: 1px solid black;"></div>  |  |            |

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

**Project Name:**  
**Project Location:**

**Date:**  
**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

| <b>QUALITATIVE MEASUREMENTS: ("To what level...")</b> |   | <b>Score</b> |
|---|---|--------------|
| <b>DESIGN/TECHNOLOGY:</b>                             |   |              |
| 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?   |              |
| <b>SCHEDULE/BUDGET:</b>                               |   |              |
| 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?   |              |
| <b>PROJECT TEAM:</b>                                  |   |              |
| 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?   |              |
| <b>TOTAL SCORE:</b>                                   |   | <b>0</b>     |
| <b>AVERAGE SCORE:</b>                                 |   | <b>0.0</b>   |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| 18   | <b>COMMENTS: (Required for scores of less than 3)</b>              |  |
|  |  |  |
| <b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 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   | <b>LIMITATIONS:</b>  |  |
|  |  |  |

[illegible]

04/25/08



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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Project Name:</b><br><b>Project Location:</b><br><br><b>Evaluator Name:</b> | <b>Date:</b><br><b>UI Project #:</b><br><b>CDB Project #:</b><br><b>Firm Name:</b><br><b>Key Team Members:</b> |
|--|--|

| 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        |
| <b>SCORING LEGEND:</b><br>(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?  |            |
| <b>TOTAL SCORE:</b>   |  | <b>0</b>   |
| <b>AVERAGE SCORE:</b>   |  | <b>0.0</b> |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| 24   | <b>COMMENTS: (Required for scores of less than 3)</b>              |   |
|  |  |   |
|  |  |   |
| 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   | <b>LIMITATIONS:</b>  |   |
|  |  |   |

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

**Project Name:**  
**Project Location:**  
**Evaluator Name:**

**Date:**  
**UI Project #:**  
**CDB Project #:**  
**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?   |       |    |    |

|   |  |            |            |            |
|---|--|------------|------------|------------|
| <b>SCHEDULE/BUDGET:</b>   |  |            |            |            |
| 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?   |            |            |            |
| <b>PROJECT TEAM:</b>  |  |            |            |            |
| 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?  |            |            |            |
| <b>TOTAL SCORE:</b>   |  | <b>0</b>   | <b>0</b>   | <b>0</b>   |
| <b>AVERAGE SCORE:</b>   |  | <b>0.0</b> | <b>0.0</b> | <b>0.0</b> |
|   |  |            |            |            |
| 33  | <b>COMMENTS: (Required for scores of less than 3)</b>  |            |            |            |
|   |  |            |            |            |
|   |  |            |            |            |
| 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  | <b>LIMITATIONS:</b>  |            |            |            |
|   |  |            |            |            |

**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

| <b>QUALITATIVE MEASUREMENTS: ("To what level...")</b>                                    |   | <b>Score</b> |
|--|---|--------------|
| 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?                                      |              |
| <b>TOTAL SCORE:</b>  |   | <b>0</b>     |
| <b>AVERAGE SCORE:</b>  |   | <b>0.0</b>   |
|  |   |              |
| 6  | <b>COMMENTS: (Required for scores of less than 3)</b>   |              |
|  |   |              |
|  |   |              |
| <b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>  |   |              |
|  |   |              |
| 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  | <b>LIMITATIONS:</b>   |              |
|  |   |              |

## **PSC Evaluations – Electronic Storage Process**

1. Initial set-up of the PSC Evaluations Storage (by AITS/UOCP&RES):
  - a. The individual file folders for the current PSCs with contracts (2007/2008) will be created and filed alphabetically.
  - b. Each PSC file folder will include an Excel summary sheet to tally the evaluation average score.
  - c. Each PSC file folder will include this document with instructions to create and file evaluations.
  - d. There will be a master file folder, X-MasterFolder, with blank Excel Summary file and a ReadMe file for reference.
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. “File” the pdf or scanned evaluation in the appropriate PSC folder.
  - d. Input the evaluation data into the PSC summary sheet. The totals will calculate automatically.
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.
4. Set-up for new PSC Files (by Campus Units):
  - a. Create a copy of the master file folder, X-MasterFolder.
  - b. Paste the folder into the correct alphabetical directory (A-D, E-I, J-R, S-Z).
  - c. Rename the copy of the master file with the PSC Company Name.
  - d. Rename the copy of the Excel file with the PSC Company Name. The naming convention is [PSCcompanyname]Summary.xls.
  - e. Open the Excel file and input the PSC name and location (city and state).

## PSC EVALUATIONS FILE STORAGE STRUCTURE

