

University of Illinois Contractor Evaluations

Summary

The University of Illinois implemented a new contractor evaluation process in January 2021. In the new process the completion of contractor and subcontractor evaluations takes place entirely within the Vendor Services Application (VSA) rather than having the evaluation completed on spreadsheet which is then attached to an evaluation within VSA.

Contractor Evaluations

A single Contractor evaluation is completed for each contract associated with a capital project. The evaluation form, shown below, consists of the following sections:

- Evaluation Summary – identifies the project, contract and vendor for the evaluation.
- Quantitative Measurements – data from PRZM related to the performance of the contract.
- Evaluation Score – section for rating the performance of the vendor on specified criteria sections as follows:
 1. Safety
 2. Schedule
 3. Coordination and Supervision
 4. Responsiveness
 5. Project/Final Closeout
- Evaluation Recommendation – provides final score and recommendation for the evaluation.
- Evaluation Documentation – contains any supplemental documentation on the evaluation.

The first phase takes place once the Substantial Completion certificate is entered in PRZM for the contract. The evaluation is created automatically in VSA for the project manager to complete. Once the project manager has completed scoring sections 1-4 and assigned a recommendation the first phase of the evaluation is complete. At this point the primary vendor contact in PRZM will receive an email notification indicating the evaluation can be viewed by vendor staff in VSA. At this point the status of the evaluation will be “SC Complete”.

The final phase takes place upon Final Closeout on the contract. The SC Complete evaluation in VSA is automatically reopened to allow the project manager to complete scoring section 5 and make any necessary updates to the recommendations and supporting documents. During this final phase of scoring the evaluation will not be viewable by vendor staff. Once the project manager completes the evaluation the primary vendor contact will receive an email notification stating that the evaluation is once again available for viewing in VSA. At this point the status of the evaluation will be “Complete” and no further changes can be made.

Subcontractor Evaluations

The subcontractor evaluation process is also now completed in the evaluation module of VSA. The subcontractor evaluation form is identical to the contractor evaluation form without the Quantitative Measurements section. The process only contains one phase where all the sections are completed at which point the primary contact for the vendor is notified that the evaluation is available for viewing in VSA.

Contractor Evaluation Scoring Explanation

The evaluation criteria are each given a score from 1 to 5 with 5 being the highest. A score of 0 can also be given indicating that the vendor isn't being scored on that specific scoring criteria. The application determines the average score for each section, ignoring any occurrences of a 0, and then determines the final score based on the average score for each section that has been completed.

Contractor Evaluation Form Example

A sample of a completed contractor evaluation form is shown here:

The screenshot displays a contractor evaluation form with two main sections: 'Evaluation Summary Details' and 'Quantitative Measurements Section'.

Evaluation Summary Details

Evaluation Type: Contractor	Evaluation Status: Complete
Evaluation Creation Date: 01/06/2021	Project Location: UIUC
Projects Number: [Redacted]	Project Name: [Redacted]
CDB Project Number: [Redacted]	FCPWeb Project Manager: [Redacted]
Division of Work: Division 3 - Heating A/C Temp Control Work	FCPWeb Project Contract: [Redacted]
	Legal Vendor Name: [Redacted]

Quantitative Measurements Section

Original Total Construction Contract Amount	[Redacted]
Number of Change Orders Issued	5
Total Dollar Value of Change Orders (CO)	[Redacted]
Percentage of CO to Total Contract Amount	7.03%
Total Dollar Value of Liquidated Damages Assessed	1000.0
Notice to Proceed Start Date	02/13/2018
Original Date of Substantial Completion	01/11/2019
Revised Substantial Completion Date per Executed Change Order	01/11/2019
Actual Date of Substantial Completion	03/05/2019
Schedule Variance	53
Was Client negatively impacted by schedule variance?	No
Was schedule variance a result of other contractors?	Combined

Comments on Quantitative Measurements: [Redacted]

Evaluation Score Section

[Explanation of Evaluation Data](#)

Section 1: Safety

Did the Contractor submit and implement a project specific safety plan?	5
Did the Contractor report any/all safety issues at every OAC meeting?	5
Section 1 Score	10
Average Section 1 Score	5.0

Section 2: Schedule

Did the Contractor complete the post-award documentation (insurance forms, schedule of values, project schedule, etc.) in a timely manner?	4
Did the Contractor turn in submittals in a timely manner?	4
Was the Contractor effective in scheduling the work and organizing construction operations?	5
Did the Contractor comply with wage rates, labor laws, and regulations indicated in the specifications (Diversity, Project Goals, etc.)?	4
Did the Contractor submit regular updates to the schedule and revised progress schedules as appropriate?	5
Did the Contractor have adequate equipment, tools and materials to maintain the project schedule?	4
Did the Contractor have sufficient competent personnel to keep the project on schedule?	5
Did the Contractor cause any schedule delays to the project?	4
Section 2 Score	35
Average Section 2 Score	4.38

Section 3: Coordination and Supervision

Was the Contractor represented at progress (OAC) meetings by a person with appropriate decision making authority?	5
Did the Contractor work with the Client and Project Manager to maintain occupancy and traffic flow in areas impacted by remodeling, renovation, and/or additions?	4
Did the Contractor effectively manage other Prime Contractors, their own workforces, and any sub-contractors?	5
Did the Contractor coordinate work with the utilities and appropriately schedule any required outages?	4
Did the Contractor submit the appropriate waivers as required by the Contract Documents?	5
Section 3 Score	23
Average Section 3 Score	4.60

Section 4: Responsiveness

Was the Contractor proactive in notifying the PSC and/or University of any deficiencies or problems with the Contract Documents?	4
Did the Contractor proactively work with the PSC to resolve any conflicts between conditions on-site and the Contract Documents without additional cost or delays?	5
Was the Contractor responsive and cooperative with the University Client and Project Manager?	4
Did the Contractor respond to RFP/COs in a timely manner after receipt from the PSC?	5
Section 4 Score	18
Average Section 4 Score	4.50

Section 5: Project/Final Closeout

Did the Contractor complete all punchlist items within the required timeframe?	5
Did the Contractor respond to warranty calls within a satisfactory time and completed work to resolve the issues?	5
Did the Contractor provide closeout documentation (warranties, manuals, as-builds, etc.) in a timely manner?	5
Section 5 Score	15
Average Section 5 Score	5.00

Total Evaluation Score	23.48
Average Evaluation Score	4.70

Comments:
good solid performance by this vendor on this contract.

Evaluation Recommendation

Evaluation Creation Date: 01/06/2021	Evaluation Score: 4.70
--	----------------------------------

(Y) Yes; (N) No; (C) Conditional would use contractor again but with limitations listed below.

Would you recommend contracting with the Contractor for future projects?	Yes
Would you recommend contracting with the Contractor for projects with this budget range?	Yes

Limitations:
No limitations on this vendor.

Lessons learned:
Lessons learned go here.

Evaluation Attachments

Attachment Name	Attachment Type
score2.JPG	Evaluation