

## New Consultant Grading Scale

The Consultant Evaluation Procedure recently underwent some changes that affect how the work performance of consultants is evaluated. One of these changes was replacing the 0 to 100 scale with a new 1 to 5 scale. The Department keeps a 5 year history of scores for the purpose of considering past performance in the consultant selection process. This means that for the next 5 years there will be performance evaluations from both scales when considering past performance. Since past performance is considered in selection, this will require the selection committees to use judgment in considering past performance. When a selection committee is faced with the situation of considering the past performance of firms with evaluations from both scales, a qualitative comparison of the evaluations must be made. **A direct conversion from one scale to the other should not be made.**

The new rating system is more objective, with each scoring level having specific performance standards, whereas the old system assessed the Department's satisfaction with the consultant's performance using a wide scoring range which was much more open to subjective interpretation. For example, a consultant who regularly met the schedule with quality work would typically receive a score of 90 in the previous performance evaluation system because the PM considered their work a good performance. Whereas a score of 3 in the new performance evaluation system, would be given to a firm that consistently met the expectations of the Department. A firm that consistently meets the Departments expectations is doing a good job and therefore a score of 3 would be considered a good score.

The scales and their definitions are included in this document to help with those comparisons.

<b>Previous Performance Levels</b>	
<b>Excellent</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Good</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>Marginal</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>0- 60</b>

<b>New Performance Levels</b>	
<b>General</b>	<b>Schedule</b>
<p><b>5 Outstanding Performance</b> Far exceeds expectations</p> <p><b>4 Above Satisfactory Performance</b> Often exceeds expectations</p> <p><b>3 Satisfactory</b> Consistently achieves expectations</p> <p><b>2 Below Satisfactory Performance</b> Sometimes achieves expectations, needs improvement</p> <p><b>1 Unacceptable Performance</b> Consistently below expectations</p>	<p><b>5 Outstanding Performance</b> Always ahead of schedule without need for resubmission</p> <p><b>4 Above Satisfactory Performance</b> Regularly ahead of schedule without need for resubmission</p> <p><b>3 Satisfactory</b> On schedule in accordance with agreed schedule dates</p> <p><b>2 Below Satisfactory Performance</b> Behind schedule</p> <p><b>1 Unacceptable Performance</b> Behind schedule. Performance affecting final completion.</p>

Quality Work Type 3	Quality Work Type 4
<p><b>5 Outstanding Performance</b> Delivered high-quality products and services with less than usual Department assistance</p> <p><b>4 Above Satisfactory Performance</b> Delivered high-quality products and services with normally expected Department assistance</p> <p><b>3 Satisfactory</b> Delivered good products and services with normally expected Department assistance</p> <p><b>2 Below Satisfactory Performance</b> Delivered acceptable products and services with considerable unwarranted Department assistance</p> <p><b>1 Unacceptable Performance</b> Delivered low-quality products and services</p>	<p><b>5 Outstanding Performance</b> Consistently exceeded expectations</p> <p><b>4 Above Satisfactory Performance</b> Often exceeded expectations</p> <p><b>3 Satisfactory</b> Met expectations</p> <p><b>2 Below Satisfactory Performance</b> Occasionally below expectations</p> <p><b>1 Unacceptable Performance</b> Consistently below expectations</p>

Quality Work Type 9	CEI - Work Type 10
<p><b>5 Outstanding Performance</b> Completed task with minimal Department review/involvement required. Consultant proactively handled any issues</p> <p><b>4 Above Satisfactory Performance</b> Completed task with a few minor issues. Comment resolution required little effort.</p> <p><b>3 Satisfactory</b> Completed task with several minor issues. Comment resolution required discussions and/or meetings</p> <p><b>2 Below Satisfactory Performance</b> Completed task with numerous issues. Comment resolution required discussions, meetings and rework.</p> <p><b>1 Unacceptable Performance</b> Failed to complete task</p>	<p><b>5 Outstanding Performance</b> Sets standard/Exemplary performance</p> <p><b>4 Above Satisfactory Performance</b> Sometimes exceeds the standard/Shows some extra effort</p> <p><b>3 Satisfactory</b> Meets the standard/does a good job</p> <p><b>2 Below Satisfactory Performance</b> Sometimes misses the mark/ Does well enough to get by</p> <p><b>1 Unacceptable Performance</b> Sorely lacking/would not recommend</p>

## **Constructability**

**5 Outstanding Performance**

Project design feature had no time or cost increases related to the design feature.

**4 Above Satisfactory Performance**

Project design feature had some minor issues that the consultant aggressively pursued to resolve and there were no time or cost increases related to the design feature.

**3 Satisfactory**

Project design feature had some issues which the consultant pursued to resolve and that resulted in minor time and/or cost impacts.

**2 Below Satisfactory Performance**

Project design feature had several issues which the consultant provided limited assistance to resolve and that resulted in significant time and/or cost impacts.

**1 Unacceptable Performance**

Project design feature contained multiple significant issues which the consultant provided no assistance to resolve and that resulted in substantial time and/or cost impacts.