|  |
| --- |
| State of Kansas - Architect / Engineer Evaluation Department of Administration, OFPM-DCC |
|  |  |  |
| DCC Project Number |  | Project Title |
|  |  |  |
| **Name of Firm**  |  | **Primary Contact** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **User Agency** |  | **Project Location** |  | **Date Occupied** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Name of Evaluator** |  | **Title** |  | **Date of Evaluation** |
| Scoring: | A (4) – exceptional (consistently exceeds expectations)B (3) – above average (often exceeds expectations)C (2) – average (meets expectations)D (1) – needs work (frequently fails to meet expectations)F (0) – failing (consistently fails to meet expectations)Scores must be in **half point increments** with 4.0 and the highest. | DCC Use Only |
|  |  |
| **No.** | **DESIGN** | Score |
| 1. | The design reflected an understanding of the program elements. |  |
| 2. | The design reflected a thorough field investigation of existing conditions. |  |
| 3. | The design resolved functional space relationships, including flexibility and future additions. |  |
| 4. | The designer demonstrated knowledge and proper application of building codes, regulations and laws, including the code footprint. |  |
| 5. | The design addressed and resolved both daily and long term maintenance issues. |  |
| 6. | The design exhibited good use of established construction technologies. |  |
| 7. | The overall appearance of the facility is aesthetically pleasing and reflects the facility’s intended use. |  |
| 8. | The firm met established schedules for meetings and reviews. |  |
| 9. | The firm handled communications and administrative duties in a professional manner. |  |
| 10. | The firm was effective in analyzing the budget and identifying possible add alternates. |  |
| 11. | The final drawings were complete, clear, concise and well organized. |  |
| **Total section points (max 44)** |  | **Total section questions answered (max 11)** |  | **Average Score (max 4)** |  |
|  | **CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS** |  |
| 12. | The architectural and engineering drawings were coordinated among disciplines and had few, if any discrepancies. |  |
| 13. | The final specifications were complete, clear, concise and well organized. |  |
| 14. | The architectural and engineering specifications were coordinated and had few, if any discrepancies. |  |
| 15. | The final drawings and specifications complied with all applicable building codes. |  |
| 16. | The firm met established schedules for reviews and meetings. |  |
| 17. | The firm handled communications and administrative duties in a professional manner. |  |
| 18. | The firm was prompt when answering questions, providing clarifications and issuing addenda during the bidding phase. |  |
| 19. | The project was bid within the construction budget. |  |
| **Total section points (max 32)** |  | **Total section questions answered (max 8)** |  | **Average Score (max 4)** |  |
|  | **CONSTRUCTION ADMINISTRATION** |  |
| 20. | The firm was prompt in checking and distributing submittals, payment requests, change orders and other administrative responsibilities. |  |
| 21. | The firm was prompt in responding to requests for clarifications and requests for information. |  |
| 22. | The firm was responsive to problems encountered during construction and prompt in providing resolutions, including errors and omissions. |  |
| 23. | The firm provided adequate observation time at the jobsite and provided timely, comprehensive field observation reports. |  |
| 24. | The firm was effective in maintaining overall quality control. |  |
| 25. | The firm was effective during the final phase of the project, insuring completeness of punchlist items, close out documentation and as-built drawings. |  |
| **Total section points (max 24)** |  | **Total section questions answered (max 6)** |  | **Average Score (max 4)** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Instructions:** Please complete this form and forward it electronically to Design, Construction & Compliance at the OFPM-DCC to professional.qualifications@ks.gov. Forms will be forwarded to the Project Architect/Engineer for response. All evaluations are then placed on file at the OFPM-DCC. |
| If any individual item is scored below a C (2) the evaluator must include an explanation with factual information substantiating the lower rating. |
|  |