Form 605
September 2026

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	A B C D F ☐☐☐☐☐
2.	The design reflected a thorough field investigation of existing conditions.	A B C D F ☐☐☐☐☐
3.	The design resolved functional space relationships, including flexibility and future additions	A B C D F ☐☐☐☐☐
4.	The designer demonstrated knowledge and proper application of building codes, regulations and laws, including the code footprint.	A B C D F ☐☐☐☐☐
5.	The design addressed and resolved both daily and long term maintenance issues.	A B C D F ☐☐☐☐☐
6.	The design exhibited good use of established construction technologies.	A B C D F ☐☐☐☐☐
7.	The overall appearance of the facility is aesthetically pleasing and reflects the facility's intended use.	A B C D F ☐☐☐☐☐
8.	The firm met established schedules for meetings and reviews.	A B C D F ☐☐☐☐☐
9.	The firm handled communications and administrative duties in a professional manner.	A B C D F ☐☐☐☐☐
10.	The firm was effective in analyzing the budget and identifying possible added alternatives.	A B C D F ☐☐☐☐☐
11.	The final drawings were complete, clear, concise and well organized.	A B C D F ☐☐☐☐☐
	CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS	
12.	The architectural and engineering drawings were coordinated among disciplines and had few, if any discrepancies.	A B C D F ☐☐☐☐☐
13.	The final specifications were complete, clear, concise and well organized.	A B C D F ☐☐☐☐☐

14.	The architectural and engineering specifications were coordinated and had few, if any discrepancies.	A B C D F ☐☐☐☐☐
15.	The final drawings and specifications complied with all applicable building codes.	A B C D F ☐☐☐☐☐
16.	The firm met established schedules for reviews and meetings.	A B C D F ☐☐☐☐☐
17.	The firm handled communications and administrative duties in a professional manner.	A B C D F ☐☐☐☐☐
18.	The firm was prompt when answering questions, providing clarifications and issuing addenda during the bidding phase.	A B C D F ☐☐☐☐☐
19.	The project was bid within the construction budget.	A B C D F ☐☐☐☐☐
	CONSTRUCTION ADMINISTRATION	
20.	The firm was prompt in checking and distributing submittals, payment requests, change orders and other administrative responsibilities.	A B C D F ☐☐☐☐☐
21.	The firm was prompt in responding to requests for clarifications and requests for information.	A B C D F ☐☐☐☐☐
22.	The firm was responsive to problems encountered during construction and prompt in providing resolutions, including errors and omissions.	A B C D F ☐☐☐☐☐
23.	The firm was effective during the final phase of the project, insuring completeness of punch list items, closeout documentation and as-built drawings.	A B C D F ☐☐☐☐☐
24.	The firm was effective in maintaining overall quality control.	A B C D F ☐☐☐☐☐
25.	The firm provided adequate observation time at the jobsite and provided timely, comprehensive field observation reports.	A B C D F ☐☐☐☐☐

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.