

Prime Provider Evaluation Criteria

(for information only)

No.	Criteria	Relative Weight	1 Unsatisfactory	2 Below Average	3 Satisfactory	4 Above Average	5 Excellent
Project Manager Evaluation							
1.	Quality of Deliverables						
1.a.	Accuracy - Information and quantities are correct	7.5	Deliverables submitted: contained significant errors and red lines showing that QA/QC was not completed / conducted	Deliverables submitted: contained more errors and red lines than expected, thus required additional QA/QC	Deliverables submitted: contained a reasonable level of red lines; required minor corrections	Deliverables submitted: were in good form; contained few red lines	Deliverables submitted: were in excellent form; required few, if any, red lines saving TxDOT time
1.b.	Completeness - Deliverables included all required elements	5	Deliverables submitted: were incomplete (e.g. missing more than 10% of deliverable's details/information) and were unorganized; required significant clarification to and/or additional details or notes and caused significant delays	Deliverables submitted: were somewhat complete (e.g. missing less than 10% of deliverable's details/information) and were somewhat organized; required clarification to details or notes and caused minor delays	Deliverables submitted: were complete and organized (e.g. NO missing details/information), AND required a REASONABLE AMOUNT of minor (between 10% and 20% of deliverable) clarifications to details or notes and were corrected without causing delays	Deliverables submitted: were complete and organized (e.g. NO missing details/information), AND required FEW (less than 10% of deliverable) clarifications to details or notes required and were corrected without causing delays	Deliverables submitted: were complete and well organized (e.g. NO missing details/information), NO clarifications required saving TxDOT time

Prime Provider Evaluation Criteria

(for information only)

No.	Criteria	Relative Weight	1 Unsatisfactory	2 Below Average	3 Satisfactory	4 Above Average	5 Excellent
2.	Timeliness of submittals - Deliverables/reports submitted on time	7.5	Deliverables submitted: were consistently late, schedule delays were common	Deliverables submitted: were received mostly on time but some were late	Deliverables submitted: were received on time or within recommended time frames and overall project development progress met expectations	Deliverables submitted: were received slightly (1 to 3 days) ahead of schedule	Deliverables submitted: were received ahead (more than 3 days) of schedule
3.	Contract administration						
3.a.	Budget - Costs billed are consistent with progress of work to date, budget is well managed	1	PM / WA Manager: did not manage, identify, or readily communicate issues with budget impacts	PM / WA Manager: had some budgeting issues and could have communicated issues more effectively	PM / WA Manager: managed the budget satisfactorily and maintained communication regarding budget issues	PM / WA Manager: displayed good budget management and communication skills	PM / WA Manager: managed the budget well; quickly identified and communicated issues with budget impacts; and provided solutions to address impacts
3.b.	Schedule - Adherence to schedule and ability to meet deadlines	1	PM / WA Manager: frequently missed deadlines which significantly impacted the schedule	PM / WA Manager: met most of the deadlines; however, some missed deadlines caused negative impacts to the schedule	PM / WA Manager: met deadlines and managed the schedule satisfactorily	PM/WA Manager: schedule was managed well; when issues that could impact the schedule were identified, they were addressed	PM/WA Manager: schedule was well managed; was proactive in addressing issues that had potential schedule impacts

Prime Provider Evaluation Criteria

(for information only)

No.	Criteria	Relative Weight	1 Unsatisfactory	2 Below Average	3 Satisfactory	4 Above Average	5 Excellent
3.c.	Invoices - Invoices are accurate, timely, consistent, and prepared according to the payment type and contract terms	1	Invoices: were frequently submitted late; contained multiple significant errors; did not use correct invoice template(s); invoices were frequently rejected	Invoices: were mostly submitted on time but contained some errors causing invoices to be rejected	Invoices: were submitted on time with no errors but required some requests for additional clarification/information (three or more pieces of documentation) prior to approving invoices	Invoices: were submitted on time with no errors but required little in additional clarification/information (two or less pieces of documentation) prior to approving invoices	Invoices: were submitted on time, with no errors, and required NO additional clarification/documentation/information
4.	Responsiveness & availability of the PM - PM anticipates and identifies needs of TxDOT and makes necessary adjustments	7.5	PM / WA Manager: was rarely available or responsive to requests; did not resolve issues; did not return calls or emails; missed or was late to scheduled meetings; required frequent prompts to get a response.	PM / WA Manager: usually available or responsive to requests; resolved most issues but was slow; returned most calls or emails; missed or was late to some meetings; required some prompting to get a response.	PM / WA Manager: available and responsive to requests; resolved most issues in an adequate time period; returned calls and emails; attended meetings.	PM / WA Manager: consistently available and responsive to requests; resolved most issues quickly; promptly returned calls and emails; attended meetings.	PM / WA Manager: consistently available and responsive to requests; showed initiative to quickly resolve issues; promptly returned calls or emails; anticipated needs.

Prime Provider Evaluation Criteria

(for information only)

No.	Criteria	Relative Weight	1 Unsatisfactory	2 Below Average	3 Satisfactory	4 Above Average	5 Excellent
5.	Resolution of issues - Issues are quickly resolved without TxDOT help	2.5	PM / WA Manager: repeatedly failed to identify and resolve issues, which resulted in a supplemental; required frequent contact by TxDOT PM to resolve issues	PM / WA Manager: was slow to identify and resolve issues; required some prompting by TxDOT PM to resolve issues	PM / WA Manager: was satisfactory in identifying issues and working with the TxDOT PM to resolve issues in a timely manner	PM / WA Manager: proactively identified issues and worked well with TxDOT PM to resolve issues in a timely manner with no prompting needed	PM / WA Manager: often anticipated issues and took the initiative to resolve issues independently; resolved all issues quickly
6.	Communication and coordination - Issues are communicated promptly and professionally	2.5	PM / WA Manager: did not communicate and coordinate well and was often unclear, misleading, or unprofessional; coordination was not timely and required prompting by TxDOT PM	PM / WA Manager: had some issues with communication and coordination; some items were unclear or misleading; some prompting by TxDOT PM was required	PM / WA Manager: did a satisfactory job in communicating and coordinating; little to no prompting was required by TxDOT PM	PM / WA Manager: communicated and coordinated well; ensured issues were communicated with all the appropriate parties	PM / WA Manager: always communicated and coordinated in a clear, effective, and professional manner; ensured issues were communicated promptly and with all the appropriate parties; was proactive in addressing issues

Prime Provider Evaluation Criteria (for information only)

No.	Criteria	Relative Weight	1 Unsatisfactory	2 Below Average	3 Satisfactory	4 Above Average	5 Excellent
7.	Management of subproviders - PM took responsibility for subs work and managed any issues	2.5	PM / WA Manager: did not manage subproviders well thus causing delays or other problems, issues, and/or disagreements	PM / WA Manager: had some issues in managing subproviders thus causing minor delays	PM / WA Manager: did a satisfactory job in managing subproviders with little interference to production	PM / WA Manager: managed the subproviders well with no interference to production	PM / WA Manager: managed the subproviders very well with no issues apparent to TxDOT; took responsibility for all products
8.	Adequate use and prompt payment of HUB/DBE firms - HUB/DBE firms were utilized according to requirements	1	PM \ Firm: subprovider(s), including HUB/DBE, notified TxDOT of non-payment, prime needed to be prompted to use subproviders, including HUB/DBE, and/or prime did NOT make a good faith effort to use subproviders; did NOT promptly pay subproviders; failed to document prompt payment in PSCAMS	PM \ Firm: prime needed some prompting to use subproviders, including HUB/DBE but did make a good faith effort to use subproviders; was occasionally late in paying subproviders and/or occasionally late in documenting prompt payment in PSCAMS	PM \ Firm: prime needed little to no prompting to use subproviders, including HUB/DBE and made a good faith effort to fulfill contract HUB/DBE terms and conditions; met the prompt payment requirements and consistently documented prompt payment in PSCAMS	PM \ Firm: prime was proactive in making use of subproviders, including HUB/DBE; met the prompt payment requirements and consistently documented prompt payment in PSCAMS	PM \ Firm: prime was proactive in making use of subproviders, including HUB/DBE and EXCEEDED contract HUB/DBE terms and conditions; met the prompt payment requirements and consistently documented prompt payment in PSCAMS

Prime Provider Evaluation Criteria

(for information only)

No.	Criteria	Relative Weight	1 Unsatisfactory	2 Below Average	3 Satisfactory	4 Above Average	5 Excellent
9.	PM performance - Based on their performance, would you want to work with this PM again?	1	Firm PM / WA Manager: deliverables had significant errors and red lines; submitted incomplete deliverables; missed deadlines frequently; was rarely available; behaved in an unprofessional manner; managed resources poorly; required frequent prompting by TxDOT PM	Firm PM / WA Manager: deliverables had more errors and red lines than expected; deliverables were somewhat complete (missing less than 10% of deliverable's details/information) causing schedule delays; some budgeting and communication issues; was occasionally available when requested; slow to identify and resolve issues; some issues in managing resources	Firm PM / WA Manager: deliverables contained a reasonable level of red lines, were complete, and were organized, but needed minor corrections (between 10% and 20% of deliverable) with little or no delay to the schedule; managed budget and other resources satisfactorily; was typically available; resolved issues in a timely manner	Firm PM / WA Manager: deliverables were in good form, were complete, and were organized; deliverables had few (less than 10% of the deliverable) red lines and/or clarifications to details/information issues with submittals; good management of budget and other resources; was available and responded to issues within 24 hours	Firm PM / WA Manager: deliverables were high quality, complete, and on-time; managed budget and resources very well; promptly responded (within 12 hours); proactive and anticipated needs; took responsibility for all products

Prime Provider Evaluation Criteria

(for information only)

No.	Criteria	Relative Weight	1 Unsatisfactory	2 Below Average	3 Satisfactory	4 Above Average	5 Excellent
Firm Evaluation							
1.	Firm Responsiveness - Identifies TxDOT needs making necessary adjustments, (e.g. adjusting resources to meet demands, replacing PM due to problems)	10	Firm: rarely responsive to requests, requiring multiple attempts; did not resolve most issues, or required escalation of issues above PM; did not provide adequate or timely resources to support the project	Firm: usually responsive to requests, but occasionally required follow ups.; resolved most issues but was slow, or required prompting by TxDOT; resources weren't provided in a timely manner to support the project	Firm: responsive when requests; resolved issues in an adequate time period, with little prompting by TxDOT; adequately resourced to support the project	Firm: consistently available and responsive when requested; resolved issues quickly; anticipated resource needs to support the project	Firm: consistently available and responsive when requested; showed initiative to quickly resolve issues; proactive in anticipating needs and was part of normal project communications
2.	Firm Invoicing - Invoices are accurate, timely, consistent, and prepared according to the payment type and contract terms	5	Firm Invoices: were frequently submitted late; contained multiple significant errors; did not use correct invoice template(s); invoices were frequently rejected	Firm Invoices: were mostly submitted on time but contained some errors causing invoices to be rejected	Firm Invoices: were submitted on time with no errors but required some requests for additional clarification/information (three or more pieces of documentation) prior to approving invoices	Firm Invoices: were submitted on time with no errors but required little in additional clarification/information (two or less pieces of documentation) prior to approving invoices	Firm Invoices: were submitted on time, with no errors, and required NO additional clarification/documentation/information

Prime Provider Evaluation Criteria

(for information only)

No.	Criteria	Relative Weight	1 Unsatisfactory	2 Below Average	3 Satisfactory	4 Above Average	5 Excellent
3.	Firm Resource Management - Personnel, expertise, and equipment are appropriately allocated for the project.	5	Firm: did not manage resources; resources were limited and/or frequently changed resulting in disruption to production (e.g. unwarranted PM replacement) or caused delays to others (e.g. construction contractor)	Firm: had some issues in managing/ maintaining resources causing minor delays	Firm: did a satisfactory job in managing/ maintaining resources with limited impacts	Firm: managed/ maintained resources well with minimal interference to production	Firm: exceeded expectations; managed/ maintained resources very well with minimal resource adjustments and with little or no impacts to production