Consultant Performance Evaluation Process

Andy Lutz | citizens energy group
Director | Program & Technical Services
Agenda

- Goal
- Who
- What
- When
- Where
- Why
- How
- Next Steps
Consultant Performance Evaluation Process

Goal: Develop a consultant performance evaluation process that is fair, consistent, objective, timely, and that which would serve as a tool to improve performance and working relationships between Citizens and their consultants (Engineering and Professional Services ONLY)
Who

The Consultant Performance Evaluation Process shall be consistently administered by the responsible Citizens employee who engages with consultants to perform work on Citizens projects.
The Consultant Performance Evaluation Process has been developed by a cross functional team comprised of members from ACEC and Citizens

- Beth Glidden
- Dave Kiesel
- Andy Lutz
- Carly Senak
- Debi Bardhan
- Jeff Drake – Burgess & Niple
- Luke Leising – Guidon Design
- Jay Thorne
- Rick Rampone – PB
- Beth Bauer - ACEC
What
Consultant Evaluation – Engineering and Professional Services
What
Consultant Evaluation – Engineering and Professional Services

• Major Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant’s Name:</th>
<th>Consultant’s Project Manager:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Period:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Name: Project Number: Contract Value ($) and Purchase Order Number:

Contract Type: □ Firm Fixed Price □ Cost Reimbursement □ Other (please specify)

Citizens Project Manager: Citizens Business Unit: Type of Deliverable:
# What

## Consultant Evaluation – Engineering and Professional Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>EXCEPTIONAL 5</th>
<th>EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS 4</th>
<th>MEETS EXPECTATIONS 3</th>
<th>DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS 2</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY 1</th>
<th>SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance exceeds contractual requirements</td>
<td>Performance meets all requirements and exceeds some requirements</td>
<td>Performance meets all contractual requirements</td>
<td>Performance does not meet some contractual requirements</td>
<td>Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Consultant’s timely responses to RFIs &amp; Submittals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Problem Solving - Creative, cost effective solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Completeness of Construction documents e.g.: Drawings, Tech Specifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Final level of CO’s required due to planning and design deficiencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What

Consultant Evaluation - Engineering and Professional Services

- Major Differences
  - Consultant Evaluation Wrap-Up
  - Added Consultant's Name & Role
  - Added Consultant's Agree With Evaluation (Y or N)
  - Added Consultant's Comments Box
  - Added Consultant's Option to Request a Meeting With Section Director
  - Added Consultant's Option to Indicate if Sub-Consultant Evaluation Was Completed and Shared With CEG

(Consultant must review and sign evaluation.)

Please indicate if you would like a confidential meeting with the Director to further discuss this review.

☐ Yes or ☐ No

Has Consultant evaluated and shared Sub-consultant’s evaluation?

☐ Yes or ☐ No

CITIZENS Director Review __________________________ Date __________________________

cc: CITIZENS: Applicable Vice President, Director, Project Manager and Supply Chain representative
CONSULTANT: Vice President / Officer
Project File
iTrust Supply Chain
What
Consultant Evaluation – Engineering and Professional Services

• Scoring

Unsatisfactory (1)

Does Not Meet Expectations (2)

Meets Expectations (3)

Exceeds Expectations (4)

Exceptional (5)
Consultant Evaluation – Engineering and Professional Services

• Definitions for Scoring
  – **Exceptional (5)** – Performance exceeds contractual requirements.......few minor problems.....corrective actions were highly effective
  – **Exceeds Expectations (4)** – Performance meets all contractual and exceeds some......some minor problems.....corrective actions were effective
  – **Meets Expectations (3)** – Performance meets all contractual requirements......some minor problems.....prompt corrective actions were satisfactory
  – **Does Not Meet Expectations (2)** – Performance does not meet some contractual requirements......performance reflects a serious problem.....consultant has not yet identified a corrective action or the proposed action was marginally effective or was not fully implemented
  – **Unsatisfactory (1)** – Performance does not meet most contractual requirements......performance reflects serious problems.....identified corrective actions or proposed actions were ineffective
IMPORTANT!!

If rating anything other than 3, it requires an explanation of the rating as to why the rating was either below or above a 3.

If any categories or sub-categories are not applicable (e.g. 1e), then score as N/A and adjust/calculate the evaluation rating based on the items scored.
When

At the beginning of an engagement (e.g. project kick-off meeting), share the Consultant Evaluation Form with the Consultant, and agree upon the appropriate milestones at which the evaluation will be conducted and/or as deemed necessary by the Citizens Project Manager. The consultant evaluation shall be conducted at least once during each phase of the project.

Throughout the project, regularly communicate performance on key metrics including timeliness, budget, customer focus, cost savings, missed deadlines, design oversights, etc.

At the closeout meeting, the final performance discussion should occur along with the sign-off of the Consultant Evaluation Form.
Where

The template for the Consultant Evaluation Form is located on the ACEC Citizens Committee team site on the ACEC Indiana website and iTrust


iTrust  →  Capital Programs & Engineering  →  CP&E General Documents  →

Vendor Evaluation Forms
The objectives of the consultant performance evaluation process are to:

1. **Define and formalize a process** for consultant feedback
2. Evaluate the execution and quality of contractually agreed upon work
3. **Collaborate with the Consultant to identify areas of improvement** where the Consultant is not performing to expectations
4. **Benchmark the Consultant’s performance** against similar Consultants
5. **Assess performance trends** and resolve any issues prior to impacting productivity or the partnership
6. **Seek feedback from the Consultant** to improve Citizens’ own processes and people
7. Determine whether to engage in further work with the Consultant
The steps to complete the consultant performance evaluation process are explained below and illustrated in the preceding workflow:

1. Project Manager completes the Consultant Evaluation Form
2. Manager reviews the Consultant Evaluation Form with Project Manager. The Project Manager and Manager may meet to discuss Consultant performance multiple times during the evaluation process.
3. The Manager meets with the Consultant to review performance and discuss the Consultant Evaluation Form. The Manager may meet with the Consultant to discuss performance multiple times during the evaluation process.
4. If requested, the Director meets with the Manager and Consultant to discuss the Consultant Evaluation Form. The Consultant also has the option to meet one-on-one with the Director.
5. The Project Manager signs the Consultant Evaluation Form.
6. The Manager signs the Consultant Evaluation Form.
7. The Consultant signs the Consultant Evaluation Form.
8. After signatures are received from the Project Manager, Manager, and Consultant, the Director signs the Consultant Evaluation Form.
9. Project Manager provides a copy of the evaluation to the Consultant.
10. A Business Unit Designee enters the evaluation into the Consultant Performance Survey Database and files the evaluation on iTrust.
Consultant Evaluation for Sub-Contractors

Engineering and Professional Services
Why

- Provide XBE’s and other sub-consulting firms an opportunity to receive input on their work quality, responsiveness, resources, ability to meet schedule and budget, and where they excel and areas of possible improvement.
- Provide primary firms performance information for future selections – and Citizens information for possible future prime selections.

When

- At least once during typical projects – or annually during larger, longer projects.
How

• Evaluations need to be fair, objective and consistent with Citizens.

• Ongoing communication between respective firms’ PM’s is critical – the evaluations should not present any surprises!
Next Steps

• Conduct follow-up meetings to address consultant/project manager feedback

  This Is a Living Document!!

• Identify future needs
  – Payment of Sub Consultants
  – Requirement of Sub Consultant Submittal
  – Others?
Questions?

Contact Information

Andy Lutz| citizens energy group
Director| Program & Technical Services
Phone: 317-517-4725
Email: alutz@citizensenergygroup.com