

TQI



APC Fall Seminar 2019 | November 21, 2019

Improving Contractor Evaluation Process



Introductions

Brian Link, PE, Project Manager, Michael Baker International



Introductions

Co-chairs

- Scott Grannas, President, Grannas Bros. Stone & Asphalt Co. Inc.
- Christine Reilly, PE, Chief, Construction & Materials Division, PennDOT
- Brian M. Ranck, PE, Construction Engineering Manager, PTC


Background and Improvements

Scott Grannas, President, Grannas Bros. Stone & Asphalt Co. Inc.



Existing Process and Issues

- The TQI Team came to the following conclusions about the current process:
 - The existing evaluation system lacked enough clarity to define the *EXPECTED PERFORMANCE*
 - The category weights did not reflect the priorities of the Industry, Department, and Commission

CS-4307 (11-09)  **CONFIDENTIAL REPORT** Page 1 of 10

Prime
 Sub
 Interim Report (major performance problems or outstanding performance)
 Mid Term Report (projects exceeding 18 months duration)
 Final Report

District: _____ Contractor: _____
 Contract No.: _____ Contractor ID No.: _____
 Contract Amount: _____ Address: _____
 County: _____
 State Route No.: _____ Superintendent: _____
 Evaluator: _____ Assistant Const. Engr./Mgr.: _____

Possible Points Agreed By: PENNDOT Initials _____ Contractor Initials _____ Date _____

	KEY TO DETERMINING PERFORMANCE					Scoring System
	1.00	0.85	0.70	0.50	0.0	
1. Managing the Project	C	E	E	F	C	
1A. Project Leadership	O	X	X	A	O	X 15 = _____
1B. Communications	N	C	P	L	N	X 13 = _____
1C. Scheduling	S	E	E	S	S	X 13 = _____
	I	E	C	T	S	<u>41 max</u>
2. Managing Compliance	T	S	E	T	T	
2A. Quality of Work on Operations	N	E	D	O	N	X 14 = _____
2B. Safety/Traffic	T	X	P	M	T	X 10 = _____
2C. Compliance to Regulations	L	P	E	E	L	X 7 = _____
	E	C	F	T	F	<u>31 max</u>
3. Managing Resources	X	A	R	E	A	
3A. Managing Subs	C	T	M	X	I	X 7 = _____
3B. Personnel Skills	E	I	A	P	L	X 9 = _____
3C. Equipment Management	E	O	N	E	S	X 6 = _____
3D. Materials Management	D	S	C	A	T	X 6 = _____
	S	N	E	T	O	<u>28 max</u>
				N	S	Total Points (100 MAX) _____

*Values must be developed from the average scores on Supporting Evaluation (Pages 3 thru 8)

Notes: (1) If a category is non-applicable for a particular project, the possible points for that category must be distributed to the remaining categories in that section.
 (2) Total Points between 85 and 100 or Total Points less than 10 and scores in Column "D" and "E" require use of the Supporting Comments Form (Page 2)

Rating Down the Middle

- Rating down the middle could be due to:
 - Additional justification required (see form to right)
 - Avoidance of potential conflict
 - Potentially seen as just something to get through to close out a job
 - Perception that there may not be a real impact one way or the other

CS-4307 (11-09) **CONFIDENTIAL REPORT**

Pennsylvania Department of Transportation
Past Performance Report – Supporting Comments

Prime Interim Report
(major performance problem)
 Sub Mid Term Report
(projects exceeding 18 months)
 Final Report

Use this form when:

(1) Individual criteria score is "Fails to Meet Expectations" (Column D) or "Consistently Fails" (Column E).
 (2) Total Points less than "70.0"
 (3) Total Points between 95 and 100.

District: _____ Contractor: _____
 Contract No.: _____ Contractor ID No.: _____

Section	Category	Criteria	Supporting Comments (Actual example of behavior demonstrated)
1	C	1	The superintendent usually submitted schedules of planned activities late after the established deadline as noted in the project's diary on July 7, and August 28, as well as on other dates recorded. This schedule tell me what was going to happen next week and I received it well next week. (This is an example of a behavior for a criteria.)

Evaluations neither Reward nor Penalize

- 94% of the evaluations met expected performance or better and only 6% **could** result in a reduction in a performance factor
- Average score is $\approx 76\%$

This should be a tool to promote and recognize quality.

Impact

- It's not anticipated that these new guidelines will have a significant impact on Past Performance Factors
- There is greater opportunity to acknowledge quality work

PERFORMANCE FACTOR	LOW	MID	HIGH
1	0.00	4.95	9.99
2	10.00	14.30	18.69
3	18.70	23.60	28.59
4	28.60	32.90	37.29
5	37.30	42.20	47.19
6	47.20	51.50	55.89
7	55.90	60.90	65.99
8	66.00	70.00	74.09
9	74.10	75.60	77.19
10	77.20	78.95	80.79
11	80.80	82.55	84.39
12	84.40	86.15	87.99
13	88.00	89.75	91.59
14	91.60	93.25	94.99
15	95.00	97.50	100.00

Impact

CALCULATED PERFORMANCE FACTOR	EXPECTED PERFORMANCE	RESULT
Indicates Existing Performance Factor should be increased	Each of the 3 component scores for all reports are equal to or greater than Expected Performance	Existing Performance Factor to be increased by one (1) point
Indicates Existing Performance Factor should be decreased	Each of the 3 component scores for all reports are equal to or greater than Expected Performance	Existing Performance Factor to remain the same
Indicates Existing Performance Factor should be increased	Any component score on any report is less than Expected Performance	Existing Performance Factor to remain the same
Indicates Existing Performance Factor should be decreased	Any report where the total score within the most recent six-month period is less than Expected Performance	Existing Performance Factor to be decreased by one (1) point
Indicates Existing Performance Factor should remain the same	N/A	Existing Performance Factor to remain the same

Improved Guidelines

- Will be a supplement to the existing paper form and ECMS form
- Better defines:
 - A – Consistently Exceeds
 - B – Exceeds Expectations
 - C – Expected Performance
 - D – Fails to Meet Expectations
 - E – Consistently Fails

Quality of work

- **Existing** – No definition of what is expected

2. Managing Compliance

2A. Quality of Work on Operations

	PERFORMANCE				
Non-Applicable	Consistently Exceeds	Exceeds Expectations	Expected Performance	Fails to Meet Expectations	Consistently Fails
N/A	1.00	0.85	0.70	❖ 0.50	❖ 0.00
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1. The contractor completes all work in accordance with specifications and in accordance with accepted construction practices.

Quality of work

- **Proposed** – For every line, examples are given for each rating

2. Managing Compliance

2.1 Quality of Work on Operations

2.1.1 The contractor completes all work in accordance with specifications and in accordance with accepted construction practices.

The contractor:

- A. Meets all specifications and lot acceptance and achieves incentive bonuses (if applicable). The contractor is concerned about quality and puts forth the effort to provide quality work.
- B. Meets all specifications and lot acceptance, with fewer than two occurrences of minor penalties where the contractor made every effort to provide quality work. The contractor willingly makes corrections to comply with specifications.
- C. Meets specifications with acceptable construction practices.
- D. Fails to meet specifications and standards on three or more occasions, resulting in poor work quality and deficiencies.
- E. Consistently fails to meet specifications and standards, resulting in poor work quality or major deficiencies; is not concerned about quality work and must be consistently reminded of specifications by the IIC; and does not willingly correct deficiencies.

Improved Guidelines (Started from District 9's)

- Existing – No definition of what is expected

2B. Safety/Traffic	N/A	1.00	0.85	0.70	❖ 0.50	❖ 0.00
1. The contractor responds to safety concerns identified by inspectors.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- Proposed – For every line, examples are given for each rating

2.2.1 The contractor responds to safety concerns identified by inspectors.

The contractor:

- Takes a proactive approach to safety; immediately responds to all safety issues identified by inspectors; and takes appropriate action to minimize repeat occurrences.
- Responds in a timely manner to all safety concerns identified by inspectors and takes appropriate action to minimize repeat occurrences.
- Responds in a timely manner to all safety concerns identified by inspectors.
- Is regularly reminded about safety issues and does not adequately address safety concerns identified by the IIC. Efforts to force compliance leads to escalation above the project level.
- Fails to respond to safety concerns identified by the IIC. Repeated concerns lead to escalation above the project level.

Reallocation of Category Weights

Contractor Evaluation Point Allocation

- Moved points between categories to better align with Industry, Department, and Commission priorities

Category	Current Point Allocation (CS-4307)	Reallocation
1. Managing the Project	41	38
1.1 Project Leadership	15	13
1.2 Communication	13	13
1.3 Scheduling	13	12
2. Managing Compliance	31	38
2.1 Quality of Work on Operations	14	19
2.2 Safety/Traffic	10	12
2.3 Compliance to Regulations	7	7
3. Managing Resources	28	24
3.1 Managing Subs	7	6
3.2 Personnel Skills	9	7
3.3 Equipment Management	6	5
3.4 Materials Management	6	6

Clearance Transmittal Process

- **C-19-009**
- Link to CT Email (this presentation will be posted on APC's website):
<https://eftp.mbakertnl.com/link/M0x5nylxmZaVvMCe2hK1O6>
- Comments due back by December 3, 2020.
- Only a 1-step because it was developed in an industry/owner committee

Question and Comments

Thank you to our TQI Construction Process Team Members

- Scott Grannas/Grannas Bros.
- Chris Reilly/PennDOT
- Brian Ranck/PTC
- John Burnett/PennDOT
- Steve Dale/PTC
- Matt Yacobenas/JD Eckman
- Mike Cottle/Cottles Inc.
- Mark Eckman/JD Eckman
- Adam Bratrude/PennDOT
- Mike Sulesky/HRI
- Chris Woll/Allan Myers
- Joe Casper/PennDOT
- Matt Weaver/PennDOT