

Performance Evaluation Criteria – General Construction

Performance Rating	% Range
Exceptional	100-90%
Good	89-75%
Satisfactory	74-60%
Marginal	59-40%
Unacceptable	<40%

- Each question is scored from 1 to 5, and the total gives the Supplier's overall Performance Rating.
- Questions with Not Applicable are excluded from the evaluation when selected.
- When Not Applicable is selected, the Supplier's Performance Rating is adjusted proportionally so that the same % ranges apply when *Not Applicable* is selected.

Performance Rating	Description	Points
Exceptional Performance Rating	Performance consistently exceeds all contractual obligations and demonstrates superior results in every aspect of the Contract. The Supplier has proactively identified and implemented improvements that have enhanced the overall success of the project.	5
Good Performance Rating	Performance consistently meets contractual obligations and exceeds in some areas. No performance issues have occurred.	4
Satisfactory Performance Rating	Performance is acceptable and mostly meets Contractual obligations. Supplier has met Contractual requirements most of the time. Minor performance issues have occurred for which proposed corrective actions taken by the Supplier appear satisfactory, or completed corrective actions were satisfactory.	3
Marginal Performance Rating	Performance is adequate but marginally meets contractual obligations. The Supplier has met contractual requirements some of the time. Performance issues have occurred, for which the Supplier has submitted minimal corrective actions, if any. The Contractor's proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.	2
Unacceptable Performance Rating	Performance is consistently unsatisfactory. For instance, the Supplier has failed to meet Contractual requirements or was unable to achieve the Corrective Action Plans to the City's satisfaction.	1

Performance Evaluation Criteria – General Construction

#	Evaluation Question	Performance Rating
1a	Did the supplier correctly interpret contract requirements, anticipate issues, and provide effective solutions?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unacceptable
1b	Were submittals, additional information requests, invoices, schedules, and closeout documentation accurate, where applicable, complete, and timely?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unacceptable
2a	Were mobilization, schedules, updates, milestones, and resources effectively managed?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unacceptable
2b	Was substantial performance achieved as per schedule, and were deficiencies/warranty items resolved?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unacceptable
3a	Were costs reasonable/verifiable, and were change orders fair, substantiated, and timely?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal, Unacceptable or Not Applicable
4a	Was onsite supervision competent and were staff/subcontractors coordinated effectively?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unacceptable
4b	Was the site safe, organized, and efficiently maintained?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unacceptable
5a	Was the supplier cooperative and responsive with City staff and stakeholders?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unacceptable
5b	Did the supplier maintain proper access, notifications, and professional conduct toward the public?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal, Unacceptable or Not Applicable
6a	Were all safety legislation "Ministry of Labour (MOL)", regulatory requirements, and City policies/procedures followed?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unacceptable
7a	Did materials, workmanship, and testing meet standards with minimal rework?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unacceptable
7b	Were deficiencies and warranty issues resolved promptly and effectively?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unacceptable