

# Performance Evaluation Criteria – Consultant Services

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 – Consultant Services

#	Evaluation Question	Performance Rating
<b>1a</b>	Were meeting minutes, invoices, and closeout documentation accurate, complete, timely, and compliant with contract requirements?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unacceptable
<b>1b</b>	Did the supplier independently interpret site-specific conditions, anticipate issues early, and propose viable, cost-effective solutions that protected schedule and budget?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unacceptable
<b>2a</b>	Were change orders infrequent, justified, supported with accurate information, and discussed early enough to process before work was carried out?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unacceptable
<b>2b</b>	Were drawings and contract documents accurate, complete, coordinated, met applicable standards, incorporated reviewer comments, and were submissions consistent with proper match lines and implemented comments?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unacceptable
<b>3a</b>	Was work efficiently planned and organized, schedules provided as required, and milestones met?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unacceptable
<b>4a</b>	Did the supplier manage project hours effectively, forecast hours remaining, and communicate overages proactively?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unacceptable
<b>4b</b>	Were change order (CO) requests priced competitively, fair, reasonable, and supported with documentation?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal, Unacceptable or Not Applicable
<b>5a</b>	Did the supplier review contractor pricing, submittals, and additional information requests, where applicable, in a timely manner and maintain logs (submittal log / CO log)?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal, Unacceptable or Not Applicable

# Performance Evaluation Criteria – Consultant Services

#	Evaluation Question	Performance Rating
<b>5b</b>	Did the supplier review, recommend, and certify progress payments accurately and on time?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal, Unacceptable or Not Applicable
<b>5c</b>	Did the supplier track deficiencies and warranty items and ensure resolution?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal, Unacceptable or Not Applicable
<b>6a</b>	Did the project manager take an active role, manage supplier team and subcontractors effectively?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unacceptable
<b>6b</b>	Team was appropriately resourced, competent, and changes communicated and approved.	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unacceptable
<b>7a</b>	Did the supplier maintain open communication, respond promptly, remain flexible, and participate effectively in meetings?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unacceptable
<b>7b</b>	Did the supplier demonstrate professionalism with stakeholders and public?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unacceptable
<b>8a</b>	Did the supplier meet all applicable regulatory requirements (AODA, MECP, TRCA, OTM Book 7 etc.) and incorporate appropriate safety considerations into the design?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unacceptable
<b>8b</b>	Did the supplier appropriately review contractor safety practices, attend site regularly and raise issues?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal, Unacceptable or Not Applicable
<b>9a</b>	Did the supplier perform adequate investigations and surveys to support design?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unacceptable

# Performance Evaluation Criteria – Consultant Services

#	Evaluation Question	Performance Rating
<b>1a</b>	Were meeting minutes, invoices, and closeout documentation accurate, complete, timely, and compliant with contract requirements?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unacceptable
<b>1b</b>	Did the supplier independently interpret site-specific conditions, anticipate issues early, and propose viable, cost-effective solutions that protected schedule and budget?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unacceptable
<b>2a</b>	Were change orders infrequent, justified, supported with accurate information, and discussed early enough to process before work was carried out?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unacceptable
<b>2b</b>	Were drawings and contract documents accurate, complete, coordinated, met applicable standards, incorporated reviewer comments, and were submissions consistent with proper match lines and implemented comments?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unacceptable
<b>3a</b>	Was work efficiently planned and organized, schedules provided as required, and milestones met?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unacceptable
<b>4a</b>	Did the supplier manage project hours effectively, forecast hours remaining, and communicate overages proactively?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unacceptable
<b>4b</b>	Were change order (CO) requests priced competitively, fair, reasonable, and supported with documentation?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal, Unacceptable or Not Applicable
<b>5a</b>	Did the supplier review contractor pricing, submittals, and additional information requests, where applicable, in a timely manner and maintain logs (submittal log / CO log)?	Exceptional, Good, Satisfactory, Marginal, Unacceptable or Not Applicable