



CIP PARTNERS ACADEMY

CPE PROGRAM OVERVIEW

CITY OF AUSTIN
CAPITAL CONTRACTING OFFICE
MARCH 10, 2021

COURSE OBJECTIVES

- CPE Program Background
- CPE Program Purpose
- Program Use & Administration
- CPE Program Review & Changes
- Scoring Criteria & Evaluation Guidelines
- Rebuttals & Appeals
- Q & A

A LITTLE BIT OF HISTORY

Purpose: To provide a uniform method of evaluating, tracking and reporting vendor performance to support high quality City projects.



2003 Resolution

2014 Administrative Rule R161-13.37

- requirements for a Citywide vendor performance evaluation program;
- Determined that Vendor performance should be maintained for historical record
- Past performance is to be used in future solicitation award decisions.

Consultants

- Performance history is used in the evaluation process for Qualifications-Based Selection (QBS) processes.
- Item 8 on the evaluation matrix
- A consultant can receive up to 10 points for this item in what is typically a 100-point scale



USING THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SCORES

	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3a	Item 3b	Item 4	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7	Item 8		Item 9		
Points:	[Yes or No]	[Yes or No]	[10]	[20]	[20]	[15]	[15]	[10]	[10]	[100]	[15]	[115]	
Firm (or Joint Venture)	MBE/WBE Procurement Program	Turned in all Required Documents	Team's Structure	Team's Project Approach	Experience of Project Manager Project Professional & Project Principal PM [15]	P Prin [5]	Prime Firm's Comparable Project Experience	Major Scopes of Work Comparable Project Experience	Team's Experience with Austin Issues	COA Experience with Prime	SUB TOTAL	Optional Interview	TOTAL POINTS

QBS Evaluation Matrix Example

CPE PROCESS



- Performance evaluation includes Consultant staff and indirectly the subs/suppliers who perform on the project.
- City Team – managing department, sponsor/user department, SMBR and other relevant parties such as QMD when applicable.
- Vendor may request an in-person review/rebuttal meeting and a subsequent Appeal Hearing.

Project Team

PM consults with the project team, completes the performance evaluation, and provides to the program administrator in CCO.

CCO

Program administrator reviews the evaluation for completeness and adherence to the evaluation guidelines and contract requirements; maintains the record and the data for reporting; and emails a copy of the CPE to the vendor.

Evaluation Use

Evaluations for work performed during the past 5 years is taken into consideration in the award of future contracts.

CPE PROGRAM REVIEW (RECENT ENHANCEMENTS)

- **Purpose Of the Review** – to improve the effectiveness of the program and compliance with program requirements.
- **Process** – conduct working sessions with departments involved in CIP Delivery. Changes were made based on recommendations from the team.
- **Result** – enhancements to the program will be implemented April 1, 2021 which improve the clarity of the criteria, provide for more regular communication about performance status, improve the accountability of City staff and improve internal processes.

SPECIAL THANKS AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO THE CPE REVIEW TEAM

Project Managers

- Amica Bose, Austin Transportation Department
- Morgan Byars, Watershed Protection Department
 - John Daniels, Austin Public Library
 - Reynaldo Hernandez, Parks & Recreation Department
 - Dedurie Kirk, Austin Water
 - Tony Lopez, Public Works Department
 - Paul Mendoza, Public Works Department
- Dan Valbracht, Austin Transportation Department

CCO Staff

- Melissa Pool, Administrative & Finance Manager
- Felecia Shaw, Business Process Consultant Senior
- Sonya Powell, Contract Management Sp III/CPE Administrator

CHANGES TO THE CPE PROGRAM (EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 2021)

- Revised Consultant Evaluation Form
- Removal of “Deliverables” criterion
- Revised timelines for CPE submittal
- New Performance Progress Tool
- Reporting and improved internal processes

CHANGES TO THE CPE PROGRAM (EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 2021)

■ **Quality of Work Performed & Deliverables Combined Into One Category**

- The current form has Quality of Work Performed & Deliverables listed as two different criteria. We combined the two categories as there was overlap between the criteria.
- Why make this change? There were similarities and interdependencies between the two categories. The similarities could have the result that a consultant could possibly get a lower score in both categories if the deliverable was sub-standard or a higher score in both categories if the performance was exceptional. The two have now been combined into one category and weighted more heavily than the other criteria because of its importance.

■ **Revised CPE Form**

- The form has been revised to include short descriptions of successful performance for each category. The form is also transitioning to an automated form in the City of Austin's project and contract management system (eCAPRIS) which will make completing it simpler.

CHANGES TO THE CPE PROGRAM (EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 2021)


■ Other Internal Changes

- Bi-annual reporting to departments on program compliance, standard communications about the CPE program at project meetings, and onboarding training for City Project Managers and CCO staff will be implemented.
- These internal changes will benefit consultants by alerting the consultant at project start as well as through-out the project that they are being evaluated; and making them aware of what they will be evaluated on.
- This will also ensure new PMs and CCO staff are aware from the beginning of employment, about the CPE Program and the tools available to them concerning CPE evaluations.
- Lastly, reporting bi-annually should improve compliance with CPE Program requirements.

CHANGES TO THE CPE PROGRAM (EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 2021)

- **Progress Report Tool-closely resembles the CPE form that allows for documented communication between the COA PM and the Consultant on the same criteria the consultant will be evaluated against.**
 - Not required, but will be available on-line
 - Allows for on-going communication between the PM and the consultant
 - No surprise scoring upon final evaluation, Consultant will receive a copy of the form
 - Consultant can request this form from their PM to know where they stand through-out the project

INTERIM PROGRESS REPORT TOOL EXAMPLE

 Consultant Performance Evaluation - Interim Progress Report			
<i>Capital Contracting Office</i>			
Project Name:			
Solicitation Number:			
CIP Subproject ID Number:			
Phase:	() Design (through Bid & Award Phase); () Construction		
Phase (if not Design or Construction)	() Preliminary Design; () Schematic Design; () Study & Report; () Survey; () Post-Award; () Warranty		
Contract Number:	CT / MA #: _____ DO #: _____		
Rotation List Name, if applicable			
Consultant: (Name of Firm)			
Consultant's Project Manager: (Name & email address)			
Consultant's Principal: (Name & email address)			
Industry (Select one): () Engineering, () Architecture, () Surveying, () Planning, () Landscape Architecture	Engineering Discipline (Select all that apply): () MEP, () Geotechnical, () EUE Services, () Structural, () Environmental, () Tunneling, () Transportation, () Drainage, () WRR/F Pipelines, () WRR/F Facilities, () General Civil, () Program Management, () Construction Management		
EVALUATION CRITERIA			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Needs Improvement (1 Point) = Does not meet contractual, technical or professional requirements. - Successful Performance (2.5 Points) = Meets contractual requirements. - Exceptional Performance (3 Points) = Exceeds contract requirements to the City's benefit. <p>Detailed Performance Evaluation Guidelines can be found at: http://www.austintexas.gov/department/consultant-performance-evaluation</p>			
1. Schedule / Timeliness of Performance - The Consultant submitted a baseline schedule and met milestones. Deliverables were submitted to the Owner in accordance with the agreed upon schedule(s). Consultant alerted the City to possible schedule problems well in advance of delays. The Consultant provided responses to RFP's emails/request for proposals, etc., in a timely manner.			
Comments:			



CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Capital Contracting Office

Project Name:	
Solicitation Number:	
CIP Subproject ID Number:	
Phase:	<input type="checkbox"/> Design (through Bid & Award Phase); <input type="checkbox"/> Construction
Phase (if not Design or Construction)	<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Design; <input type="checkbox"/> Schematic Design; <input type="checkbox"/> Study & Report; <input type="checkbox"/> Survey; <input type="checkbox"/> Post-Award; <input type="checkbox"/> Warranty
Contract Number:	CT / MA #: _____ DO #: _____
Rotation List Name, if applicable	
Consultant: (Name of Firm)	
Consultant's Project Manager: (Name & email address)	
Consultant's Principal: (Name & email address)	
Industry (Select one): <input type="checkbox"/> Engineering, <input type="checkbox"/> Architecture, <input type="checkbox"/> Surveying, <input type="checkbox"/> Planning, <input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Architecture	Engineering Discipline (Select all that apply): <input type="checkbox"/> MEP, <input type="checkbox"/> Geotechnical, <input type="checkbox"/> SUE Services, <input type="checkbox"/> Structural, <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental, <input type="checkbox"/> Tunneling, <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation, <input type="checkbox"/> Drainage, <input type="checkbox"/> W & WW Pipeline, <input type="checkbox"/> W & WW Facilities, Civil, <input type="checkbox"/> Program Management, <input type="checkbox"/> Construction Management <input type="checkbox"/> General

EVALUATION CRITERIA

<p>- Needs Improvement (1 Point) = Does not meet contractual, technical or professional requirements.</p> <p>- Successful Performance (2.5 Points) = Meets contractual requirements.</p> <p>- Exceptional Performance (3 Points) = Exceeds contract requirements to the City's benefit.</p> <p>Detailed Performance Evaluation Guidelines can be found at: http://www.austintexas.gov/department/consultant-performance-evaluation</p>	Needs Improvement (1 point)	Successful Performance (2.5 Points)	Exceptional Performance (3 Points)
The descriptions provided for the criteria below indicate successful performance.			
<p>1. Schedule / Timeliness of Performance - The Consultant submitted a baseline schedule and met milestones. Deliverables were submitted to the Owner in accordance with the agreed upon schedule(s). Consultant alerted the City to possible schedule problems well in advance of delays. The Consultant provided responses to RFI's/emails/request for proposals, etc., in a timely manner.</p>	□	□	□
<p>2. Budget / Cost Control - The Consultant provided timely, complete & accurate Opinion of Probable Cost or interim construction estimates per contract. Consultant suggested solutions there were cost effective, appropriate and were provided in a timely manner.</p>	□	□	□

Consultant Performance Evaluation Form (Effective 4/1/2021)

EVALUATION CRITERIA

(EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 2021)

■ **Item 1 – Schedule/Timeliness of Performance**

- The Consultant submitted a baseline schedule and met milestones. Deliverables were submitted to the Owner in accordance with the agreed upon schedule(s). Consultant alerted the City to possible schedule problems well in advance of delays. The Consultant provided responses to RFI's/emails/request for proposals, etc., in a timely manner.

■ **Item 2 – Budget/Cost Control**

- The Consultant provided timely, complete & accurate Opinion of Probable Cost or interim construction estimates per contract. Consultant suggested solutions there were cost effective, appropriate and were provided in a timely manner.

■ **Item 3 – Invoicing and Payments**

- Consultant paid subconsultants timely in accordance to statutory requirements and the contract. Billing was made to correct contracts. Supporting documentation for charges was provided and questions were answered in a timely manner.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

(EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 2021)

- **Item 4 – MBE/WBE/DBE Procurement Program**
 - The Consultant complied with approved MBE/WBE/DBE compliance goals. Request for Changes, and M/W/DBE close-out requirements.
- **Item 5 – Regulatory Compliance and Permitting**
 - The Consultant determined the appropriate permitting path and met all applicable regulatory and permitting requirements associated with the contract.
- **Item 6 – Adequacy and Availability of Workforce**
 - The Consultant possessed and maintained adequate resources and equipment throughout the project(s) to meet the demands of the contract, including a sufficient number of qualified staff, properly equipped and available for the required tasks. Key personnel were available throughout the project.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

(EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 2021)

■ **Item 7 – Project and Contract Management**

- The Consultant understood and effectively managed the project and met all contractual requirements. The Consultant reviewed and analyzed Subconsultant Deliverables and oversaw their work in an effective manner. Consultant successfully established project scope, schedule, budget and provided regular updates on deliverable status and timely performed construction administrative tasks.

■ **Item 8 – Communications, Cooperation & Business Relations**

- Consultant provided effective, professional, verbal and written communications to City staff, Contractor, and project stakeholders.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

(EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 2021)

■ Item 9 – Quality

- The Consultant worked in accordance with the established Quality Control Plan (QCP). The drawings/plans reflected existing conditions accurately. Deliverables submitted were complete in all respects. All comments and review requests were adequately incorporated into Deliverables. The Deliverables were properly formatted and well-coordinated. The Consultant provided adequate support for “As-Built” drawings. Change orders due to design deficiencies were minimal.

Note: The quality performance criterion is weighted more heavily due to its importance overall.

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION GUIDELINES

OVERALL EVALUATION / RATING DEFINITIONS

Needs Improvement (1 pt.) Criterion 9 (2 pts.)	Successful (2.5 pts.) Criterion 9 (5 pts.)	Exceptional (3 pts.) Criterion 9 (6 pts.)
Performance does not meet contractual requirements and recovery did not occur in a timely or cost effective manner	Performance meets contractual requirements.	Performance exceeds contract requirements to the City's benefit.
Serious problems exist and corrective actions have been ineffective	May have had minor problems; however, satisfactory corrective action was taken.	May have identified cost savings; provided innovative options or efficiencies; added value.
Major errors, extensive minor errors, and/or recurring problems	Problems were not repetitive.	Consistently exceeded City expectations and always provided exceptional results.
Performance indicates little or no effort extended to satisfy the minimum contract requirements		

IMPROVING YOUR SCORE

- **Communication – It's critical**
 - Establish a line of communication with your PM.
 - Communicate clearly and often
- **Errors in reports/deliverables**
 - Misspellings/grammar issues with proposals, drawings, other documents
 - “Design by redline”
- **Invoicing**
 - Do NOT invoice for work that has not been completed
 - Can be a waste of resources for the Consultant & City staff

IMPROVING YOUR SCORE

Exceptional Ratings

- Providing service above what's required...
 - Innovation
 - Working ahead of the schedule
 - Providing deliverables without prompting
 - Mitigating risk(s) ahead of time
 - Minimal change orders/amendments

IF A CONSULTANT HAS NO PREVIOUS WORK WITH COA

Industry

Engineering

Architecture

Surveying

Planning

Landscape Architecture

Engineering Disciplines

MEP

Drainage

Geotechnical

W&WW

SUE Services

Pipelines

Structural

Facilities

Environmental

General Civil

Tunneling

Transportation

THE INDUSTRY AVERAGE IS USED, FOR ENGINEERING PROJECTS,
THE DISCIPLINE AVERAGE IS USED-UP TO A “SUCCESSFUL
RATING”

When Are Evaluations Conducted?

Consultants/Professional Services

Stand-alone – End of design, end of construction; project completion if no construction phase.

Rotation Lists – by project, end of design, end of construction, or project completion if no construction phase.



+Progress Checks

Frequent Feedback is Key!



Testing Rotation Lists

- **Materials testing** – twice a year;
- **Geotechnical** -end of each project;
- **Forensic Engineering** -project assignment completion.

REBUTTALS

Rebuttal

If not in concurrence with score, vendor has the ability to rebut the evaluated score.

- Requires written notification of intent to rebut within 10 days of receiving the score
- Rebuttals are an informal process that allows firm to discuss issues and provide support for consideration of score modification
- Outcome of meeting whether the score stands or is modified is provided within 5 days after the Rebuttal Meeting
- If firm still does not concur, firm may appeal score

APPEALS

Appeals

If not in concurrence with rebuttal outcome, vendor has the ability to appeal the evaluated score.

- Requires written notification of intent to appeal within 4 days of receiving the rebuttal decision
- Informal process that allows firm to discuss issues and provide support for consideration of score modification
- Outcome of meeting within 10 days after the Appeal Meeting
- Outcome of decision is **final.**

SUMMARY

- The CPE Program is a very involved & dynamic process
- Be familiar with your contract and the criteria you are being evaluated against
- Be proactive in receiving/requesting evaluation scores
- Communication is key!



QUESTIONS?



CPE PROGRAM CONTACTS

Sonya Powell, CPE Administrator, Contract Management Specialist III

Sonya.Powell@austintexas.gov

Melissa Pool, Admin & Finance Manager, Support Services Division

Melissa.Pool@austintexas.gov

CPE PROGRAM RESOURCES

<https://www.austintexas.gov/department/cpe-program>



TOGETHER WE BUILD AUSTIN!

THANK YOU!